Explicitating Structural Shifts in English-Arabic Translation: A Corpus-based Study of the Causal Conjunctives *Because* and *li'anna*

Ashraf Abdel Fattah

Translation & Interpreting Institute (TII)
College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Hamad bin Khalifa University, Doha, Qatar

Abstract:

This study seeks to contribute to addressing a gap in theory-driven corpus-based research focused on explicitating tendencies in Arabic translated texts. It provides a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the translation of the English causal conjunction *because* and the use of the corresponding Arabic conjunction *li'anna*. Adopting a Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)-based approach, the author analyses bilingual concordance output for the English hypotactic conjunction *because*, highlighting some interesting patterns of explicitating and upgrading shifts, which for the most part do not seem to be dictated by contrastive linguistic requirements. The study also examines the concordance output of the Arabic causal hypotactic conjunction *li'anna* contrasting it with the corresponding conjunction or construction in the source text. Like a previous study of bilingual concordance output for the English hypotactic conjunction *although/though* (Fattah, 2016), the present study analyses all conjunctive shifts involving the causal conjunctions *because* and *li'anna*, assessing whether, and to what extent, those shifts represent patterns of structural explicitation, which are not attributable to the translator's style, source language/text, or target language requirements.

Keywords: Arabic, corpus, explicitation, SFL, translation, upgrading

1. Introduction: Explicitation as a translation-specific feature

The concept of explicitation has been the focus of extensive research in translation studies. It has been posited as one of the linguistic features that distinguish translated from non-translated texts. The assumption is that those features, which are distinctive of translated text per se, are not engendered by the source or target language systems. Baker (1996, p. 176) describes explicitation as an overall 'tendency to spell things out in translation', which is born of a 'subconscious' or 'subliminal' strategy to make things more explicit in translation. Among the manifestations of explicitation highlighted in the literature are various lexicogrammatical features observed in a variety of language pairs, e.g. a higher frequency of conjunctions, causal adverbs and explanatory vocabulary in translated texts in general compared to non-translated texts in the same language.

Most approaches encountered in the literature so far have been of the taxonomic variety, with various levels of differentiation among the different categories proposed (see for example Klaudy, 1996 and Blum-Kulka, 1986). None of these studies is couched in a linguistic theory that allows adequate theory-driven operationalizations of the features involved. This study, however, belongs to a different approach, which is informed by systemic functional theory (see Fattah, 2010; 2016). As used here, term explicitation will typically entail the lexicogrammatical realization in the Target Text (TT) of some semantic 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.

Grammatical manifestations of explicitation could arguably take the form of specifying or enhancing the conjunctive cohesiveness of the TT, or unpacking complex syntactic constructions or grammatical de-metaphorization in the TT in the sense of Steiner (2004; 2018), which is a specific kind of 'unpacking' of grammatical metaphors often resulting in lengthening target texts or reducing their density.[1] Thus, explicitation could manifest itself at any point along the lexicogrammatical cline, with lexical features tending to be closer to the level of consciousness than grammatical ones, which are more subtle and perhaps more commonly obligatory (Fattah, 2017). Grammatical explicitation can be regarded as a re-mapping of the semantics onto the lexicogrammar of the target language. Such structural shifts could take place along the two systemic functional dimensions of rank and metafunction, with the result of expanding condensed passages and reducing informational density (Steiner, 2008; Fabricius-Hansen, 1996; Doherty, 2002; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

In this study, the terms 'conjunctive marker/expression' or simply 'conjunctive' is used a collective term referring to both 'conjunctions' and 'conjunctive Adjuncts', in the systemic functional sense. Any device serving a conjunctive relation obtaining between segments of text, irrespective of their lengths or grammatical realizations, will be regarded as a conjunctive marker. Thus, the causal prepositional construction *li'anna* will be treated here as a conjunctive marker, or conjunctive for short, even though it is simply analysed in traditional Arabic grammar as a prepositional particle followed by a nominal clause.

2. The Data

The bilingual purpose-built parallel corpus on which this study is based is 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 translations (TT1H) was produced

by the Egyptian literary writer, novelist and educationalist, Muhammad Farid Abu Hadid (1893-1967) and the other (TT2M) by the 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) *The Arab Conquest Of Egypt And The Last Thirty Years Of The Roman Dominion*, 2nd Edition, Oxford: OUP (**128,884** words) **(ST1B)**	Abu Hadid, Muhammad Farid (1893-1967)	*Fath al-Arab li Misr* (Arab Conquest of Egypt) (1941, repr. 1996), 2nd Edition, Cairo: Madbouli (**117,122 words**) **(TT1H)**
Russell, B. (1946/1995), History of Western Philosophy, Book One: Ancient Philosophy, London: Routledge. (**120,038** words) **(ST2R)** Total ST: **248,922** words)	Mahmoud, Zaki Naguib (1905-1993)	*Tarikh al-Falsafah al-Gharbiyah (al-kitab al-awwal: al-falsafah al-qadimah* (History of Western Philosophy, Book One: Ancient Philosophy), (1952/1967) Cairo: Matbaʻat Lagnat al-Taʼlif wa al-Targamah wa al-Nashr (**117,854** words) **(TT2M)** Total TT: **234,976** words)

In the following sections, the analysis will focus on the English causal conjunctive *because*, followed by the Arabic causal conjunctive *li'anna,* whose concordance lines in the corpus will be examined closely to see if there are any significant patterns of shifts indicative of conjunctive explicitation or upgrading in the sense adopted in this study.

3. English Causal Conjunctives
3.1 Overall Statistics
The overall frequency and distribution of the identified English causal conjunctive markers across the two source texts (ST1B & ST2R) are set out in Table 2. The list of conjunctive markers is derived from Halliday & Mathiessen (2004), Halliday & Hasan (1976), Martin (1992) and Quirk *et al* (1985). The figures listed have been arrived at after examining 'raw' concordance lines for every conjunctive marker and eliminating occurrences interpreted to be non-conjunctive or non-causal in the case of multivalent conjunctives (e.g. *since, as, then, thus*) as well as occurrences in original Arabic quotations in the case of ST1B.

