

An Explication ‘Syndrome’: A Corpus-based Investigation of Explicating Shifts in the Translation of the Concessive Conjunction ‘*Although/Though*’

Ashraf Abdel Fattah

Translation & Interpreting Institute (TII)
Hamad Bin Khalifa University ,Qatar Foundation
Doha, Qatar

This corpus-based study provides a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the translation of a conjunctive marker in a specially designed English-Arabic corpus. Adopting a Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)-based approach, the author analyses bilingual concordance output for the English hypotactic conjunction *although/though*, highlighting some interesting patterns of structural ‘explication’ in translation, whether directly related to the conjunction itself or observed within its immediate cotext. With the concept of ‘explication’ being redefined from an SFL perspective, this study highlights some structural explicating tendencies in the translated corpus, assessing whether those tendencies can justifiably be regarded as translation-specific explicating shifts, i.e. not attributable to the translator’s style, source language/text, or target language requirements. The study demonstrates how structural explication is often associated with an upward shift on the grammatical rank-scale, together with other patterns of expansion and reinforcement of conjunctive markers, which do not seem to be necessitated by any structural requirements in the target language. This study also shows how potentially explicating shifts tend to occur in concomitant clusters, an explication ‘syndrome’, as it were, whereby information is repackaged into looser, more easily processable constructions. The present study contributes to addressing a conspicuous gap in theory-driven corpus-based research focused on translation-specific features in Arabic translated texts. Furthermore, the conception of explication adopted in this study constitutes a departure from the taxonomic approach characteristic of a large body of literature on explication, which often engenders a flat model of description and classification with vague overlapping categories.

Keywords: Arabic, corpus, explication, Systemic Functional Linguistics, translation

1. Introduction: The Concept of Explicitation

Corpus-based translation studies has recently witnessed a surge of interest in translation-specific features.¹, i.e. linguistic features that distinguish translated texts in general from non-translated texts, irrespective of the source or target language. In this context, Baker (1995, 1996) suggests the use of comparable corpora as a resource for investigating such features, in addition to the traditional parallel approach involving corpora of source texts and their target texts. As defined by Baker (1995: 234), a comparable corpus consists of two components: original non-translated texts in any language and translated text in the same language from a given source language or languages. Both components are meant to be comparable in domain, register, time span and length. The purpose of this novel approach, especially when used in conjunction with the more usual parallel approach, is to identify those distinctive features of translated text *per se*, that are not engendered by the source or target language systems.

Among these features is 'explicitation', described by Baker (1996: 176) as an overall 'tendency to spell things out in translation', a tendency born of a 'subconscious' or 'subliminal' strategy to make things more explicit in translation. Many studies of translation focusing on explicitation highlight various lexicogrammatical, and even orthographic, features suggestive of this explicating tendency in a variety of language pairs. Among these features are the use of optional *that* in reported speech in translated vs. non-translated English texts and a higher frequency of conjunctions, causal adverbs and explanatory vocabulary in translated texts in general.

Overall, the body of literature on explicitation reveals two broad types of approach: *taxonomic* and *theory-driven*. The taxonomic approach, being not motivated or informed by a coherent theoretical framework, engenders a flat model of description and classification, with vague overlapping categories. Most approaches encountered in the literature so far have been of the taxonomic variety, with various levels of differentiation among the different categories proposed (Klaudy, 1996, 1998; Blum-Kulka, 1986; Schmied and Schäffler, 1997)².

The second type of approach, on the other hand, is informed by a coherent theoretical framework, namely Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)³. It is to this approach that the present study belongs, going even beyond the attempts made so far to apply an SFL model to the investigation of explicitation in translation. Regardless of its definition, characterization or typology, the term explicitation will typically entail the lexicogrammatical realization in the Target Text (TT) of some element or feature perceived to be implicit (or less explicit) in the Source Text (ST), though generally inferable or retrievable from its co-text or context of situation or culture. Such lexicogrammatical manifestations could take a **grammatical** form such as the expanded simplification or unpacking of complex syntactic constructions, or a **lexical** form such as providing additional textual material with a view to filling a perceived cultural gap, avoiding ambiguity, reducing vagueness or enhancing comprehensibility or processability (Baker, 1992; Vanderauwera, 1985).

2. Types of Grammatical Explicitation

It will be useful to think of the features of explicitation as forming a spectrum or cline, at one end of which are the primarily lexical features while at the other end are the essentially grammatical ones (Fattah, 2010). Around the middle of the cline, there will be a fuzzy area of

semi-structural features where the two types shade into one another. This is hardly surprising given the scalar nature of the lexicogrammatical stratum⁴. It is to be noted that the lexical pole will include Klaudy's (1998) so-called pragmatic explicitation⁵ as well as cases of increased lexical specificity or added experiential meaning with or without a contextual trigger (Steiner, 2008: 249). It could also be argued that lexical features tend to be closer to the level of consciousness than grammatical ones, which are generally more subtle and perhaps more commonly obligatory.

It is frequently the case, however, that more than one type of explicitation can be observed in a given clause or clause complex, and that the individual explicitations themselves fall in the fuzzy area in the middle of the continuum, giving rise to indeterminacy in categorization. Rather than being an 'artefact' of the classification, this fuzziness or indeterminacy is a reflection of a fundamental principle of natural language, the principle of 'systemic indeterminacy', which should be built in any representation or interpretation of language rather than being treated as a remarkable feature (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 173; and 1999: 547).

The major type of grammatical explicitation on which this paper is focused is Structural Explicitation. This can be viewed as a re-mapping of the semantics onto the lexicogrammar of the target language (whether optional or obligatory, conscious or subconscious) involving structural shifts (Catford, 1965) within groups, clauses and clause complexes such that the resulting text segment is perceived to be more explicit or less 'complex' than its ST counterpart. Such structural shifts can take place along the two dimensions of *rank* and *metafunction*, frequently resulting in expanding condensed passages and reducing informational density (Steiner, 2008; Fabricius-Hansen, 1996; Doherty, 2002; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Thus, a word may be expanded into a group, a group into a clause, or a clause into a clause complex⁶. In other words, there may be an overall tendency for target language equivalents to move up the rank scale, with the result that the same ideational content becomes unpacked and redistributed into larger, more loosely 'strung out' units. The perceived 'explicitating' effect is attributable both to a higher word count and a lower lexical density⁷. Interestingly, this kind of structural explicitation is akin to the differences in complexity between spoken and written language highlighted by Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 654),

The re-mappings of structural explicitation in the sense adopted in this study fall into the following three broad types:

I. Shifts from the experiential to the logical metafunction, basically in the form of: clause \Rightarrow clause complex, through the use of a structural conjunction \pm conjunctive Adjunct. This includes cases of demetaphorization and 'clausalization' of circumstantial elements (external augmentation; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

II. Shifts within the logical metafunction, involving the number and/or type of conjunctive markers used, or the tactic (interdependency) relation between clauses.

