

Contrastive Analysis of Concessive Conjunctions in Translated and Non-translated Arabic Texts: An Exploratory Study

Ashraf Fattah & Rashid Yahiaoui*

Translation and Interpreting Studies Dept. College of Humanities and Social Sciences Hamad bin Khalifa University, Qatar Foundation, LAS Building, First Floor: Office A135, P.O. Box 5825, Doha, Qatar

Corresponding Author: Rashid Yahiaoui, E-mail: ryahiaoui@hbku.edu.qa

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: March 11, 2019

Accepted: June 23, 2019

Published: August 31, 2019

Volume: 10 Issue: 4

Advance access: July 2019

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

Key words:

Arabic,
Concessive,
Conjunction,
Corpus,
Explicitation,
SFL,
Translation

ABSTRACT

This study seeks to contribute to addressing a gap in theory-driven corpus-based research focused on the so-called translation specific features (TSF) in Arabic translated texts. It provides a contrastive Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)-informed analysis of concessive/contrastive connective markers in a selected comparable corpus made up of translated and non-translated Arabic texts. This area of corpus-based research has been mainly driven by an interest in the linguistic features distinguishing translated from non-translated texts. The characteristic feature of the present study is the fact that it is based on a comparable corpus of translated and non-translated texts written by the same authors in more or less the same genre. Based on a comparison of concordance data, the study will highlight some interesting patterns of difference in the types and frequencies of concessive conjunctions used, as well as ‘explicitating’ and ‘upgrading’ tendencies between the two components of the corpus. Viewed from an SFL perspective, some such differences do not seem to be triggered by the English source texts involved or dictated by contrastive linguistic requirements but rather by the translation process itself.

INTRODUCTION

Since the nineties, corpus-based translation studies have traditionally focused on authentic parallel corpora composed of source texts and their corresponding target texts. Largely informed by corpus linguistics, this area of translation research has been mainly driven by an interest in the linguistic features that distinguish translated texts in general from non-translated texts, regardless of the source or target language. Deploying the techniques of corpus linguistics, researchers engaged in corpus-based analysis of translated texts have observed and posited certain features or tendencies which seem to be distinctive of the language of translation, as opposed to non-translated texts in the same language, regardless of the language pair involved.

The use of comparable corpora was suggested by Baker (1996) as a resource for investigating such features, where a comparable corpus consists of two separate collections of texts in the same language, one of which is composed of original texts in the language in question while the other consists of translations in that language from a given source

language or languages. Both components are meant to be in the same language and comparable in domain and register. The goal of this novel approach, especially when used in conjunction with the more usual parallel approach, is to identify or rather isolate any translation-specific patterns, or the distinctive features of translated text *per se*, that are not attributable to the source or target language systems. A comparable investigation of this kind, given an appropriate corpus, should provide some insight into the translation process itself as well as the individual translator’s translational behaviour, i.e. ‘the translator’s fingerprints’ (Aijmer and Lewis 2017: 3), particularly in the unique case where the comparable corpus studied is composed of collections of translated and non-translated texts produced by the same person, as is the case in this exploratory study.

Work which has adopted and demonstrated the strength of this approach includes Braithwaite (1995), who shows that translated texts tend to be ‘simpler’ than non-translated texts in the same language as reflected in the lower type-token ratio and lower lexical density of the former. Similarly, in a study based on a comparison of concordance data from

two corpora, Olohan and Baker (2000) conclude that the use of the *that*-connective is far more frequent in the translated corpus than the non-translated corpus. An investigation of the specific linguistic properties of translated texts requires a robust theoretical model to provide the necessary linguistic and textual operationalizations for the complex phenomena involved. Such a model is offered by systemic functional theory, which is powerful and rich enough to provide a principled account of translation specific features (Teich 2013).

This paper seeks to contribute to addressing a gap in theory-driven corpus-based research focused on the so-called translation specific features (TSF) in Arabic translated texts. Our study thus falls within the domain of descriptive translation studies, focusing specifically on any distinctive properties of translated as opposed to non-translated Arabic texts, an area of research which could provide insights for translation teaching, contrastive linguistic studies, language contact and change (Teich 2013). We engage in a quantitative and qualitative analysis of concessive/contrastive conjunctive markers in a specially compiled comparable corpus. There are two distinctive aspects of this study which set it apart from similar work in the field of comparable corpus-based analysis. First, the study adopts a Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)-informed approach for analysing concessive/contrastive connective markers in the compiled corpus. The second characteristic and novel feature of the present study is the fact that it is based on a comparable corpus of Arabic translated and non-translated texts written by the same authors in more or less the same domain and register.

Thus, the aim of this exploratory study is to identify and seek to explain salient differences in the use of concessive/contrastive conjunctive devices in the texts involved. More specifically, this paper seeks to identify any discernible patterns of difference in the use of concessive/contrastive conjunctives in Arabic translated and non-translated texts produced by the same writers and belonging to the same domain, and the extent to which those patterns could be attributed to or associated with explicitation. For this purpose, concordance outputs for those conjunctive markers in both corpora are subjected to a close qualitative and quantitative analysis in pursuit of any consistent or recurrent differences between the Arabic texts in terms of the deployment of the conjunctive markers themselves and any relevant concomitant structural patterns. Viewed from a systemic functional perspective (Halliday and Matthiessen 2014), any patterns or tendencies suggested by those differences are assessed to see if they are triggered by the source texts of the translated corpus, dictated by contrastive linguistic requirements or indeed attributable to the individual translator's translational behaviour or style, given the unique feature of this comparable corpus.

THE DATA

The corpus on which this study is based (see Table 1) is made up of two subcorpora: a parallel component composed of two English source texts written in the domain of history and philosophy, with a total word count of 248,922 words, and their Arabic translations. One of the Arabic target texts (TT1H)

was produced by the Egyptian literary writer, novelist and educationalist, Muhammad Farid Abu Hadid (1893-1967) while the other (TT2M) by the well-known writer, intellectual and professor of philosophy Zaki Naguib Mahmoud (1905-1993). The second subcorpus is a comparable one including, in addition to the above Arabic target texts, full Arabic non-translated titles authored by the same two translators and belonging to similar domains (history and philosophy). This non-translated corpus comprises six titles, three by each translator/author, totalling 358,862 words (listed in full in Table 1). The selection of these titles was largely determined by availability and comparability to the translational corpus in terms of genre and register. However, when drawing comparisons or looking for any distinctive patterns or trends, it is important to recognize the inevitable internal imbalances in the composition and sizes of full-text corpora involved in any corpus-based study as well as their implications for the interpretation of findings. Indeed, as Baker (2004: 171) notes, such inevitable imbalances 'are not specific to corpus-based studies', but are rather inherent in 'any attempt to look for similarities and differences', where aspects of comparison 'can never be totally balanced in every respect'.