Table 2. *Overall Frequency & Distribution of English Causal Conjunctives in the Corpus*

Conjunctive	ST1B (128,884 words)	ST2R (120,038 words)	TOTAL
accordingly	32	18	50
as	39	22	61
as such		3	3
because	49	128	177
consequently	18	7	25
considering		3	3
due to the fact that	2		2
for	115	128	243
for + ving (for fear of +ving)	13	21	34
for the/this purpose/reason	6	12	18
hence	15	7	22
in consequence	2	2	4
in order that		5	5
in order to	11	17	28
in so far as		8	8
in such a way as to		1	1
in the hope of + ving		1	1
inasmuch as	5		5
lest	3	1	4
seeing that			
since	12	105	117
so	65	24	89
so as to	7	6	13
so long as	2	10	12
so that	49	9	58
then	50	35	85
thereby		4	4
therefore	91	155	246
through + ving	1	3	4
thus	44	65	109
to (purposive)	204	84	288
with a view to +ving		1	1
with the result that			
TOTAL	835	885	1720
Percentage/total word count	0.65%	0.74%	0.69%

Given the argumentative expository genre of ST2R, it is hardly surprising that it displays a higher overall frequency of causal conjunctive markers relative to its overall size in terms of word count. As Table 2 also shows, ST2R also exhibits a wider variety of causal conjunctives (as reflected in the fewer blank cells in the ST2R column) as well as heavier reliance on non-purposive conjunctives, whether those denoting Cause (e.g. *because*; *since*) or Effect (e.g. *therefore*; *thus*). Unlike ST2R, ST1B seems to favour purposive conjunctives (e.g. *to*; *so that*), which may be attributable to historians' tendency to speculate about the purposes behind actions. A glance at

Table 2 also reveals that the most frequently occurring causal conjunctives in the English corpus are: (purposive) *to* (288), *for* (243), *therefore* (246), *because* (177) and *since* (117).

In the following section, the concordance lines of the causal conjunctive *because* will be analysed. Apart from its high frequency, this conjunctive has the extra advantage of being a straightforward monovalent causal marker. Thus, unlike such conjunctions as *since*, *as* or *to*, *because* does not require the analyst to decide, when sorting concordance output, which logico-semantic relation it marks among possible types, especially in cases of overlap or indeterminacy, which will obviously influence the outcome of the analysis.

3.2 *Because*

A total of 171 relevant instances of the hypotactic causal conjunction *because* were extracted by the concordancer from both English texts. As Table 3 shows, ST2R uses this conjunction much more heavily than ST1B (75% compared to 25% for ST1B).

Table 3. *Arabic equivalents of because in the translated corpus*

Arabic equivalents of *because*	ST1B/TT1H	ST2R/TT2M
لأَنَّ *li-'anna*	17	93
و/ذلك لأَنَّ *wa- ðālika li-'anna* (and that is because)	4	8
سبب/مرجع/علة...أَنَّ *sabab/marji'/'illat...'anna* (the cause/reason...that)	-	6
فـ *fa-* (for)	9	2
إذ *'ið* (for/because)	6	4
other	7	15
Total Tokens	43	128

An analysis of the concordances reveals that 157 (i.e. 92%) of these instances are hypotactic clause nexuses with progressive sequence (α ^ β) (Halliday, 1965/1981), i.e. X because Y, while the regressive sequence (β ^ α), i.e. because Y, X, is found only in 3 instances (Table 4). In addition to these two sequences, there are 7 instances (all in ST2R) where the *because*-clause is construed as an Attribute in a circumstantial relational clause, with the Carrier realized as a reference item used for anaphoric text reference, e.g. *…but that is because we use this adjective in a narrower sense…* (ST2R).

Table 4. *Grammatical environments for because*

	α ^ β	β ^ α	α <<β>>	α missing	Relational Clause	TOTAL
ST1B	41	2	-	-	-	43 (25%)
ST2R	116	1	-	4	7	128 (75%)

Turning now to the Arabic equivalents chosen by the translators for all the identified instances of *because*, a glance at Table 3 above reveals that the most frequent Arabic conjunctive

used as an equivalent for *because* in both translated texts is the Arabic hypotactic conjunctive لأن *li-'anna* (40% and 73% in TT1H and TT2M, respectively), which is the natural systemic equivalent provided by common English-Arabic dictionaries for the progressive sequence. But the table also shows that the translators occasionally opted for other equivalents, which seem to denote some translation shifts. Since *li-'anna* seems to be an adequate candidate for *because* in the majority of cases, in both translated texts, an interesting question arises here as to the motivation behind such shifts and any particular patterning they may signify.

A. Explicitating Shifts
A closer examination of the concordances and their wider co-text does indeed reveal a number of patterns of potentially explicitating shifts, which in most cases do not seem to be dictated by any lexicogrammatical requirement:

I. Shifts in interdependency (taxis)
II. Reinforcement shifts
Table 5 provides a summary of the frequency and distribution of these shifts in the translated corpus.

Table 5 *Explicitating shifts in the Arabic translations of because*

	ST1B/TT1H	ST3R/TT3M
Hypotaxis to Parataxis by restructuring	6	11
Hypotaxis to Parataxis by conjunction	15	6
Reinforcement	1	10
Other explicitation shifts	-	1
Ignored tokens	6[2]	-
Total explicitation shifts	22	28
Tokens analysed	43	128
Percentage of shifts per tokens	51%	22%

Each of the above types of shift will now be examined and exemplified from the concordance lines.

I. Shifts in taxis
In this type of shift, a hypotactic causal clause complex of the type 'X because Y' is transformed into a 'looser' paratactic nexus or cohesive sequence, either through simply using a paratactic causal conjunctive (إذ *'ið* or فـ *fa-*) instead of the equivalent hypotactic *li-'anna* or restructuring the clause complex into a paratactic sequence with a secondary relational clause, typically introduced by the internal additive linker و *wa-* (and) and involving the use of anaphoric text reference to the primary clause. The information condensed in a hypotactic clause complex is thus 'repackaged' or 'redistributed' into two potentially independent clauses; for example:

(a) X because Y → X and Z[that$_x$ is because Y];
(b) X because Y → X and Z[the cause (of that$_x$) is Y];
(c) X because Y → X and Z[that$_x$ is attributable to Y]

In (a), (b) and (c), the primary clause (X) is first stated and then 'picked up' again in its entirety by means of a text reference item (that$_x$), which is either used as a participant in a circumstantial relational clause (Z), as in (a), or as a part of a nominalization or verbalization of the causal relator[3] in an identifying relational clause, as in (b) and (c), respectively. In all cases, the original *because*-clause is rendered as an embedded clause introduced by the structural binder أن *'anna* (that). Furthermore, this kind of rewording or 'repackaging' of information seems to throw the causal relation into relief by announcing it in a relational attributive or identifying clause. The use of a causal noun may also be thought of as an alternative resource for foregrounding, enumeration or assessment of the causal relation (cf. Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999; Coffin, 2004; and Achugar & Schleppegrell, 2005); thus, 'partly because' may become nominalised as 'one reason' and 'merely because' as 'the only reason'.

