Comparative study: Conjugations in English and Arabic

دراسة مقارنة: أدوات الاقتران باللغتين الإنجليزية والعربية

المدرس المساعد: سارة ماهر عبد الكريم

قسم الاعداد والتدريب - شعبة البحوث والدراسات التربوية

Research submitted by

Assistant lecturer: Sarah Maher Abdulkareem

Sarahalhamadany@gmail.com

Abstract

Comparative research on "conjuncts" in English and Arabic is the focus of this investigation. It examines their syntax, semantics, and position, as well as their form, function, and position in respect to the total relevant, and compares and contrasts the two languages. The investigation is broken up into three sections; the first and second sections focus on "conjuncts" in English and Arabic, respectively. The third is preserved so that it may deal with features of the similarities and differences of "conjuncts" in both languages, if there are any.

Keywords:- 1- Cohesion 2- Elaboration 3- Extension 4- Enhancement 5- Adverbs

الملخص

ان المغزى من هذا البحث هو التركيز على المقارنة بين «أدوات الربط» في اللغتين العربية والإنكليزية، ويختبر البحث أدوات الربط من حيث تركيبها في الجملة والمعنى الدلالي لها وموقعها، إضافة الى شكل ووظائف هذه الأدوات وموقعها فيما يتعلق ببقية الجمل المتصلة. كما يقارن البحث ويوضح أوجه التناقض بين اللغتين .

وتنقسم الدراسة الى ثلاثة اقسام، يركز القسم الأول والثاني على «أدوات الربط» في اللغتين العربية والإنكليزية على التوالي، بينما يتم تخصيص القسم الثالث من هذا البحث للتعامل مع خصائص التشابه والاختلاف لأدوات الربط في كلتا اللغتين إن وجد أيا منها.

الكلمات المفتاحية :- ١-التماسك ٢- التفصيل ٣- الامتداد ٤- التعزيز ٥- ظروف الحال

1. Introduction

"Conjuncts" There are grammatical techniques called «conjuncts» that link ideas to one another and to what has come before in a sentence. However, the formal differences between English conjuncts and their identical Arabic counterparts may provide a challenge for Arabic speakers learning English. Another consideration is that trainees must distinguish between "conjuncts" and other forms of connecters. To utilize "conjuncts" correctly, trainees must first understand the semantic implications conjunct. (Wikipedia, 2000:2).

2. Aim of the Research:

This study will look at "conjuncts" in both English and Arabic. It examines their syntactic and semantic responsibilities in a phrase using examples. Aspects both similarity and diversity will be thoroughly examined.

3. Hypothesis:

The hypothesis of this study is that English and Arabic conjuncts are officially different because in English they are adverbs and in Arabic they are particles, but they do the same job, which is to link two or more units. So, it's believed that conjuncts in both languages are methods that are used to connect ideas but don't change the sense of the sentence as a whole.

1- Conjunction and its cohesive role in translation

The concept of cohesion has been proposed and investigated by a number of linguists, such as A number of linguists, including Callow (1974), Gutwinski (1976),

De Beaugrande (1981), and Hoey (1991), have advocated and researched the idea of cohesiveness, but the best known and the most detailed model has been developed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), in Cohesion in English. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion occurs "When the meaning of one part of the text depends on the meaning of another part. One depends on the other in such a way that it can't be decoded well without the other" Baker, in 1992. (p. 4).

cohesiveness is described by the dictionary as "a chain of lexical, grammatical, and other types of relationships that connect different parts of a text." These connections... organize and, in some ways, build a text, like when the reader has to figure out what words and phrases mean by looking at other words and phrases in the same line or paragraph" Baker, in 1992. (p. 180). Patterns of cohesiveness are the interactions or linkages that make up this concept. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), there are five primary techniques that may be used to establish coherence: reference, replacement, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion.

Reference is the first cohesive gadget, which is defined as "a network of semantic relationships that makes it possible for the listener or reader to follow the actors, entities, events, and so on in a text. Reference is attained in several languages" (Baker, 2011, pp. 191). by various functional items such as pronouns, definite

articles, demonstratives, and comparatives.