As indicated in the introduction, the contrastive analysis in this paper will be focused on concessive/contrastive conjunctions, which is fairly limited and amenable to automatic analysis using concordance software. However, with the use of an untagged Arabic corpus, a significant amount of manual sorting and analysis is still needed to 'clean' any crude concordance output extracted from an untagged Arabic text. Thus, we will conduct an overall quantitative analysis of the common concessive conjunctives in the comparable corpus, presenting their overall frequencies and percentages in the two Arabic subcorpora and highlighting any significant patterns of variation. We will then focus on the frequency and distribution in the comparable corpus of some features and patterns emerging from the analysis of concessive conjunctives.

GLOBAL STATISTICS

The overall frequency and distribution of the identified Arabic concessive conjunctive markers across the Arabic comparable corpus are set out in Table 2¹. The figures listed in the table are based on the concordance output for the pre-identified list of concessive markers, some of which could be poly-functional or multivalent conjunctives. Except *لكن* (but), whose concordance output also includes non-concessive occurrences, the counted occurrences of the listed markers are mostly concessive or contrastive, i.e. involving an element of counter-expectancy or contrast.

As shown in Table 2, translated texts are generally making more frequent use of concessive conjunctives than their corresponding non-translations. This observed trend is more pronounced in the case of Mahmoud's translations and non-translations (1.17% vs. 0.80%) than Abu Hadid's (0.99% vs. 0.59%). It is also noteworthy that the total number of occurrences of concessives is higher in Abu Hadid's translation (1157) than in his non-translations (814), even though the former is 14.42% smaller in size than the latter. As will be explained in some detail later in this paper, this

Table 1. A Parallel and Comparable Corpus

Source text	Translator/Author	Translated text	Non-translated texts
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)	فتح العرب لمصر (Arab Conquest of Egypt) (1941, repr. 1996), 2 nd Edition, Cairo: Madbouli (117,122 words) (TT1H)	(1) صلاح الدين وعصره (Saladin and His Epoch) (1927, repr. 2002), Cairo: Maktabat al-Usrah, The General Egyptian Book Organization (35,554 words) (NT1H) (2) أمتنا العربية (Our Arab Nation) (1961), Cairo: Dar al-Ma'arif (62,531 words) (NT2H) (3) السيد عمر مكرم: زعيم مصر الأول (Omar Makram, Egypt's First Leader) (1937, repr. 1997), Cairo, Dar al-Hilal (38,768 words) (NT3H) Total NTH: 136,853 words
Russell, B. (1946/1995), <i>History of Western Philosophy, Book One: Ancient Philosophy</i> , London: Routledge. (120,038 words) (ST2R)	Mahmoud, Zaki Naguib (1905-1993)	تاريخ الفلسفة الغربية (الكتاب الأول: الفلسفة القديمة) (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) (TT2M)	(1) نحو فلسفة علمية (Towards a Philosophy of Science) (1958, repr. 1980), 2 nd Edition, Cairo, Al-Anglo. (107,457 words) (NT4M) (2) حياة الفكر والعالم الجديد (Intellectual Life in the New World) (1956, repr. 1987), 3 rd Edition, Cairo, Dar el-Shorouk (53,775 words) (NT5M) (3) موقف من الميتافيزيقا (A Stance on Metaphysics) (1953, repr. 1987), 3 rd Edition, Cairo, Dar el-Shorouk (60,777 words) (NT6M) Total NTM: 222,009 words

higher frequency of concessives in the translated corpus could be attributed to the correspondingly high frequency of concessive/adversative markers in the source texts ST1B and ST2R (Table 3).

A similar pattern of distribution of concessive conjunctives across the comparable corpus is exhibited in relation to the top five most frequent concessive markers in the entire corpus, as shown in Table 4. It is clear from the table that, except the weaker conditional concessive وإن (even if), all these conjunctives are more common in Mahmoud's translations than his non-translations. Similarly, except أن غير أن, all the top five concessives are more common in Abu Hadid's translation than his non-translations. Indeed, Abu Hadid's translation seems to make up for the lower frequency of أن غير أن by its heavier reliance on the almost identical أن على, which is twice as common in Abu Hadid's translation (0.10%) as it is in his non-translations (0.05%).

Interestingly, all the top five concessive markers, except the conditional concessive وإن (even if), are paratactic. We will have more to say about the tactic patterns of concessive conjunctives in the next section, but suffice it to say now that the only conjunctive among the top five concessives to be significantly more common in the non-translations than the translations as a whole is the conditional concessive وإن

(even if). In fact, the conditional concessive markers, which are arguably weaker than the prototypical concessive markers, are collectively less common in the translations than the non-translations in general. This is highlighted by their much lower proportion relative to the total number of concessive markers in the translated texts, as illustrated by Table 5. Thus, the translated corpus can be said to favour stronger concessive markers and disfavour weaker conditional ones.

The lower frequency of conditional concessives in the translations seems to be consistent with an overall predilection for stronger concessive conjunctives in the translations compared with the non-translations, as indicated, for example, by the preference in the translations for the longer, and arguably stronger, conjunctive group على الرغم/بالرغم من أن (in spite of (the fact) that...) instead of the shorter مع أن (with that...), which is more common in the non-translations² (see Table 2).

As Table 3 above shows, the paratactic conjunctive group ذلك (in spite of that), which includes the text reference item ذلك (that) as a Complement in a prepositional phrase, is more common in the translations than the non-translations. This is also confirmed by Table 6, which includes the other concessive conjunctive Adjuncts with a text reference item in the comparable corpus, which shows that those conjunctive groups are twice as frequent in both translated texts than their

Table 2. Overall Frequency & Distribution of the Main Arabic Concessive/Adversative Conjunctions

