

## **But - what does it mean? A case study of a clinical report<sup>a</sup>**

*Ian A. Williams  
Univ. de Cantabria*

### *Abstract*

A high degree of isomorphism is often assumed to exist between fairly closely related languages in the translation of scientific, especially medical, texts. This isomorphism may be reflected in the communicative situation, specific genres and their associated formats, and down to the terminology, much of which is derived from, and created from, Greek and Latin. On the other hand, each language is known to have its own peculiarities and preferences. The tension generated between these two opposing forces can lead to anomalies, particularly if, in the translation process, the sentence is taken as the largest translation unit. We report a case of "malignant equivalent frequency syndrome" presenting as a dysfunction in the transfer of coordinated BUT sentences to structures of equivalent frequency, which was associated with disturbed textual patterns and impaired communicative function. Expression of other closely related syntactic structures was normal, but some microstructural elements were either altered or absent.

---

a. The English original: J. J. T. Tate, J. Rawlinson, G. T. Royle, F. J. Brunton, I. Taylor (1988), "Pre-operative or postoperative colonic examination for synchronous lesions in colorectal cancer". *Br. J. Surg.*, 75, pp. 1016-1018. The Spanish version: "Exploración pre o posoperatoria del colon para la detección de lesiones sincrónicas en el cáncer colorrectal". *Br. J. Surg. (Ed. esp)*, Vol. 1, Nº 1, Enero 1989, pp. 83-86.

Textual analysis indicated a breakdown in the mapping of the higher levels of meaning onto the surface texture. The results suggest that communicative intention, textual patterns and information structure, as well as surface features, must be taken into account in the translation of this kind of text.

### *Introduction*

"Benign superficial equivalent frequency" was first described in a clinical setting by Newmark in 1979<sup>1</sup>. It is characterised by replacement in the surface texture of certain lexico-grammatical features of the source language (SL) by others of equivalent frequency in the target language (TL) when the subject is transferred from one cultural and linguistic context to another. The condition is considered superficial if deeper layers are uninvolved, and benign if overall communicative function remains unimpaired. Since then, malignancy associated with this condition has been reported by Neubert and Shreve<sup>2</sup>, who found that global coherence could be seriously affected even when equivalent frequency appeared to be focal, that is limited to the sentence level. Hatim and Mason<sup>3</sup> have also reported alterations in coherence and text patterns at the segmental level (paragraph and other subunits) in different fields and in different cultural and linguistic contexts, including Spanish and English. However, little attention has been given to this matter in the clinical setting, possibly because of the high degree of isomorphism that is assumed to exist in this case between fairly closely related languages. Thus, the most frequently used genres, the research report and the case report, have similar formats in English and Spanish, communication is usually from specialist to specialist, and much of the terminology is either derived from classical Greek and Latin or built from the roots and affixes of these languages as neologisms. We report a case of malignant equivalent frequency syndrome in an English - Spanish clinical setting and review the literature.

### *Case Report*

The "patient" was a Spanish subject of English origin, whose condition was discovered at a routine examination performed for other reasons.

Examination revealed a lack of **BUT** (*pero*) coordination on the TL side. The distribution of **but**, **although**, **however** and other related structures, together with their TL expression is given in Table 1. Only two instances of *pero* were found (see Fig. 1A) and increased levels were observed for the subordinator *aunque* (Fig. 1B), and related adverbials (*no obstante*, *sin embargo*) (Fig. 1C). At the microstructural level, some elements such as verb forms, adverbs, etc. presented abnormalities, or were absent. Occasionally, no connector was present (juxtaposition), and, in one instance, absence of a contrastive connector was associated with a viewpoint adverbial, or conjunct, (*en este sentido*) (Fig. 1D). The SL-TL correspondence of other related structures (**although** and **however**) was normal (Table 1). Textual analysis was performed with the Hatim and Mason<sup>3</sup> (H&M) technique modified by addition of Halliday<sup>4</sup> medium<sup>b</sup>. This analysis revealed focal and segmental disturbance of the expected text pattern, information structure and coherence (Figs. 2 and 3), resulting in impaired communicative function. The final diagnosis was malignant equivalent frequency syndrome due to failure in the mapping of higher levels of meaning onto the surface structures in the creation of texture.