III. **Shifts within cohesive conjunction**, also involving the presence, number and/or type of conjunctive markers used.

3. The Data

This study is based on a purpose-built bilingual corpus, which consists of English source texts and their Arabic translations. This unidirectional parallel corpus is composed of a set of three English titles in the domains of history and philosophy, with a total word count of 387,557 words, together with their Arabic translations produced by the former Egyptian literary writer, novelist and educationalist, Muhammad Farid Abu Hadid (1893-1967) and the former well-known writer, intellectual and professor of philosophy Zaki Naguib Mahmoud (1905-1993) (see Table 1).

Table 1 A parallel unidirectional corpus

Source Text	Translator/Author	Translated Text
Butler, Alfred J. (1902, repr. 1978) <i>The Arab Conquest Of Egypt And The Last Thirty Years Of The Roman Dominion</i> , 2 nd Edition, Oxford: OUP (128,884 words) (ST1B)	Abu Hadid, Muhammad Farid (1893-1967)	<i>Fath al-Arab li Misr</i> (Arab Conquest of Egypt) (1941, repr. 1996), 2 nd Edition, Cairo: Madbouli (117,122 words) (TT1H)
(1) Durant, W. (1935/1963), <i>The Story of Civilization: Our Oriental Heritage</i> (Introduction: The Establishment of Civilization + Book Two: India and Her Neighbors), New York: MJF Books (138,635 words) (ST2D)	Mahmoud, Zaki Naguib (1905-1993)	(1) <i>Nash'at al-Hadarah + al-Hind wa Jiranuha</i> (The Establishment of Civilization + India and Her Neighbors) (1965) Cairo: Matba'at Lagnat al-Ta'lif wa al-Targamah wa al-Nashr (138,574 words) (TT2M)
(2) Russell, B. (1946/1995), <i>History of Western Philosophy, Book One: Ancient Philosophy</i> , London: Routledge. (120,038 words) (ST3R)		(2) <i>Tarikh al-Falsafah al-Gharbiyah (al-kitab al-awwal: al-falsafah al-qadimah)</i> (History of Western Philosophy, Book One: Ancient Philosophy), (1952/1967) Cairo: Matba'at Lagnat al-Ta'lif wa al-Targamah wa al-Nashr (117,854 words) (TT3M)
Total ST: 387,557 words)		

Total TT: 373,550 words)

In the following sections, the analysis will focus on two English concessive conjunction *though/although*, whose concordance lines will be examined closely to see if the corresponding Arabic equivalents in the target texts display any significant pattern of structural explication in the sense adopted in this study

4. English Concessive Conjunctives

4.1 Overall Statistics

The overall frequency and distribution of the identified English concessive/adversative⁸ conjunctive markers across the three source texts (ST1B, ST2D & ST3R) are set out in Table 2. The figures shown represent the number of concordance lines extracted on the basis of the pre-defined list of concessive conjunctives. Non-concessive or non-adversative instances of *still*, *while/whilst* and *yet* have been eliminated from the concordance output.

Table 2 Overall Frequency & Distribution of the Main English Concessive/Adversative Conjunctives

Conjunctive	ST1B (128,884 words)	ST2D (138,635 words)	ST3R (120,038 words)	Total
although/though	187	66	138	391
at any rate	7	-	11	18
but	825	437	857	2119
even if	10	5	16	31
however	105 (4 hypo)	43 (4 hypo)	112 (10 hypo)	260
in any case	10	1	4	15
in either case	3	3	2	8
nevertheless	22	20	14	56
still	9	8	14	31
whatever/ whatsoever	11	8	36	55
whereas	19	6	19	44
whenever/whenever	-	2	12	14
wherever	5	7	11	23
while/whilst	135	49	50	234
whoever	1	1	4	6
yet	83	24	31	138
Hypotactic	372	152	296	820
Paratactic	1060	528	1035	2623
TOTAL	1432	680	1331	3443

It is obvious from the table that the top four concessive conjunctions in the English corpus are: *but*, *although/though*, *however* and *yet*. Table 3 shows the overall distribution of the top four concessive conjunctions in the three English source texts relative to their size in terms of

word count. As the table shows, ST3R has the highest frequency of the top concessive markers (0.95%) closely followed by ST1B (0.93%), and then ST2D (0.41%).

Table 3 Percentage of the top four Concessive Conjunctions in the English Corpus

	ST1B	ST2D	ST3R
Text Size (in words)	128,884	138,635	120,038
Tokens	1200	570	1138
Percentage	0.93%	0.41%	0.95%

The focus will now be placed on the second most frequent concessive conjunction, viz. *although/though*. Being a prototypical monovalent concessive conjunction, *although/though* does not require any initial pruning of its concordance lines, which makes it more manageable than the much more frequent polyvalent *but*.

4.2 Although/though

As Table 2 shows, there are 391 instances of *although/though* extracted by the concordancer from the English corpus, with ST1B having the largest share of this hypotactic conjunction than the other two English texts (48% compared to 17% and 35% in ST2D and ST3R respectively). For the purpose of evaluating translation shifts involving the English conjunction *although/though*, 5 lines from the concordance output from ST1B will be eliminated from the following analysis due to the fact that the corresponding Arabic text seems to have been copied or quoted from original Arabic references, on which the English source text is based (concordance lines 52, 56, 63 and 150)⁹, or the concessive clause is omitted in the translation (concordance line 149). Similarly, one concordance line is disregarded in ST2D (concordance line 37) because of a typographic error where the preposition *through* is mistyped as *though*. Thus, the number of relevant instances of *although/though* in ST1B, ST2D and ST3R is 182, 65 and 138 respectively. Table 4 shows that the conjunction used in most of these instances is *though*.

Table 4 Distribution of *though* and *although* in the English corpus

	ST1B	ST2D	ST3R
Although	67	2	38
Though	115	63	100
Total	182	65	138

A close examination of the hypotactic clause nexuses mediated by the conjunction *although/though* reveals 3 textually distinct sequences of the dependent (concessive) and dominant (consequence) clauses in the nexus; as Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 392) note, there is a thematic choice involved in determining the sequence of clauses in a clause nexus:

- (i) $\alpha \wedge \beta$ (consequence \wedge concession) – progressive sequence
- (ii) $\beta \wedge \alpha$ (concession \wedge consequence) – regressive sequence
- (iii) $\alpha \ll \beta \gg$ (concession clause enclosed within a consequence clause) - enclosure

Table 5 shows the distribution of these sequences in the English corpus. While enclosure seems to be the most frequent option in both ST2D and ST3R, ST1B tends to favour a progressive

sequence. This variation in clause sequence across the three English texts will be considered again when translation shifts involving *although/though* are analysed below.