The second and the third categories of cohesive device are substitution and ellipsis, which involve networks of grammatical relations that presuppose the existence of certain elements throughout the text. Substitution is "the replace of one item with another," whereas ellipsis is "the omission of an item." The two processes are essentially identical; ellipsis can be interpreted as a form of substitution in which nothing is substituted. (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 88).

The last cohesive device is lexical cohesion. Unlike the four previous patterns, which are grammatical, "lexical cohesion" is "the cohesive effect created through the selection of vocabu-

lary" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. There are two primary forms of lexical cohesion: repetition and collocation.

2 . Conjunction in Arabic and English

2.1 Conjunction in the English language

Conjunction is the fourth coherent pattern suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976). Unlike every other cohesive mechanism, "conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but by virtue of the way they convey particular meanings; they are not primary mechanisms for reaching out into the preceding (or subsequent) text, but they express certain meanings that involve the presence of other components of the discourse" (p. 226). Conjunctive markers are lexical items

that indicate the connections among propositions in a speech, such as additive, adversative, or continuative relations, and thus connect sentences, clauses, and paragraphs (Baker, 2011, p. 200). In their initial work, Halliday and Hasan (1976) based on their coherent relationships in language, divided conjunctive indicators into four primary categories: additive, adversative, causal, and temporal. In contrast, following research by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) proposes a more thorough model that systematically categorizes conjunctions. all its possible subclasses. These subclasses include elaboration, extension and enhancement, which Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) divide into further subtypes.

According to The first kind of conjunction, according to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), is elaboration, which occurs when "one clause elaborates on the meaning of another by further specifying or describing it" (p. 396). Elaboration has two subtypes, apposition, which involves restating or representing the elaborated items by exposition or example, and clarification, which involves restating, summarising or clarifying the elaborated items Halliday and Matthiessen (2004). Table 1 summarizes Halliday and Matthiessen's (2004) classification of elaboration subtypes and indicators (p. 541–543).

Type of conjunction	Subtypes		Items
Elaboration	Appositive	Expository	*in other words, that is, I mean, to put it another way.*
		Exemplifying	*for example, for instance, thus, to illustrate.*
	Clarification	Corrective	*or rather, at least, to be more precise*
		Distractive	*by the way, incidentally*
		Dismissive	*in any case, anyway, leaving that aside*
		Particularising	*in particular, more especially*
		Resumptive	*as I was saying, to resume, to get back to the point*
		Summative	*in short, to sum up, in conclusion, briefly*
		Verifactive	*actually, as a matter of fact, in fact*

Table 2.1: List of elaboration subtypes and markers

Table 1 : List of elaboration subtypes and markers

The second type of conjunction is extension, This happens when "one clause adds something new to another, extending the meaning of the latter" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 405). Extension has two subtypes, **addition** and **variation**.

Table 2 summarises the subtypes and items involved in this type of conjunction.

Types of conjunction	Subtypes		Items
Extension	Addition	Positive	*and, also, moreover, in addition*
		Negative	*nor*
	Adversative		*but, yet, on the other hand, however*
	Variation	Replacive	*on the contrary, instead*
		Subtractive	*apart from that, except for that*
		Alternative	*or (else), alternatively*

Table 2 : List of extension subtypes and markers

The third type of conjunction is enhancement, which refers to When "one clause clarifies the meaning of another by referring to time, place, manner, cause, or condition" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 410). The enhancement category of conjunction has four subtypes: matter, manner, spatio-temporal and causal-conditional. Table 3 shows these subtypes and some example items.

Types of conjunction	Subtypes			Items
Enhancement	Matter	Positive		*here, there, as to that, in that respect*
		Negative		*in other respects, elsewhere*
	Manner	Comparative		*likewise, similarly; in a different way*
		Means		*in the same manner*
	Spatio-temporal	Simple	following	*then, next, afterwards [including correlatives first...then]*
			simultaneous	*just then, at the same time*
			preceding	*before that, hitherto, previously*
			conclusive	*in the end, finally*
		Complex	immediate	*at once, thereupon, straightaway*
			interrupted	*soon, after a while*
			repetitive	*next time, on another occasion*
			specific	*next day, an hour later, that morning*
			durative	*meanwhile, all that time*
			terminal	*until then, up to that point*
			punctiliar	*at this moment*
	Causal - conditional	Casual	general	*so, then, therefor, hence*
			specific	*Result: as a result*
				Reason: on account of this
				Purpose: for that purpose
		Conditional	positive	*then, in that case, in that event, under the circumstances*
			negative	*otherwise, if not*
			concessive	*yet, still, though, despite this, however, even so, all the same, nevertheless*