Conjunctive	TT1H 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	TT2M 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
ولكن (but)	612	404	602	790
إلا أن (however)	4	11	85	62
على أن (however)	120	63	76	49
غير أن (however)	88	118	76	37
و/مع ذلك (in spite of that)	39	23	88	85
و/مع هذا (in spite of this)	12	7		
و/رغم/على الرغم من/ذلك/هذا (in spite of that/this)		1	4	8
و/على كل/أي حال (in any event)	20	7	14	14
TOTAL PARATACTIC	896 (0.77%)	634 (0.46%)	945 (0.80%)	1046 (0.47%)
و/ف/بينما (and/for/while)	2	2	23	41
في/على حين (whereas)	69	17	29	32
على الرغم مما (in spite of what...)			7	10
بالرغم مما (in spite of what...)				2
و/رغم ما (and despite what...)	1		2	7
مع أن (with that/although)	33	18	20	86
على الرغم/بالرغم من أن (in spite of (the fact) that...)			53	33
و/رغم أن (and/despite (the fact) that...)				1
ف/حيثما (wherever)			24	4
و/ف/مهما (and/for/whatever)	37	11	38	94
أينما (wherever)	2		2	6
ولو أن (even though)	17	35	58	11
و/ف/حتى لو (and/for/even if)	4	1	30	46
حتى ولو (even if)				
و/ف/حتى إن (and/for/even if)				
و/ف/حتى إذا (and/for/even if)				
و/حتى بعد/قبل/إذ (and/even after/before/when)				
وإن (even if)	44	35	29	109
وإذا كان (and if (although))		19	12	9
و/ف/لئن (and/for/if (although))	6	5	26	47
كانتأ ما/من (be it what/who (whatever/whoever))	1	1	10	10
و/أياً كان (whatever)	1	2	2	10
سواء (regardless of whether)	13	8	10	37
دون أن (without that...)	1		52	131
بغير أن (without that...)	30	26	2	7
TOTAL HYPOTACTIC	261 (0.22%)	180 (0.13%)	429 (0.36%)	733 (0.33%)
TOTAL TOKENS	1157	814	1374	1779
% Hypotactic (relative to total tokens)	22.56	22.11	31.22	41.20
% Paratactic (relative to total tokens)	77.44	77.89	68.78	58.80
% (relative to word count)	0.99	0.59	1.17	0.80

corresponding non-translations. In fact, this also seems to be consistent with a wider trend emerging from an analysis of the parallel corpus, where the text reference item ذلك (that) seems to be frequently deployed in upgrading and tactic explicitating shifts in the translated subcorpus (see Fattah, 2010, 2016 and 2018). We will come back to this issue when we examine some features of relevance to upgrading and expansion.

In the following Section, we will compare the distribution of hypotactic and paratactic concessive conjunctions

in the comparable corpus to see if there are any salient differences or patterns that could be attributed to, or resonate with, shifts in interdependency (from hypotaxis to parataxis or vice versa) in the parallel corpus.

INTERDEPENDENCY PATTERNS

Previous work on this corpus (see for example Fattah 2018) has revealed optional shifts from hypotaxis to parataxis,

which were observed to be consistently more common in Abu Hadid's translation (TT1H). That this is a trend in the translated texts seems to be confirmed by Table 7, which shows that the frequency of paratactic concessives is much

Table 3. Overall Frequency & Distribution of the Main Concessive/Adversative Conjunctives in the English STs

Conjunctive	ST1B (128,884 words)	ST2R (120,038 words)
although/though	187	138
at any rate	7	11
but	825	857
even if	10	16
however	105	112
in any case	10	4
in either case	3	2
Total	1147 (0.89%)	1140 (0.95%)

higher in TT1H (0.77%) and TT2M (0.80%) than Abu Hadid's non-translations (NTH) (0.46%) and Mahmoud's non-translations (NTM) (0.49%) respectively. Mahmoud's translation of Russell (1946/1995) (TT2M) has the highest frequency of both paratactic and hypotactic concessives, but the difference between translations and non-translations is much higher in the case of parataxis (0.31%) than in the case of hypotaxis (0.09% and 0.02% for TT1H/NTH and TT2M/NTM respectively). These differences seem to be consistent with a predilection for parataxis in the translations observed in the parallel corpus analysis, although this bias may be vitiated or obscured by other factors.

The relative proportions of hypotactic and paratactic concessive conjunctives also seem to suggest such a paratactic tendency in the translations, though this could well have been influenced by the corresponding proportions in the source texts, as illustrated in Table 8.

A close look at Table 8 reveals a definite shift in the tactic balance in favour of parataxis in Mahmoud's translation (TT2M) compared to his non-translations, which, in theory,

Table 4. Frequencies of the Top Five Concessive Markers in the Comparable Corpus

Conjunctive	Tt1h 117,122 words	Nth 136,853 words	Tt2m 117,854 words	Ntm 222,009 words
ولكن (but)	612	404	602	790
% per size	0.52%	0.30%	0.51%	0.36%
على أن (however)	120	63	76	49
% per size	0.10%	0.05%	0.06%	0.02%
غير أن (however)	88	118	76	37
% per size	0.08%	0.09%	0.06%	0.02%
و/مع ذلك (and/with (in spite of) that)	39	23	88	85
% per size	0.03%	0.02%	0.07%	0.04%
وإن (and even if)	44	35	29	109
% per size	0.04%	0.03%	0.02%	0.05%
Total	903	643	871	1070
% per size	0.77%	0.47%	0.74%	0.50%

Table 5. Frequencies of Conditional Concessive Conjunctives in the Comparable Corpus

Conjunctive	TT1H 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	TT2M 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
و/ف/حتى لو (and/for/even if)	4	1	30	46
حتى ولو (even if)				
و/ف/حتى إن (and/for/even if)				
و/ف/حتى إذا (and/for/even if)				
و/حتى بعد/قبل/إذ (and/even after/before/when)				
وإن (even if)	44	35	29	109
وإذا كان (and if (although))		19	12	9
و/ف/لنن (and/for/if (although))	6	5	26	47
Total	54	60	97	211
% size	0.05	0.04	0.08	0.10
Total concessives	1157	814	1374	1779
% concessives	4.67	7.37	7.06	11.86

Table 6. Frequencies of Conjunctive Adjuncts with Text Reference

Conjunctive	TT1H 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	TT2M 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
و/مع ذلك (and/with (in spite of) that)	39	23	88	85
و/مع هذا (and/with (in spite of) this)	12	7	-	-
و/رغم/على الرغم من/ذلك/هذا (and/notwithstanding that/this)	-	1	4	8
total	51	31	92	93
% size	0.04	0.02	0.08	0.04

Table 7. Frequencies of Paratactic & Hypotactic Concessive Conjunctions in the Comparable Corpus

Parataxis	NTH <	< NTM	< TT1H	< TT2M
	0.46%	0.49%	0.77%	0.80%
Hypotaxis	NTH <	< TT1H	< NTM	< TT2M
	0.13%	0.22%	0.34%	0.36%

could be attributed to an influence of the source texts. But there is little evidence of any such influence in Abu Hadid's translation (TT1H), whose relative tactic proportions seem to be almost identical with their counterparts in his non-translations (NTH).