Table 5 Distribution of concessive sequences involving *although/though* in the English corpus

	ST1B	ST2D	ST3R
$\alpha \wedge \beta$	88 (48%)	15 (23%)	51 (38%)
$\beta \wedge \alpha$	64 (35%)	24 (37%)	29 (20%)
$\alpha \ll \beta \gg^{10}$	30 (17%)	26 (40%)	58 (42%)
Total	182	65	138

The extracted bilingual concordances for *although/though* also reveal interesting patterns of translation shifts, which could be deemed to be manifestations of explicitation, though with varying degrees of subtlety. To start with, Table 6 provides an overview of the most frequent Arabic conjunctives selected by the translators as equivalents for *although/though*. There does not seem to be one predominant Arabic equivalent for *although/though* in all three translated texts. Conditional concessive conjunctions, such as *لو/إن/إذا/لئن* *lau/ 'in/ 'ð«/la'in* (if, even if), are common in all three target texts, but TT1H seems to favour paratactic concessive conjunctions, such as *لكن* *l«kin/l«kinna* (but), in spite of the availability of hypotactic options. On the other hand, TT2M and TT3M draw more heavily on the hypotactic concessive conjunctions, especially the conjunction groups *على الرغم من* *'ala ar-raġmi min*, *بالرغم من* *bi-rraġmi min* and *رغم أن* *raġma 'anna* (in spite of the fact that), these being among the principal markers of hypotactic concessive enhancement.

Table 6 Arabic equivalents of *although/though* in the translated corpus

	ST1B/TT1H	ST2D/TT2M	ST3R/TT3M
<i>لكن</i> <i>l«kin/l«kinna</i> (but)	41	4	6
<i>رغم/على الرغم من</i> <i>raġ ma/'ala-r-raġmi min</i>	-	27	55
<i>غير أن</i> <i>ġaira 'anna</i> (however/yes/nevertheless)	10	-	-
<i>على أن</i> <i>'al« 'anna</i> (however/yes/nevertheless)	31	-	-
<i>مع أن</i> <i>ma'a 'anna</i> (even though)	27	1	5
<i>لو/إن/إذا/لئن</i> <i>lau/ 'in/ 'ð«/la'in</i> (if, even if)	31	26	65
<i>و</i> <i>wa-</i> (and)	13	2	1
None	2	1	3
Other	27	4	3
Total	182	65	138

However, looking more closely at the Arabic equivalents selected by the translators for *although/though*, one can discern certain patterns of explicating shifts which do not seem to be necessitated by any lexicogrammatical requirement, as generally evidenced by the availability of equally adequate, but less explicit, alternatives in the sense adopted in this study. Four main types of potentially explicating shifts can be recognized:

I. Shifts in taxis (interdependency)

II. Shifts in sequence (relative ordering of interdependent clauses)

III. Reinforcement shifts

IV. Other explicating shifts

As will become clear from the discussion of these types below, it is generally the rule rather than the exception to find clusters of explicating shifts co-occurring in a certain stretch of text. Nonetheless, the above distinction is based on the predominant feature observed in relation to the English conjunction *although/though* in a clause nexus. Some overlap between the above categories is inevitable, but the instances where this is observed are counted only once under one of the above types, which is deemed to be the most salient in a particular instance. Table 7 provides an overview of the frequency and distribution of the above four types of potentially explicating shifts.

Table 7 Main types of explicating shifts involving *although/though*

	ST1B/TT1H	ST2D/TT2M	ST3R/TT3M	Total
Tactic	115	6	8	129
Sequence	14	8	9	31
Reinforcement	4	10	34	48
Other	7	6	23	36
Total	140	30	74	244
Total Tokens of <i>although/though</i>	182	65	138	385
Percentage	76.92%	46.15%	53.62%	63.38%

I. Shifts in Taxis

These shifts are characterized by the use in the target text of a paratactic nexus or cohesive sequence instead of the equally available hypotactic option, which seems to be closer to the English construction. As noted above, concessive paratactic shifts seem to be much more prevalent in TT1H, an observation which is strongly confirmed by the counts listed in Table 8.

Table 8 Paratactic shifts in the translation of *although/though*

	ST1B/TT1H	ST2D/TT2M	ST3R/TT3M	TOTAL
Conjunction	101	5	7	113
Restructuring	14	1	1	16
Total	115	6	8	129
Total Tokens of <i>although/though</i>	182	65	138	385
Percentage	63.19%	9.23%	5.8%	33.51%

Thus, tactic shifts observed in TT1H constitute 63.19% of all the instances of *although/though* in ST1B, compared to 9.23% and 5.8% in TT2M and TT3M respectively. This type of shift either simply involves the use of a paratactic conjunction, mostly concessive, or, less commonly, some restructuring of the hypotactic clause complex, whereby the information is repackaged or redistributed in a looser paratactic construction, with or without the concessive element.

Table 9 provides a summary of all the paratactic conjunctions used by the translators in response to *although/though*. As the table shows, paratactic concessive conjunctions (لكن *l<kin/na*, على أن *'ala 'anna* and غير أن *gaira 'anna*) are used in 88 instances in the translated

subcorpus (i.e. 77.88% of all 113 instances grouped in this category). Statistically, the main non-concessive conjunction featured in this category is **و** *wa-* (and) (12.39%).

Table 9 *Paratactic conjunctions used in the translation of although/though*

	ST1B/TT1H	ST2D/TT2M	ST3R/TT3M	TOTAL
لكن (<i>l«kin/na</i>)	39	4	5	48
على أن (<i>l« 'anna</i>)	30			30
غير أن (<i>gaira 'anna</i>)	10			10
و (<i>wa-</i>)	12	1	1	14
ثم (<i>thumma</i>)	2			2
ف (<i>fa-</i>)	2		1	3
بل (<i>bal</i>)	2			2
وأما (<i>wa-'amma</i>)	1			1
وذلك أن (<i>wa-ð«lika 'anna</i>)	1			1
none (asyndetic)	2			2
Total	101	5	7	113
Total Tokens of <i>although/though</i>	182	65	138	385
Percentage	55.49%	7.69%	5.07%	29.35%

The counts of the other paratactic conjunctions listed in Table 9 (including two asyndetic paratactic instances) are too small to allow for any generalizations. But the common feature shared by all these cases is a shift from hypotaxis to parataxis, where there does not seem to be any factor strictly precluding the former.