Example (1) from the parallel corpus illustrates a shift of the pattern (a) above[4]:

(1a) English ST1B: ||| I admit that John's text, <<as it stands>>, lends colour to this view, || because the short paragraph in which the invasion is mentioned is placed just before that recounting the death of Cyrus.|||

(1b) Arabic TT1H:

فإنا نسلم بأن نص عبارة كتاب حنا كما هي تساعد على الأخذ بهذا الرأي، وذلك لأن الفقرة القصيرة التي ذكرت فيها هذه الغزوة جاءت قبل ذكر موت قيرس مباشرة.

(1c) English back-translation: ||| We admit that the text of John's book, as it is, helps the adoption of this view, || *wa- ð«lika li-'anna* (and that is because) the short paragraph in which this invasion is mentioned came just before the mention of Cyrus |||

There does not seem to be any motivation or syntactic requirement for the construction *wa-ð«lika li-'anna* (and that is because), as can be attested by simply using *li-'anna*, thereby opting for the equally adequate hypotactic agnate.

In example (2), an assessed or evaluated causal relation (in the sense of Coffin, 2004: 274) is realized as a nominal group within a 'thematic equative' clause (Halliday, 1994):

(2a) English ST2R: ||| The Church won, || partly because it had almost a monopoly of education, || partly because the kings were perpetually at war with each other, || but mainly because, with very few exceptions, rulers and people alike profoundly believed that the Church possessed the power of the keys. |||

(2b) Arabic TT2M:

وإنما ظفرت الكنيسة بالنصر لأنها ـمن جهةـ كادت تحتكر التعليم ولأن الملوك ـمن جهة أخرىـ كانوا في حرب لا تنقطع بعضهم مع بعض؛ لكن العلة الرئيسية لنصر الكنيسة هي أن الحكام والشعب على السواء كانوا يعتقدون اعتقاداً راسخاً بأن الكنيسة في يدها مفاتيح السماء،...

(2c) English back-translation: ||| Rather, the Church gained victory || *li-'anna-h«* (because it) - on the one hand – almost monopolized education, || *wa- li-'anna* (and because) kings – on the other hand – were at war that does not end with each other; || but the main reason for the victory of the Church was that rulers and people alike profoundly believed that the Church possessed the power of the keys.

The structure of the entire clause complex in (2) can be represented as:

X partly because Y1, partly because Y2, but mainly because Y3 → X on the one hand because Y1, and on the other hand because Y2; but the main reason for X(nominalised) was Y3. Using the SFL notation of clause complexing, the shift in taxis can also be demonstrated as follows:

ST: α ^ (β1 ^ β2 ^ β3) → TT: 1(α ^ (β1 ^β2)) ^ 2

Note that the secondary clause in the paratactic sequence in the TT, which is the upgraded β3 in the ST, is an identifying clause forming a thematic equative 'the main reason (for α) = β3', with the dominant clause α in the ST reappearing as a nominalised qualifier in the causal nominal group. Thus, the shift in taxis is used as a resource for setting up this equation, where the causal relation is made to function as a participant in a relational clause, and where it can be thematised and evaluated ('the main reason'). However, this shift is by no means obligatory, as evidenced by the rendering of the previous *because*-clauses, β2 and β3.

Example (3) shows another instance of a shift in taxis but with the causal relation being realized this time through a prepositional Adjunct containing a text reference item, whose antecedent is the initiating clause:

(3a) English ST1B: ||| But because Makîn gives A.H. 69 as the year of his death, || Amélineau concludes that Isaac died Nov. 6, 688. |||
(3b) Arabic TT1H:
ولكن مكين يذكر في تاريخه أن تاريخ وفاة إسحق سنة 69 للهجرة <u>ومن ذلك يستخلص</u> أميلنو أن إسحق مات في 6 نوفمبر سنة 688.
(3c) English back-translation: ||| But Makîn mentions in his account that the year of Isaac's death was A.H. 69, || *wa min ð«lika* (and from that) concludes Amélineau that Isaac died on 6 November 688. |||

Here a hypotactic causal clause complex (β ^ α) is rendered as a paratactic nexus (1 ^ 2).

II. Reinforcement Shifts
All the instances grouped under this category are characterized by an observed tendency towards adding a semantic component of reinforcement, foregrounding or exclusiveness to the causal relator, which may be realized as a conjunction, participant or process. For instance, the causal relator may be realized as a noun (such as السبب *'as-sabab*, the cause) serving as the Thing of a nominal group, which is given thematic prominence as the Value in a thematic equative; consider example (4):

(4a) English ST2R: ||| We should not naturally say that it is the form that confers substantiality, || but that is because the atomic hypothesis is ingrained in our imagination. |||
(4b) Arabic TT2M:
إننا اليوم لا نقول – إلا بمعنى متكلف – بأن الصورة هي التي تخلع على الشيء شيئيته؛ <u>ولكن السبب في هذا هو</u> أن النظرية الذرية قد ضربت بجذورها فينا حتى استولت على خيالنا

(4c) English back-translation: ||| We today do not say – except in an affected sense – that it is the form that confers on the thing its thingness, || but *'as-sabab* (the cause) of this *huwa* (it) (is) that the atomic hypothesis is so ingrained in us that it has captured our imagination. |||

By means of such an equative construction, the nominalized causal relation becomes strongly thematized and foregrounded. Note how the senses of identity and exclusiveness conveyed by this structure (cf. Halliday, 1994) are reinforced or enhanced by the optional insertion of the independent pronoun هو *huwa* (it), which is functioning here like an 'equals sign'. Thus the implied meaning is something like 'the cause of X is nothing but Y'. A similar reinforcement shift can also be observed in example (2), which, together with the shift in taxis commented on above, shows how explicitation shifts tend to occur in clusters.