### Discussion

The uses of **BUT** have been well described<sup>4,5</sup> and are summarized in Table 2. The incidence of the adversative and concessive types is much higher than the remaining types in the clinical setting. In our case, these two types predominated, while one example was interpreted as an appended structure on macroscopic examination. Moreover, only these three uses of **but** are susceptible to transformation - benign or malignant - into subordinate structures with **although** (*aunque*).

- 
- b. Hatim and Mason analyse sections of texts into sequences with macrotextual rhetorical functions. These sequences are subdivided into elements which can be characterised by rhetorical functions at a lower local level. Halliday analyses clause structure as a message, in which the sender organises the clause according to what the receiver is assumed already to know: i.e., progression from *given*, *presupposed* or *known* in the communicative situation to *new*. He also analyses the clause in terms of information structure, in which the sender organises the clause according to what he/she wants to say: i.e., progression from *theme* to *rheme*. Usually, the theme will be chosen from given information and the new will fall within the rheme. Both systems play an important role in coherence during the process of inserting clause elements into sequences at the higher discourse level.

A number of factors have been identified as having an influence on **BUT** coordination and its interpretation both at the surface and at deeper levels. A contrastive interpretation is usually indicated when parallel syntax and contrasting lexical items are present in the coordinated units. This interpretation may be strengthened by location in the more objective sections (Methods and Results). In contrast, if such parallelism is absent and disparate elements are coordinated, then temporal or cause-effect relationships may be implicated. When location is in the more argumentative sections of the report (Introduction and Discussion), this cluster of features will normally indicate a concessive interpretation. However, the only requirement for both types is that there be some kind of opposition expressed between the two coordinated units and there would appear to be a continuum ranging from the contrastive to the concessive type.

Halliday and Hasan<sup>6</sup> noted that the implied opposition may derive either from the content or from the communicative situation, and referred to this feature as "external" or "internal", respectively. When an overt opposition exists in the lexico-grammatical features, which would normally imply objective "external" contrast in terms of the content and, therefore, equality between the two units, the interpersonal "internal" relation may still override the essential equality of coordination to establish the predominance of one unit over the other. An interpretation can then only be arrived at from the communicative situation. Factors at deeper levels must come into play.

According to Quirk et al.<sup>5</sup>, when a message is constructed, "it is courtesy to the receiver [...] to provide the point of the message with enough context for this point to be both clearly identified and unambiguously understood" (p. 1360). Moreover, these authors indicated that, when two coordinated units are placed in sequence, the second unit gains focal prominence from its position; that is, the second is placed in focus against the background of the first in agreement with the general principle of communicative dynamism (CD). This principle is complemented by other factors of text organisation, such as the movement from general to particular, large to small, outside to inside, etc., as identified by van Dijk.<sup>7</sup>

An example taken from the Results section in the case under study will illustrate the point:

There was a greater proportion of cancers of the caecum among patients with barium enema *but* the proportions at other sites were similar.

Since the syntax is not parallel and, therefore, does not emphasise the lexical contrast between "caecum" and "other sites" and between "greater" (i.e., different) and "similar", a purely objective contrast may be ruled out. If we then apply the above CD principles, what is in focus is the similarity. We may deduce, therefore, that the authors' intention is to stress the validity of their results, since only minimal bias could have been introduced by the difference. The Spanish translation was as follows:

Hubo una mayor proporción de cáncer de ciego entre los pacientes sometidos al enema de bario, **aunque** las proporciones de las restantes localizaciones fueron similares.

If our interpretation is correct, the position of the subordinator *aunque* would clearly seem to distort the message: it should occur initially to minimise the importance of the difference. Alternatively, if objective statement of the results were intended, the subordinator *mientras que* might have been a better choice.