However, this paratactic shift is frequently associated with other manifestations of explication somewhere nearby, as attested by example (1):

(1a) English ST1B [Conc 41, ST1BandTT1HAlthough]:||| Hence, although his article on the Mukaukas ('Fragments Coptes' in Journal Asiatique, October-November, 1888, pp. 389-409) has a real importance, || it does not range over a wide enough field;|||

(1b) Arabic TT1H:

و على ذلك فإنه كتب مقالاً عن المقوقس بعنوان "قطع قبطية" في جريدة (Journal Asiatique) شهر أكتوبر ونوفمبر سنة 1888 صفحة 389-409 وهو مقال ذو قيمة حقيقية ولكنه لم يبحث فيه بحثاً مستفيضاً واسع النطاق

(1c) English back-translation: ||| Hence, he wrote an article on the Mukaukas entitled 'Coptic Fragments' in the Journal (Journal Asiatique), October and November, 1888, pp. 389-409, || and it is an article of real importance, || *wa-l«kinna-hu* (but-he) did not conduct an extensive wide-ranging research in it;|||

Note how the English hypotactic clause complex [although X ^ Y] is reconstrued in the translation as a paratactic sequence made up of 3 clauses [1 ^ *wa-* (and) 2 ^ *wa-l«kinna* (but) 3]; thus: Although ⇒ *wa-l«kinna* (but); X ⇒ 2 and Y ⇒ 3. The first clause in the paratactic sequence (1), on the other hand, is simply an upgraded nominal group: *his article on the Mukaukas* ⇒ *he wrote an article on the Mukaukas*. Note also the concomitant upgrading of the individual elements within the nominal group: the possessive determiner serving as Deictic into a participant (*his* ⇒ *he*); the noun serving as Thing (*article*) into a full participant in the resultant figure; and the prepositional phrase serving as Qualifier (*on the Mukaukas*) into a circumstantial

element of Matter. The process, which was left implicit in the English prepositional phrase *on the Mukaukas* (i.e. written on the Mukaukas) is made explicit in the translation *كتب kataba* (wrote), even though a similar nominal group construction in Arabic could have been just as adequate. Thus the same quantum of information comes to occupy a wider domain of realization, with a consequent reduction in lexical density. Moreover, the shift from nominal group to clause, or element to figure, is associated with a concomitant shift in information status from Given to New. So the nominal group *his article on the Mukaukas* is treated in the *although*-clause as a Given element in one information unit, as if it is already known or predictable from the context, with the New element being *has a real importance*. In the Arabic translation, on the other hand, this Given element now becomes New in a separate additional information unit and is explicitly laid out to the reader: *كتب مقالاً عن المقوقس* (he wrote an article on the Mukaukas).

The second less common category of paratactic shift (see Table 8) is characterized by an element of restructuring in the clause complex involved, which is frequently associated with a logico-semantic shift. This type of shift is observed in 16 instances of the concordance output for *although/though*, almost all of which are in TT1H. The concessive element may be downranked as a circumstantial element in the primary clause, but then followed by an elaborating paratactic secondary clause, with the entire sequence thereby acquiring the flavour of general/specific construction ; for example:

(2a) English ST1B [Conc 47, ST1BandTT1HAlthough]:||| From that moment the Muslim power was not again seriously menaced, || although the coast towns long continued subject to isolated and fruitless raids on the part of Byzantine sailors or pirates.|||

(2b) Arabic TT1H:

ومنذ ذلك الحين لم يخش المسلمون شيئاً اللهم إلا غزوات مفردة، إذ لبث بحارة الروم ولصوصهم زمناً طويلاً يهبطون على مدن الساحل يغيرون عليها، ولكن غاراتهم كانت عقيمة تترد خائبة

(2c) English back-translation: ||| From that moment the Muslims feared nothing except isolated incursions, || 'ið (for) the Byzantine sailors and thieves continued for a long time to descend upon the coast towns raiding them, || wa-l«kinna (but) their raids were fruitless, || they bounce back in failure. |||

Here an obvious paratactic shift has taken place giving rise to a paratactic sequence of 4 clauses: X *although* Y \Rightarrow 1 ^ *'ið (for)* 2 ^ *wa-l«kinna (but)* 3 ^ (asyndetic) 4. Note how the ideational content of the *although*-clause is redistributed in the paratactic sequence through extensive restructuring. The original concessive element denoted by the conjunction *although* is turned into a subtractive circumstantial element within the first Arabic clause, which serves as a preamble paving the way for the next paratactic elaborating clause introduced by *إذ 'ið (for)*; thus the first two clauses in the paratactic nexus have a general/specific structure. Note also the repetition or synonymy involving the lexeme RAID: *غزوات gazaw«t* (incursions), *يهبطون yahbi³ūn* (descend upon), *يغيرون yuġ«rūn* (raid), *غاراتهم gar«tu-hum* (their raids). The Epithets *isolated* and *fruitless* in the nominal group *isolated and fruitless raids* now appear in two separate clauses (1 and 3), with the noun originally functioning as Thing being repeated in both clauses. The last clause in the sequence is a redundant elaborating clause: *ترتد خائبة* (they bounce back in failure), yet another instance of explicitation.

II. Shifts in Sequence

As Table 7 above shows, there are 31 instances of shifts in the sequence of dominant and dependent clauses linked by the conjunction *although/though*, i.e. approximately 8% of the total tokens of *although/though*. These sequence shifts take one of the following forms, whose frequency and distribution are shown in Table 10:

$$\beta \wedge \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha \wedge \beta; \alpha \ll \beta \gg \Rightarrow \alpha \wedge \beta \text{ or } \alpha \ll \beta \gg \Rightarrow \beta \wedge \alpha$$

Table 10 *Distribution of sequence shifts in the translation of although/though in the bilingual corpus*

	ST1B/TT1H	ST2D/TT2M	ST3R/TT3M	TOTAL
$\beta \wedge \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha \wedge \beta$ (% relative to ST $\beta \wedge \alpha$)	8 (12.5%)	1 (4.17%)	3 (10.34%)	12
$\alpha \ll \beta \gg \Rightarrow \alpha \wedge \beta$ (% relative to ST $\alpha \ll \beta \gg$)	6 (20%)	6 (23%)	2 (3.45%)	14
$\alpha \ll \beta \gg \Rightarrow \beta \wedge \alpha$ (% relative to ST $\alpha \ll \beta \gg$)	-	1 (3.85%) TCom	4 (6.9%) (3TCom)	5
$\alpha \wedge \beta \Rightarrow \beta \wedge \alpha$	-	-	-	-
Total	14	8	9	31
Total Tokens of $\alpha \wedge \beta$ in ST	88 (48%)	15 (23%)	51 (38%)	154
Total Tokens of $\beta \wedge \alpha$ in ST	64 (35%)	24 (37%)	29 (20%)	117
Total Tokens of $\alpha \ll \beta \gg$ in ST	30 (17%)	26 (40%)	58 (42%)	114
Total Tokens of <i>although/though</i>	182	65	138	385

Interestingly, no shift in sequence is observed in the translation of any of the $\alpha \wedge \beta$ instances of *although/though* in the English source texts. The counts in Table 10 seem to suggest a higher preference for $\alpha \wedge \beta$ and lower preference for $\alpha \ll \beta \gg$ and $\beta \wedge \alpha$ (especially the former) in the target texts, though to a variable extent. The relative ordering of hypotactic complexes linked by the same concessive conjunctions featured here should be examined in an Arabic non-translated corpus of the same genre to assess the validity of this observation and see whether such shifts could be attributed to an overall tendency in Arabic texts.