This semantic feature of exclusiveness in the causal relation seems to be like a motif running through various instances of reinforcement shifts highlighted here. An interesting manifestation of exclusiveness is the deployment of a special type of rhetorical conditional construction as a device for enhancing or reinforcing the causal relation. This type of shift can be represented as follows: X because Y → if X, then that$_x$ is (only) because Y; or the cause of that$_x$ is Y. Commonly used for making a strong assertion, such a rhetorical device may be associated with the use of an Adjunct or any other construction denoting exclusiveness, as in example (5):

(5a) English ST2R: ||| The sun and stars, he said, are fiery stones, but we do not feel the heat of the stars because they are too distant. |||
(5b) Arabic TT2M:

وقال إن الشمس والنجوم صخور مشتعلة، وإذا كنا لا نحس حرارة النجوم، فما ذاك إلا لبعدها،...

(5c) English back-translation: ||| And he said that the sun and stars are fiery stones || *wa- 'ið«* (and if) we did not (do not) feel the heat of the stars, that is not (for a reason) save for its distance (that is only due to its distance). |||

A characteristic feature of this construction, unlike typical conditionals, is that the proposition of the *if*-clause (protasis) is considered to be firmly established in its intended context; in other words, as Kitis (2004) notes, it is 'firmly placed in the realis domain totally devoid of any conditionality or hypotheticality' (p.44). Thus, there is nothing hypothetical about the fact that *we do not feel the heat of the stars*, at least in the context of (5). The main clause (apodosis), on the other hand, is now devoted to highlighting the original causal relation between X and Y, further enhancing the sense of exclusiveness: if X (is true), then it is only because Y. Note also how the consequence relation typically expressed by a conditional construction is reversed in (5c): the apodosis here gives the reason for the protasis, not the consequence as would normally be expected in an ordinary conditional construction (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p.739).

Other cases of explicitation through enhanced exclusiveness involve the use of the restrictive binder إنما *'innama* (only) or a shift in the causal relation bringing out a conditional or concessive element along the lines of (6) and (7), respectively:

(6a) English ST2R: ||| "<u>Because</u> my son or my wife is dead," says Teles, <<who was one of these popularizing Cynics, >> || "is that any reason for my neglecting myself, || who am still alive, || and ceasing to look after my property?" |||

(6b) Arabic TT2M:

يقول "تيليز" وهو أحد هؤلاء الكلبيين الناشرين للمذهب بين الناس: "<u>أإذا</u> مات ابني أو ماتت زوجتي، كان ذلك مبرراً لإهمال نفسي، وأنا ما أزال حياً، والعدول عن العناية بما أملك؟"؛

(6c) English back-translation: ||| Says Teles, <<who was one of the Cynics popularizing this ideology among people,>> || "*'a'ið«* (interrogative marker + if) my son or my wife died, || this was a reason for neglecting myself, <<and I am still alive,>> || and the abandonment of looking after what I own?'. |||

Thus the translation shift in (6) can be represented as follows:

Because X, is that$_x$ a reason for Y$_{nominalized}$? → **If** X, is that$_x$ a reason for Y$_{nominalized}$?

(7a) English ST2R: ||| 'Cato put out of the Senate also, one Manilius, <<who was in great towardness to have been made Consul the next year following,>> || <u>only because</u> he kissed his wife too lovingly in the day time, and before his daughter…|||

(7b) Arabic TT2M:

وكذلك أخرج "كاتو" من مجلس الشيوخ رجلاً يدعي "مانليوس"، كان قد قطع شوطاً بعيداً في طريقه إلى أن يكون قنصلاً في العام التالي، <u>مع أنه</u> لم يفعل سوى أن قبّل زوجته قبلة جاوزت الحد في التعبير عن غرامه بها، وكان ذلك في وضح النهار وعلى مرأى من ابنته؛

(7c) English back-translation: ||| Cato put out of the senate a man [[called Manilius, || (who) had made great progress on his way to become Consul in the next year]], || <u>although</u> he did (nothing) || except that he kissed his wife a kiss [[(which) overstepped the bounds in the expression of his passion for her,]] || and that was in the day time, and before his daughter; |||

The *because*-clause in (7) is rendered as a clause complex, i.e. α only because β → α although β except that γ. Another concomitant manifestation of explicitation here is the optional upgrading of the two circumstantial elements *in the day time* and *before his daughter* into an additive relational clause, which now stands in paratactic construction with the former matrix clause, the two being linked by the conjunction و *wa-* (and). To make this possible, the content of the matrix clause is picked up by the text reference item ذلك *ð«lika* (that). This expansion of a circumstantial element, which is a kind of 'minor process, subsidiary to the main one' (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 263), brings out the features of a relational clause embodied in it. Thus, the ideational content of one clause is now repackaged into two ranking clauses: *he kissed his wife too lovingly in the day time, and before his daughter* → *he kissed his wife too lovingly **and** that was in the day time and before his daughter.*

4. Analysis of the Arabic Causal Conjunctive لأن *li-'anna (because)*
A similar overall picture of upgrading and explicitating patterns emerges from an analysis of

the concordance output of the Arabic causal conjunctive *li-'anna*. As was the case with the English conjunction *because* in ST2R, TT2M has a much higher frequency of *li-'anna*: 357 compared with 87 in TT1H (Table 6).

Table 6. *Distribution of لأن li-'anna in the Arabic translated corpus*

	TT1H	TT2M
و لأن / wa-/li'anna (and/because)	87	357
Corpus size in words	117,122	117,854
Tokens/100,000 words	74	303

A close examination of the concordance lines of causal *li-'anna* shows that this conjunctive is mostly associated in the corpus with the English causal conjunctions *because* and *for* (Table 7). Surprisingly, however, as the following discussion will reveal, a high percentage of the occurrences of *li-'anna* in both target texts have no corresponding conjunctives in the source texts but rather involve arguably explicitating shifts triggered by a desire to establish conjunctive cohesion in the absence of a conjunctive marker in the ST. Table 7 shows the most common causal conjunctives rendered as *li-'anna* in the translated corpus.