It seems probable, however, that the apparent lower frequency of concessive conjunctives in Abu Hadid's translation (TT1H) relative to its source text (ST1B (Butler, 1902/1978)) is due to logico-semantic shifts into other non-concessive paratactic conjunctives, which are not included in the counts, a reflection perhaps of a higher predilection for concessive/adversative conjunctives in English than Arabic texts. For example, in a random sample of 150 concordance lines from the concordance output for *but* (824 instances in total) in ST1B-TT1H, only 92 instances of *but* (61.33%) have been translated as paratactic concessive conjunctives. The remaining 58 instances (38.67%) have all been rendered as paratactic nexuses linked by non-concessive conjunctives or none at all (2 instances), as shown in Table 9. As noted earlier, another possible indicator of this overall paratactic tendency is the higher frequency of conjunctive Adjuncts with a text reference item.

A similar pattern of preponderance of paratactic concessive/contrastive conjunctions can be observed in Table 10, which shows the Arabic equivalents of *but* in a random sample of 150 concordance lines from the concordance output for *but* in ST2R-TT2M (857 in total). Thus, the paratactic equivalents (concessive and non-concessive) in the sample amount to 145 out of 150, i.e. approximately 95%.

REINFORCEMENT

The analysis of concordance lines of some English and Arabic conjunctives in the corpus has also revealed a tendency to add a semantic component of reinforcement, foregrounding or exclusiveness in the immediate co-text of the conjunctive in question; a feature which will be collectively referred to as 'reinforcement'. Reinforcement of the con-

cessive relation could manifest itself as the deployment of a particular rhetorical construction or device denoting exclusiveness or emphasis, or the use of optional correlative conjunctions. It has also been observed that reinforcement shifts seem to be more common in Mahmoud's translation (TT2M) than Abu Hadid's. Obviously, it would be difficult to assess these manifestations of reinforcement in the comparable corpus without linking them to some fairly specific orthographic clues that can be investigated automatically using a concordancer. For this reason, optional correlative reinforcement is relatively easier to investigate, relying, as it does, on the use of conjunctive combinations. The overall frequency of the most common concessive correlative conjunctives in the comparable corpus is set out in Table 11.

As the table shows, concessive correlatives are more common in the translations, especially Mahmoud's, than the non-translations. A closer look at the correlative use of the concessive conjunction *إلا أن* (however) in Mahmoud's translations and non-translations reveals another interesting pattern; as shown in Table 12, it co-occurs with a weaker conditional concessive in approximately 74% of its correlative instances in Mahmoud's non-translations, as opposed to 44% in his translations. By contrast, *إلا أن* occurs in combination with a strong concessive (*على الرغم من أن* notwithstanding that), where it is even more redundant, in 43% of its correlative instances in Mahmoud's translations as opposed to 15% in his non-translations.

Similarly, other reinforcement elements seem to be considerably more frequent in the translated corpus. Among these is the frequent use of an emphatic modal Adjunct denoting certainty, such as the prepositional phrase *بغير شك* (without a doubt). An analysis of the concordance output of the keyword *شك* (doubt) in negative constructions denoting a modality of high probability reveals that these emphatic modal constructions are indeed more frequent in the translated texts as shown in Table 13.

In fact, a closer analysis of the concordance output for such constructions reveals that 'explicitly objective' modal constructions denoting certainty (in the sense of Halliday and Matthiessen (2014: 679) seem to be much more common in the translated than the non-translated corpus as illustrated by Table 13.

Almost all the explicitly objective constructions listed in Table 6-13 involve an embedded expansion or rank-shifting, where the modalized proposition is realized as an embedded clause separated from the modality, the latter being 'propositionalized' and thereby thrown into relief, hence the rein-

Table 8. Relative Proportions of Hypotactic and Paratactic Concessive Conjunctions in English Source Texts, Arabic Target Texts and Arabic Non-Translated Texts

	ST1B	TT1H	NTH	ST2R	TT2M	NTM
Text Size	128,884	117,122	136,853	120,038	117,854	222,009
Tokens	1434	1157	814	1331	1374	1782
%	1.11%	0.99%	0.59%	1.11%	1.17%	0.80%
Hypo	26.01%	22.56%	22.11%	22.24%	31.22%	41.25%
Para	73.99%	77.44%	77.89%	77.76%	67.78%	58.75%

Table 9. Arabic Equivalents of *But* in a Random Sample from the Concordance of *But* in Abu Hadid's Translation (TT1H)

Conjunctive		Taxis	Total	% per sample size
Concessive	لكن (but)	Para	69	46
	على أن (however)	Para	10	6.67
	غير أن (however)	Para	11	7.33
	مع ذلك (with (in spite of) that)	Para	2	1.33
Total			92	61.33
Non-concessive	و (and)	Para	39	26
	و/أما (and/as for...)	Para	4	2.67
	ثم (then)	Para	4	2.67
	بل (rather)	Para	4	2.67
	ف (for)	Para	3	2
	و/بعد (and/then)	Para	2	1.33
	none	Para	2	1.33
Total			58	38.67

forcement. Thus, 'X will certainly happen' ['(it is) certain that X will happen'. Note that this embedded expansion relies on the use of the binder or complementizer أن (that), which is heavily involved in an overall tendency towards 'clausalization' (Fattah 2018).

Similar explicitly objective constructions involving an embedded expansion seem to be markedly more common in the translated texts. Just like the above modal realizations, such explicitly objective constructions have one thing in common: they all involve the writer explicitly expressing his judgement or assessment of an assertion in the form of a 'substantive proposition' (Halliday and Matthiessen 2014: 679), e.g. من السهل أن (it is easy that), من الممكن أن (it is possible that), من المتوقع أن (it is expected that), من العدل أن (it is fair that), من الواضح أن (it is clear that), etc. Thus, they generally take the form of a relational clause with the Attribute being realized by a prepositional phrase and the Carrier by an embedded clause introduced by the complementizer أن (that): Attribute [من (of) + definite verbal noun/adjective] + Carrier [أن (that) + clause]; for example:

(1a) English ST2R: Presumably he is thinking of such things as numbers.

(1b) Arabic TT2M:

ومن الجائز أنه يقصد بذلك أشياء كالأعداد مثلاً

(1c) English back-translation: (of the possible) [(that he) means by that things like numbers for example].