Table 3 List of enhancement subtypes and markers

2.2 Conjunction in the Arabic language

In Arabic, the idea of a conjunction has been interpreted as either a grammatical connecting technique that primarily coordinates units like words, phrases, clauses, and sentences or as a continuous pattern that unites various elements of the text both semantically. In the first theory, which is supported by the majority of Arab grammarians &

rhetoricians, conjunctions are introduced as "connectives" or "connective particles" (ḥurūf urf al-'af, in Arabic), which join various sections of a phrase together.

Nine main connective particles are identified, namely wa 'and', fa 'and/then,' thumma 'then', hatta 'until', aw 'or' am 'or', lakin 'but', bal 'rather/but actually,' and laa 'not' (Eid, 1975). This prominent view of

According to Al-Amri (2004), the "grammar of the sentence" in Arabic grammar, which emphasizes case or moods inflection, is what determines how sentences are structured.

On the other hand, Many Arab discourse analyzers and modern traditional Arabic (MSA) academics have more recently been interested in the cohesive function of conjunctive particles. (Al-Batal, 1990; Al-Jubouri, 1984; Alsaif, 2012; Beeston, 1983; Cantarino, 1975; Hassan, 1979; Holes, 2004; Ryding, 2005; Williams, 1989; Wright, 1967). By defining and analyzing various syntactic and semantic uses of these particles and/or by adding new conjunctive markers, these works have sought to broaden our understanding of the idea of conjunction in Arabic. For example, Ryding's work (2005) is one she categorized Arab conjunctive markers according to their grammatical purposes and effects in one of the most recent studies in MSA. (see Table 4).

Disjunctives		أو	*aw* ('or')
		أم	*am* ('or')
Sentence-starting connectives	topic shift	أما	*amma* ('as for')
	Addition	إلى ذلك	*ila dhalik* ('in addition to that, moreover, furthermore')

	Place	حيث	*hayth* ('where')
		بينما	*bay-na-maa* ('while, whereas')
		بعدما	*ba'-da-ma* ('after')
		بعد أن	*ba'-da 'an* ('after')
		بعدئذ	*ba'-da idhin* ('after')
	Time	حين/حينما	*hiin/hiina-ma* ('when, at the time when')
		عندما	*in-da-maa* ('when, at the time when')
		عندئذ	*in-da-idhin* ('then, at that time')
Adverbial conjunctions		قبل أن	*qablq 'an* ('before')
		ثم	*thumma* ('then, and then, subsequently')
		كما	*ka-ma* ('just as, similarly, likewise')
	Similarity	مثلما	*mithil-a-ma* ('like, just as, as')
		قدر ما	*qadr-a-ma* ('as much as, just as, as … as')
		حسبما	*hasb-a-ma* ('according to, in accordance with, depending on')
	Possibility	ربما	*rubb-a-ma* ('perhaps, maybe, possibly')

Table 4: Ryding's categorisation of Arabic conjunction (Ryding, 2005, pp409-421)

Another comprehensive categorisation model for conjunctions in Arabic is found in Alsaif (2012). One of the most recent efforts in MSA, it automatically discovered and categorized Arabic discourse conjunctives based on their discourse connections. Alsaif (2012, pp. 75-87) categorises Arabic conjunctions in eight groups, as follows:

1. The coordinating conjunction connectives

- wa' (و) and' - fa' (و) and so/and then/yet/thus'

- idh' (إذ) since, inasmuch as, as' - aw' (أو) or'

- lakin (لكن) 'but, yet'

2. The subordinating conjunction connectives

- idha' (إذا) if' - illa' (إلا) except'

- illa idha' (إلا إذا) except if' - illa an' (إلا أن) but'

- illa baa'd' (إلا بعد) except after' - amma' (أما) as for'

- inna-maa' (إنما) but, but moreover, rather' - hayth(حيث) 'where'