However, apart from any such tendency, and in spite of the relatively small number of instances in question, it could be argued that an $\alpha \wedge \beta$ sequence is generally the easiest to process, followed by $\beta \wedge \alpha$, and then $\alpha \ll \beta \gg$ (Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1039, who consider the so-called 'right-branching clauses', i.e. $\alpha \wedge \beta$, to be 'the easiest to comprehend', while enclosed clauses, which they call 'nested' or 'medial-branching' clauses, are supposed to cause 'the most awkwardness', especially if they are long and are themselves complex). Obviously, the relative ordering of clauses in hypotactic clause complexes¹¹ in general will depend on various other factors such as the type of logical relation, the relative length and complexity of the hypotactic clause (compare 'the principle of end-weight' in Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1362), and possibly whether the clause complex itself is embedded or nested, as well as other textual considerations including the possibility of choice in thematic status (Matthiessen, 1995: 154).

As Table 10 shows, sequence shifts from $\beta \wedge \alpha$ seem to be most common in TT1H, followed by TT3M. In some instances, the shift seems to be triggered by internal nesting involving subcomplexes of clauses as in example (3), where $(\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2) \wedge \alpha$ is translated as $\alpha \wedge (\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2)$, arguably for ease of comprehension:

(3a) English ST3R [Conc 5, ST3RandTT3MAlthough]: ||| Although his army was composed mainly of Macedonians, || and although most European Greeks submitted to him unwillingly, || he considered himself, at first, as the apostle of Hellenism. |||

(3b) Arabic TT3M:

ذلك أن الإسكندر قد اعتبر نفسه بادئ ذي بدء رسولاً يبشر بالروح الهلينية، على الرغم من أن جيشه كان مؤلفاً من أكثرية مقدونية، وعلى الرغم من أن معظم اليونان الأوروبيين قد خضعوا له عن غير إرادة منهم؛

(3c) English back-translation: ||| That is because Alexander considered himself, at first, as an apostle preaching Hellenic spirit, || 'ala-r-raġmi min 'anna (although) his army was composed of Macedonian majority, || wa-'ala-r-raġmi min 'anna (and although) most European Greeks submitted to him unwillingly. |||

Here the sequence is reversed from regressive to progressive, with the dominant clause being given thematic status. It is worth noting that the translator had the option to reproduce the original sequence; witness:

(3d) Closer rendering:

فعلى الرغم من أن جيش الإسكندر كان مؤلفاً من أكثرية مقدونية، وعلى الرغم من أن معظم اليونان الأوروبيين قد خضعوا له عن غير إرادة منهم، فقد اعتبر نفسه بادئ ذي بدء رسولاً يبشر بالروح الهلينية؛

(3e) English back-translation: ||| fa-(for) 'ala-r-raġmi min 'anna (although) Alexander's army was composed of Macedonian majority, || wa-'ala-r-raġmi min 'anna (and although) most European Greeks submitted to him unwillingly, || he considered himself, at first, as an apostle preaching Hellenic spirit. |||

Most of the shifts from $\alpha \ll \beta \gg$ give rise to a progressive sequence $\alpha \wedge \beta$. A more subtle shift is observed in almost all the remaining instances where the resulting sequence is $\beta \wedge \alpha$; it is as if the translator is wavering between reproducing the original enclosed construction, thereby preserving the topical Theme, and switching to the less complex $\beta \wedge \alpha$, with the consequence of forsaking the Theme. As a compromise, the translator opts for a kind of Topic-Comment clause, which seems to be very close to, though not identical with, an enclosure; for example:

(4a) English ST3R [Conc 48, ST3RandTT3MAlthough]: ||| But appetite, \ll though sometimes ignoble, \gg may be comparatively noble. |||

(4b) Arabic TT3M:

غير أن الشهوة – وإن تكن أحياناً وضيعة- فقد تكون شريفة نسبياً؛

(4c) English back-translation: ||| But appetite - wa-'in takun (and-if-it/even if it) is sometimes ignoble - fa-(then) it may be comparatively noble; |||

Here, in spite of the Arabic punctuation marks (the dashes), which seem to mark separation of the included conditional-concessive clause, it can be argued that this clause is

hypotactically linked to the following main clause. In other words, it is an integral part of a syntactic construction rather than an included digression purporting to be an impromptu aside. This is evidenced by the use of the structural *fa-*, which is typical of conditional constructions, as well as the fact that dropping the even *if*-clause yields an ungrammatical clause:

(4d)

*غير أن الشهوة فقد تكون شريفة نسبياً؛

If the included clause was meant to be a true enclosure, the whole construction should have been:

(4e)

غير أن الشهوة – وإن تكن أحياناً وضيفة - قد تكون شريفة نسبياً؛

Note also how the English elliptic enclosed clause is fully reconstituted in the translation; had brevity been a concern for the translator here, perhaps he could have opted for a nominalised circumstantial element, which is not uncommon in both Arabic TT and NT, e.g. رغم وضاعتها أحياناً. (despite its ignobility sometimes).

III. Reinforcement Shifts

The third type of potentially explicating shifts observed in the concordance output for *although/though* is reinforcement, which mostly takes the form of using correlative concessive conjunctions, where the second conjunction introducing the dominant clause is potentially redundant, and where there are no corresponding correlative conjunctions in the ST. Table 11 shows the counts of correlative conjunctions involving *although/though* in the ST, with or without corresponding correlatives in the TT.

Table 11 *Correlatives involving although/though*

	ST1B/TT1H	ST2D/TT2M	ST3R/TT3M	TOTAL
Correlatives in both ST & TT	2	-	1	3
Correlatives only in ST	6	2	1	9
Total	8	2	2	12
Total Tokens of <i>although/though</i>	182	65	138	385
Percentage	4.4%	3.08%	1.45%	3.12%

Table 12 sets out the counts and percentages of reinforcement shifts in the translation of *although/though*. As the table shows, correlatives seem to be most common in TT3M (23.19% compared to 1.1% and 12.31% in TT1H and TT2M respectively).

