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ABSTRACT

A Comparative Study of Aspects of Information Structure in the Arabic and English Expository Paragraph

Harold M. Blond

The objective of this thesis is to describe and compare aspects of the structuring, ordering and modification of information within Arabic and English expository paragraphs as they appear in learned journals in each language dealing with similar subject matter. Sample texts in English and Arabic have been analyzed in order to make general statements concerning differences in the structuring and ordering of information in terms of coordination and subordination of propositional content on one hand, and the relative uses of restrictive and non-restrictive modification on the other. The results of the study were examined in the light of their implications for the teaching of ESL composition to Arabic speaking learners specifically, and for the teaching of foreign languages generally.
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CHAPTER I

PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM

Linguistics has devoted increasing attention to the analysis and comparison of samples of language comprising more than one sentence. This has expressed itself in varying fields of endeavor with a great deal of overlap occurring, e.g., Comparative Discourse studies: (Fuller, 1959; Grimes, 1975; Gleason, 1968), Text Analysis: (Christensen, 1967; Van Dyk, 1973, 1977; Halliday and Hasan, 1975; Newsham, 1978; Sing, 1978), Contrastive Rhetoric: (Kaplan, 1972, 1978; Strei, 1972; Williamson, 1978), Comparative Stylistics: (Crystal and Davies, 1969; Enkvist, 1973). The purpose of this study is to examine some facets of Arabic and English at the level of text in order to see if definable and comparable differences can be extrapolated and described. The problem area is introduced and defined in the following pages. This is accomplished in five subsections which: (1) present the problem; (2) state the overall purpose of this study; (3) give a rationale for conducting the study; (4) delineate the scope of the paper and (5) define core terminology.

1.1 Introduction

The following article from, "Al Mustaqbil", a well known Lebanese weekly published in Paris (January 9, 1981), has been translated by the
On the eve of the commencement of meetings of the second session of the Jerusalem Commission, Marrakesh, the red Atlasian city was completing all its preparations for listening to King Hasan II's inaugural speech after what approaches a year has passed since his chairing of this commission which developed out of the Fas Islamic Council. The council members at large assigned to this session, which will continue for two days a special importance, it being about to be held in the shadow of the Zionist Entity's continuing of operations intending.
to Judaise Jerusalem and the Haram al Ibrahimi and to
entrenching the Israeli presence within it. And circles
within the commission which comprises 14 states represented
at the foreign ministerial level say that the roster
at the meetings of Marrakesh will focus on 3 points
with which two working papers will deal (and) which the
P.L.O. will present and (also) the general secretary
of the Islamic Council Organization, Mr. J. al Shaty,
(parenthesized expressions mine)

What at first strikes the English reader is the length of the
sentences and the quantity of supportive or additional information
that is appended to each main clause. The overall body of the text
does not digress from the topic area as designated in the title. Yet
the article somehow appears to structure its content differently from
what English readers are accustomed to. This element of "foreignness"
in-Arabic style becomes increasingly clear when one examines ESL
compositions written by Arabic speakers, and especially when
attempting to translate selections of Arabic prose into stylistically good as well as grammatically accurate English. From a series of meetings with ESL teachers carried out during the winter term of 1981 at the Continuing Education Department of Concordia University I found that compositions of Arab students were variously described as verbose, repetitive, indirect or tangential, qualities that seem unrelated to grammatical or idiomatic mastery alone. Similarly, in the course of my experience as a student of Arabic I have observed that English speaking learners often had difficulty following the line of thought as expressed in the development of the text. Arabic speakers in discussing English expository style with me have often described it, whether in a positive or negative light, as bare or sparse in finer detail. Arabic and English, then, would seem to have varying conceptions of text and differing perceptions of what constitutes well formed exposition -- phenomena which may be attributable to, among other things, differing conventions both explicit and implicit for the structuring and modification of information within written text.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to describe and compare aspects of the structuring, ordering and modification of information within Arabic and English expository paragraphs as they appear in certain journals dealing with similar subject matter in each language. The sample texts have been analyzed in order to allow general statements concerning differences in the structuring and ordering of information in terms of
coordination and subordination on one hand, and the relative uses of restrictive and non-restrictive modification on the other, in both corpora. The results of the study are examined in the light of their implications for the teaching of ESL composition to Arabic speaking learners specifically, and for the teaching of writing in foreign languages generally.

1.3 Need for the Study

One of the main premises of this study is that neither mastery of sentence grammar nor awareness of the broader rhetorical patterns of written exposition is in itself sufficient for foreign language teaching, learning and translation; rather there exists an intermediate level where syntax and semantics coalesce, directly endowing exposition with a characteristic "texture" (Christensen, 1967; Halliday and Hasan, 1975). This study attempts to contribute to research which aims at characterizing and comparing cross-lingual variation in the structuring of expository content within written text in objectively definable, describable, and comparable ways. On the applied level, foreign language teaching and translation are two fields that would benefit from a greater general awareness and specific knowledge of cross-lingual variation in the structuring of information in expository writing.

The results of this study and others like it might contribute to the teaching of reading and writing skills in foreign languages by externalizing some factors involved in variations between the target language and the first language in ways that are demonstrable and
pedagogically useful.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

The area of interest here is expository writing, of the type used to "present facts or ideas" (Bander, 1978), where the greatest emphasis is placed on the cognitive content of the written communication and on its logical structuring.

The exposition that is examined is of the explicative sort employed in articles of an academic nature. The content area from which samples are drawn includes subjects in the humanities and the social sciences.

The sampling unit that provides the data for this study is the paragraph. The paragraph samples are restricted to those introduced by a topic sentence which is in turn elaborated upon in following sentences and clauses bearing subordinate information. The writing style of all the samples is expository, the tenor being explicative in all cases. The paragraph was chosen as the basic sampling unit not because it in itself was the object of analysis but because it provides more or less equivalent segments of text used and recognized as such in both the Arabic and English corpora. The limitations in paragraph type and tenor are intended to restrict the samples to units of maximal similarity regarding their purpose, style, rhetorical function and structure, i.e., their register (Ellis, 1966).

The study itself is limited to a quantitative analysis for specific linguistic features and a comparison of their occurrences within and across corpora in terms of frequency, average and ratio. The first
feature is syntactic while the second is more properly semantic. Both are confined initially to sentence grammar alone although the end purpose is to make statements concerning the structuring of information in the texts as wholes.

The first involves sentence size and composition. Size is defined in terms of the number of clauses of which a sentence is comprised. Composition is defined according to frequency and ratio of clause types. Types are classified by how a clause is comprised and composition according to the frequency and ratio of clause types appearing in a sentence. Clause type is defined according to: (a) manner of linkage to the clause immediately preceding in the text, i.e., by coordination, subordination or by absence of grammatical linkage, and (b) presence and frequency of parallel constructions whenever these occur within the clause.

The second area of language that is analyzed for and compared across corpora is the relative use of restrictive modification in describing nouns and noun slot items making up the texts.

The results of the study are intended to allow general statements only with regard to the data at hand and not to all Arabic and English expository prose in the humanities and the social sciences. It is hoped, however, that the results of the present study will contribute to further research in the comparison of information structure in written texts across languages by pointing out directions for further and more intensive research.
1.5 Definition of Terms

The following are definitions of core terms and concepts as used or referred to in the course of the study. The definitions themselves are primarily operational in nature.

1. CLAUSE: A complete propositional statement realized in written text with a grammatical subject and a predicate consisting of a finite verb and optionally of any one or more objects, complements and/or adverbia elements.

2. CLAUSE, Coordinate: A clause linked to another preceding in the text by the relations expressed in the coordinate conjunctions and or (and by the negatives neither nor) as well as by the conjunction, but.

3. CLAUSE, Main: A clause to which one or more subordinate clauses are linked; it in turn remaining unlinked to any other clause by subordination.

4. CLAUSE, Subordinate: A clause linked to another immediately preceding in the text by the relations expressed in subordinate conjunctions introducing adverbia, relative, conditional, concessive as well as nominal elements.

5. COORDINATE CONSTRUCTION: A segment formed when two or more syntactically equivalent structures are linked together by coordinate and, or (or by the negatives neither, nor) and share the same clause elements or act as a series of modifiers for the same head noun phrase.

6. MODIFICATION, Nonrestrictive: Additive information attributed to
a nominal and realized structurally as a relative clause, an appositive or as an adjective functor, and which, if deleted does not alter the basic propositional statement of which the nominal is a part.

7. MODIFICATION, Restrictive: Information that qualifies or limits the range of applicability of a nominal such that if the information is deleted the propositional statement in which the nominal is involved collapses. It is realized structurally in the same way as non-restrictive modification.

8. PROPOSITION: A basic word grouping in which either a quality is attributed to an entity or in which an act is done by or to an entity.

9. TEXT: A sequence of words written in a particular style that, globally, express meaning in relation to a given context.

10. TERMINAL UNIT OR "T-UNIT" (Hunt, 1965): Operationally defined here as any single independent or coordinate clause, and any complex sentence, i.e., a main clause together with any subordinate clauses that may be linked to it.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The following Chapter briefly summarizes approaches to the definition and comparative analysis of text having particular relevance to this study. This includes: (1) a review of core concepts underlying the study in the fields of "linguistic relativity", language at the level of text and the comparative analysis of text: (2) an overview of analytical frameworks used and referred to: (3) a statement about the literary Arabic language which is examined here and (4) a review of previous contrastive studies of text.