In the reported case, the sequence of the coordinated units could be interpreted as decreasing in intensity or anticlimactic in only two instances. One of these was translated by *pero* (see Fig. 1A), and the second by *aunque* (not shown). The second unit in both instances could be interpreted as explanatory, and there was a close lexical link between the two units but no parallelism to indicate contrast. In the first instance, a comparison was linked to statistical significance, which is usually presented as secondary supporting evidence in the discussion of clinical significance. In the second instance, the advantage of one of the diagnostic techniques was minimised in the second coordinate unit.

The presence of parallelism or of a triad (a three unit structure) indicated a climactic progression and resulted in translation by other means than *aunque*. However, most sentences involving **BUT** seem to be climactic. This is particularly true of the replacive and correlative uses, but the presence of parallelism and the tendency to move from general to the particular (i.e., from background to focused information) serve to bring the contrastive and concessive uses into line with those other functions. Since **BUT** can only join two units and, therefore, the structure is basically binary, the presence of a third coordinated unit means coordination at two different levels: **{A + B} BUT C; A BUT {B + C}**. Nevertheless, a triad appears to have a special rhetorical quality that naturally implies a climax, even without explicit coordination, as in Caesar's famous statement: "I came, I saw, I

**conquered"**. Our analysis showed that only one of 5 triads had **BUT** downgraded to *aunque*, which lends support the hypothesis of Quirk et al.:<sup>5</sup>

Coordination achieves that seemingly impossible task of giving three units equal status and yet making the third climactic (p. 1473).

When syntactic and lexical markers of information focus are absent and if there is no clear indication of a temporal or causal relationship between the coordinate units, the main information focus can only be identified by moving beyond the sentence for clues at a more global level. As seen in figures 2 and 3, the translator seems to have misread the authors' argument and has, therefore, often downgraded units through subordination when they should have constituted the main clause (and focus) in order to carry the argument forward more clearly. In those 9 instances when *aunque* was located in mid-sentence, i.e., in the place occupied by **BUT** in the SL text, we maintain that the authors' intention and the information structure would have been made clearer by attaching the subordinator to the initial clause.

The pathogenesis of equivalent frequency syndrome remains uncertain. It may be related to restricting the unit of translation to the sentence or below.<sup>1</sup> The TL will probably have sufficient resources to allow many different lexical and syntactic realisations of the same propositional content. However, their communicative value will not be the same. If an appropriate choice based on equivalent frequency is made from the stock of resources, the alteration will result in the benign superficial form. It appears that some people have inherent protection against malignancy, which may derive from their intuition, aided by long and healthy experience of communicative and translation processes. If, however, the meaning is seen to be distorted, the malignant form has developed and affected deeper structural layers. In our patient, some or all of the following contributory factors may have been involved:

a) In Spanish, the anticlimactic use of *pero* may prove to be the norm, thus bringing it closer to subordinate use of *aunque*;

b) The argumentative presentation in the Results section (Fig. 2), which is normally characterised by objective exposition of data, is atypical;

c) The presentation of two techniques has misled the translator into emphasising the comparisons between them and their good qualities, when the authors' purpose was to show that both were clearly unsatisfactory.

d) The translator may have missed the significance of the few references to "postoperative colonoscopy" - in the title and in the conclusions to the main article and to the Abstract. They underline the message, which could be summarised as follows: despite the common use of the two techniques and despite the small number of patients with synchronous cancer, we must not be satisfied that the job has been completed with surgery; postoperative examination is, therefore, necessary to ensure a satisfactory result.

In our opinion, the SL text was well structured, well written and achieved its communicative goal because all levels of expression were in harmony. The same cannot be said for the TL text. This does not mean that we are proposing literal translation, or that *adequacy* should be the norm in the translation of pragmatic texts. Quite the opposite. Pragmatic texts should be made *acceptable*, and this is only possible if all text levels are appropriately matched. If this is not achieved, the communicative purpose may not be entirely lost but readability will be impaired and, in severe cases, the reader may well stop reading.