Here, it would have been equally possible for the trans-

lator to opt for a less pronounced, i.e. implicit, realization of the objective modality, as in the ST, by using such variants as قد يقصد (he may mean), ربما يقصد (perhaps he means) or expressing the modality as a process يجوز (maybe).

Another possible manifestation of reinforcement is the seemingly optional use of the foregrounding construction أم (as for)...ف (then) as a thematic device for enhancing the prominence, markedness or contrast of the Theme. As Table 15 shows, the conjunction أم is twice as frequent in TT1H as it is in NTH, and one and a half times more frequent in TT2M than NTM.

Another form of reinforcement exhibited in the comparable corpus is the more frequent use of intensifiers such as the pre-modifier اللهم used to reinforce the subtractive or exceptive sense of the particle إلا in اللهم إلا (which may be rendered 'only except/unless' or 'except/unless indeed'), thus denoting that 'the exception is something very rare' (Lane 1863/1984: 83). Similarly, intensification could take the form of a Cognate (Absolute) Accusative nominal group introduced by the determiner كل or تمام ('all' used as an emphazier as in 'all confused', or 'full') and functioning as a Qualifier or circumstantial Adjunct of Degree, e.g. يختلف كل الاختلاف (different all the difference); يعتمد (relies all the reliance); صريحاً كل الصراحة (frank all the frankness). As Table 16 reveals, these two types of intensifiers are markedly more frequent in the translated texts than their respective non-translations.

Table 10. Arabic Equivalents of *But* in A Random Sample from the Concordance of *But* in Mahmoud's Translation (TT2M)

Conjunctive		Taxis	Total	% per sample size
Concessive	لكن (but)	Para	96	64
	غير أن (however)	Para	9	6
	إلا إن (except that)	Para	6	4
	على أن (however)	Para	4	2.67
	ومع ذلك	Para	1	0.67
	على الرغم من أن	Hypo	1	0.67
	فلنن	Hypo	1	0.67
Total			118	78.67
Non-Concessive	أما (and/as for...)	Para	10	6.67
	بل (rather)	Para	9	6
	و (and)	Para	6	4
	لأن	Hypo	2	1.33
	none	Para	2	1.33
	لولا	Hypo	1	0.67
	إنما	Para	1	0.67
فـ	Para	1	0.67	
Total			32	21.33

Table 11. Concessive Correlative Conjunctions in the Comparable Corpus

Concessive correlative conjunctions	TT1H 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	TT2M 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
على كل/أي حال (...in any event)	5	4	3	4
مع ذلك (...with (in spite of) that)	20	21	14	24
حقاً/صحيح، ولكن (True...but)	15	4		
إلا أن (...however)	1		58	46
نعم (yes...)			52	33
إلى جانب ذلك (...side by side with that (at the same time))	-	-	5	-
Total	41	29	132	107
Total (without repetition)	40	29	132	106
% size	0.03	0.02	0.11	0.05

Table 12. Correlative Instances of إلا أن in Mahmoud's Translations (TTM) and Non-Translations (NTM)

Correlative instances of إلا أن	TT2M 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
على الرغم من أن...إلا أن (notwithstanding that...yet)	28	7
نعم...إلا أن (yes...yet)	2	1
بينما...إلا أن (while...yet)	1	
ولئن...إلا أن (and if...yet)	21	2
وإن...إلا أن (and if...yet)	4	32
إذا...إلا أن (if...yet)	1	
ولو...إلا أن (and if...yet)	-	
مع (with) + nominalization	-	1
على الرغم من/رغم (in spite of/notwithstanding) + nominalisation	1	3
على الرغم مما		
Total	58 (0.05%)	46 (0.02%)

It is arguably yet another manifestation of reinforcement that the assertive or emphatic use of the aspectual-modal particle *قد*, with or without the proclitic conjunctions *و* (and) and *ف* (then; therefore; so; that is), or the emphatic proclitic *لـ*, is drawn upon much more heavily in the translated than the non-translated texts, as clearly illustrated by Table 17. It would be beyond the scope of this study to examine in any depth the vexed question of the functions and uses of this seemingly aspectual-modal marker in Modern Standard Arabic⁴. For the purpose of this study, we will assume without further discussion that, when used in con-

junction with a verb in the past (perfect) tense, the verbal particle *قد* has an assertive or emphatic function (cf. Baker, 1992: 135) confirming or stressing the occurrence of the process denoted by the verb⁵. We will also assume, quite plausibly, that the marker *لقد* is even more emphatic than *قد* by virtue of the additional emphatic proclitic *لـ*.

It is obvious from Table 17 that the particle *قد/لقد*, when used in conjunction with a past (perfect) verb, is twice as common in the translated texts as it is in the respective non-translations written by the same translators. As the table also shows, the overall frequency of these particles exhib-

Table 13. Modal Constructions Involving the Node شك (Doubt) in the Comparable Corpus

Modal constructions involving the node شك (doubt)	TTH 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	TT2M 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
negative + كَش (doubt), e.g. لا شك في (no doubt in); لا شك أن ((there is) no doubt that); بلا شك (with no doubt); من غير شك (without a doubt); شك (without a doubt); بغير شك (without a doubt); لم يكن شك (there was not...doubt); ليس شك (there is not...doubt).	134	39	63	30

Table 14. 'Explicitly Objective' Modal Constructions Denoting Certainty in The Comparable Corpus

Explicitly objective' modal constructions denoting certainty	TTH 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	TT2M 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
لا شك ³ o doubtn	94	16	43	17
الحق أن (the fact (is) that)	20	11	4	12
الثابت أن (the proven (fact is) that)	6	1	-	-
المؤكد أن (the certain (fact is) that)	4		2	-
المحقق أن (the established (fact is) that)	4	1	-	-
الواقع أن (the fact (is) that)	-	2	9	-
Total	128	31	58	29
% size	0.11	0.02	0.05	0.01

Table 15. Frequency and Distributions of the Conjunction أما in the Comparable Corpus

	TTH 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	TT2M 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
أما (as for)	31	21	208	209
فأما (so as for)	7	7	7	12
وأما (and as for)	130	71	78	193
Total	168	99	293	414
% size	0.14	0.07	0.25	0.18

Table 16. Frequency of Some Intensifiers in the Comparable Corpus

	TTH 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	TT2M 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
إلا اللهم (only except/unless)	13	1	15	5
% size	0.011	0.0007	0.013	0.002
كل/تمام (all) + verbal noun	37	9	42	17
% size	0.032	0.007	0.036	0.008
جداً (very)	6	4	81	60
% size	0.005	0.003	0.069	0.027

its an author-specific variation, where they are considerably more frequent in Abu Hadid than Mahmoud's texts. However, what is interesting here is the strong tendency exhibited by the translated texts to use such assertive/emphatic particles. There is an even stronger tendency to use the more emphatic *لقد* in Mahmoud's translation, where it is approximately 3.3 times more common than it is in Mahmoud's non-translations.