2.1 Introduction

It has long been recognized intuitively that speakers of different languages perceive and categorize phenomena differently, sequencing and arranging these perceived categories within written discourse in various ways. This is obvious to any foreign language student or translator. The idea that world view is conceived of differently in various languages and, conversely, that language serves to limit if not determine outright phenomenological reality is expounded in the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of Linguistic Relativity. According to such a view of the language-culture interface, anyone who
would learn a foreign language or translate between languages must master not only new grammatical, lexical and idiomatic forms but also different ways of viewing phenomena and events, and different ways of linking these as related concepts within accepted modalities of use (Sapir, 1958; Whorf, 1964). When the reader is exposed to samples of written material of more than one sentence in length, he can usually tell whether it forms some kind of unity or is a collection of unrelated pieces. Such a unity implies the existence of an entity greater than the sum of its parts, which when written forms a text. According to Halliday and Hasan, a text is conceived of as a semantic unit which is realized structurally by means of syntactic and lexical elements (Halliday and Hasan, 1975). A sequence of sentences may constitute a text varying in degree and quality from other texts. This quality of being a text or having "texture" in the terminology of Halliday and Hasan is proved by relations of "cohesion" one one hand and "register" on the other. Cohesion, or the meaningful linking of elements in a text, exists at two levels; one within the text itself, the other in the extra-linguistic reality jointly perceived by the producer and the receiver. Within a text cohesion is provided linguistically, the purpose being the linking of elements semantically either to what has come before in the flow of the discourse, or to what is yet to come. Meaningful links between elements of a text that do not come by way of the lexico-grammar of language but by way of a shared phenomenological world that is "understood" to both the producer and the receiver are ties that exist between the referents that language symbolizes. The non-cohesive factor that enters into text formation is the context that it is presented in and for. The context
determines its mode of presentation, i.e., its "register" (Ellis, 1966). Text register has a culturally defined format which in the case of certain modalities of expression are fairly explicit. Academically-oriented expository prose is an example of "register" which has guidelines as to its mode of presentation or style, guidelines which, as is contended here, affect the texture of the text. The nature of a text then, according to Halliday and Hasan is a function of cohesive relations existing between reference items and referents (co-text), shared and perceived environment, and the situationally defined mode of presentation or register (context) (Halliday and Hasan, 1975: 1-24, 293-305).

Pike, in the early Fifties anticipated the study of language at levels beyond the sentence by positing that the notion of constituency could be applied not only to the phonological, morphological and syntactic aspects of language but also to the socio-cultural contexts in which it is used. Discourse was perceived of as the "ultimate level of organization", its superordinate constituent being the "behioreme", i.e., that major unit having a culturally defined beginning and end on the one hand and having internal structurae on the other. This unit would also be analyzable into constituent sub-elements throughout the hierarchy of levels of language, i.e., into constituent structures (Pike, 1967: 34-36).

Grimes, using Pike's broad definition as a starting point develops a theoretical framework for discourse studies rooted in both generative-semantic theory and tagmemics and which is applicable to written text as well as verbal behaviour. Discourse studies, according to Grimes, must take two factors into account: (1) "underlying formational
structures", or the content element, also defined in terms of sociolinguistic and individual constraints and norms: (2) "transformations" or the realization of the former linguistically in communicatively acceptable forms, in syntax, information structure and style (Grimes, 1975: 30-32). The basic unit for analysis of discourse, whether oral or as written text, is the proposition, a purely semantic unit allowing cross-linguo-cultural comparison. Propositions are of two types -- lexical and rhetorical. A lexical proposition (using the terminology of case grammar) is a linking of arguments by a predicate in a case-role relationship, i.e., as expressed in a simple assertive clause, e.g., "And Mata ben Yunis defends Greek logic". The arguments may themselves be embedded propositions e.g., "However, he who reads between the lines will probably read something else." (from corpus) Rhetorical propositions (similar to Halliday and Hasan's cohesive relations of conjunction) (Halliday and Hasan, 1975: 226-230) involve the linking of lexical propositions on the basis of purely semantic relations without any role or case obtaining between them; e.g., as expressed in the conjunctival relation "because" in "And there is no doubt that this research has great importance because it adds another episode to the chain of human development." The configurations of rhetorical complexes formed in the joining of lexical propositions by rhetorical ones constitute an "outline" of the rhetorical structure of the discourse (Grimes: 107-108).

The term "contrastive rhetoric" is used by Kaplan in a number of works (Kaplan, 1972, 1976, 1978a, 1978b) in his explorations for the foundations of a theory of text analysis across languages which takes as its underlying assumptions linguistic relativity and the culturally-
coded nature of expository style. Expository writing is viewed as being made possible by a set of skills, an analytical framework which the writer, in learning a new language transfers from his native tongue to the target language. These skills and framework provide a frame of reference already familiar to the learner. The framework is a "logico-semantic set" which finds its realization in the grammar and lexis of the language in question (Kaplan, 1978b). The criteria for well-formed text are culturally specified and relative, reflecting particular conceptions of the phenomenological world and relations within it. Relations common to all expository prose such as sequence, logic, space, and time, are conceived of and expressed differently in various languages. The would-be learner must grasp the mode of linear thinking, and the ways of expressing and relating ideas within the "realizable range" of the target language both in terms of choice and arrangement (Kaplan, 1978a:9).

2.2 Analytical Framework

The idea of "outlining" or "patterning" of discourse formed the conceptual framework for numerous analyses based on the coordination and subordination of elements within text (Fuller, 1959; Christensen, 1967; Winterowd, 1969; Pitkin, 1969; Kaplan, 1972, 1978a, 1978b; Widdowson, 1978). It was Pitkin who first developed an applicable technique as well as a methodology for comparing text structure with reference to the coordination and subordination of elements of information within. In devising a system of analysis based primarily on semantic criteria independent of graphemic conventions, Pitkin
invented schemata that became relevant for cross-linguistic studies. His basic analytical unit is the "discourse unit", a unit related to other discourse units "horizontally" by means of coordination or complementation and "vertically" through subordination or, conversely, superordination. Horizontally-related units are functionally equal in relating new information to a shared superordinate unit, or they are units that complement each other, i.e., question-answer, positive-negative. A "discourse bloc" is any aggregate of discourse units that relate directly or indirectly (through a mediating unit) to the same superordinate discourse unit (Pitkin, 1969: 138-142). A discourse unit may or may not be equivalent to a graphemic sentence, the prime criteria for its definition as a unit being the hierarchical relationship it bears to other units in a text through conjunction. Such relationships may join units in a coordinately equal footing, vis-a-vis a semantically superordinate unit they refer to in text, or they may subordinate one unit to another. The limits then of such units would be a function of the coordinate or subordinate conjunctive relations obtaining between them. The units themselves may be conceived of at many levels, i.e., as coordinated elements within a clause, clauses or sentences themselves or even paragraphs in an article or chapters in a novel. The "discourse bloc" would be a unit formed by a semantically superordinate unit together with all units directly or indirectly subordinate to it. It is the relations of coordination and subordination obtaining between elements of text with "discourse bloc" units which provide the first frame of reference for the present study.

The other aspect of text analysis examined here involves differential use, cross-linguistically, of restrictive and
non-restrictive modification in giving information about the propositional elements of a text. Christensen in applying structural paradigms to the teaching of "good" English written style refers to type and placement of modification in providing writing with what he designates "high" or "low" "texture", i.e., ample or limited supportive information to the main clauses of the text (Christensen, 1967: 3-4).

Gray focuses on the uses of restrictive and non-restrictive modification in lending different qualities and densities of texture (in Christensen's sense) to written discourse. Modification in general is conceived of in a purely semantic sense, being defined by Gray as "the expansion, contraction and general classification of meaning" (Gray, 1977: 123), which may be structurally realized as a word, phrase, a whole proposition or even as an increment of text.

Restrictive modification serves to qualify or limit the scope of its head unit whereas non-restrictive modification provides either additional or redundant information that in effect constitutes a new proposition (Gray, 1977: 112-114). As Gray perceives it, restrictive modification acts to make increasingly precise assertions rather than making additional assertions and its use characterizes "sophisticated" writing in English (Gray: 114-119).

The imputed predisposition towards restrictive modification in English writing merges well with Hunt's findings concerning the development of syntactic structures in the writing of school children at three grade levels. Hunt found that children's writing evolves from a coordinating-of-elements phase to an increased use of full subordinations, some of which develop into reductions (Hunt, 1976), which are often restrictive in English.
2.3 The Arabic Language

Arabic is used in various colloquial forms and in virtually the same literary form by nations and ethnic groups extending from the Soviet Union to Africa. Literary Arabic is used for almost all written communication (the occasional cartoon caption and some play dialogue are important exceptions) and it is this form which has developed clearly defined conventions of usage.

In that part of the world that is both Arab and Muslim the Arabic language (i.e., the literary language) achieved a value that was second only to the Islamic faith in importance. Because of its believed Koranic provenance, modern literary Arabic has changed only slightly from its scriptural form (Patai, 1976: 47). A number of prescriptive rhetorics designed as guidelines for communicating (persuasively) in literary Arabic were developed by Muslim scholars in attempting both to preserve and interpret the language of the Quran.

It is not the purpose of this study to examine the uses of highly developed rhetoric in Arabic (i.e., its uses of style to appeal to the emotions, its exploitation of rhythm, meter and literary devices for embellishment, all of which have been dealt with adequately elsewhere) but rather to examine an area of syntax and semantics which will allow a limited comparison of the structuring of information in the Arabic and English expository texts, more a question of elements of the code in which stylistic devices are encoded rather than the devices themselves.
2.4 Contrastive Studies

Very little has been done in the way of cross-linguistic contrastive analyses of text in general and even less on Arabic and English in particular. There are two contrastive studies in the rhetoric and styles of Spanish and English composition, studies relating primarily to conventions of thematic organization and the staging of author's point of view (Santiago, 1968; Strei, 1972). There also exists a comparative study of scientific writing in Macedonian and English (Konecni, 1976). Studies in the comparative cohesion of French and English have been carried out by Newsham (1978), and Singh (undated).

In the comparison of Arabic and English there are two studies: those of Kaplan (1972) and Williamson (1978). Both of these studies are restricted to the analysis of the ESL compositions written by Arabic speakers for their data on Arabic style. Both bring to attention the elaborate use of coordinating structures, apposition and parallelism in the Arab writers' samples and present models for the outlining of information in the ESL compositions based on Pitkin's model of discourse units.

The present study seeks to draw comparisons between actual samples of what is considered to be correct and representative written language in both Arabic and English. Within the following Chapter the type, selection and analysis of the data which forms the basis of this study will be discussed in detail.
CHAPTER III

THE STUDY

In this section the data examined and the systems of analysis applied in this study are discussed under three subheadings: (1) a description of the data itself, its sources and the mode of sampling used in its selection, (2) an explanation of the systems of analysis applied to the data in theoretical terms, (3) a description of the treatment of the data, i.e., techniques of analysis and criteria for their application.