Table 12 *Reinforcement shifts in the translation of although/though*

	ST1B/TT1H	ST2D/TT2M	ST3R/TT3M	TOTAL
Correlatives	2	8	32	42
Other	2	2	2	6
Total	4	10	34	48
Total Tokens of <i>although/though</i>	182	65	138	385
Percentage	2.2%	15.38%	24.64%	12.47%

The primary clause may even be marked by two conjunctive expressions; for example:

(5a) English ST3R [Conc 12, ST3RandTT3MAlthough]:|| Although it is fanciful and in part quite unscientific, || it is very important, || since it involves the greater part of the imaginative effort required for conceiving the Copernican hypothesis. ||

(5b) Arabic TT3M:

وعلى الرغم من أن هذه النظرية تشطح مع الخيال الجامح، وأنها إلى حد ما بعيدة عن النظرة العلمية كل البعد، إلا أنها مع ذلك غاية في الأهمية، لأنها تتضمن الشطر الأكبر من مجهود الخيال اللازم لتصور النظرية الكوبرنيقية؛

(5c) English back-translation: || wa-'ala-r-raġmi min 'anna (and in spite of (the fact) that) this theory gives itself over to wild imagination || and that it is in part far removed from the scientific outlook, || 'illa 'anna-ha (yet it) ma'a ð«lika (in spite of that/nevertheless) is extremely important, || since it involves the greater part of the imagination effort required for conceiving the Copernican hypothesis. ||

Here the translator opted for three concessive conjunctives when only one, على الرغم من أن, 'ala-r-raġmi min 'anna (in spite of/notwithstanding (the fact) that/although) could have been an adequate equivalent for *although*. The other two conjunctive markers are clearly redundant but they serve to reinforce the concessive relation. Note also the upgrading of the nominal group complex in the *although*-clause (fanciful and...unscientific) into a clause subcomplex in the translation (gives itself over to wild imagination and it is far removed from...), which makes the concessive clause longer and heavier in Arabic. Perhaps the translator felt at the end of this clause subcomplex that the reader may well need a reminder of the concessive relation and further bonding of the components of the clause complex.

A reinforcing explication through the use of correlatives may also be associated with a shift in sequence from $\alpha \ll \beta \gg$ to $\beta \wedge \alpha$; for example:

(6a) English ST2D [Conc 19, ST2DandTT2MAlthough]:|| Jainism and Buddhism, $\ll \text{though}$ impregnated with the melancholy atheism of a disillusioned age, \gg were religious reactions against the hedonistic creeds of an "emancipated" and worldly leisure class. ||

(6b) Arabic TT2M:

فالجائنية والبوذية، ولو أنهما مترعتان في ثناياهما بلون من الإلحاد الكئيب، الذي ساد ذلك العصر بعد أن زالت عن عينيه غشاوة الأحلام وأوهامها؛ إلا أنهما في الوقت نفسه كانتا بمثابة رد الفعل من جانب الدين في مقاومته لمذاهب اللذة التي أخذت بها طبقة من الناس حررت نفسها ونعمت في حياتها بالفراغ.

(6c) English back-translation: || Jainism and Buddhism, wa-lau 'anna-huma (and if they/even if they) are impregnated in their midst with a kind of melancholy atheism, [[which prevailed in that age after the screen of dreams and their illusions vanished from its eyes,]] || 'illa 'anna-huma (yet they) fi-l-waḡti nafsihi (at the same time) were tantamount to reactions on the part of religion in its resistance against the creeds of hedonism, [[which were adopted by a class of people, who emancipated themselves and enjoyed leisure in their life.]] ||

Here conjunctive reinforcement is brought about through the optional use of an extra two conjunctive expressions in the dominant clause: إلا أن 'illa 'anna (yet) and the Adjunct في الوقت نفسه fi-l-waḡti nafsihi (at the same time). Moreover, the entire clause complex is a $\beta \wedge \alpha$ construction constituting the Comment element in a Topic-Comment construction, which is arguably less complex than the corresponding $\alpha \ll \beta \gg$ construction. Perhaps this shift in

sequence is partly motivated by other features of explicitation, e.g. the use of a heavy embedded qualifying relative clause complex (*which prevailed in that age after the screen of dreams and their illusions vanished from its eyes*.) for the simple prepositional phrase *of a disillusioned age*, which is functioning as a Qualifier in a nominal group. The translator could have opted for a 'leaner' rendering without the additional reinforcing conjunctions, the shift in sequence, and the unnecessary expansion of various Qualifiers in nominal groups as in 6(d):

(6d) Closer less explicit rendering:

فالجانية والبوذية - ولو أنهما مترعتان بالإلحاد الكئيب لعصر متحرر من الأوهام - كانتا رد فعل من جانب الدين في مقاومته لمذاهب اللذة التي أخذت بها طبقة متحررة ومنعمة في حياتها بالفراغ.

(6e) English back-translation: ||| Jainism and Buddhism, <<*wa-lau 'anna-huma (and if they/even if they)* are impregnated with the melancholy atheism of a disillusioned age>> were reactions on the part of religion in its resistance against the creeds of hedonism, [[which were adopted by a class emancipated and enjoying leisure in its life.]] |||

There are 6 other instances of reinforcement without the use of correlatives in the translations of *although/though*. As Table 11 above shows, these are equally distributed in the three target texts. One such instance (Conc 40, ST2DandTT2MAlthough) involves the repetition of the concessive element in the form of a concessive Adjunct with a reference expression in the dominant clause following a heavy concessive clause subcomplex, i.e. $\beta (1 \wedge 2) \wedge \alpha$. Two instances (Conc 104, ST1BandTT1HAlthough and Conc 69, ST3RandTT3MAlthough) involve an element of exclusiveness in the concessive clause. The remaining 3 instances (one in each target text: Conc 134, ST1BandTT1HAlthough; Conc 52, ST2DandTT2MAlthough; and Conc 35, ST3RandTT3MAlthough) involve the use of a 'universal conditional concessive' (Martin, 1992: 200 and Quirk *et al*, 1985: 1101); for example:

(7a) English ST3R [Conc 35, ST3RandTT3MAlthough]:||| No one thinks || it unjust to put the best men into a football team, || although they acquire thereby a great superiority|||

(7b) Arabic TT3M:

فلن تجد أحداً من رأيه أنه من الظلم أن تنتقي خير اللاعبين لفريق كرة القدم، مهما تعظم سيادتهم على غيرهم بانتخابهم لذلك الفريق؛

(7c) English back-translation: ||| You will not find anyone, || whose view (is) that it is unjust to select the best players for a football team, || *mahm*« (no matter how/however) great their superiority becomes over others by virtue of their selection of that team. |||

Here the universal conditional concessive *mahm*« (whichever/however/no matter how) is used instead of the ordinary single concessive contingency, as in the English source text, thereby reinforcing the counter-expectation or the concessive opposition: it is not unjust to select the best players no matter how superior this would make them. Thus, the validity of the thesis of the dominant clause becomes universal.

Other features of explicitation in example (7) include the interpersonal explicitation in *فلن تجد* (you will not find), the unnecessary addition of the Qualifier *على غيرهم* (over others), and the lexical repetition of *انتخابهم* (their selection) and *الفريق* (the team) in *بانتخابهم لذلك الفريق* (by virtue of their selection of that team), in preference to an implicit text reference item comparable to *thereby* in the ST.