By contrast, this distinctive pattern of predominance of the assertive/emphatic *قد* in the translated texts is not exhibited in the case of modal *قد* used in conjunction with the present (imperfect) to denote possibility. In fact, the pattern is even reversed about Mahmoud's translation (TT2M) and his non-translations (NTM), where *قد* is almost six times as frequent in NTM, as illustrated in Table 18.

In addition to the above reinforcement features discussed above, comparable corpus analysis furnishes other interesting contrasts between the translated and non-translated texts involving 'text reference', which is discussed next.

TEXT REFERENCE

As noted earlier, text reference, in the sense of Martin (1992: 139)⁶, seems to be frequently involved in some explicating shifts observed in the translated texts, notably paratactic shifts, upgrading and reinforcement (see Fattah 2016 and 2018). In the context of concessive conjunctives, for example, the use of the demonstrative *لكلذ* (that) as text reference item in a paratactic conjunctive group has been found to be more frequent in translated than non-translated texts (Table 6). The common thread that seems to be running through such explicating instances involving the de-

ployment of text reference is that a demonstrative reference item (commonly *لكلذ* (that)) is deployed in the repackaging or expansion of a clause into a clause complex or in transforming a hypotactic clause complex into a looser paratactic one. This paratactic transformation may take the following form for example:

X لأن (because) Y → X و (and) Z [لكلذ (that) لأن (because) Y]

Thus, the demonstrative pronoun *لكلذ* (that) is used to contract or encapsulate an entire clause (X) (or a part thereof) into a participant (or a part thereof) in another relational clause (Z), with the paratactic additive *و* (and) being used to connect the two clauses. Similarly, a clause with multiple circumstantial elements may have one of them shifted or expanded into an additional conjoined (usually relational) clause where the matrix clause (or its process) is contracted into a text reference item in order to enable this kind of expansion, as in the following example: *he kissed his wife too lovingly in the day time, and before his daughter* → *he kissed his wife too lovingly لكلذ (and that) was in the day time and before his daughter*.

This expansive use of text reference is by no means confined to causal relations. Here is another example involving an implicit concessive logico-semantic relation, which was made explicit in the translation by dint of text reference:

(2a) English ST2R: ||| It is also on record ||| that the trade of Tinnîs with Irak alone amounted to between 20,000 and 30,000 dinârs yearly ||| before it was crushed by vexatious tariffs. |||

(2b) Arabic TT2M:

وقد ورد في الأخبار كذلك أن تجارة (تتيسر) مع العراق وحده بلغت من عشرين ألف دينار إلى ثلاثين ألفاً في السنة الواحدة، ولكن ذلك كان قبل أن تقضي عليها الضرائب الفادحة.

Table 17. Frequency and Distribution of *قد* and *لقد* With the Past (Perfect) Tense in the Comparable Corpus

	TTH 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	TT2M 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
قد	643	276	479	568
وقد	616	389	167	93
فقد	260	178	221	144
Total قد	1519	843	867	805
% size	1.30%	0.62%	0.74%	0.36%
لقد	58	70	70	44
ولقد	31	18	44	14
فلقد	2	10	6	7
Total لقد	91	98	120	65
% size	0.08	0.07	0.10	0.03
Total قد + لقد	1610	941	987	870
% size	1.38	0.69	0.84	0.39

Table 18. Frequency and Distribution of *قد* in Association with the Present (Imperfect) Tense in the Comparable Corpus

	TTH 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	T2TM 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
قد/وقد/فقد	59	44	38	371
% size	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.17

(2c) English back-translation: || It is also reported || that the trade of Tinnis with Irak alone amounted to between 20,000 and 30,000 dinârs yearly, || ولكن ذلك (but that) was before heavy tariffs crushed it. ||

Note how the implicit concessive relation in (2a) is made explicit in the translation (2b), where a projected hypotactic clause complex is converted into a paratactic one mediated by the conjunction ولكن (but), with the *before*-clause being construed as an Attribute in a circumstantial relational clause, where the Carrier is realized as an anaphoric text reference item, i.e.

X before Y ($\alpha \wedge \beta$) → X ولكن (but) Z [ذلك (that)_x] was before Y ($1 \wedge 2$)

Interestingly, an analysis of the concordance lines for ذلك (and that), used as a demonstrative pronoun (i.e. Head rather than a Modifier in a nominal group), reveals that it is indeed more common in the translated than the non-translated texts, especially in the case of Abu Hadid, as shown in Table 19.

It would also seem that the translated texts in general, but Abu Hadid's in particular, exhibit an overall propensity for text reference, which is most commonly realized in Arabic by the singular demonstrative ذلك (that) and هذا (this). In fact, phoric elements in general turn out to be remarkably more frequent in Abu Hadid's translation than his non-translated texts, while the reverse is true in the case of Mahmoud's translations and non-translations, as shown in Table 20, which sets out the frequency and distribution of the main reference expressions in the comparable corpus. However, the overall frequency of the demonstrative ذلك/ذلك ('that' whether on its own or prefixed by the proclitic conjunctions و or ف) seems to be consistently higher in Abu Hadid's translation (1.53%) and Mahmoud's translations (0.81%) than Abu Hadid's non-translations (0.83%) and Mahmoud's non-translations (0.61%) respectively. A possible explanation for this is the more frequent use of this demonstrative in-text reference as highlighted above.

The relatively high frequency of ذلك (that) in the translated texts may be partly attributable to the fact that it is arguably more explicit, and perhaps less ambiguous, than the other devices commonly used for text reference, namely the singular masculine demonstrative اذ (this) and the singular masculine pronominal clitic → (it).

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

In this paper, we conducted a quantitative and qualitative analysis of Arabic concessive conjunctives, as well as other potentially explicating features in our compiled corpus. The purpose of this investigation was to uncover any consistent or recurrent differences between the Arabic translated and non-translated texts in the corpus with regard to concessive conjunctions and clause combining patterns as

well as other potentially explicating features in the translated corpus.