- be-sabab' (بسبب) because of' - ba'-da-ma' (بعدما) after'

- in-da-ma' (عندما) when, at the time when' - gyr anna(غير أن) '(however'

- bay-na-maa' (بينما) while, whereas' - kulla-ma' (كلما) whenever'

- be-ma'na akhar (بمعنى آخر) ' (in other words' - ka-anna(كأن) '(as'

- ka-ma' (كما) just as, similarly, likewise' - bal' (بل) rather, but actually'

- ky' (كي) to' - li-dha(لذا) 'for this'

- la-siya-ma' (لا سيما) particulary' - li-anna' (لأن) because'

- li-ky' (لكي) for, in order to' - lw' (لو) if' (in past(

- lw-la' (لولا) if not' - ta-la-ma' (طالما) as long as'

- wa-qabl' (وقبل) and before' - idha-fatan ila' (إضافة إلى) ' in addition to'

- bog-ya-ta' (بغية) desire, to' - byd' (بيد) but'

- byd an' (بيد أن) but' - fadh-

lan an' (فضلا عن) as wll as'

- hin-na-ha' (حينها) when that' - na-tija-ta' (نتيجة) result of'

- qubail' (قبيل) shortly before' - ragma' (رغم) though'

- ragma anna' (رغم أن) although' - khilafan le(خلافا ل) 'unlike'

- nadhran le (نظرا ل) 'because of '

3. The noun connectives

- idha-fatan ila' (إضافة إلى) in addition to' - bog-ya-ta (بغية) 'desire, to'

- byd' (بيد) but' - byd an' (بيد أن) but'

- fadh-lan an' (فضلا عن) as well as' - hin-na-ha (حينها) 'when that'

- na-tija-ta' (نتيجة) result of' - qubail (قبيل) 'shortly before'

- ragma' (رغم) though'

- ragma anna' (رغم أن) although'

- khilafan le (خلافا ل) 'unlike' - nadhran le (نظرا ل) 'because of'

4. The adverbial connectives

- aidhan' (أيضا) also' - hal' (حال) when'

- hatta' (حتى) until, till, as far as' - hatta lw' (حتى لو) even if'

- hiin' (حين) when, at the time when' - kadha-lika) كذلك) 'and that'

- li-dali-ka' (لذلك) therefore' - min thamma) من ثم) 'then'

- thumma (ثم) 'then, subsequently' - koso-san (خصوصا) 'in particular, specially'

5. The (prepositions + relative pronoun) connectives

- fi-ma' (فيما) while' - mimma' (مما) which (+past verb')

6. The preposition connectives

- ithra' (إثر) after' - mondho' (منذ) since'

- be' (ب) by' - qabl' (قبل) before'

- aqiba' (عقب) shortly after' - qabla an' (قبل أن) before that'

- jarra' (جراء) because' - ba'ad' (بعد) after'

- li (ل) 'for' - khilal (خلال) 'during'

7. The prepositional phrase connectives

- bel-moqabil' (بالمقابل) in contrast' - be-ttali (بالتالي) 'consequently'

- be-fadhl' (بفضل) thanks to' - ala ragm (على الرغم من) 'although'

- be-hadaf' (بهدف) in order to' - fil moqabil (في المقابل)

'in contrast'

- be-ragm (برغم) 'although' - fi hal (في حال) 'in case'

- bel-ida-fah' (بالإضافة) in addition' - fi hiin (في حين) 'while'

- be-rragm (بالرغم من) 'although' - fi dil (في ظل) 'under'

8. Other discourse connectives

- a'la alo'mom (على العموم) 'in general' - a'lawh a'la (علاوة على) 'in addition to'

- mathalan' (مثلا) for example'' - a'la lax (على العكس) 'opposite'

- bekh-ti-sar' (باختصار) briefly, in sum' - a'la naqid (على النقيض) 'in contrast'

- bel-asas' (بالأساس) basically' - natijatan li (نتيجة ل) 'resulted by'

- bel-edafa' (بالإضافة) in ad-

dition, additionally' - o'mo-man' (عموما) generally'

• bel-fee'l' (بالفعل) indeed' - fi'lan' (فعلا) indeed'