The prognosis of the malignant form is poor. If symptoms are noted in the early stages, a specialist should be consulted and the outcome may be favourable. Usually, however, the condition is not detected until extensive damage has occurred. Preventive measures seem to hold out more hope for the future. People should be trained not to examine the surface for what might be called "cosmetic surgery", but to learn to recognise how the deeper structures are expressed at the surface and how they interact in communication.

*Acknowledgement:* The author expresses his thanks to Dr. Luis Pejenaute for drawing his attention to the value of parody of scientific genres.

## References

1. Newmark PP. A layman's view of medical translation. *Br Med J* 1979; N° 6202: 1405-1407.
2. Neubert A, Shreve GM. *Translation as Text*. 1992; Kent State University Press.

3. Hatim B, Mason I. *Discourse and the Translator*. 1990; Longman.
4. Halliday MAK. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 1985; Edward Arnold.
5. Quirk R, Greenbaum S, Leech G, Svartvik J. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. 1985; Longman.
6. Halliday MAK, Hasan R. *Cohesion in English*. 1976; Longman.
7. Dijk T van. *Text and Context*. 1977; Longman.

Table 1  
Distribution of BUT, ALTHOUGH, HOWEVER,  
and related structures in the SL text, and TL translations

Type	Nº	Translation	Nº
But	19	<i>pero</i>	2
		<i>aunque</i>	10
		<i>no obstante</i>	2
		<i>sin embargo</i>	1
		<i>con todo</i>	1
		<i>en este sentido</i>	1
		[juxtaposition]	2
Although	6	<i>aunque</i>	6
However	5	<i>no obstante</i>	4
		<i>sin embargo</i>	1
[Juxtaposition]	1	<i>sin embargo</i>	1

Table 2  
Uses of BUT [Based on Halliday<sup>4</sup> and Quirk et al.<sup>5</sup>]

Type	Example	Meaning	Spanish
1. Adversative	They are pretty, <b>but</b> they are difficult to grow	<i>on the other hand</i> [X and yet Y]	<i>pero</i>
2. Concessive	I can't grow them, <b>but</b> I keep trying	<i>nevertheless</i> [if P then, unexpectedly, Q]	<i>pero</i>
3. Replacive	Don't drown them, <b>but</b> give them just enough	<i>instead</i> [not X but Y]	<i>sino</i>
4. Conditional	I would grow them, <b>but</b> they are too difficult	<i>except that</i> [Q if not for P]	<i>pero</i>
5. Correlative	I not only grow them <b>but</b> I sell them	<i>and also</i> [X and also Y]	<i>sino</i>
6. Appended Comment	They all died - <b>but</b> I did warn you	<i>by the way</i> [X but let me add Y]	<i>pero</i>



Figure 1  
 TL versions of BUT sentences with *Pero* (1A), *Aunque* (1B), *No obstante* (1C) and  
 Juxtaposition plus *En este sentido* (1D)