3.1 Sources of the Data

Written text is the object of analysis in this study, and of written text a type that is very conventionalized in its structure, exposition. In his categorization of types of writing, Jakobovits distinguishes between "mechanical and creative sequencing". The former includes those genres that follow formats partly generated by explicitly-known and usually-taught patterns of expression, while the latter derives from none that is as easily definable. Exposition would fall into the former category, while novel writing, for example, would fall into the second (Jakobovits, 1969: 13). The term "exposition" is used in this study to include prose written with the purpose of
"presenting facts and ideas" (Bander, 1978: 94), where the writer's primary concern is conveying information in what he understands as a "logical structure".

The type of exposition examined here is of the explicative sort employed in articles of an academic nature. The content area from which samples are drawn includes subjects in the humanities and social sciences. Scientific discourse was rejected on the assumption that such subject matter has its own conventions apart from the language in which it is expounded, a factor which might minimalise possible cross-linguistic variation in the structuring of text in Arabic and English. Literature was avoided as a source of samples due to its preoccupation with the exploitation of language itself as a medium of expression.

The sampling source used in the study is the typologically defined paragraph, i.e., that portion of printed text extending from one indentation to the next on the page. The selection of the samples was achieved by opening to the centre page of each article and choosing the first paragraph that conformed to the following limitations:

(1) The paragraph contained a topic statement supported by others subordinate to it either directly or indirectly. (2) The paragraph carried information dealing with the body of the text, i.e., introductory, transitional and concluding paragraphs were excluded. (3) Only explicative content was selected, i.e., paragraphs describing or relating processes, events, ideas, systems or persons in an explanatory tenor. (4) Samples of similar size, i.e., word count, were sought. The paragraph was chosen as the sampling unit, not because it in itself is the object of study but because it provides
a more or less equivalent segment of text used and recognized as such in both the Arabic and the English corpora. Although Arabic prose has not traditionally been organized into paragraphs either typologically or conceptually, the articles from which the Arabic samples are extracted are clearly printed and organized in paragraph form, as in most contemporary expository prose.

Twenty samples of explicative expository prose were selected from twenty different articles published in journals treating subject areas in the social sciences and humanities. Ten of the samples were taken from Arabic and ten from English-language publications. An attempt was made to match subject areas in the samples taken from each language, e.g., pairing a sample taken from an historical article in Arabic with one of a similar type in English. Furthermore, the sources of the samples were maximally varied, i.e., each sample represents a different article and a different author.

Under the heading of "humanities" are four broadly defined subject areas that include fifteen samples, while the social sciences are represented in three subject areas encompassing the five remaining samples. The subject areas in the humanities and the distribution of samples among them are as follows: Islamic studies: one in Arabic, one in English, studies in Arabic literature (history and criticism): four in Arabic, two in English, history and biography: two in Arabic, four in English and finally philosophy: one Arabic sample.

The samples drawn from the social sciences are distributed in subject areas as follows: Area studies: one in Arabic, one in English, Economics: one in Arabic, one in English and finally education: one in English. The samples are to be found in Appendix I.
3.2.1 Systems of Analysis: Introduction

The purpose of this study is to define, extract and compare quantitatively linguistic phenomena occurring within the range of sentence grammar in sample texts of a similar type and purpose taken from two languages, and to use the findings as a basis for describing empirically verifiable differences in textual structure. Specific formal elements within the sentence are examined in order to arrive at generalizations of comparison concerning a semantic property existing in segments larger than the sentence, i.e., the structuring and patterning of information in texts of similar genre.

Two levels of meaning upon which the study rests are proposition and text, both of which convey information in written language. The proposition is a basic semantic grouping in which a quality is either attributed to someone/thing or in which an act is done by or to someone/thing. In relation to form, the proposition has been defined variously as a "tenseless set of relationships involving verbs, nouns and/or embedded elements if there are any" (Fillmore, 1968: 23), and as a grammatical unit that makes a comment, or says something about "terms", i.e., "a noun'slot grammatical unit which labels, names or refers to an entity" or noun phrase (Pike, 1967: 488-490). The proposition is viewed here as the basic information-conveying unit, the smallest element of statement of which larger segments of text are composed. Gray applies the term "assertion" to these propositional statements. Written text, according to Gray, represents the answer portion of a dialogue in which the answerer anticipates questions that may be directed to him. In dialogue itself the burden of exposition is
placed on the question-answer sequence and its execution distributed
among the participants. In a composition or text, however, the
writer strings together a number of propositions in the form of
statements that contain the answer to implicit or explicit questions
that may be raised by the reader, i.e., "subject-attribute assertions"
(Gray: 13-17).

A text conveys meaning that is more than the sum of its
propositional content. From a purely semantic viewpoint a text may be
conceived of as a string of propositions that convey meaning and
relate to one another and to an external environment contextually,
topically and cohesively. The context of a text is its field of
discourse, a shared perceived reality on the part of writer and reader.
The propositional elements are further connected by virtue of a
"shared collective intent" (Widdowson, 1978: 227) that is being
communicated, i.e., a topic area. A text, then conveys a comprehensive
meaning that exists aside from the content of each of its propositional
elements. Whereas context is rather an extra-linguistic factor in
the meaning of text, a matter of culture, its topic area must be
organized and presented through formal linguistic means. Both
context and topic give a text coherence, a sense of well-organized and
meaningful content in the minds of writer and reader. Cohesion is
more properly a function of the use of language in relating propositions
and their parts to each other in a segment, of connecting elements to
what has gone before and to what is yet to come. Cohesion endows a
text with "the continuity that exists between one part of the text
and another" through the grammatical and lexical system of the language
in question (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 5, 229).
The information contained in the abstract semantic qualities of text and proposition is realized through the formal linguistic means available in a given language. The manner in which the information is expressed in writing, however, may differ in accordance to language and values. The format and styling of composition of various genres are not necessarily a universal system, and even if they are realized in language, they are not necessarily determined by language. In addition to the lexicon and grammar of the language in question the student of composition must learn "the mode of linear thinking and the ways of relating ideas in writing" (Kaplan, 1978a: 9).

The aspect of relating ideas that is being examined and compared here is the structuring of information in text in terms of coordination and subordination of elements in relation to one another and the use of restrictive and non-restrictive modification in describing such elements. In so far as this study attempts to make general comparative statements about expository "usage" on the basis of language "use" in Arabic and English corpora (Leech and Svartvik, 1975), the units of analysis must be defined structurally as well as semantically. The semantic framework of analysis together with the structural realizations taken to present it will be described and exemplified below.

3.2.2 The System of Analysis

A written text, as viewed from the level of analysis applied here, comprises a series of propositions given in a linear sequence some of which are coordinated, some subordinated and still others placed in parallel relationship to their neighbours. A proposition that
makes a statement and which is formally realized as a declarative clause is defined here as a "propositional statement". These networks of propositional statements appear in both the Arabic and English paragraph samples in sentence-like subdivision, i.e., typographical sentences separated from other like units immediately preceding and following, with a capital and a period in English, and with only a period in Arabic. These units correspond to what English traditional grammar and prescriptive manuals have defined as sentences of varying degrees of complexity according to the number of coordinated and subordinated subunits included. The traditional grammar of Arabic, however, recognizes the sentence only at the level of a single clause. The word in Arabic for "sentence" and "clause" are one and the same, jumla, for in Arabic there is no distinction between them (Wright ii, 1898: 251-2; Beeston, 1970). For example, a segment containing a main clause and a dependent clause in English would traditionally be described as a complex sentence, whereas the same sequence in Arabic would be conceived of as two clause-sentences. Beyond the level of the single sentence-clause traditional Arabic grammar has recognized no larger unit of written language until one arrives at the chapter heading. In fact, however, much if not most of contemporary Arabic expository prose, especially of the type analyzed here, uses the convention of paragraphing and sentence division in organizing and presenting its content to the reader, a phenomenon relatively new in Arabic writing which may be explained, at least in part, in terms of Western European influence.

The clause, then, exists as a unit emically recognized in both English and Arabic that contains a grammatical subject and a predicate
linked to that subject. The subject may be realized (1) as a noun phrase, e.g.,

"And this conscious rejection will motivate him..." AR.1:4:x-xii

or (2) as an embedded nominal in subject slot position, e.g.,

"What is encountered is therefore a continuum..." EN.3:5

The predicate must include a verb phrase and may include one or more of
the "clause elements" (Quirk, 1973: 12-13), i.e., an (1) object slot
segment, e.g., as a noun phrase,

"grammar benefits logic..." AR.3:1

or as a nominalization, e.g.,

"And he maintains that it is the correct measure..." AR.3:4

(2) a complement, e.g.,

"The prospects even for the Singapore base were bleak", EN.2:5

(3) an adverbial, e.g.,

"that he set out in his literary creation..." AR.1:1

A clause may be independent, dependent or parallel in relation to others in the text. An independent or main clause is one to which one or more subordinate clauses may be linked while the clause itself is not linked (in terms of sentence grammar) to another clause. An independent clause may appear as a single, simple clause often introduced by and in Arabic, the and signalling a vague cohesive tie of seriation (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 23307), e.g.,

"And mankind is at one with rationality" AR.3:8

or as the main clause in a complex sentence, e.g.,

"And these occupiers brought in military fiefdoms, that is giving agricultural land to the commanders and princes so that they might benefit from its resources without taking care of the land or
planting it" AR:9:5

A coordinate clause is linked to another immediately preceding
by the structural relations expressed in the coordinate conjunctions
and or (and by the negatives neither nor) and but, e.g.,

"And our evaluation according to our preferred method in literary
studies, is extracted from poetic examples which we stand before
a while, and which we grace with an examination." AR.10:1

A subordinate clause is one which is linked to another preceding
immediately by the relations expressed in subordinate conjunctions
introducing adverbial, relative, conditional, concessive as well as
nominal elements, e.g.,

(1) adverbial:

"which we grace with an examination until we deduce from them..."
AR.10:1

(2) relative:

"the bulk of the expenditures which the naval staff was planning..."
EN.2:1

(3) conditional

"And if you, asking what this water scoop is, (then) scan the
stanzas..." AR.10:5

(4) nominal:

"Churchill insisted that its development could take place..." EN.2:7

Within any one of the above clause types a coordinate construction
may occur, i.e., a segment formed when two or more syntactically
equivalent structures linked together in an "and" or "or" relationship
(or by the negatives neither and nor) share the same clause elements or
act as a series of modifiers for a single headword, e.g.,
(1) sharing same clause elements:

"And a group of hangers on and exploiters appeared who cooperated with the foreigners in impoverishing the society and exploiting it."