The results of the comparable analysis suggest a more frequent use of concessive conjunctives in the translated than the non-translated texts, which is attributable to their higher frequency in the English texts compared with the Arabic texts belonging to more or less the same genre. A similar pattern of distribution of concessive conjunctives was observed in relation to the top five most frequent concessive markers in the comparable corpus, with the order of frequency maintained among the individual texts, i.e. NTH < TT1H and NTM < TT2M. This seems to suggest that Arabic texts have a lower propensity for concessive conjunction than their comparable English texts, at least as far as this kind of genre is concerned. This finding echoes Basil and Hatim's (1997, 111) observation that Arabic in general exhibits a preference for through-argumentation rather than counter-argumentation, which is primarily mediated by concessive conjunctives.

A significant qualitative difference was also noted in relation to the types of concessive conjunctives used in the translated texts compared with their corresponding non-translations. The translated texts seemed to exhibit a certain propensity for stronger concessive conjunctives as opposed to the weaker conditional concessives, which were found to be more common in the non-translations. A notable example of this tendency is the preference in one of the two target texts for the longer, and arguably stronger, conjunctive group على الرغم/بالرغم من أن (in spite of (the fact) that...) instead of the shorter مع أن (with that...), which is more common in the non-translations. In so far as this difference could not be consistently attributed to the respective source texts, it could be suggestive of an explicating tendency manifesting itself as an exaggeration of the concessive logical relation between clauses.

The analysis of the comparable corpus also seems to confirm an apparent preference for or shift in the direction of parataxis, although this paratactic tendency is not uniformly exhibited by the two translated texts. The comparable analysis revealed that the frequency of paratactic concessives is much higher in TT1H (0.77%) and TT2M (0.80%) than NTH (0.46%) and NTM (0.49%) respectively. Moreover, the paratactic gap between TT2M and NTM, as well as between TT1H and NTH, (0.31% in both cases) is much larger than the hypotactic gap (0.02% and 0.09% respectively). The relative proportions of hypotactic and paratactic concessive conjunctives also seem to suggest such a paratactic tendency in the translated texts, though this could be partly attributed to the corresponding proportions in the source texts.

The comparable analysis also revealed a reinforcement tendency, especially in Mahmoud's translation (TT2M), which could be regarded as a form of emphatic explicita-

Table 19. The Frequency and Distribution of ذلك (And That) in the Comparable Corpus

	TTH 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	TT2M 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
ذلك (and that)	118	70	57	66
% size	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.03

Table 20. Frequency and Distribution of the Main Reference Expressions in the Comparable Corpus

ms = masculine singular; fs = feminine singular; md = masculine dual; fd = feminine dual	TTH 117,122 words	NTH 136,853 words	TT2 117,854 words	NTM 222,009 words
هذا (and/so ⁷ this (ms))	640	420	782	1907
لهذا (and/so for-this (ms))	45	43	53	78
بهذا (and/so with-this (ms))	17	19	72	178
هذه (and/so this (fs))	312	533	582	1530
لهذه (for-this (fs))	5	21	35	66
بهذه (and/so with-this (fs))	6	17	39	87
هذان (and/so these (md))	6	5	5	14
هاتان (these (fd))		4	1	7
هؤلاء (and/so these)	65	111	103	145
لهؤلاء (for- (to) these)	2	4	9	7
أولئك (and/so those)	6	4	65	14
لأولئك (for those)			4	
ذلك (and/for/that (ms))	34	21	32	92
ذلك (and/so that (ms))	1791	1132	949	1357
	1.53%	0.83%	0.81%	0.61
بذلك (and with-that (ms))	80	78	44	148
لذلك (and/so for-that (ms))	42	30	61	146
ولذا (and/for-that)			38	
بتلك (and/so that (fs))	309	355	178	567
بتلك (with-that (fs))	16	12	5	18
ولتلك (and for-that (fs))	7	16	9	22
Total	3391	2904	3,066	6391
% size	2.90	2.12	2.60	2.87

tion (Fattah, 2016). This involved the addition of a semantic component of emphasis, foregrounding or exclusiveness in the translated text. Reinforcement features uncovered in the translated corpus included the more frequent use of double or triple concessive correlatives and ‘explicitly objective’ modal constructions, especially those denoting high probability. Such constructions, which were found to be nearly four times as common in the translations as they are in the non-translations, involve embedded expansion or rank-shifting through the use of the binder or complementiser أن (that), which is heavily involved in an overall tendency towards ‘clausalization’ (Fattah, 2016 and 2018).

Other manifestations of reinforcement emerging from the comparable analysis include the higher frequency of the foregrounding construction أما...فـ (then) in the translations, especially Abu Hadid’s, which can arguably be a possible form of textual explicitation manifesting itself as an exaggerated thematization tendency. Some intensifiers, such as the exceptive pre-modifier اللهم and the emphatic determiner كل, were also found to occur more frequently in the translations. Another notable manifestation of reinforcement observed in the comparable analysis is the substantially more frequent use in the translations of the assertive or emphatic aspectual-modal particle قد, with or without the proclitic conjunctions و (and) and فـ (then; therefore; so; that

is), or the emphatic proclitic لا, when used in conjunction with a verb in the past (perfect) tense. It was also observed that the distinctive pattern of predominance of the assertive/emphatic قد in the translated texts is not exhibited in the case of modal قد used with a verb in the present (imperfect) tense to denote possibility.

Finally, the comparable analysis demonstrated the heavier use of the text reference expression ذلك (that) in various combinations in the translated texts, which was frequently associated with explicating shifts in parallel corpus analysis (see for example Fattah, 2018), notably paratactic shifts, upgrading and reinforcement. Thus, the analysis of the concordance output for the demonstrative pronoun وذلك (and that) revealed a higher frequency in the translated than the non-translated texts, especially Abu Hadid’s, which seems to suggest that upgrading and paratactic shifts are considerably more common in Abu Hadid’s translation than Mahmoud’s. In fact, the comparable analysis also showed that the overall frequency of the demonstrative ذلك/فـ/ذلك is consistently higher in the translated corpus. This could be attributable to the more frequent use of this demonstrative in-text reference.

While some of the above findings seem to resonate with those of similar studies in other language pairs (see for example Fabricius-Hansen 1996; Steiner 2008; Hansen-Schirra et al 2012), the conjunctive and structural patterns emerging

from this study are worthy of further investigation involving other types of conjunctions, genres and language pairs to see if, and to what extent, they are indicative of universalist tendencies in translation. Such investigations will also have interesting implications for diachronic studies of language contact and change.