Table 7. *Causal conjunctives rendered as لأن li-'anna in the translated corpus*

Text	Causal Conjunctions					Rendered as لأن *li-'anna*					
	as	because	for	since	Total	as	because	for	since	Total (li-'anna)	Total Tokens (li-'anna)
ST1B	39	49	115	12	215	4	20	12	1	37 (43%)	87
ST2R	20	128	128	105	381	3	98	106	38	245 (71%)	347

An analysis of the co-text of the remaining concordances of *li-'anna* in the translated corpus reveals consistent patterns of explicitation, which can be conveniently grouped into two major categories:

I. Logico-semantic explicitation, i.e. explicitation viewed from the perspective of the logical metafunction (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004); and

II. Upgrading (see the definition below).
Table 8 gives an overview of the frequency and distribution of both types of explicitation patterns involving *li-'anna* in the translated corpus. It should be noted that the categories listed in Table 8 represent predominant patterns observed in the analysed instances, around which other features tend to cluster. It is clear from the table that both patterns of grammatical explicitation are relatively more common in TT1H (56%) than TT2M (28%).

Table 8. *Patterns of explicitation involving the causal conjunctive لأَنَّ li-'anna*

	TT1H	TT2M	Total
LOGICO-SEMANTIC	26	78	104
UPGRADING	23	18	41
Total	49	96	145
Tokens	87	347	434
Percentage	56%	28%	33%

I. Logico-semantic explicitation

This is the major category of explicitating shifts observed in the extracted concordance lines of *li-'anna*. As will be discussed and exemplified below, such shifts generally occur within the logical metafunction, where comparable patterns of agnation are available to the translators in the target language. Broadly speaking, all such shifts involve the use of the causal conjunctive *li-'anna* for overt marking of implicit logico-semantic relations holding either:

1. between paratactic or cohesive sequences; or
2. between clauses in hypotactic clause complexes.

In the first subtype (henceforth labelled as *paratactic/cohesive*) the clauses or sentences concerned may be separated in the ST by a semicolon, colon, dash or full stop. Thus, the use of the causal conjunctive *li-'anna* in this case as an inter-clausal binder or linker (when used with the text reference demonstrative ذلك *ð«lika* (that)) may be regarded as a stratal shift from the graphological (punctuation mark) to the lexicogrammatical (causal conjunctive). In the second subtype (henceforth referred to as *hypotactic*), the hypotactic clause complex in question generally includes either a non-finite or non-defining relative clause, with a degree of logico-semantic indeterminacy between the two clauses, hence the use of the causal conjunctive *li-'anna* in the TT. A breakdown of these subtypes, together with the counts of their distribution in the two translated texts, is set out in Table 9.

Table 9. *Logico-semantic shifts involving the causal conjunctive لأَنَّ li-'anna*

		TT1H	TT2M	Total
Paratactic/cohesive	comma	0	1	1
	semicolon	1	18	19
	colon	1	2	2
	dash	0	1	1
	full stop	9	30	39
	Total paratactic/cohesive	**11**	**52**	**63**
Hypotactic	Non-finite	5	10	15
	Non-defining	10	13	23
	Total hypotactic	**15**	**23**	**38**
Total logico-semantic		26	75	101
Total لأَنَّ li-'anna tokens		87	347	434
% per لأَنَّ li-'anna tokens		30%	22%	23%

As the table shows, TT2M exhibits a slightly greater tendency towards replacing punctuation marks with an explicit causal conjunctive, while TT1H seems to have a greater predilection for explicitating the implicit or indeterminate conjunctive relation in non-finite and non-defining clause complexes. Both subtypes of logico-semantic explicitation will be discussed and exemplified next.

1. Paratactic/Cohesive Explicitation

If the punctuation practice in English is 'a fairly recent innovation, never very consistently used' (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 399), then it is much more recent and far less uniform in Arabic, where there is still no fully standardized system of punctuation (Holes, 1995: 204). As Holes (ibid) notes, whatever punctuation is used in Arabic texts, 'it functions alongside the native system of textual chunking, which relies on coordinating and subordinating conjunctions' for signalling logico-semantic relations. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that major Arabic grammar textbooks do not address punctuation usage in any depth. That is not to say, however, that the use of punctuation marks in Arabic texts is an entirely random affair, where a full stop, for instance, could appear in the middle of a nominal group or a prepositional phrase. Furthermore, written Arabic texts do exhibit instances of asyndetic juxtaposition of potentially independent clauses separated only by punctuation marks, where overt conjunctive markers could have been used together with, or instead of, punctuation.

The discourse functions of punctuation markers, especially semicolon and colon, as Fabricius-Hansen and Ramm (2008, p. 5) note, 'have not yet been thoroughly investigated from the perspective of discourse structure or discourse processing, let alone in a cross-linguistic setting'. For the purpose of the present analysis, it is interesting to note, following Huddleston & Pullum (2002, p. 1735), that the comma, semicolon and colon, which 'normally mark boundaries within a sentence', indicate a weaker boundary than the full stop. Calling the former 'secondary boundary marks', Huddleston and Pullum (ibid) argue that they may be arranged into 'a hierarchy of relative strength', with the semicolon and colon placed between the full stop (the strongest) and the comma (the weakest). It would be difficult to argue for a similar hierarchy in Arabic, given the current state of punctuation practice, but it will be assumed here without further discussion that the two poles of any such hierarchy would still be the comma and full stop. Thus, the shift from a full stop to a semicolon may signal a step along the cline towards connectedness, unless it turns out that there is a predilection for using the semicolon in Arabic texts in general or in the translator's individual style. Obviously, the introduction of a specific causal conjunctive would be regarded as further enhanced connectedness, i.e. conjunctive explicitation; consider example (10):

(10a) English ST2R: ||| 'Stop,' || he said, || 'don't hit it! ||| ♦ It is the soul of a friend |||

(10b) Arabic TT2M: فقال له: قف ولا تضربه، لأنه يحتوي على روح صديق!

(10c) English back-translation: ||| He said to him, || 'Stop || and don't hit it, || <u>because</u> it contains the soul of a friend. |||

Note how the implicit elaborating relation holding between the first and second sentence in ST2R is rendered as an explicit causal relation realized by *li-'anna*. An equally implicit rendering would have been acceptable:

(10d) Implicit rendering: !فقال له: قف ولا تضربه، إنـه يحتوي على روح صديق

Another example of paratactic explicitation is (11), where two clauses in a paratactic nexus separated only by a colon are rendered as two sentences cohesively linked by *ð«lika li-'anna* (that is because):

(11a) English ST1B: ||| What helped Nicetas was a genuine detestation of Phocas: || the measure of his crimes was full even in the judgement of the Romans … |||
(11b) Arabic TT1H:

أما (نيقتاس) فقد أعانه أن (فوكاس) كان كريهاً عند الناس كراهة لا شك فيها. ذلك لأن جرائمه قد زادت على الطاقة حتى في نظر الرومانيين أنفسهم.