<p>The proportion of patients with a synchronous adenoma who had endoscopic examination was twice that of DCBE, <b>although half the colonoscopies were incomplete, but</b> this difference does not reach statistical significance.</p>	<p>La proporción de enfermos con adenoma sincrónico y exploración endoscópica fue del doble que la de los sometidos a EODC <b>pero, aunque la mitad de las colonoscopias fuera incompleta</b>, esta diferencia no alcanzó significación estadística.</p>	<p>Effective bowel preparation is of paramount importance for accurate DCBE <b>but</b> the presence of a carcinoma anywhere in the large bowel may, <u>in our opinion</u>, inhibit the effect of preparation.</p>	<p>La preparación del colon es de la máxima importancia para la realización del EODC, <b>aunque</b> la presencia de un carcinoma en cualquier localización colónica puede inhibir el efecto de la preparación.</p>
<p><b>Fig. 1A:</b> Note the preservation of the coordinator (<b>bold</b>) in association with severe displacement of the subordinate clause (<u>underlined</u>), resulting in a minor alteration of the information structure. Both structures appear anticlimactic.</p>		<p><b>Fig. 1B:</b> Detail of surface structure before (left) and after (right) treatment. The SL marker (<u>underlined</u>) of the main focus is absent in the TL text, where the main argument appears subordinated, resulting in a change from climactic to anticlimactic progression.</p>	
<p>Double contrast barium enema (DCBE) is the commonest investigation used to examine the large bowel in the UK <b>but</b> it <u>has failed</u> to demonstrate synchronous tumours in <u>some reported instances</u> and, <i>even in expert hands</i>, does miss some small adenomas.</p>	<p>La técnica empleada con mayor frecuencia en el Reino Unido para explorar el colon es el enema opaco con doble contraste (EDOC); <b>no obstante</b>, <u>en muchas ocasiones</u>, dicha exploración <u>fracasa</u> cuando se trata de demostrar la existencia de tumores sincrónicos e <i>incluso, efectuada por las manos más expertas</i>, pasa por alto algunos adenomas de pequeño tamaño.</p>	<p>It has been suggested that such patients should have total colectomy and ileocolic anastomosis, <b>but</b> we agree with others who favour such radical treatment only in younger patients with multiple adenomas.</p>	<p>Se ha indicado que dichos pacientes deberían someterse a colectomía total más anastomosis ileocolíca; <b>en este sentido</b>, <u>nosotros</u> coincidimos con otros autores en que dicho tratamiento radical debe reservarse para los individuos más jóvenes que presenten adenomas múltiples.</p>
<p><b>Fig. 1C:</b> Detail of a segment of the Introduction showing only minor alterations to the information structure, with preservation of the marker of main focus (<i>italics</i>). Distortion of verb form and adverbial (<u>underlined</u>) is evident. Note the triadic structure indicating climactic progression.</p>		<p><b>Fig. 1D:</b> Note the obliteration of the connective tissue associated with the appearance of a viewpoint adjunct (<b>bold</b>), thus establishing an area of cohesion between the adjacent structures. The rare presence of the pronoun (<u>underlined</u>) restores contrastive emphasis.</p>	

Figure 2

Sections from SL (top) and TL (bottom) texts analysed by the H&amp;M technique with addition of Halliday medium