(2) modifying the same headword:

"inciting the public in a haphazard and demagogic manner..." AR.9:7

Upon examining how the content of the samples was organized in terms of clause number and type it became apparent that each paragraph contained hierarchical patterns of subordination branching off from main clauses. These same subordinations often included in themselves further subordinate and coordinate elements of varying depth. In each paragraph sample there seemed to exist information-bearing clusters larger than the clauses of which they were comprised, yet smaller than the paragraph in which they stood. Awareness of such clusters has long been recognized in the literature and has been the starting point for many indices for the analysis of text in terms of the patterning or "outlining" (Grimes, 1975: 38) of subordination and coordination.

Notable among these are Christensen's "Subordinate Units" (Christensen, 1967), Pitkin's "Discourse Units" (Pitkin, 1969), Gray's "Independent Assertion Structures" (Gray, 1977) and of particular interest here, Hunt's "Terminal Unit". In his "Grammar Structures Written at Three Grade Levels", Hunt studies the writing of school children at various levels of proficiency. In order to account for strings written by immature students (who tended to connect long sequences of proposition-statements coordinate, with or without the coordinator and) Hunt devised the "Terminal Unit" or "T-Unit", i.e.,

"...the shortest grammatically allowable sentences into which the
theme could be segmented..." such that... "if it were segmented into units any shorter, some fragment would be created" (Hunt, 1965: 23).

The "T-Unit" includes, then, complex sentences but not compounds. A sentence beginning with a coordinator is not considered a fragment but rather a separate "T-Unit". Hunt's index has been adopted and applied here because it provides clear structural criteria (the use of clause types as defined above), recognizable and recognized in both languages for designating a semantic phenomenon, viz., the hierarchical ordering of information in complexes of subordinate and coordinate clauses and elements of clauses. The "T-Unit" is operationally defined here as being any complex sentence or independent coordinate clause. A "T-Unit" may include a main clause together with any clauses syntactically subordinate to it (through the means available in sentence grammar), e.g.,

"And military ideology is a term from the terms of military science by which is meant the charted military policy which expresses the state's point of view concerning that which pertains to the fundamental modalities and laws of armed conflict and that which relates to the nature of war and its (the state's) point of view and concerning the essential means of preparing the country and the armed forces for battle." AR 2:2.

Clauses or sentences beginning with a coordinator and not already linked to a subordinate clause in another "T-Unit" constitute separate "T-Units", e.g.,

"And Ma'tā bn Yūnis defends Greek logic..." AR 3:5

Using the above categories and criteria it is possible to analyze
the sample texts in both English and Arabic into "T-Units" and clauses. Clauses may be further categorized into main, coordinate and subordinate types, while the coordinate constructions appearing within these clauses may also be tallied. The first analytical framework applied in this study is the analysis of "T-Unit" number, size and composition per sample, then per corpus and the comparison of the results across corpora. "T-Unit" size is defined in terms of the number of clauses of which it is comprised, and composition according to the frequency and ratio of clause types appearing in it. Clause type is defined in terms of the number of clauses of which it is comprised, and composition according to the frequency and ratio of clause types appearing in it. Clause type is defined according to (a) its manner of linkage to the clause immediately preceding in the text, i.e., by coordination, subordination or by absence of grammatical link, and (b) the presence and frequency of coordinate constructions whenever these occur within the clause.

The textual material examined here has thus far been viewed at the clausal level, i.e., as strings of propositional statements linked to others in the text by relations of subordination, coordination or parallelism. Within these propositional statements (clauses) themselves, however, there is further scope for conveying of information, i.e., in the form of modification. From a semantic perspective modification is "a word or group of words that adds meaning to another" (Braun, 1947: 11). When applied to a noun phrase or nominal segment which is an element of propositional statement, such as addition of meaning may be restrictive, or non-restrictive. Non-restrictive modification gives further information about the head that it modifies, a head already
identified in the context of the propositional statement of which it is an element. The non-restrictive modification itself is not necessary for such identification. In essence it creates an additional proposition by making a new statement about the head. Non-restrictive modification, then, is used to provide additional information about an element of a propositional statement and can be deleted without altering the meaning of that statement, e.g.,

(a) My wealthy father disinherited me.

(b) My father, a wealthy man, disinherited me.

(c) My father, who is wealthy, disinherited me.

In each of the above cases, a non-restrictive modification in three syntactic forms, i.e., adjective, appositive, relative clause, adds meaning to the basic propositional statement. If one deletes the "wealth" aspect, the basic statement about "my father disinheriting me" still stands. The non-restrictive modification itself provides a "Dependent Assertion", i.e., a dependent proposition, in that while it makes a propositional statement (My father is wealthy), it does not exist syntactically separate from its basal propositional-statement-clause) (Gray, 1977: 113). For the purposes of this study non-restrictive modification is defined as information added either pre- or post-positionally to a noun phrase or nominal segment of a clause and which if deleted does not alter the basic propositional statement contained in the clause. Non-restrictive modification is realized syntactically in both Arabic and English as a relative clause, an appositive construction or as an adjective functor, e.g.,

(a) a relative clause,

"And a group of hangers on and exploiters appeared who
who cooperated with foreigners in impoverishing the
society." AR.9:7

(b) an appositive construction,
"And these occupiers brought in military fiefdoms, that is,
aricultural land to the commanders." AR. 9:5

(c) an adjective functor,
"And military ideology is a term of the forms of military
science which means the charted military policy." AR.2:2

Modification that serves to narrow or limit the semantic scope of
its head is restrictive. Unlike modification of the non-restrictive
type restrictive modification does not create a new proposition but
rather acts to make the existent proposition of which the head is part
increasingly precise and specific (Gray, 1977: 114). In actuality,
the head receives its explicit identify from the modification supplied
(Quirk and Greenbaum, 1973: 376) in such a way that such modification
cannot be removed without altering the meaning of the proposition-
statement of which the head is an element, e.g.,

(a) ESL instructors are well off.
(b) Instructors of ESL are well off.
(c) Instructors who teach ESL are well off.

In each of the above examples a restrictive modification in three
possible syntactic forms, i.e., adjective, adjective functor and
relative clause, serves to qualify the meaning of its head, especially
regarding range and applicability, i.e., "instructors". The deletion of
the qualifying modification "ESL" would completely change the meaning of
the statement in that "being well off" would apply to all instructors or
to instructors in general rather than only to "ESL" instructors.
Restrictive modification is defined here as information that qualifies or limits the range of meaning of a noun phrase or nominal segment of a clause such that if the modificational information is deleted the propositional statement, of which the modified term is a part, would collapse. Such modification is realized syntactically in the same way as restrictive modification, i.e.,

(a) a relative clause,

"Non Romantic literature develops only in the thick of the struggle that the writer raises..." AR. 1:6

(b) an appositive construction,

"There is no proof that the Qur'an intended to regulate every detail of life..." EN. 1:5

(c) an adjective or adjective functor,

"...The charted military policy..." (See quote "c" above under non-restrictive modification - AR. 2:2

A statement can be made concerning the relative amounts and ratios of restrictive to non-restrictive modification found in the English and the Arabic corpora as per propositional and clausal content. The greater use of the restrictive modification would show a greater reliance on narrowing statements of a precise nature, while increased reliance on non-restrictive modification would demonstrate a tendency towards interpolating supportive or supplementary information within the propositional development of the text (Gray, 1977). The tallying and comparison of frequency and ratios of restrictive to non-restrictive modification is the second analytical goal of this study.

It is hypothesized that the Arabic and English expository paragraph as it appears in the samples under study structure their informational
content differently in the following respects:

(a) The Arabic samples show a greater tendency towards large "T-Units", using within these a greater number of subordinate clauses and coordinate constructions than do the English samples.

(b) The Arabic samples tend to use a greater ratio of non-restrictive to restrictive modification than do the English samples.

3.3 Treatment of the Data

The typographically defined sample paragraphs were first reexamined to determine if they did, indeed, form units which were distinguishable from other like units in the texts. The samples then were redefined as paragraphs in a semantic sense using Pitkin's concept of the "discourse bloc" as the criterion, i.e., one semantically superordinate element together with any other elements directly or indirectly subordinate to it (Pitkin, 1969).

3.3.1 "T-Unit" and Clause Type Analysis

Each sample paragraph in both the English and the Arabic corpora was analyzed into "T-Units", i.e., main clauses together with any dependent clause subordinated to it and including any additional clauses embedded in either the main or the dependent clauses. Clauses beginning with a coordinator or no link at all constituted separate "T-Units" if they were independent. The number of "T-Units" was tallied by sample
and then by corpus.

The "T-Units" were further analyzed into independent and subordinate clauses as defined above. In addition the coordinate constructions occurring within these were also noted. The number of occurrences of each was calculated per sample, then per "T-Unit" for each corpus. The maximum and then minimum numbers of clauses according to type and coordinate structures per "T-Unit" were given for both corpora. Finally ratios were given each for independent and subordinate clauses and then for coordinate constructions, to the total clausal content per corpus.

3.3.2 Restrictive and Non-restrictive Modifications Analysis

All the clausal content of each corpus (i.e., independent and subordinate clauses together any coordinate constructions within them) was analyzed for every occurrence of restrictive and non-restrictive modification as defined above. The total incidence of each was tallied per sample then per corpus. The means of the number of occurrences of both modification types was calculated per sample, then per clause (including coordinate structures) for each corpus. Ratios were then calculated for the occurrences of restrictive to non-restrictive modification within each corpus as a whole, then per sample and per clausal structure. Finally the ratios of restrictive and then non-restrictive modifications between the corpora were calculated.

The results of the above described analyses are discussed in table form in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this section the results of the analysis will be presented and discussed with reference to three tables. The results will be given under two subheadings: (1) the results of the analysis and comparison for T-Units and clause types and (2) the results for the analysis and comparison for restrictive and non-restrictive modifications.

4.1 T-Units and Clause Types

The data reviewed and discussed in this section are summarized in Tables I, II and III. Table I gives the tallies for number of words, T-Units, clause types (including independent, dependent clauses and coordinate structures), and for restrictive and non-restrictive modifications for each sample paragraph. Totals are given for each corpus. Table II contains the means and ratios for the above categories, while Table III gives the maximal and minimal cases for each relevant category.