• be-hujati an' (بحجة أن) be-cause of' - fil-waqi (في الواقع) 'in fact, of course'

• ba'ad dhalika' (بعد ذلك) af-ter that' - fi a'qab (في أعقاب) 'after all'

• jadyir bi-dhiker (جدير بالذكر) ' (it should be noted' - khita-man' (ختاما) finally'

• dalilan a'la' (دليلا على) evi-dence for' - ka-daleel' (كدليل) as an evidence'

• ghalik anna' (ذلك أن) that because' - li-a'jel' (لأجل) for'

• a'la sabil al-mithal (على سبيل المثال) 'for example' - kho-lasah' (خلاصة) to sum up'

• fi hadhih elathna (في هذه الأثناء) 'in the meantime' - li-

a'lla' (لئلا) for not'

• lihadha assabab (لهذا السبب) 'for this reason' - wa fi alkhitam (وفي الختام) 'finally'

The most used conjunctive marker in Arabic is wa 'and', which, in different circumstances, has a variety of grammatical and rhetorical applications. According to Holes (1995) The conjunction "and" (wa) may function as a literary device or a connection between sentences, and it can be used to indicate the following relations:

▪ It denotes the beginning of a section containing bits of information. It is common practice to place it at the beginning of a paragraph, and it is found almost exclusively in narrative literature, when it "serves the same purpose of denoting the end of one

sentence as it does the beginning of the next. (Holes, 1995, p. 217).

- It conveys additive relations, where two or more equal clauses are stacked on top of one another. Wa 'and' behaves as and in English in this adding connection.

- It uses English to convey temporal links like "then.", where it signals the successive relationship between clauses.

- It expresses simultaneous action, where two actions in different clauses are connected with wa 'and', which gives the meaning of at the same time and without giving "particular topical prominence" by showing which action happens first (Holes, 1995, p. 219).

- It expresses circumstantial relations, usually giving the meaning of when/while in English. In this relation, wa 'and' introduces and connects the circumstantial clause to the main clause.

- It expresses adversative relations, in which two or more adversative clauses are connected and wa 'and' acts as but/yet-The secondary most typical conjunctive marker analysed in this study is aw 'or'. In Arabic, aw 'or' is "(Ryding, 2005, p. 418) states that a disjunctive shows a choice between two or more components, but that choice is inclusive and might encompass any or all of the elements.

The third most frequent conjunctive marker analysed is thumma 'then', which usually connects sequential actions, and expresses the temporal relation

between actions: Thumma often denotes that the activity of the previous phrase has been accomplished, so presenting a new occurrence or circumstance (Cantarino, 1975, p. 36). This is because of its temporal sense.

The fourth most frequent conjunctive marker analysed in this study is lakin' but/yet' According to (Cantarino, 1975), it often implies an adverse link to the preceding word, sentence, or circumstance.

Lastly, the fifth most frequent conjunctive marker analysed in this study is hattaa' until'. It can be used for a variety of functions, but when it used as a conjunctive marker, it usually introduces a phrase that "demonstrates the effects or outcome of the preceding clause." When used in this

manner, it alludes to a prior occasion or deed." (Ryding, 2005, p. 413).

3. Contrastive differences in preferences for conjunctive markers between English and Arabic

While cohesive devices Languages do show contrastive variations in preferences for establishing cohesiveness, either by utilizing particular cohesive devices more often than others or in specific combinations that may not match English patterns of cohesion. These contrastive variances are present in most languages. In regards to preferences for the usage of conjunctive markers, this section briefly compares and contrasts English and Arabic.

A number of studies in Arabic

have been carried out discussing the concept of cohesion, including conjunction, from different angles (Al-Jabr, 1987; Hassan, ;1979Mehamsadji, 1988; Williams, 1989). These studies include some discussions of contrastive differences between English and Arabic in cohesive devices and other linguistic features. (Al-Amri, 2004; Al-Kashef, 2011).

As regards contrastive differences relating to the pattern of conjunction, there are some structural and discourse-related factors that may account for these differences.