(11c) English back-translation: ||| As for Nicetas, what helped him was that Phocas was held in undoubted detestation by the people ||| *ð«lika li-'anna* (that is because) his crimes were beyond toleration even in the eyes of the Romans themselves.|||

Again, the translator could have opted for an equally implicit conjunction, with the two sentences separated by a semicolon. As noted above, the causal conjunctive *li-'anna* is also used by the translators to mark an implicit logico-semantic relation holding between two clauses in a non-defining or non-finite hypotactic clause complex, i.e. 'hypotactic explicitation', which will be discussed next.

 2. Hypotactic Explicitation
In all cases of hypotactic explicitation observed in the analyzed corpus, the causal conjunctive *li-'anna* is used to explicitly link the dominant and dependent clauses in the clause complex. As Table 9 above shows, there 23 occurrences of *li-'anna* in the translated corpus where the corresponding English construction that triggered the use of *li-'anna* is a hypotactic clause complex with the dominant clause being either elaborated or extended by a non-defining relative clause (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). There are no grammatical analogues of non-defining relative clauses in Arabic; but it can probably be stated in general terms that English non-defining relative clauses are often translated as relative clauses in Arabic or upgraded to additive paratactic clauses, especially where the non-defining relative clause seems to be in an extending (additive) relation with the main clause. In all the occurrences of *li-'anna* corresponding to non-defining relative clauses in the corpus, the translator opts for a causal interpretation of the potentially elaborating (clarifying) or additive relation realized by the non-defining relative pronoun. Arguably, this causal shift makes the indeterminate logical relation more specific. Consider example (12) where the implicit hypotactic elaboration denoted by the non-defining relative pronoun is turned into an explicit causal relation realized by *li-'anna* :

(12a) English ST2R: ||| It follows that there is something degraded about a shoemaker, || who must exchange his shoes in order to live. |||
(12b) Arabic TT2M:
ويلزم عن هذا أن صانع الأحذية مشوب بصفة تحط من قدره، لأنه مضطر أن يتخذ الأحذية وسيلة يبادل بها سلعاً أخرى لكي يعيش.

(12c) English back-translation: ||| It follows from this that the shoemaker is associated with a quality [that] degrades him, || *li-'anna-hu* (because-he) is obliged to make shoes a means [which] he exchanges for other commodities in order to live. |||

Note how the non-defining relative clause in ST2R serves to introduce into the discourse a characterization or explanation of that 'degraded' aspect of the shoemaker. However, the translator sharpens this clarifying relation by turning it into an unequivocal causal relation, thereby providing the explicit cause of this 'degradation' associated with the shoemaker. It should be noted, however, that this shift to an explicit causal relation is not dictated by any structural requirement but rather seems to be motivated by a desire on the part of the translator to enhance the logical connectedness of the text. Some non-defining instances of the relative pronoun *which* are rendered as a paratactic additive relation realized by the conjunction و *wa* (and), as in (13):

(13a) English ST2R: ||| None of them got anywhere near the size and distance of the sun, || which all underestimated. |||
(13b) Arabic TT2M:

ولم يستطع واحد منهم أن يدنو من التقدير الصحيح لحجم الشمس وبعدها، وجاءت كل تقديراتهم في ذلك أقل من التقدير الصواب.

(13c) English back-translation: ||| None of them could get near the correct estimate of the size and of the sun and its distance || and all their estimates were lower than the correct estimate. |||

There are other instances where a corresponding relative clause is used, where a causal clause complex could have been used; compare (14) and (15) in Table 10:

Table 10. *Relative and causal clause options in the TT*

	(14)	(15)
(a) ST2R	||| On the one hand, it was obvious that his armies, <<<u>which</u> were not very large,>> could not permanently hold so vast an empire by force |||	||| In this operation the Spartans, <<<u>who</u> cared only about their own territory,>> took no part. |||
(b) TT2M	𝔸𐩠 ▼𝄫⚌⚌ 𝄫𝄫ᶦᶦ, ⫯𝄫 ‡¡ ⁂⫯𝄫‡ ⫮° ⊌𝄫‡⨀ Σ◇ 𝄫‡¡ ▪Ƶ⫯ 𝄫𝄫ₐᶦ𝄫 ⸮⫮ ⟍🔳 ▪⫯‡♪ ᴬ⦿γ ⟪⚌𝄫 ⫯𝄫Ƶ⫯⦿ ⊑ , ÷≈ₐ𝔠≈ᵢⱼɕ̇ Σ𝄫 ▢⬤⟵÷Ƶ⫯♪ . 𝄫ₐ𝔼⟵÷Ƶ𝄫	‡⬤⟵𝄫ā≈‡ā °⫿♫a≈⦿ɕ̇ ◦ 🔳 ⬤⫿ 𝄫𝄫√ff′𝄫𝄫𝄫 .ff′ 𝄫𝄫̇ċ √⸮I𝐀𝐙f𝄫
(c) BT	||| On the one hand, it was obvious that his armies, << *'al-lat»*<u>which</u> were not very large,>> could not continue to control so vast an empire by force permanently |||	||| Sparta did not take part in this matter, || *li'anna* (because) Spartans did not care except about their territory. |||

Note also how the rendering of (15a) is less complex in terms of grammatical intricacy, with an enclosed hypotactic elaborating relative clause being turned into a causal hypotactic clause in a progressive clause complex (α ^ β):

ST2R 15(a): α <<=β>> ⇨ TT2M 15(b): α ^ xβ

The rendering of (14a), however, retained the enclosed relative clause construction: α <<=β>>, although, as is the case in (15), a causal hypotactic clause complex could have also been selected:

كان بديهياً أن جيوشه لم تكن لتستطيع أن تظل مسيطرة على مثل هذه الإمبراطورية الفسيحة بالقوة سيطرة دائمة لأنها لم تبلغ حداً كبيراً من الضخامة،

||| On the one hand, it was obvious that his armies could not continue to control so vast an empire by force permanently || _li-'anna-ha_ (because they) were not very large |||