In Table I it can be seen that the total number of words in each corpus is almost the same, i.e., 1480 in the English and 1431 in the Arabic, the difference between them being 49 words. The longest sample in Arabic is 189 words, and in English 193 words. The shortest
sample in Arabic is 110 words, while in English it is 143 words. The mean number of words per sample in Arabic is 143 words compared with 148 in English. The corpora then, in terms of word count are very similar, with the English samples being a bit longer on the average, per sample.

Although the Arabic corpus has slightly fewer words than its English counterpart, the total number of T-Units found in the former is very slightly larger, with 66 in the Arabic as compared with 62 in the English and the mean per sample text being 6.6 and 6.2 T-Units respectively. The maximum number of T-Units appearing in an Arabic sample is 9 and in an English sample 7, while the minimum T-Units are 3 and 5 respectively. The Arabic corpus on the average spreads a very slightly smaller verbal content over 4 more T-Units with the Arabic corpus showing a greater range in the number of T-Units used in individual samples.

Both corpora then are very similar regarding the numbers of words and T-Units into which they are arranged with the Arabic samples showing greater individual variation in the numbers of T-Units into which their sample paragraphs are organized.

The number of independent clauses (i.e., simple clauses unlinked to any other in the text by relations of subordination on one hand, and of superordination on the other) appearing in both corpora are also similar with slightly more tallied in the Arabic corpus, 34 are compared with 31 in the English. The mean number of independent clauses registered in the Arabic samples is 3.4 and in the English 3.1, and per T-Unit 0.51 and 0.50 respectively. According to these results the Arabic and English corpora do not reveal significant differences in
the degree of reliance on simple sentence structures in realizing their informational content within the sample texts.

The tally for dependent clauses shows that the Arabic corpus used more than a third more of these than did the English, 71 in the former compared with 42 in the latter, the means numbers per sample text being 7.1 and 4.2 respectively, and per T-Unit 1.07 in the Arabic and 0.67 in the English. The maximum number of dependent clauses in an Arabic sample is 12 and in an Arabic T-Unit, 7. In the English corpus the maximum number of dependent clauses in a sample is 8 and in a T-Unit 4. Since both corpora used independent clauses, there is no minimum number for either corpus. These results show that the Arabic texts, on the average, use significantly more (application of the t-test of Significance to the tallies for both corpora resulted in a level of confidence of 0.05) dependent clauses per T-Unit and per sample text than do their English counterparts. In addition the Arabic corpus shows a greater range in the possible number of dependent clauses it uses per T-Unit and per sample.

The tally for coordinate structures shows that the Arabic corpus used exactly one third more in all samples than did the English, 60 in the former compared with 40 in the latter, with the mean per sample being 6 and 4 per T-Unit, 0.90 and 0.67 respectively. The maximum number of coordinate structures per text are 11 in the Arabic and 7 in the English samples, and per T-Unit 6 and 4 respectively. Both corpora contain sample texts, however, having only one coordinate structure, and T-Units with no coordinate structures at all (i.e., T-Units made up of an independent coordinate clause). From the above results it can be seen that the Arabic corpus employed significantly
more coordinate structures per sample text and per T-Unit than did the English (application of the t-test of Significance to the tallies for both corpora resulted in a level of confidence of 0.05), with the Arabic samples showing a greater range per T-Unit, i.e., 9 to 6 possible occurrences of coordinate structures in the former compared with 0 to 4 in the latter.

The tally for all clause types shows that the Arabic corpus, although comprising slightly fewer words and T-Units than the English, contains 26.6% more clausal structures, 196 in Arabic compared with 144 in English; the mean number per text being 19.6 and 14.4 respectively, and per T-Unit 2.96 and 2.32. The maximum number of clauses in an Arabic T-Unit is 8 (in English 6), or one third more than in the latter. According to these results the Arabic samples on the average use larger T-Units composed of more clauses than do the English, and show a greater numerical range of occurrence than does the English corpus by 33% more possible clauses to a T-Unit.

In summary, Arabic T-Units as revealed in the data tend to hold more clausal content, although their average word content is less, and of this clausal content there is more than a third more dependent clauses and exactly a third more coordinate structures, on the average, per T-Unit. The range of possible occurrences for both dependent and coordinate structures passes through all the possibilities from 0 to the maximums in both corpora, meaning that although the Arabic data uses more of the dependent and coordinate structures on the average, it does not necessarily do so in every instance.
4.2 Restrictive and Non-restrictive Modification

The results of the analyses for restrictive and non-restrictive modifications are given in Tables I, II and III. In Table I the number of occurrences of both restrictive and non-restrictive modifications are given for each sample text and then for each corpus in total. Table II shows the mean number of occurrences for each type of modification per sample, per T-Unit and per clause. In Table III the maximum and minimum number of instances of both types of modification are given per sample, per T-Unit and per clause.

In Table I it can be seen that the Arabic corpus contains a total of 294 restrictive modifications, while the English one shows 382, with the mean number of occurrences per sample being 29.4 and 38.2 respectively. Per T-Unit the Arabic corpus averages 4.45 restrictive modifications compared with 6.16 in English, i.e., the average Arabic T-Unit contains nearly one fourth fewer of such modifications even though it has a greater mean number of clauses than its English counterpart by 26.6 percent. Per clause the mean number of restrictive modifications are 1.5 in the Arabic and 2.6 in the English, again showing a tendency on the part of the Arabic corpus as a whole to use fewer restrictive modifications to a degree of significance at the 0.01 confidence level, this according to the results of applying the t-Test of Significance for small samples to the data.

The tally for non-restrictive modifications show that both corpora tend to use this type to a much lesser extent than they do for modification of the restrictive type, with the English corpus using, on the average, less than half the non-restrictive modifications that
the Arabic does. The Arabic corpus used 21 non-restrictive modifications and the English 45, the means per sample being 2.1 and 4.5 respectively. The mean number of occurrences of non-restrictive modification per Arabic T-Unit is 0.68 compared with 0.33 per English T-Unit. The average Arabic T-Unit, taking into account that it holds more than one third more clauses than its English counterpart, still contains more than twice the non-restrictive modification on the average. Per clause, the mean number of occurrences for the Arabic corpus is 0.23, and in the English 0.15, showing a difference of more than a third more non-restrictive modifications in the average Arabic clause, even though the Arabic corpus contains slightly more than one third more clauses through which these non-restrictive modifications must be spread.

The ratio of restrictive to non-restrictive modifications within each corpus are 6.50 for the Arabic and 18.19 for the English corpus, showing that while both have a great deal more restrictive than non-restrictive modification, the Arabic corpus uses about 19 times and the English only about 6 times as much restrictive modification. This difference is reflected in the average ratios per sample of 0.65 in Arabic and 1.81 in English. The ratio of restrictive to non-restrictive modifications per clause is 6.52 for the Arabic corpus and 17.33 for the English corpus.

The ratio of restrictive modifications in the Arabic corpus to those in the English is 0.58, or more than one half the number, while the ratio of non-restrictive modifications in the Arabic to the English corpus is 1.53 or approximately one and a half times the number of non-restrictive modifications.
In summary, given a similar number of words in each corpus and more than a third more clausal content in Arabic, the latter corpus has more than one third more non-restrictive modifications than the English, while having approximately one third fewer restrictive modifications.
TABLE I

Raw Data from the Arabic and English Corpora

I.a The English Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE NUMBER</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Count</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Units</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Clauses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Clauses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Structures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Clausal Content</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications-Restrictive</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Non-restrictive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.b The Arabic Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE NUMBER</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Count</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Units</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Clauses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Clauses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Structures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Clausal Content</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications-Restrictive</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Non-restrictive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II
Means and Ratios for Arabic and English Corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II.a Means per Sample Text</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Words</td>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>148.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of T-Units</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Independent Clauses</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dependent Clauses</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Coordinate Structures</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Clauses - All Types</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Restrictive Modifications</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II.b Means per T-Unit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Words</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>23.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Independent Clauses</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dependent Clauses</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Coordinate Structures</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Clauses - All Types</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Restrictive Modifications</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-restrictive Modifications</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II.c Means per Clause</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Restrictive Modifications</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-restrictive Modifications</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II.d Ratios</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive to Non-restrictive Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per corpus</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>18.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per sample</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per clause</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>17.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive in English to Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-restrictive in English to Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III.a Maximum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Units per sample</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Clauses per T-Unit</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Structures per T-Unit</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses - all Types per T-Unit</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III.b Minimum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Units per sample</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Clauses per T-Unit</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Structures per T-Unit</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses - all Types per T-Unit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In this chapter the study will be summarized and discussed under the following headings: 1) a review of the purpose and scope of the study, 2) a review of the treatment and 3) a synopsis of the results.

5.1 Summary of Purpose and Scope

The motivation for the study derived from two practical issues: firstly, the problems facing the native Arabic speaker in learning the reading and writing of Academic English, and secondly the difficulties involved in translating expository material between the English and the Arabic. It was found that Arabic L1 learners who demonstrated even quite a fair mastery of English morphology, syntax and lexis frequently handled their expository assignments in a way that has oftimes been characterized by ESL instructors as wordy, digressive and including what would seem to the native English reader to be an inordinate amount of tangential information. This, in addition to the writer’s experience in translating text from Arabic into publishable English, has led to the supposition that Arabic may structure and present expository information in ways that differ from English, and that some of these differences might be attributable to 1) the types of relations obtaining
between elements of information comprising a unit of text, on one hand and 2) the relative uses of non-restrictive and restrictive types of modifications in elaborating on these elements.

The theoretical inspiration for the study derived from Kaplan's exploratory concepts of "Comparative Rhetoric," wherein the scholar sought to show that systematic patterns in the organization of exposition can be discerned according to the language in question, and that such patterns are a function of, among factors, different ratios of coordination of content to subordination as encoded in the "realizable range" in the grammar of the language (Kaplan, 1972, 1976, 1978).

Furthermore, the present study has taken its cue in part from work done on the role of restrictive and non-restrictive modification in affecting the characteristics of various categories of English prose. The most noteworthy studies referred to here are those of Christensen in his examination of information structure in what he deems to be "good" English prose (Christensen, 1967), and of Gray in his descriptive framework for the analysis and comparison of different rhetorical formats in English wherein he lays great emphasis on the uses of "qualifying" compared with "additive" types of modification as a variable in the structuring of prose content (Gray, 1977).