For instance, there are certain discrepancies as a consequence of various approaches to information construction, chunking, and linking. In English, it is typi-

cal to provide information in brief sections. In contrast, Arabic often uses lengthy passages of text, with a typical paragraph consisting of only one phrase (Baker, 2011, p. 201). Therefore, the high frequency of conjunctive markers in Arabic may be regarded as a consequence of the the Arabic phrase requires the joining of many components. Additionally, English relies on a highly developed punctuation system that further denotes the connections between informational bits. In comparison, Arabic has just recently adopted a punctuation and paragraphing system (Holes, 2004). The Arabic sentence may use more conjunctive markers since less punctuation is employed to indicate the relationships between propositions. in-

stead of using punctuation marks (Holes, 2004). In addition, The employment of a large range of conjunctive markers with several semantic links to link these bits of information in English is clearly related to the preference for delivering information in smaller chunks.

In contrast, Arabic employs fewer conjunctions, but they serve a variety of purposes and have meanings that are deduced from the discourse's context (Baker, 2011).

This difference could explain the high frequency of specific conjunctive markers in Arabic texts.

The distinctions depending on register must also be considered in any consideration of how conjunctive markers are used differ-

ently across languages.

Register may be seen of as "patterned linguistic reflections of contextual variation" that have been conventionalized (Neumann 2014:36). Register studies emphasise that language use varies systematically with different contexts of use. Such linguistic variation is usually analysed in terms of multi-dimensional constellations of linguistic probabilistic co-occurrence connections that describe characteristics (Biber, 1988, 1993, 1995; Biber & Finegan, 1994; Ghadessy, 1988, 1993). Every register has its own linguistic characteristics or patterns of co-occurrence of characteristics that set it apart from other registers.

When certain registers tend to be more conjunctive than others

and each genre has its own predilection for particular forms of conjunctions, the relationship between conjunction and register variation becomes apparent. Religious and fiction registers, for example, than others, utilize more conjunctions (Smith & Frawley, 1983). Although the usage of conjunctive markers in translated and untranslated Arabic is the major focus of this research, the study moves on with the understanding that conjunctive markers may reveal differential uses not only between languages but also across registers. For this reason, it was deemed necessary to include two distinct registers in the study (Crystal, 1998:81).

This part provided background to the two main sets of concepts that this study investigates: the recurrent features of translated language, and the concept of conjunction. A brief background discussion of the main recurrent features identified in the literature and the main studies in this area was provided, together with an overview of the concept of conjunction in English and Arabic. The relation between these two concepts was set out. The aim of this discussion was to investigate the possible implications of the relationship between these two sets of concepts, to gain a sound understanding of the use of conjunction as operationalization Studies of the common characteristics of translated language, notably in the translation of English into Arabic, and finally to delineate the existing research

gap in this research area.

Conclusion

We may draw the conclusion that there are certain places that are shared by conjuncts in both English and Arabic, and that there are other areas that are exclusive to one language over the other.

The "conjuncts" of the two languages are quite different. While they are particles in Arabic as opposed to adverbs in English, they both use "conjuncts" to provide a connective purpose.

In contrast to Arabic, where "conjuncts" are set in place, English does not. Arabic conjunctive particles can only be positioned medially.

Regarding the connection between "conjuncts" and their overall importance. Both languages share the idea that the presence or absence of "conjuncts" has no effect on the syntactic connection of the whole sentence.

There are certain semantic functions like "enumeration," "result," "transition," "equation," and "antithesis" that are shared by both languages with regard to the semantics of "conjuncts." Other features are limited to one language alone, not both.

Reference

1.　94 .

2.　Abdul-Hameed, M. M. (1946). Sharhul-Ashmooni: Vol.4. Cairo: Al-Halabi Press.

3.　Al-Andalusi, Abu Hayyan (1987). Irtishaful-Darab. Vol.2. Mustafa A. Al-Nammas (ed.), Cairo: Al-Madani Publishing House.

4.　Al-Antaki, M. (With-

out Date). Al-Muheet fir Aswat il-„Arabiyyati wa Nahwiha wa Sarfiha. Vol.2. Beirut: Dar ul-Sharq Bookshop.

5. Ali, A.Y. (1997). The Meaning pf the Holy Qur"an. U.S.A: Amana Publications.

6. Crystal, D.(1998). A Dictionary of Phonetics and Linguistics. London: Blackwell.

7. Dayrell, C. (2007). A quantitative approach to compare collocational patterns in translated and non-translated texts. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 12(3),

8. De Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). Introduction to Text Linguistics. London & New York: Longman.