Sequence Rhetorical Function	Element Rhetorical Function	Textual Realisation showing <b>Information Focus</b> , <b>Themes</b> , and [ellipses]	Thematic Progression T = Theme; R = Rheme	Rhematic Progression in main clauses only
I Tone-setter or topic sentence	E1: presents topic	There is a <b>significant risk</b> of synchronous neoplasia in patients being treated for colorectal cancer.	R1: <i>risk of s.neoplasia</i> > T3+4	E1 a significant risk
II Substantiation	E2: citation frame E3: % figures (A) E4: % figures (B)	<b>Recent reports suggest that the risk</b> is from <b>4.5 to 9 per cent</b> for a synchronous cancer and [the risk is] from <b>27 to 29 per cent</b> for a synchronous adenoma.	T2: <i>reports from context</i> T3: <i>risk</i> > R3 <i>s.cancer</i> > T5-8 T4: [ <i>risk</i> ] > R4 <i>s.adenoma</i> > T10-11	E3 size of risk % (A) E4 size of risk % (B)
III Aspect A: general + <b>contrast</b> > particular	E5: background E6: condition E7: condition E8: focus E9: limits E8	Often <b>synchronous cancers</b> do not adversely affect the prognosis if <b>they</b> are recognized and treated promptly <b>BUT</b> if [they are] <b>ignored</b> , [they] present later as a so-called <b>metachronous growth</b> <b>which</b> may be at a <b>more advanced stage</b> .	T5: <i>s.cancer</i> T6: <i>they</i> = s.cancer T7: [ <i>they</i> ] T8: [ <i>they</i> ] > R8 <i>m.growth</i> > T9 T9: <i>which</i> = m.growth	E5 often no risk E8 possible ↑risk
IV Aspect B: unknown + <b>contrast</b> > known	E10: background E11: focus E12: substantiates E11	<b>The significance of synchronous adenomas is not fully understood</b> <b>BUT their presence</b> is associated with an <b>increased risk</b> of metachronous colorectal cancer. <b>Those in the general population with an adenomatous polyp</b> may have a <b>six-fold</b> increased risk of developing colorectal cancer subsequently.	T10: <i>significance of s.adenoma</i> T11: <i>their presence</i> = of <i>s.adenoma</i> T12: <i>people-adenomatous polyp</i> = <i>s.adenoma</i>	E10 ? total risk E11 link with ↑risk E12 size of risk 6X
Sequence I presents the topic ( <b>significant risk</b> ) and sets it in its context ( <b>synchronous neoplasia + colorectal cancer</b> ). Sequence II substantiates the topic by quantifying the risk for two aspects of <b>neoplasia</b> in a bifurcated rheme: <b>cancer</b> (malignant) and <b>adenoma</b> (benign). Sequences III and IV elaborate on these two rhemes. Sequence III has a constant theme ( <b>synchronous cancers</b> ) and two parallel contrasted structures. It moves semantically from general to particular and at the information level from background to focused information. The contrast and movement are reflected lexically: <b>often - may</b> (= sometimes); <b>recognized - ignored</b> ; <b>not affect - more advanced stage</b> (= possible effect); <b>early - late</b> ; <b>synchronous - metachronous</b> . In Sequence IV, the different themes show a part-whole relationship with <b>synchronous adenoma</b> from rheme 4. Progressions can be seen from background to focused information, from general ( <b>not fully understood</b> ) to particular (i.e., what is known), and in time ( <b>subsequently</b> ). Thus, Sequences III and IV both add to the interpretation of <b>significant risk</b> . All the textual patterns harmonise to stress the seriousness of the risk.				
I Tone-setter	E1: states thesis	<u>Los enfermos</u> sometidos a tratamiento por cáncer colorrectal presentan un <b>riesgo significativo</b> de desarrollar neoplasias sincrónicas.		
II Substantiation	E2: citation marker E3: % figures (A) E4: % figures (B)	Según estudios recientes, <b>el riesgo</b> oscila desde el <b>4,5 al 9 %</b> con respecto a un cáncer sincrónico y [el riesgo oscila] desde el <b>27 al 29 %</b> con respecto a un adenoma sincrónico.		
III Aspect A	E5: focus E6: condition E7: condition marker E8: [status??]	A menudo, <b>el cáncer sincrónico no afecta de manera adversa al pronóstico</b> , a condición de que <u>los enfermos</u> sean diagnosticados y tratados precozmente, en caso de no ser así,		
IV Aspect B	E9: characterises R8 E10: focus E11: adds detail to E10 E12: substantiates E11	[enfermos] presentan más tarde el llamado <b>crecimiento "metacrónico precoz"</b> en un estadio más avanzado. <b>La importancia de los adenomas sincrónicos no es bien conocida</b> , <b>AUNQUE su presencia</b> se asocia con un <b>incremento del riesgo</b> de aparición de un cáncer colorrectal metacrónico. <b>Los portadores de un pólipo adenomatoso</b> pueden tener un <b>riesgo 6 veces superior</b> de desarrollar cáncer colorrectal en una etapa posterior.		
In Sequences I and II, the starting points ( <i>enfermos, estudios</i> ) are both taken as "given" in the clinical context. The risk is introduced and substantiated, but more as characterisation of the disease than as the topic for discussion. In Sequence III, the parallelism is absent, as is the lexical contrast in the conditions (E6,E7). E5 now appears to be the main focus while the status of E8 remains unclear, since it is linked only by juxtaposition (note the commas) and the theme is not <i>cáncer sincrónico</i> but <i>enfermos</i> . E9 has been downgraded and characterises its referent rather than limiting it (cf. SL text <b>may be</b> ). Sequence IV maintains the SL thematic structure but again the focus appears changed, with E11 adding detail to E10. These changes in focus and thematic pattern weaken the "risk" and give a more optimistic view.				