        This explicitating causal shift, which is clearly not necessitated by any structural requirement, serves to enhance the logical connectedness between the two clauses involved. The second type of hypotactic explicitation observed in the data involves a non-finite hypotactic clause complex, where the use of _li-'anna_ is triggered by a hypotactic clause complex with the dominant clause being either elaborated or extended by a non-finite relative clause. As Table 9 above shows, there are 10 such occurrences of _li-'anna_ in the translated corpus. There are 4 instances where the non-finite clause complex includes the causal conjunction _as_; thus the causal relation is already explicit in the ST. Almost all the remaining instances involve a non-finite dependent ing-clause, where the semantic relation obtaining between the two clauses is relatively implicit. Arguably, the unavailability of corresponding non-finite forms in Arabic forces the translators to provide an explicit relation gleaned from the context. Consider example (29):

(16a) English ST2R: ||| The body, << being compound;>> is clearly not immortal; |||
(16b) Arabic TT2M:

فواضح أن الجسد ليس بخالد لأنه مركب من عناصر.

(16c) English back-translation: ||| It is clear then that the body is not immortal, || _li-'anna-hu_ (because-it) is composed of elements. |||

The non-finite clause in (16a) could be interpreted either as an elaborating non-defining relative clause without the Wh- element, in the sense of '…, which is compound'; or as an enhancing/causal hypotactic clause, with the causal relationship being left implicit, in the sense of '… since it is compound'. Obviously, the translator opted for the latter in (16b), making the causal relation explicit and using the simpler α ^ xβ structure. Note also the lexical explicitating shift represented by the potential redundant qualifying prepositional phrase من عناصر (of elements).

II. Upgrading
The term 'upgrading' is used here in a hierarchical sense to denote an observed translational shift from a group, group element or embedded clause to a ranking clause with a generally identical experiential content. In conjunction with this overall tendency to shift from the group to the clause, and consequently from the clause to the clause complex or sequence, there seems to be a propensity to unpack or demetaphorize nominalizations, a feature associated with explicitation. This kind of shift from the experiential toward the logical in the systemic functional sense results in an expansion or, as it were, 'clausalization' of constructions, while using more or less the same information content, thereby reducing lexical density. In all instances, the outcome of the upgrading shift is a hypotactic causal clause nexus mediated by the conjunctive _li-'anna_.

Obviously, a crucial factor in the assessment of such 'clausal' rewordings as instances of explicitation is the availability in the target language of more lexically dense agnates, which are closer to the ST wording. Generally, upgrading involving this conjunctive is realtively more common in TT1H than TT2M.

Upgrading Involving Adjuncts
As Table 11 shows, the most frequent type of upgrading involves a circumstantial or, less commonly, modal Adjunct, which is upgraded or shifted to a ranking clause in a clause complex that includes the matrix clause through the intermediary of the conjunctive *li-'anna.*

Table 11. *Upgrading involving causal conjunctive li-'anna*

Upgraded element	TT1H	TT2M	Total
Adjunct	18	25	43
Nominal Group	3	-	3
Embedded Clause	4	7	11
Total	25	32	57
Total *li-'anna* tokens	87	347	434
% per *li-'anna* tokens	29.1%	09%	13%

Thus, the circumstantial element, which can be regarded as 'a figure in miniature' (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999: 218), is expanded into a full-blown clause with its own process and participants (a shift from internal to external augmentation). In ideational terms, this shift involves dematphorization, i.e. transforming one figure into a sequence of two figures linked by a causal relation, which is realized by the conjunctive *li-'anna*:

Demetaphorization (unpacking/external augmentation): figure X [process + participant(s) + circumstance] ⇨ figure X1 [process + participant (s)] *li-'anna* figure X2 [demetaphorized process + participant (s)] (Fattah, 2010).

Here is an example of this kind of upgrading or demetaphorizing shift:

(17a) English ST2R: ||| Power and wealth are desirable for the sake of honour; ||…|||
(17b) Arabic TT2M:

إن القوة والثروة مطلوبان <u>لأنهما</u> وسيلتان للشرف،...

(17c) English back-translation: ||| Power and wealth are desirable *li-'anna-huma* (because-they) are (two) means of honour, || … |||

Here the circumstantial cuasal adjunct *for the sake of honour* is expanded into a full-fledged ranking clause introduced by the causal conjunctive *li-'anna*, an upgrading shift which does not seem to be necessitated by any syntactic requirement; witness the equally possible circumstantial agnate: من أجل الشرف/وسيلتين للشرف/كوسيلتين للشرف . Thus, the translation cited above could be described in SFL terms as involving a shift from the experiential to the logical, where the causal relation is now congruently construed as a conjunction.

In the following interesting example from TT1H, two instances of upgrading both

involving the conjunctive *li-'anna* can be observed:

(18a) English ST1B: ||| We have already seen [[that early in the siege a number of Copts in Babylon had been thrown into prison, either from their refusal to abandon their creed or on suspicion of disloyalty]]. |||
(18b) Arabic TT1H:

وقد ذكرنا من قبل أنهم سجنوا في أول الحصار كثيراً من القبط الذين كانوا في الحصن، <u>وذلك لأنهم</u> أبوا أن يتركوا دينهم أو <u>لأنهم</u> رابهم منهم أمر .

(18c) English back-translation: ||| We have already mentioned || that they [the Romans] imprisoned at the beginning of the siege many Copts who had been in the fortress, || *wa- ð«lika li-'anna-hum (and that is because-they)* had refused to abandon their creed || or *li-'anna* (because) something made them [the Romans] mistrustful of them [the Copts]. |||

Here we have what is called a 'metaphenomenal mental clause' (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 252) in the ST, with the Phenomenon being realized by an embedded passive finite clause, which contains 4 circumstantial Adjuncts:

Adjunct 1 (temporal): *early in the siege*; Adjunct 2 (spatial): *into prison*; Adjunct 3 (causal): *from their refusal to abandon their creed*; Adjunct 4 (causal): *on suspicion of disloyalty*.