The questions that became significant at that point were (1) what units of text were to be analyzed and how such units were to be defined in a cross-linguistically valid manner, and after having defined such units, (2) what cross-linguistically objective criteria for measurement and comparison might be applied to these units in order to analyze for differential organization in text of otherwise similar subject content in English and Arabic.
An examination of the literature yielded two facets of text structure for measurement and comparison and three structurally defined units in which the former are encoded.

The global unit was to be the typological paragraph, but only insofar as it corresponded to a semantically equivalent unit, i.e., Pitkin's semantically defined "discourse block" (strings of propositions linked to one another by relations of either coordination or subordination in such a way that all units involved in the string are directly or indirectly subordinate to one supra-ordinate unit) (Pitkin). The constituent elements of the discourse block samples were to be the T-Unit (Hunt), which, in turn, is realised atomistically by the clause, a basic proposition-bearing string used and recognised as such in both Arabic and English. Each unit above relates to another in a constituent relationship such that one is comprised of subordinate subbranchings of the next, i.e., the paragraph discourse block is composed of T-Units, which in turn are made up of either independent clauses alone, or together, with any dependent clauses appended to them.

While it was the paragraph that provided the sampling unit for the study, it was the T-Unit and the different possible clause types that formed the raw data for the comparative-quantificational analysis. Insofar as the purpose of the analysis was to make general statements concerning a semantic property, i.e., the structuring and modification of propositional content in expository prose and this with reference to structural realizations in actual texts, all data were analyzed and defined in terms of conventional sentence grammar.

The first facet of text structure that was analyzed and compared in the study was the relative use of coordination and subordination
in the organization of the propositional content of the paragraph samples. Concretely this involved analyzing for sentence size and composition, size being defined in terms of the number of clauses of which a sentence was composed, and composition in terms of the frequencies of clause types used in the sentence. Clause type was defined according to: (a) the manner of linkage to the clause immediately following in the text, i.e., by coordination, subordination or by absence of grammatical linkage, and (b) the presence and frequency of parallel constructions whenever these occurred within the clause.

By using the "T-Unit" criterion for defining the beginning and end of sentences (which allowed the disregard of specific conventions of punctuation, often differing in the English and Arabic samples) it was possible to define sentence size by the absence or number of dependent clauses involved. A sample paragraph then could show varying numbers and sizes of T-Units. Larger T-Units and less of them in a sample paragraph would indicate a greater degree of subordination while, conversely, smaller T-Units and more of them in another sample of similar word count would show a greater degree of coordination. A third possibility, which was not considered earlier but which presented itself during the course of the study, was the occurrence of both simple sentences and large complex sentences as T-Units within a given sample indicating use of both independent and subordinate structures.

The second aspect of text structuring analyzed and compared was the use, both absolute and relative, of restrictive and non-restrictive modification in the Arabic and English corpora. The terms (restrictive and non-restrictive) were defined in a strictly semantic sense. A restrictive modification was defined operationally as any relative
clause, appositive, modifying phrase or other adjective functor which acts to narrow the scope or otherwise qualify the range or applicability of terms of a propositional statement (i.e., nominal elements of a clause) such that in deleting the modification, the statement is altered in some way. A non-restrictive modification, on the other hand, while using the same grammatical structures as modification of the restrictive type, is not essential to the proposition in which it is involved since it provides information that is additional or appendant to the statement which it accompanies. The deletion of such modification leaves whole the propositional statement of which it is part.

5.2 Review of the Treatment

Ten samples of English and ten of Arabic expository prose were selected from published articles dealing with humanities and social science subjects and paired, where possible, into similar disciplines and topic areas, e.g., an Islamic History article in Arabic was paired with a similar one in English. The unit for sampling was the typological paragraph with the following limitations: (1) only paragraphs forming discourse blocs were selected; this in order to select units of text handling their information in a similar manner, i.e., by the stating of a superordinate idea supported by accompanying subordinate units following in the text, (2) samples of similar word count were sought, (3) no transitional or conclusive paragraphs were used. The last limitation was intended to even further limit the material to text samples of similar rhetorical function and type as well as of similar size.
Each sample paragraph from both the Arabic and the English corpora was first analyzed into constituent clause-propositions (i.e., statements involving a finite verb). These were classified according to their mode of linkage (excluding sentence connectors) with the preceding one in the text, i.e., main and independent clauses, coordinate clauses (linkage by coordinate conjunction), and subordinate clauses (linkage by subordinate conjunction). In addition, occurrences of coordinate constructions in all three categories of clause were noted. The samples were then analyzed into T-Units, i.e., complex or simple but not compound sentences, every compound being considered as a series of separate T-Units corresponding to the number of coordinate clauses contained therein. The number of each category of clause, and of coordinate constructions were tallied per T-Unit, per sample and then per corpus. The number of T-Units themselves were tallied per sample and per corpus and their size noted, i.e., in terms of the number of subordinate clauses employed in their composition. The means of clause types and coordinate constructions were calculated per T-Unit, per sample and per corpus. Similarly the mean number of T-Units were calculated per sample and per corpus. The maximum and minimum numbers of occurrences of each clause type and of coordinate constructions were noted per T-Unit, per sample and per corpus. Similarly, the maximum- and minimum number of T-Units themselves were noted per sample and per corpus. Finally the ratios were calculated each for independent coordinate and subordinate clause types and then for coordinate constructions, to the total clausal content per corpus.

The second measure applied to the sample texts was a comparative quantificational analysis of the use of restrictive and non-restrictive
modifications. The total clausal content of both the Arabic and the English corpora, i.e., independent, coordinate, and subordinate clauses together with any included coordinate structures, were analyzed for every occurrence of both restrictive and non-restrictive modification (as defined above). The total incidence of each was tallied per sample, then per corpus. The means of the number of occurrences to both modification types were calculated per sample, then per clause for each corpus. Ratios were then calculated for the number of restrictive to non-restrictive modifications occurring in each corpus as a whole, then per sample, then per clausal structure. Finally the ratios of restrictive and then of non-restrictive modification in each corpus to the other was calculated.

5.3 Synopsis of the Findings

In Figures I and II a mean-derived typical sample text and T-Unit are given in figure form. The average Arabic sample text in comparison with its English counterpart has a similar number of words and independent clauses, while the number of T-Units in the average Arabic sample is slightly higher. As regards these corpora then, the organization of the information into paragraphs shows no significant difference in verbal content nor in the use of independent clauses. The slightly larger T-Unit content of the Arabic corpus seem negligible and lacking in any significance. The differences between the corpora become clear upon comparing the means for dependent and coordinate structures where the typical Arabic sample shows almost twice the former and one third more of the latter. The average Arabic sample text has
one third more clausal content in all, which expresses itself in 41 percent more dependent clauses than does the average English sample, and in one third more coordinate structures. The data for the typical T-Unit in both corpora are similar with the Arabic one also containing a similar word content but about 37 percent more dependent clauses and a fourth more coordinate structures than its English counterpart.

The Arabic corpus as a whole tends to use more non-restrictive modification (about twice as much) and approximately a fourth less restrictive modification than does the English. Per clause the differences remain sharp with the average Arabic clause using more than a third more non-restrictive modifications and about 42 percent less restrictive. The ratios of non-restrictive to restrictive modifications in both corpora show that the Arabic corpus uses around 18 times as much of the former with the English corpus using only 6 times as much.

In Figures I and II one may see in numerical and graphic form a typical Arabic paragraph-sample compared with its English counterpart. The typical (mean) average sample from both the Arabic and the English corpus uses an almost like number of both complex and simple sentences, the word count for each also being virtually identical. It is within the complex sentence itself that the differences become evident. The typical Arabic sample, while containing virtually the same number of simple and complex sentences as its English counterpart, has more than one third more dependent clauses within these complex sentences, i.e., the complex sentence as used in the typical Arabic sample is significantly larger than in the English. Furthermore, the typical Arabic sample uses a third more coordinate structures than its English counterpart, showing
at one and the same time a preference for coordination (as well as for subordination) in relation to the English. The preferred form of coordination, however, is within the clause, in terms of shared clausal elements, i.e., the pairing of NPs and VPs within the clause.

As regards the type of modification used, the typical Arabic sample shows a clear preference for the non-restrictive, using more than twice as much of this type than its English counterpart, and a propensity towards less restrictive modification by about one fourth.
Figure I: Mean-Derived Typical Sample Text for the Arabic and English Corpora
Figure II: Mean-Derived Typical T-Unit for the Arabic and English Corpora
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter conclusions are drawn on the basis of the results of the present study. Implications for the teaching of ESL to Arabic-speaking learners, particularly at the academic level, are examined and some recommendations for further research are proposed.

6.1 Conclusions

The present study was limited to a small and restricted set of samples representing one particular type of expository prose selected from clearly defined subject areas in both Arabic and English. The conclusions that are tentatively drawn below are therefore restricted to the samples and data at hand. Within the limits of this study, however, it is possible to make the following general statements.

The results suggest that the Arabic and English samples of expository prose examined here show some differential tendencies in the ways in which they organize and pattern their informational content. Since the samples selected for the study were extracted from published academic literature, they may be considered fairly representative of well-formed expository text in both languages.

The results of the analysis for coordination and subordination
of informational content show that the typical sample in each corpus, when viewed at the paragraph or discourse-bloc level, shows little difference from its counterpart regarding the number of T-Units (simple and complex sentences) used in its composition. In other words, the organization of the paragraph itself, at least of the type selected in this study (i.e., with initial topic sentence followed by subtopics relating to that sentence, either directly or indirectly, through a mediating subtopic) seems remarkably similar in typical samples from both corpora. It is suggested here that the conventions of paragraphing used in the Arabic samples may reflect a wider Western and international influence in the presentation of academic literature. The oftentimes cosmopolitan nature of academic discourse, where the emphasis is on clarity of content, would tend to contribute to standardization of format in the composition of learned articles.