9. De Sutter, G., Delaere, I., & Plevoets, K. (2012). Lexical lectometry in corpusbased transla-tion studies. In M. Oakes & M. Ji (Eds.), Quantitative methods in corpus-based translation studies: a practical guide to descriptive translation research. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

10. Delaere, I., De Sutter, G., & Plevoets, K. (2012). Is translated language more standardized than non-translated language?: Using profile-based correspondence analysis for measuring linguistic distances between language varieties. Target, 24(2).

11. Djamila, L. (2010). Shifts in translating lexical cohesion from Arabic into English. Master in Applied Language Studies thesis, University of Mentouri Constantine.

12. Duff, A. (1981). The third language: Recurrent problems of

translation into English: It ain't what you do, it's the way you do it. Oxford/New Yourk: Pergamon Press.

13. Eddakrouri, A. (2016). Web-based (Searchable) corpora. Retrieved from https://sites.google.com/a/aucegypt.edu/infoguistics/directory/Corpus- Linguistics/arabic-corpora

14. Eid, M. (1975). Al Nahw Al Mussafah [The Refined Grammar]. Cairo: Maktabat al-shabab.

15. Ellis, N. (1996). Sequencing in SLA. Studies in second language acquisition91- ,(01)18 . .126

16. Eskola, S. (2004). Untypical frequencies in translated language: A corpus-based study on a literary corpus of translated and non-translated Finnish. In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Eds.),

Translation Universals: (Do They Exist pp. 83-100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

17. Fattah, A. (2010). A corpus-based study of conjunctive explicitation in Arabic translated and non-translated texts written by the same translators/authors. (PhD), University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.

18. Fraser, B. (1990). "An Approach to Discourse Markers". Pragmatics, 14:383-95.

19. Frawley, W. (1984). Prolegomenon to a Theory of Translation. In W. Frawley(Ed.), Translation: Literary, Linguistic, and Philosophical Perspectives , London: Associated University Presses.

20. Gellerstam, M. (1986). Translationese in Swedish Novels Translated from English. In

L. Wollin & H. Lindquist (Eds.), Translation studies in Scandinavia. Lund: CWK Gleerup.

21. Ghadessy, M. (1988). Registers of Written English: Situational Factors and Linguistic Factors. London: Pinter Publishers.

22. Ghadessy, M. (1993). Register analysis: Theory and practice. London: Pinter Publishers.

23. Gregory, M., & Carroll, S. (1978). Language and situation: Language varieties and their social contexts: London: Routledge.

24. Grosjean, F., & Soares, C. (1986). Processing mixed language: Some preliminary findings. In J. Vaid (Ed.), Language processing in bilinguals: Psycholinguistic and neuropsychological perspectives , Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

25. Gutwinski, W. (1976). Cohesion in literary texts: A study of some grammatical and lexical features of English discourse. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

26. Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman. Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). An introduction to functional grammar. London: Arnold.

27. Halverson, S. (2003). The cognitive basis of translation universals. Target, 15(2.197-241).

28. Halverson, S. (2015). Cognitive Translation Studies and the merging of empirical paradigms: The case of 'literal translation'. Translation Spaces, 4(2), 310 340-)

29. Hansen-Schirra, S. (2011). Between normalization and shining-through. Specific properties of English-German translations

and their influence on the target language. In S. Kranich, V. Becher, H. d. S, & J. House (Eds.), Multilingual Discourse Production: Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives .

30. Hansen-Schirra, S., Neumann, S., & Steiner, E. (2007). Cohesive explicitness and explicitation in an English-German translation corpus. Languages in Contrast, 7(2), 241-266.

31. Hassan, T. (1979). Allughah Alarabiyyah: Ma'naahaa wa Mabnaahaa [Arabic Language: Its Structure and Meaning]. Cairo: General Egyptian Book Organization.

32. Hill, T., & Lewicki, P. (2006). Statistics: methods and applications. Cape Town: StatSoft.

33. Hoey, M. (1991). Patterns of lexis in text. Oxford: Oxford University Press.