In TT1H, however, the two causal Adjuncts have been upgraded into two separate clauses in a clause complex which is causally linked to the matrix clause by the conjunctive expression *wa- ð«lika li-'anna.* Thus, *from their refusal* becomes *because they refused*; and *on suspicion of disloyalty* becomes *because they suspected disloyalty*. The outcome of this upgrading of the embedded clause is a much looser and less dense construction with a lexical density (measured in terms of the number of lexical items divided by the number of ranking clauses) of 3.7 compared to 11 in the English embedded clause, which has 11 lexical items occupying one ranking clause. It should also be noted that this upgrading tendency is not only associated with a considerably reduced lexical density but also with retrieval of information from the co-text, e.g. the shift from passive to active voice with the explicit realization of the Agent, albeit in pronominal form.

Another type of upgrading observed in the concordances of *li-'anna* involves embedded phrases or clauses rendered as ranking clauses. The embedded clause could be a defining relative clause serving as a qualifier in a nominal group, e.g.

(19a) English ST2R: ||| It is connected by means of an ethic [[which praised the contemplative life.]]||||

(19b) Arabic TT2M:
إن الرابطة بينه وبين الرياضة هي رابطة خلقية، <u>لأنه</u> كان بهذا يعلي من شأن الحياة التأملية،
(19c) English back-translation: ||| The link between it and mathematics is an ethical link || *li-'anna-hu (because-he)* was thereby raising the status of the contemplative life. <u>|||</u>

Obviously, upgrading an embedded relative clause to a ranking clause serves to reduce the

lexical density of the target text construction since the total number of lexical items divided by the number of the ranking clauses will be less. But this upgrading shift is by no means unavoidable, as can be attested by the following alternative rendering with an equally dense clause where the relative clause is rendered as an embedded qualifying clause:

(19d) Structurally equivalent rendering:

إن الرابطة بينه وبين الرياضة هي رابطة خلقية تعلي من شأن الحياة التأملية،

Note also that the target text rendering is lexicogrammatically more explicit specifying, as it does, the causal or explanatory relation between the embedded qualifier and the thesis of the clause, namely the assertion of an ethical connection.

5.4 Summary of Findings and Conclusion

The analysis of bilingual concordance output for the two causal conjunctives because and *li-'anna* has revealed interesting patterns of conjunctive and structural explicitation in the sense adopted in this study. These explicitating tendencies, expressed as percentages of the concordance lines for every conjunctive examined, were other directly related to the conjunctives themselves or observed within their immediate textual vicinity. One crucial factor in the assessment of those explicitating shifts is the availability in most cases of less explicit agnates closer to the corresponding ST constructions.

Overall, the analysis of the observed shifts associated with both conjunctives uncovers the following frequently intertwined explicitating tendencies:

1. Explicit realization or reinforcement of causal conjunctive relations.
2. Upgrading of grammatical constituents, involving the unpacking and repackaging of complex grammatical constructions, including a predilection for paratactic sequences, especially in TT1H.

In other words, the analysis conducted in the study points to an overall tendency for TL equivalents to make logico-semantic relations explicit or more pronounced, as well as to move up the rank scale, with the result or unpacking and redistributing the same propositional content into larger, more loosely 'strung out' units. Thus, the perceived 'explicitating' effect can be said to be attributable both to the explicit realization or reinforcement of conjunctive relations and to the lower lexical and informational density of the target text equivalents, hence their enhanced comprehensibility and processability.

While resonating with the findings of similar studies in other language pairs, the patterns of structural explicitation highlighted in 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. In particular, the upgrading tendencies observed in this study are worthy of further investigation, both in parallel and comparable corpora, to establish whether they conform with or depart from systemic probabilities of instantiation in Arabic.

Endnotes:

1. For other forms of explicitation intended to avoid ambiguity, reduce vagueness or enhance comprehensibility or processability, see Baker (1992) and Vanderauwera (1985).
2. Instances where the Arabic wording is quoted from an original source, rather than translated from the English ST, have been ignored.
3. Defined as the ideational element serving 'to construe logico-semantic relations of expansion between figures in a sequence' (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999: 59).
4. For Notational conventions for representing lexicogrammatical constituency, which are adopted here, see Haliday and Matthiessen (2004: 10).

About the author:

Dr Ashraf Abdel Fattah is an Assistant Professor at the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hamad bin Khalifa University, Qatar. 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] (2nd ed.). Cairo: Madbouli; 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. (1996). Corpus-based Translation Studies: The Challenges That Lie Ahead. In H. Somers (Ed.), *Terminology, LSP and Translation* (pp. 175-86). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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* (pp. 17-35). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

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. (Original work published 1935)

Fabricius-Hansen, C. (1996). Informational density: a problem for translation and translation theory. *Linguistics 34*(3), 521-65.

Fabricius-Hansen, C. & Ramm, W. (2008). Subordination and coordination from different perspectives. In C. Fabricius-Hansen and W. Ramm (Eds.) '*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*. University of Manchester: Unpublished PhD thesis.

Fattah, A. (2016). An Explicitation 'Syndrome': A Corpus-based Investigation of Explicitating Shifts in the Translation of the Concessive Conjunction 'Although/though'. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) 7*(2), 195- 215.

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). *Construing 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* (3rd ed.). London and New York: Arnold.

Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kitis, E. (2004). Conditional Constructions as Rhetorical Structures. In *Working Papers in Linguistics* (pp. 30-51). Thessaloniki: Aristotle University.

Klaudy, K. (1996). Back-Translation as a Tool for Detecting Explicitation Strategies in Translation. In K. Klaudy, J. Lambert & A. Sohar (Eds.), *Translation Studies in Hungary* (pp. 99-114). Budapest: Scholastica.

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 Russell, B. (1946). *History of Western Philosophy.*

Martin, J.R. (1992). *English Text: System and Structure.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Russell, B. (1995). *History of Western Philosophy.* London: Routledge. (Original work published 1946)

Steiner, E. (2004). Ideational grammatical metaphor: exploring some implications for the overall model. *Languages in Contrast 4*(1): 139-66.

Steiner, E. (2008). Explicitation – Towards an Empirical and Corpus-based Methodology. In J. Webster (Ed.), *Meaning in Context: Implementing Intelligent Applications of Language Studies* (pp. 235-78). London: Continuum,.

Vanderauwera, I. (1985). *Dutch Novels Translated into English: The Transformation of a 'minority' literature*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.