It is in the structure of the T-Units themselves that one finds differences between the typical Arabic and English samples, with the former using much larger units bearing more dependent and coordinated propositional content in the form of larger complex sentences containing more subordinate clauses and coordinate constructions. Perhaps it is here that the English reader might develop a sense of tangential information or extraneous detail in the flow of the Arabic text. Perhaps it is useful to view many of the Arabic T-Units as types of miniature paragraph in their own right, with the dependent clauses in each elaborating on a topic expressed in the main or opening clause in each.

The results in the analysis for relative uses of restrictive and non-restrictive information further confirm the tendency in the Arabic
samples to "append" more additive information to the terms of propositions (i.e., the nominal elements of clauses) than in the English. The average English sample, on the other hand, employs a smaller proportion of non-restrictive to restrictive modifications, showing what seems to be preference, or narrowing, or qualifying the applicability of terms more frequently with restrictive modifications.

These findings seem to suggest that Arabic expository-prose of the type examined here when compared with the English, includes, on the whole, more propositional information within sentences in the form of more frequent coordinate structures within clauses, more subordinate clauses per complex sentence and more supplementary or additive statements in the form of (both proportionately and absolutely) more non-restrictive modifications.

6.2 Implications for Teaching

It is suggested, first and foremost, that foreign language educators become more aware of the relative nature of information organization and modification in text across languages. What may appear as wordy or digressive to the English reader constitutes well formed expression to the Arabic writer. It must be emphasized that such differences as may exist are a matter of cross-cultural "preference" in no way reflecting inherent superiority or inferiority, and that the patterns of organization of information in text vary cross-linguistically just as sentence structure and morphology do.

The differences existing at the level of text in Arabic and English are not explicitly described in many sources known to the
writer, but they should be considered by language teaching professionals in teaching advanced comprehension and production skills to Arabic-speaking learners. It is the task of materials developers and instructors to introduce awareness of these variations into their syllabuses and course content, demonstrating in pedagogically-useful ways those features which make English exposition seem more succinct and Arabic more additive. One possibility is the preparation of study materials which present the same expository text, written in English but in two versions, one incorporating typically Arabic information and text structure and the other that of English. A careful study of such texts when presented in a well-planned fashion would cause the learner to become explicitly aware of the differences between his L1 text structure and that of the target language. The learner could then be given structural criteria for modifying his L1 mode of expression to that of English users. It may prove helpful for example to set limits in the composition assignment on the number of conjunctions, both coordinate and subordinate, that might be used within a given sentence, on one hand, while giving the student exercises in the use of non-restrictive modification in defining and specifying what is being written. In general it may be said that increased awareness of cross-linguistic variation in the structuring and patterning of information in a text, seeing it as being as real a phenomenon as morphology and syntax, will contribute to more efficient and less frustrating language learning and teaching.
6.3 Recommendations for Further Study

I hope this study, having touched on one small area of contrastive text analysis, will contribute to further research into cross-lingual variation in the conveying of information in writing of similar type and purpose. Further research should examine the roles of various clause elements in structuring the content of texts, and determine in which cases and in what way their use may be contrastively significant. A more exhaustive version of the present study could, in addition to the roles of clause linkage and adjectival elements, examine the use of adverbial elements in English and Arabic, according to the different semantic functions they fulfil, such as cause, reason, circumstance, and the like. Modern Literary Arabic, for example, seems to use, in contrast to English, frequent concessive structures as a means of qualifying the propositional statement delivered in the clause.

A most practical direction for further research is in foreign language education at the advanced level. Studies might first be designed to determine whether such differences in expository text as those discussed here are related somehow to the learner's ease and efficiency of performance in reading-comprehension and essay-writing tasks. A question that might be asked is whether the Arabic L1 learner's rapidity and accuracy of performance on a set of questions designed to test his perception of main and secondary points of emphasis would be affected by the presentation of similar comprehension materials alternately in his own and then in English text styles. If the Arabic L2 learner's ability to extract salient information from
English texts is indeed found to be influenced by his own, or the
tester's, perceptions of well formedness, would rendering these
differences explicit to the learner through prepared study materials
prove useful in improving his performance? A corollary of the above
would be to develop tests to establish whether specific pedagogical
strategies that give paradigms or guidelines in structural terms would
prove useful in actually inducing the learner to rearrange his writing
into more English-like patterns.

The teaching and learning of foreign languages, especially at
more complex levels of mastery, require an awareness of and a respect
for cross-linguistic variability in textual style. It is here that
language learning involves more than the mastery of grammar and
lexis, becoming, in addition, a matter of re-acculturation of
acquiring a new way of thinking and of organizing thoughts. The
teacher who takes this perspective will be more able to help his
students by recognizing the cultural as well as the structural element
in learning to express and understand ideas in writing in a foreign
tongue.
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APPENDIX

Source Journals for Sample Paragraphs

1. al-Adab, 13, Nos. 3, 7 (1975), p. 113, p. 15.
       _______ , 17, No. 3 (1964), p. 476.
Paragraphs in Arabic
1. It is very important for every writer who desires sound well-being and development for his nation that he set out in his literary creations from a progressive revolutionary stance.

2. And revolution does not mean inciting the public in a haphazard and demagogic manner,

3. but rather it means introducing the person to his reality and causing him to reject this reality after convincing him of the impossibility of accepting it.

4. And this conscious rejection will motivate him towards rebelling against this reality and thence to revolution against it, revolution for the sake of change to the more virtuous... for the sake of creating a new reality, a reality that preserves a person's humanity.

5. And literature aims, as Rambeau said, at the changing of life in the present and the future, in ideal and reality.

6. And as Andre Malraux said, that Non-Romantic literature develops only in the thick of the struggle that the writer raises against the society under whose wing he grew up.
AR.


1. And on this basis it is possible that it be said that military ideology for the Islamic nation is religious ideology.

2. And military ideology is a term of the terms of military science which means, "The charted military policy which expresses the state's official point of view concerning that which pertains to the fundamental modalities and laws of armed conflict and that which relates to the nature of war and its purpose from the state's point of view and concerning ways of carrying out war, and concerning the essential means of preparing the country and the armed forces for battle."

3. And military ideology is defined at the highest levels of state, or with the knowledge of the supreme political and military leadership for realizing superordinate national goals and purposes.
1. And Abu Hayan al-Tawhidi holds that grammar benefits logic just as logic supports grammar.

2. And when mental-logic joins sense-logic, then there is finality and completion.

3. And Mata bn Yunis defends Greek logic.

4. And he maintains that it is the correct measure of all correct things.

5. And Mata bn Yunis' words appear in the "Eight Night" in "The Book of Pleasure and Entertainment" (as follows) "There is no access to knowledge of the authentic from the false, the truth from the falsehood, and good from the evil, the proven from the specious, the doubtful from the certain except by way of logic".

6. And in another source he states dealing with logic, "Indeed it is an instrument of argument by which the valid is distinguished from the fallacious, and the spurious from the sound (which I use) as a scale, and as a result, by virtue of it I recognize the superior from the inferior".

7. And logic is the search for intelligible goals and rational meanings, and the scrutinizing of passing thoughts and random ideas.

8. And mankind is [as] one in rationality.
1. Al-Sanūsī posits that al-Shābī had two loves, a Platonic love and a complete love.

2. As for the Platonic love it was an early love that grew in the heart of the poet out of an acquaintanceship with a girl whom he knew and grew up with until he reached the age of eleven, before arriving in Tunis, the capital.

3. But this girl died after he registered in the Zaytūna Mosque, leaving him a grief which his poetry expressed and which remained with him all his life and throughout his days.

4. And he mentions this in his journal.

5. And in addition to this platonic love there was another which dominated al-Shābī's heart and sentiment.

6. And al-Sanūsī states that the poem, "The Enchantress," is an expression of a frank dialogue between the poet and a woman who it seems was of a sort who preen themselves for men and from whom al-Shābī turned away because of his grief over his father's death.
1. One who reads this book may believe that he is reading the diary of its hero and his wife and children, the diary of a family that may appear unimportant in its detail even though it is interesting and exciting at the same time.

2. He who reads between the lines, however, and beyond them will read something else to which the author alludes with light hands as if he is dipping his quill into a family-inkwell so that he may create a pattern from its ink which will apply to others who escaped persecution.

3. And Harry represents what the Jewish people suffered in the diaspora and what this people wants from the State.

4. And Galila represents Israel, the land

5. And the wedding party is the announcement of the establishment of the state

6. And the raising of the children, and their problems are the problems of the state since its founding.

7. And the water for the tree is peace in the world.
1. As for emancipation in the natural front it derives from the ability of man in being wary of the evils of nature and penetrating its obstacles, and exploiting its resources and investing its wealth.

2. Man has been able, throughout past ages, to free himself from some of the fetters of nature.

3. But his gains in knowledge have increased greatly during this period, which has caused the wheel of progress to run with amazing speed disdaining all boundaries, assaulting barriers and obstacles.

4. And this progress in scientific and technical ability does not grow out of the effort of any one nation.

5. Indeed, it arises out of the efforts of all peoples according to their differing participation.

6. And it provides man with the means of emancipation from nature's shackles.

7. And subsequently leads to the improvement of his life.

8. And herein, then, is rapidity in scientific progress, and technical progress, and rapidity in the approaching of nations, all of them, toward the production and enjoying of its fruits.

9. And it is because of all this that it arouses social, cultural and educational problems which are not easy to examine here.
1. And in the following article is Archimandrite Yusif Naṣrallah's accounting of the Megalithic sites, that is, the ruins composed of large stone in Northern Syria, such as the sites near al-Hijana and vicinity.

2. And al-Hijana is situated at about 32 kilometers northeast of Damascus.

3. And the author describes the places extensively, with the engravings on the stone and the other remains which were found there, such as flint implements and beads and pins of bones, and so on.

4. And the article is supplied with photos and engravings and illustrations.

5. And there is no doubt that this research has great importance not only because it adds to our information about prehistoric periods in Syria, but, indeed, because it also adds another episode to the chain of human development from savagery to civilization.