Figure 3

Sections from SL (top) and TL (bottom) texts analysed by the H&amp;M technique

I	E1 E2 E3 E4 E5	In the DCBE group [ $n^{\circ} = 80$ ], there were <b>30</b> patients who had a proximal carcinoma; all patients had complete examination of the large bowel <b>but</b> in 5 patients views of the colon distal to the tumour were of poor quality, and <b>3</b> patients, in whom the technical quality of the films was good, had diverticular disease...
II	E6 E7 E8 E9	Of the <b>50</b> patients with a distal tumour, <b>36</b> had a complete examination <b>but</b> the quality was poor in <b>13</b> of these. <u>In addition</u> , 4 patients with a complete examination of satisfactory quality had severe diverticulosis.
III	E10 E11 E12	Therefore, <u>in all patients having DCBE</u> , synchronous neoplasia could not be excluded in <b>39</b> of <b>80</b> patients <b>although</b> complete examination was achieved in <b>66</b> .
<p><i>The first two elements of Sequence I are introductory and reduce the total of 80 down to the "proximal" subtotal of 30. Elements 3,4,5 form a triad with E3 providing background (30 complete) for the focused elements (5 poor + 3 problems). Sequence II has a parallel structure, with E6 introducing the "distal" subtotal and the second triad: E7, E8, E9. Between E6 and E7, however, is the "tacit" incomplete group (50 - 36 = 14). E7 is background (36 complete) for the focused elements, one of which is given independent status, and linked not by <b>and</b>, but by <b>in addition</b>; however, we still have (13 poor + 4 problems). Sequence III provides a summarising conclusion. E10 has both logical and content (underlined) themes. Note that the authors have reached the figure in E11, the main clause, by summing the numbers in the focused elements (18 poor + 7 problems) and adding the incomplete group (14): total 39, which represents the unsatisfactory examinations. The E12 figure is reached by summing the numbers in the background elements and, significantly, is placed in a subordinate clause. They could as easily have presented a total for satisfactory examinations, but this would weaken their message. [H&amp;M]</i></p>		
I	E1 E2 E3 E4 E5	Del grupo de pacientes sometido a EODC, <b>30</b> presentaron un carcinoma de localización proximal; todos los enfermos fueron sometidos a exploración completa del colon, <b> aunque</b> en 5, la visualización del colon distal al tumor fue de baja calidad, y <b>3</b> más en quienes la calidad técnica de la película era buena, presentaban enfermedad diverticular grave...
II	E6 E7 E8 E9	De los <b>50</b> enfermos con tumor distal, <b>36</b> fueron sometidos a exploración completa; la calidad <b> sin embargo</b> fue pobre en <b>13</b> de ellos. <u>Además</u> , 4 de los enfermos de los que se obtuvo una exploración completa de calidad satisfactoria presentaron enfermedad diverticular grave.
III	E10 E11 E12	Por lo tanto, la neoplasia no pudo excluirse en <b>39</b> de los <b>80</b> enfermos sometidos a EDOC <b> aunque</b> se obtuviera una exploración completa en <b>66</b> .
<p><i>Some minor superficial alterations are evident in E1 and E2. In the triad (E3, E4, E5), however, E3 is now the focused element; E4 and E5 are coordinate subordinate clauses and appear downgraded. In Sequence II, parallelism is lost. The three elements in the triad all have independent status. <b>BUT</b> is now replaced by <b>sin embargo</b> so that E9 can be at the same level as E8. In Sequence III, the SL introductory theme (underlined) has moved from E10 into E11, and the final conclusion is not so strongly supported because of the lack of parallelism and changed focus in the triads of Sequences I and II. Note the bizarre "pluperfect" verb form in E12. Disturbance of information flow and impaired communicative function are evident. [H&amp;M]</i></p>		