ENDNOTE

- 1 English glosses provided for grammatical items are intended to be their nearest equivalents, but they frequently fail to reflect the full range of their grammatical functionality. A few were left without any gloss since their meanings are context bound.
- 2 The literal or congruent sense of the preposition مع is basically one of physical accompaniment or temporal co-presence or concurrence. By metaphorical extension, very much akin to the conditional or concessive use of English *and* or Arabic و, or perhaps the concessive sense of the English expressions *at the same time* or *all the same*, the meaning of مع has spread into the notions of concessiveness or contrast by juxtaposition, copresence or co-occurrence. Thus, the use of the stronger and more congruent concessive conjunctive على الرغم/بالرغم من أن (notwithstanding/in spite of (the fact) that...) may also be regarded as a move from the metaphorical to the congruent, i.e. demetaphorization.
- 3 In all these instances the 'objective' modality is explicitly stated as a participant in a relational clause with the other participant being realized by an embedded clause introduced by the binder أن 'anna.
- 4 There seems to be a paucity of empirical studies on the aspectual and modal functions of دق in MSA. A rare exception is Bahloul (2008), who, on the basis of a wide range of empirical data from MSA, discusses the frequency and distributional properties of دق.
- 5 For the assertive/emphatic function of دق, see Al-Ghalayini, (1912/1985), Hasan (1987), Dahl and Talmoudi (1979), Hassan (1990), Holes (1995) and Ryding (2005). For a traditional grammatical account of the use of دق in Classical Arabic, see Ibn-Hisham (1359/1969).
- 6 This covers Halliday and Hasan's (1976) extended reference (to text as act) and text reference (to text as projection).

REFERENCES

- Abu Hadid, M. F. (1927/2002). صلاح الدين وعصره (Saladin and His Epoch). Maktabat al-Ussrah, The General Egyptian Book Organization.
- Abu Hadid, M. F. (1937/1997). السيد عمر مكرم: زعيم مصر الأول (Omar Makram, Egypt's First Leader). Dar al-Hilal.
- Abu Hadid, M. F. (1941/1996). فتح العرب لمصر [Arab Conquest of Egypt] (2nd ed.). Cairo: Madbouli; translation of *Arab Conquest of Egypt* by Alfred J Butler. Oxford University Press.
- Abu Hadid, M. F. (1961). أمتنا العربية (Our Arab Nation). Dar al-Ma'arif.
- Aijmer, K. & Lewis, D. (2017). *Contrastive Analysis of Discourse-pragmatic Aspects of Linguistic Genres*. Springer International Publishing.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (1996). Corpusbased Translation Studies: the challenges that lie ahead. In Somers, H. (ed.): *Terminology, LSP and Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Baker, M. (2004). A corpus-based view of similarity and difference in translation. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9/2: 167-193.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). 'Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation' in House, J. and S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies* (pp. 17-35). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Braithwaite, L. (1995). Lexicalisation and syntacticisation of the verb *piacere*: A longitudinal study of the interlanguage of learners of Italian as a foreign language. *Tuttitalia* 13, 27-38.
- Butler, A. J. (1902/1978). *The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the Last Thirty Years of the Roman Dominion*. Oxford University Press.
- Doherty, M. (2002). *Language Processing in Discourse. A Key to Felicitous Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Durant, W. (1963). *The Story of Civilization: Our Oriental Heritage* (Vol. 1). New York: MJF Books.
- Fabricius-Hansen, C. (1996). Informational density: a problem for translation and translation theory. *Linguistics* 34(3), 521-565.
- Fabricius-Hansen, C. & Ramm, W. (2008). Subordination and coordination from different perspectives. In Fabricius-Hansen and Ramm 'Subordination' versus 'Coordination' in *Sentence and Text: A cross-linguistic perspective* (pp. 1-30). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fattah, A. (2010). *A Corpus-Based Study of Conjunctive Explicitation In Arabic Translated and Non-Translated Texts Written by The Same Translators/Authors* (PhD thesis). University of Manchester.
- Fattah, A. (2016). An explicitation 'syndrome': a corpus-based investigation of explicating shifts in the translation of the concessive conjunction 'although/though', *Arab World English Journal* 7(2), 195-215.
- Fattah, A. (2018). 'Explicating structural shifts in English-Arabic translation: a corpus-based study of causal conjunctives 'because' and 'li'anna', *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies* 2(1), 39-59.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London and New York: Longman
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (1999). *Constructing Experience Through Meaning: A Language-based Approach to Cognition*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London and New York: Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar (4th ed.)*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hansen-Schirra, S. et al. (2012). *Cross-Linguistic Corpora for The Study of Translations: Insights from The Language Pair English German*. de Gruyter.

- Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kitis, E. (2004). Conditional Constructions as Rhetorical Structures. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 30-51.
- Klaudy, K. (1996). 'Back-Translation as a Tool for Detecting Explication Strategies in Translation' in Klaudy, Lambert and Sohar (Eds.), *Translation Studies in Hungary* (pp. 99-114). Budapest: Scholastica.
- Mahmoud, Z. N. (1952/1967). تاريخ الفلسفة الغربية (الكتاب الأول: الفلسفة القديمة) [History of Western Philosophy, Book One: Ancient Philosophy], Cairo: Matba'at Lagnat al-Ta'lif wa al-Targamah wa al-Nashr; translation of Russell, B. (1946). *History of Western Philosophy*.
- Mahmoud, Z. N. (1958/1980). نحو فلسفة علمية (Towards a Philosophy of Science). Cairo: Al-Anglo.
- Mahmoud, Z. N. (1956/1987). حياة الفكر والعالم الجديد (Intellectual Life in the New World). Cairo: Dar el-Shorouk.
- Mahmoud, Z. N. (1953/1987). موقف من الميتافيزيقا (A Stance on Metaphysics). Cairo: Dar el-Shorouk
- Martin, J.R. (1992). *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Olohan, M. & Baker, M. (2000). Reporting that in translated English: evidence for subconscious processes of explication?. *Across Languages and Cultures* 1(2), 141-158.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Russell, B. (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. (2008). Explication – towards an Empirical and Corpus-based Methodology. In Webster, J. (ed.). *Meaning in Context: Implementing Intelligent Applications of Language Studies*. London: Continuum.
- Teich, E. (2013). Choices in analysing choice: Methods and techniques for register analysis. In Fontaine, L. and G. O'Grady (Eds) *Systemic Functional Linguistics: Exploring Choice*. Cambridge University Press, 417-431.
- Vanderauwera, I. (1985). *Dutch Novels Translated into English: The Transformation of a 'Minority' Literature*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.