وفي النهاية الثاني ـسجل للارتداد برسالة توصف بأعمال المكتملـية أي الانتقاص التي تُكون من حجارة كبيرة في الجنوب السوري كالمواقع قريب الهيجان، وضواحيها، وتبغ قرب هيجان على نحو 32 كيلومترًا جنوب شرق دمشق، فنصت الكاتب المواقع وصيغ بها مع التقوس على الحجارة والبقايا الأخرى التي وجدت فيها من أدوات صوانية وخزفية ودبابيس، من العلم وفهد، والمقال مزود بالصور والخرائط والرسوم، وما لاشكت فيه إن هذا البحث شيء عظيم لا لأنه أضاف إلى معلوماتنا عن عصور قبل التاريخ في سورية نفسي بحسب، بل لأنه أيضاً أضاف نقطة أخرى في سلسلة تطور الإنسان من الهجرة إلى الحضارة.
And that period that falls between the end of World War Two and the year 1957 is known as the period of "The Dollar Shortage" among regions which were dealing commercially with the United States.

And the reason for this goes back to what the majority of countries, and especially those that base their economies on war, had depended on the United States for supplying them with the greater part of what merchandise they needed, that is, the imports of these countries from America were exceeding what they exported to her.

And, indeed, for this reason their need for the dollar had surpassed what they had of it in their possession.

And, in other words, indeed, they, that is the other countries, had suffered from a lack in the quantity of dollars accumulated among themselves, and the necessity of financing their imports from America.

And this also meant the necessity of America financing the surplus of its exports to the other countries.
1. Arab society came to know those economic developments which lead to convulsions in it.

2. But this time it was affected by a grave transformation when it was subjected to foreign domination, Buwayi then Seljuk.

3. This domination lead to a weakening of social services or to their disappearance.

4. It brought about the exploitation of the goodness of the country on the part of the foreigner, and at the expense of its children.

5. And these occupiers brought in military fiefdoms, that is, giving agricultural land to the commanders and princes so that they might benefit from its resources without taking care of irrigating the land or of planting it.

6. And mercantile enterprise weakened.

7. And a group of hangers on and exploiters appeared who cooperated with the foreigner in impoverishing the society and exploiting it.

8. And the foreigners attempted to rouse divisive elements such as sectarian chauvinism and racial prejudice.
1. And our evaluation, according to our preferred method in literary studies, is extracted from poetic examples themselves which we stand before a short while and which we grace with an examination until we deduce from them the critical evaluations about the artistic nature of the pre-Islamic period that we can.

2. And our example in our present study is the stanzas of Zuhayr bn. Ali Salma in describing the water scoop.

3. You will find these stanzas in his anthology, in his epic poem, "IN AL KHALİT AJID AL BAYIN FANFAQA".

4. The scoop is an instrument by which they would water agricultural land just as we irrigate our fields with the "Shaduf" and the water wheel when the Nile descends.

5. And if you be asking what manner of object this water scoop is, then scan the stanzas

6. And in this way you will find the Pre-Islamic poet describing for you, in his forms, this device in all its details.

7. And he describes it for you, with precision, how it functions

8. And it is incumbent upon you, the reader, to consider the details and follow the description with all the attention and clear reliable visual imagination that you are able to muster.
Paragraphs in English.
1. On the second issue, it has been shown as probable that some extent of human ethical judgement independent of revelation is permitted by the Qurān,

2. but no precision emerges about the extent.

3. What we can do then is state the limits on both sides.

4. On the side of latitude, I do not think it is possible to be a Muslim in the full sense while taking no ethical guidance at all from the Qurān, in view of the Qurān's heavy emphasis on the need of man for such guidance and the certainty of his going astray without it.

5. On the traditional side, it has been shown that there is no proof that the Qurān intended to regulate every detail of life in ways worked out by the traditional law schools and some indications that it permitted and perhaps encouraged independent ethical thinking.

6. Even in classical Islamic civilization attempts to impose control of the Shari'a over all spheres of life generally broke down, especially where state interests were concerned.

7. In modern society with its new problems, the traditional attitude to law and ethics has become considerably more difficult to work out without forced interpretations and practical gaps.
1. The bulk of the expenditure which the naval staff was planning was for the replacement of obsolete cruisers.

2. and it is the cruiser question which is the best known aspect of Churchill's bitter struggle with the admiralty in these years.

3. The plans for Singapore postponed all heavy expenditure on a graving dock until the financial year 1928/29.

4. In the first three years the annual average expenditure was to be well under £1.1/2 million, mainly devoted to enabling a floating dock to be ready by the spring of 1928.

5. With the Chancellor thinking of large economies after only a few weeks in office, however, the prospects even for the Singapore base were bleak.

6. The feared Rothmore press had always been opposed to the project.

7. In Cabinet, Churchill insisted that its development could take place only at a rate consistent with the financial situation and with the need, from a political point of view, to avoid any increase in expenditure in the forthcoming financial year.
1. It is almost impossible in the Indonesian context to define and estimate landless agricultural households.

2. For that group of rural households that did not control enough land to fulfill the census definition of being an agricultural holding, it is exceptionally difficult to make a sharp division between those who were and those who were not dependent on agriculture for their prime source of income.

3. Almost no landless family could survive on agricultural wage earnings alone.

4. As one encounters smaller and smaller holdings, income from other sources such as wood working, construction, trade, transportation, repairs and brick making assume increasing importance.

5. What is encountered is, therefore, a continuum of substitution of non-agricultural sources as one approaches the landless group.

6. We do not know to what extent landless labourers "depend" on agriculture.

7. No definitional juggling can overcome this problem.
1. The data on both the occurrence of teaching behaviours in the second language classroom and the relationship between those behaviours and gains in the second language are scarce and inconclusive at best.

2. One of the problems in the literature is that the numerous teaching behaviours examined have been treated collectively.

3. For example, the behaviours of modelling and questioning are analysed in the same category as error correction.

4. And the frequency of occurrence of the former is compared to that of the latter even though modelling and questioning are general discourse characteristics whereas error correction is a direct reaction to language form.

5. In this paper teaching behaviours were studied in two conceptually different categories: 1) general teachers' behaviours consisting of questioning, repetition and modelling and 2) teachers' reaction to errors made by students vis-à-vis the directness of the question and the nature of the error.
1. The lack of relevance of the "qasīda becomes accentuated in the poetry of the Khārijites.
2. Al-Tirmīzī bn. al-Hakīm is probably the only Khārijite poet to open a poem qasida-fashion, with a "nāṣīb"
3. but in this, as in some other respects, such as in his eulogies of Ummayyad rulers, he is very much the exception.
4. The others seemed to confine themselves to the "qiṭ'a" type, short poems in a language of great simplicity and directness.
5. At times, as was the case of ʿUmrān bn. Hattān, Qaṭārī bn. al-Fujāh and ʿArīṣī al-Mazmūn the poetry acquires a markedly subjective character, expressing a high degree of emotional intensity.
6. They all give expression to an attitude toward death entirely different from that which characterizes Pre-Islamic poetry (where the fear and awareness of inevitable death seem to acquire existential proportions) best illustrated in the poignant statement of ʿJarāfī bn. Al-ʿAbd in his "Muḥallāqa.
7. In Khārijite poetry, on the other hand, there is a positive, indeed a gleeful welcoming of dying because dying for their religious cause was an act of martyrdom which they felt brought about a certain reward in heaven.
1. A factor which we have referred to only in passing is the development of Abd al-Ghani al-Uraisi's thought as reflected in his writings.

2. This is most striking in the articles written in Paris and after his return to Beirut, although what we find is almost an amplification of earlier themes, presented in a more sophisticated and complete form.

3. Notable in this respect is the more rigorous underpinning of al-Uraisi's nationalism in terms of modern political concepts, and the broadening of his concerns to include questions like that of democracy.

4. An editorial written at the end of 1913 entitled "The Development of Nations in Power and Rights" typifies this latter stage.

5. It also contains an original argument for national rights of the Arabs without ever once mentioning the subject directly.
1. One of the most original contributors to the fictional genres is Jamāl al-Ghitāni who has written a number of novels and short story collections.

2. One of the most interesting from the technical point of view is, 'al-Zayni Barakāt (c. 1971).

3. The novel is at first appearance entirely historical in focus; indeed it is set in the decade immediately before the Ottoman conquest of Egypt in 1516.

4. Barakāt is the 'muḥtasib' responsible for the supervision of public morals.

5. and his presence is felt by everyone although he never actually participates in the action of the novel as a character.

6. Al-Ghitāni chooses this format, with its use of actual historical texts, parodies of religious and secular pronouncements to put together a montage which gives an accurate picture not only of an earlier period in history but also of Egypt in the 1960's, a country, as Sabri Hafiz noted above, 'asked to sacrifice its freedom for a fragile and corrupt establishment'.
1. This survey of objects has lead to some important realizations for the study of pieces of this sort.
2. There is a continuity of posture and other features in the representations of the figure in different periods, and from different areas which is independent of style and which needs to be further understood.
3. The archeological context of the pieces, information essential for the study of their cultural significance, is often nearly impossible to recover from older excavations.
4. Yet the contexts of the pieces are very different from one period and from one area to another -- houses, palaces, temples, cliff-graves, and hoards.
5. This aspect of the study needs further investigation.
6. In fact, perhaps the most important function of a survey like this one is to point the way for further and more detailed study.
EN. SAMPLE 9 - al Arabiyyah (1980)

1. Romance loan words continued to pour into the islands during the rule of the Order of St. John, known as the Order of the Knights of Malta.

2. Contacts with Muslim North Africa lessened as the war between the Crescent and the Cross became fierce in the Mediterranean basin.

3. With the Knights of Malta came the Sicilian clergy, notaries-public and clerks.

4. On the other hand, there was a large number of Muslim slaves in the islands, who at one time outnumbered the Maltese population.

5. Slaves who were converted to Christianity were often granted permission to marry local people.

6. All the above mentioned factors indicate a foreign ethnopolitical influence in the islands but not strong enough to overcome the resistance of the native language and customs.
1. The Muqaddima moves from initial comments on the author's purpose in writing to discussion of how the earliest authorities in Islam advocated the acquisition of learning from non-Muslims.

2. Economic strength and political independence are essential, he goes on, for that true national sovereignty that can be attained through reform.

3. European superiority does not stem, he insists, from either their inherent worthiness or from that of their Christian religion, but from their institutions, which are based on freedom and justice.

4. Ibn Khaldun is cited to support the contention that it is injustice stemming from a ruler with absolute powers that causes a nation's decline.

5. The solution then, is a consultative form of government in which ministers have genuine responsibilities to ruler and people and are themselves protected against capricious dismissal.