IV. Other Explicating Shifts

In addition to the above categories of explicating shifts associated with the conjunction *although/though*, there are 36 instances exhibiting other features of explication in the immediate environment of the concessive conjunction. These do not seem to be particularly related to, or triggered by, the concessive element in the clause nexus; rather, they are simply conspicuous in their own right, and hence must be noted in so far as they reflect an explicating tendency in translation. Table 13 provides a convenient subcategorization of these instances, though its validity is vitiated by the considerable overlap between the identified subcategories and the limited number of instances involved.

Table 13 *Other explicating shifts in the translation of although/though*

	ST1B/TT1H	ST2D/TT2M	ST3R/TT3M	TOTAL
Reconstitution	-	2	13	15
Repetition/Full Reference	-	-	3	3
Interpersonal	3	1	3	7
Expansion	1	3	2	6
Upgrading	3	-	2	5
Total	7	6	23	36
Total Tokens of <i>although/though</i>	182	65	138	385
Percentage	3.85%	9.23%	16.67%	9.35%

As Table 13 shows, the commonest subcategory is reconstitution of elliptic elements (15 instances), where a more or less comparable elliptic construction seems to be available to the translator; for example:

(8a) English ST3R [Conc 52, ST3RandTT3MAlthough]:||| Such a reproduction there must necessarily be - <<though not by deliberation and contrivance>> - for the Intellectual could not be the last of things, || but must have a double Act... |||

(8b) Arabic TT3M:

لقد كان يتحتم أن تجيء هذه الطبيعة صورة للأصل - ولو أنها صورة لم تجيء عن عمد ومحاولة - ذلك لأن "الكائن العقلي" يستحيل عليه أن يكون آخر الكائنات، بل لابد أن يكون له "فعل" مزدوج...

(8c) English back-translation: ||| it was inevitable that this nature (should) come to be a copy of the original - || wa-lau (even if) it is a copy (which) did not come by deliberation and contrivance - || that is because the 'intellectual being' it-is-impossible for him to be the last of creatures, but there must be for him a double Act... |||

Here the though-clause in the ST is an elliptic enclosed clause consisting only of polarity and an element of the Residue (Adjunct); the remaining elements of the Mood, having been established in the preceding dominant clause, are presupposed by ellipsis. A full non-elliptic version of the though-clause would be: *though there must not necessarily be such a reproduction by deliberation and contrivance*. Note how the Arabic rendering is closer to this full version, with reconstitution of the elliptic elements (Subject, Finite and Predicator): *though it is a copy which did not come by deliberation and contrivance*. The translator could have opted for a similar elliptic construction such as *ولو عن غير عمد ومحاولة* (though not by deliberation and contrivance).

5. Summary of Findings

The analysis of bilingual concordance output for the most frequent English hypotactic concessive conjunctive *although/though* has revealed interesting patterns of conjunctive and clause complexing explicitation, whether directly related to the conjunctives themselves or observed within their immediate co-text.

The main results of parallel analysis of the English concessive conjunctive *although/though* are set out in Table 13, which shows the frequencies of the most notable types of shifts observed in the Arabic translations in relation to their source texts. The shifts are expressed as percentages of the concordance lines for *although/though*¹². A crucial factor in assessing these shifts has been the availability in most cases of less explicit or non-explicit agnates closer to the corresponding English constructions, as evidenced by the frequent use of such agnates in similar contexts in the target texts.

Table 14 *Main findings of parallel analysis of the concessive conjunctive although/though*

Shift	Conjunction	ST1B/TT1H		ST2D/TT2M		ST3R/TT3M	
		Conc. lines	% shift	Conc. lines	% shift	Conc. lines	% shift
Tactic	<i>although/though</i>	182	63.19%	65	9.23%	138	5.80%
Reinforcement	<i>although/though</i>	182	2.20%	65	15.38%	138	24.64%
Expansion	<i>although/though</i>	182	0.55%	65	7.69%	138	13.04%

As the Table shows, the salient types of explicating shifts observed in all three Arabic translated texts are: paratactic, reinforcement and expansion shifts. It is also obvious from the Tables that while paratactic shifts are substantially more common in TT1H than the other two translated texts, the reverse is true in relation to reinforcement and, to a lesser extent, expansion shifts, with reinforcement and expansion being on average more common in TT3M than TT2M.

6. Conclusion

This corpus-based study has explored patterns of structural explicitation in the translation of the English concessive conjunction *although/though*. Adopting a broader SFL-based definition of 'explicitation', this study highlights some structural potentially explicating tendencies in the concordance output for the English hypotactic conjunction *although/though*, assessing whether those tendencies could justifiably be regarded as translation-specific explicating shifts, i.e. not attributable to the translator's style, source language/text, or target language requirements.

The paper started with brief outline of the different types of grammatical explicitation, viewed from a systemic functional vantage point, followed by description of the purpose-built bilingual corpus on which the ensuing analysis is based. The focus was then placed on the potentially explicating shifts observed in the bilingual concordance output for the conjunction *although/though*.

The analysis highlights three main types of potentially explicating structural shifts, namely: tactic (interdependency), sequence and reinforcement shifts, in addition to a few instances of reconstitution of elliptic forms, upgrading and expansion, which are also potentially

explicitating shifts. Notably, this study demonstrates how structural explicitation is often associated with an upward shift on the grammatical rank-scale, together with other patterns of expansion and reinforcement of conjunctive markers, which do not seem to be necessitated by any structural requirements in the target language. This study also suggests that potentially explicitating shifts seem to be occurring in concomitant clusters constituting an explicitation 'syndrome' (compare Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999), as it were, whereby the ideational content is unpacked or repackaged into more loosely 'strung out', more easily processable constructions with various resultant manifestations.

The patterns of structural explicitation uncovered by this study need to be further investigated with different parameters to see, for example, if they can be elicited with other types of conjunctions, genres and texts produced by other translators. Similarly, the interdependency, sequence, reinforcement and upgrading shifts observed in this study are worthy of further investigation both in parallel and comparable corpora to establish whether, and to what extent, any such shifts reflect, or indeed depart from, systemic probabilities of instantiation in Arabic.

Endnotes:

1. The notion of translation-specific features in general, and explicitation in particular, has not been without controversy in translation studies. For a recent critique of the Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis and the notion of translation-inherent explicitation, see Becher (2010), who contends that the 'alleged universality of explicitation has achieved the status of dogma', which is based on 'fallacious theoretical considerations and premature interpretations of empirical data' (ibid: 1). Without providing any empirical evidence, Becher (ibid: 19) speculates that explicitation is attributable to two properties of the communicative situation, namely the 'translators' preoccupation with reducing cultural distance' and the translators' tendency to avoid or minimize communicative risk (see Pym, 2005, who suggests similar speculative explanations for explicitation).
2. For a description and examples of these taxonomic approaches, see Olohan (2004) and Chen (2006).
3. See for example House (2004) and Steiner (2004, 2005b, 2005c, 2008), who elaborates a more complex and productive SFL-based model of explicitation.
4. For the interaction of lexis and grammar and the characteristic grammatical environment of lexical items, see also Kenny (2001), Sinclair (1991), and Halliday and Matthiessen (1999; 2004).
5. This includes explanations added by the translators, which are attributable to cultural differences between the source and target language audiences.
6. No assumption is being made here that languages are necessarily identical with respect to the hierarchy of rank within the lexicogrammatical stratum or that translation proceeds 'rank by rank'. The shift is merely noted in terms of its potential impact on information structure and distribution, hence on explicitation. From this standpoint, the significance of such shifts will have to be assessed in the light of typological differences between English and Arabic and the set of available lexicogrammatical agnates in the TL which are perceived to be lexicogrammatically closer to the ST expression (cf. Halliday, 1966; and Matthiessen, 2001)
7. Defined here as the number of lexical items divided by the number of ranking clauses (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 655). See also Steiner's (2008) operationalizations of

explicitness.

8. Given the difficulty of identifying and eliminating the adversative instances of the main concessive conjunction but, it was felt preferable to include other adversative conjunctions such as whereas and while to reflect the overall distribution of this type as well.
9. In these instances, the English source text seems to be a translation of an original Arabic text.
10. The figures given for this type of sequence also include cases where the concessive circumstantial relation could be interpreted as holding between 'elements of a figure' rather figures as a whole (cf. Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 492).
11. The sequence of paratactic clauses is generally fixed (Matthiessen, 1995).
12. For example, in 63.19% of all the concordance lines of although/though in ST1B, a paratactic shift is observed in the corresponding clause complex or sequence in TT1H.

About the author:

Dr Ashraf Abdel Fattah is an Assistant Professor in Translation Studies at the Translation and Interpreting Institute (TII), Hamad Bin Khalifa University in Doha. He has a PhD in Translation Studies from the University of Manchester. His current research interests include contrastive appraisal analysis of news discourse, media translation, translation-specific features and corpus-based translation studies.

References

- Abu Hadid, M. F. (1941/1996). فتح العرب لمصر *Fath al-Arab li Misr* [Arab Conquest of Egypt], Cairo: Madbouli, 2nd edition; translation of *Arab Conquest of Egypt* by Alfred J Butler, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1902/1978.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (1995). 'Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research', *Target* 7(2): 223-43.
- Baker, M. (1996). 'Corpus-based Translation Studies: The Challenges That Lie Ahead', in H. Somers (ed.) *Terminology, LSP and Translation*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins 175-86.
- Becher, V. (2010). 'Abandoning the Notion of "Translation-inherent" Explication: Against a Dogma of Translation Studies', *Across Languages and Cultures* 11(1): 1-28.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). 'Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation' in J. House and S. Blum-Kulka (eds) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr, pp. 17-35.
- Catford, J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Doherty, M. (2002). *Language Processing in Discourse. A key to felicitous translation*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Durant, W. (1935/1963). *The Story of Civilization: Our Oriental Heritage*, Volume One, New York: MJF Books.
- Fabricius-Hansen, C. (1996). 'Informational density: a problem for translation and translation theory', *Linguistics* 34: 521-65.

- Fattah, A. (2010). *A corpus-based study of conjunctive explicitation in Arabic translated and non-translated texts written by the same translators/authors*. University of Manchester: Unpublished PhD thesis.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & C.M.I.M. Matthiessen (1999). *Construing Experience Through Meaning: A Language-based Approach to Cognition*, London and New York: Continuum.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & C.M.I.M. Matthiessen (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London and New York: Arnold, 3rd edition.
- House, J. (2004). "Explicitness in Discourse across Languages." In J. House, W. Koller, K. Schubert (eds) *Neue Perspektiven der Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschwissenschaft. Festschrift für Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast zum 60. Geburtstag*. Bochum: AKSVerlag, 185-207
- Kenny, D. (2001). *Lexis and Creativity in Translation: A corpus-based study*, Manchester: St Jerome.
- Klaudy, K. (1996). 'Back-Translation as a Tool for Detecting Explicitation Strategies in Translation', in K. Klaudy, J. Lambert and A. Sohar (eds) *Translation Studies in Hungary*, Budapest: Scholastica, 99-114.
- Klaudy, K. (1998). 'Explicitation', in M. Baker (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 80-84.
- Mahmoud, Z. N. (1952/1967). *تاريخ الفلسفة الغربية (الكتاب الأول: الفلسفة القديمة) Tarikh al-Falsafah al-Gharbiyah (al-kitab al-awwal: al-falsafah al-qadimah)* [History of Western Philosophy, Book One: Ancient Philosophy], Cairo: Matba'at Lagnat al-Ta'lif wa al-Targamah wa al-Nashr; translation of B. Russell (1946/1995) *History of Western Philosophy*.
- Martin, J.R. (1992). *English Text: System and Structure*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (1995). *Lexicogrammatical Cartography: English Systems*, Tokyo: International Language Sciences Publishers.
- Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2001). 'The environments of translation', in E. Steiner and C. Yallop (eds) *Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production: Beyond Content*, Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, pp. 41-124.
- Olohan, M. (2004). *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies*, London and New York: Routledge
- Pym, A. (2005). 'Explaining Explicitation', in K. Károly and Á. Fóris (eds) *New Trends in Translation Studies. In Honour of Kinga Klaudy*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 29-34.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London: Longman.
- Russell, B. (1946/1995). *History of Western Philosophy*, London: Routledge.
- Steiner, E. (2004). 'Ideational grammatical metaphor: exploring some implications for the overall model', *Languages in Contrast* 4(1): 139-66.
- Steiner, E. (2005a). 'Some properties of texts in terms of "information distribution" across languages', *Languages in Contrast* 5(1): 49-72.
- Steiner, E. (2005b). 'Some properties of lexicogrammatical encoding and their implications for situations of language contact and multilinguality', in Franceschini, Rita. Hrsg. 2005. *In einer anderen Sprache. Sondernummer der Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 35, (139), Stuttgart: Metzler Verlag: 54-75.

- Steiner, E. (2005c). 'Explicitation, its lexicogrammatical realization, and its determining (independent) variables – towards an empirical and corpus-based methodology'. *SPRIKreports* (Reports of the project Languages in Contrast).
- Steiner, E. (2008). 'Explicitation – Towards an Empirical and Corpus-based Methodology', in J. Webster (ed.) *Meaning in Context: Implementing Intelligent Applications of Language Studies*, London: Continuum, 235-78.
- Vanderauwera, I. (1985). *Dutch Novels Translated into English: The Transformation of a 'minority' literature*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.