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Abstract

The work presented here has different kinds of original contributions:

Firstly, by building on the missing, limited, misleading, ambiguous, and sometimes erroneous translations of some power-related appraisal adjectives found in English-Arabic dictionaries, the present study aims to contribute to the field of lexicography, and to serve as a guiding image to help translators and language tutors in understanding or choosing appraisal adjectives in English and Arabic. From even a quick glance through dictionaries, one can see that most common words have dozens of meanings and that it is impossible to try all of these meanings each time we read a word. This study offers some helping clues in uncovering patterns of usage and variation that cannot be obtained from consulting reference resources such as dictionaries and grammars.

Secondly, this thesis is the first corpus-based study of its kind that adds a different scope to what might be called ‘appraisal theory’ applied to the Arabic language. It is surprising that linguistic researchers have not attempted to analyse ‘appraisal’ in the Arabic language given that there are a rich variety of Arabic lexical words available for describing evaluation. Though Arabic and English are two distinct languages, the study reveals remarkable similarities with respect to degree adverbs.

Thirdly, the study also explores some crucial issues regarding ‘possibility’ and ‘necessity’ as two basic elements in the study of ‘modality’ – a major carrier of appraisal/evaluation. It is argued that translating the meaning of ‘modality’ has not been as comprehensively documented as most researchers have assumed. This thesis presents different choices for translating ‘possibility’ and ‘necessity’. In other words, this study provides different realizations at the level of modal meanings in Arabic, e.g. verbs, adverbs, adjectives and articles.
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### Key to Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-H</td>
<td>Al-Hayat Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMMD</td>
<td>Al-Mawrid: A Modern English-Arabic Dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNC</td>
<td>British National Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Corpus Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COED</td>
<td>The Compact Oxford On-line English-English Dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Elias Modern Dictionary: English-Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-AR</td>
<td>Internet Arabic Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-EN</td>
<td>Internet English Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Joint (number of occurrences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACD</td>
<td>Longman Active Study Dictionary of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLS</td>
<td>Loglikelihood Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>Systemic Functional Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Story of Civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCD</td>
<td>Webster Concise English-English Dictionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arabic Transliteration System

'Transliteration' is defined as the practice of converting a text from one writing system into another in a systematic way. There are many Arabic transliteration systems that can be followed. Among them are: The British Standard (BS 4280), The International Convention of Orientalist Scholars in 1936, the United States Library of Congress, and the American Library Association.

The transliteration system adopted in this study is that of the United States Library of Congress orthographic transliteration system for Arabic consonants and vowels. This system is adopted because it is considered to be the most common system of Arabic transliteration. It is easy to use for both Arabic and English speakers and makes the utmost use of the English alphabet (see Elewa 2004).

I want to emphasise that this study will transliterate every word separately, i.e. regardless of its nominative, accusative, or genitive case. However, in some cases, the context of the sentence may require 'nunation'\(^1\), which should appear in the transliteration. In other chapters (e.g. chapter seven), my concern is with adjectival lexical entries that do not require declension. Similarly, in the case of the Arabic definite article 'م', and as a result of phonological rules, the definite article is fully pronounced when assimilated to one of the 'Moon letters', and not pronounced when assimilated to one of the 'Sun letters'. In order to avoid confusion, I will transliterate 'م' without any sort of assimilation.

Since the Arabic language has a complex system of endings, 'the sakkín taslam' approach will be adopted in this study. This approach is simply about dropping short vowels and all case endings except in a few cases where omitting them would sound odd to Arabic native speakers, e.g. قَاس qāsin (see chapter 7). In addition, قَوْى qawi\(^2\) is transliterated, according to the system adopted, without the final shaddah. In terms of همزة hamzah أ or ء, the

---

\(^1\) Nunation is the adding of a letter ن nūn to the end of a noun in order to make it in the indefinite state. It is realized by doubling the mark of the case sign on the last letter.

\(^2\) According to the transliteration system adopted in this study (The American Library Association - Library of Congress (ALA-LC), this letter is romanized 'i, and not 'iy, without regard to the presence of ' shaddah. See: www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/romanization/arabic.pdf, p. 3-4
transliteration symbol (‘) will be highlighted when it comes in medial or final position. However, in initial position the symbol is not represented (e.g. أولئك ulā‘ika). In addition, in order to show شدة shaddah ‘emphasis’ or ‘stress’ on the Arabic letter, the letter itself is doubled in transliteration, e.g. ب bb in jabbār (There are exceptions, e.g. qawī that we mentioned previously). For further details, the following chart, ³ adopted from the US library of congress transliteration system, displays the Arabic transliteration system for Arabic consonants and vowels:

³ The transliteration of the Arabic letter د is د
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ة</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ع</td>
<td>ḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>خ</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ك</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ه</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>أ</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>أ</td>
<td>-un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>ṣ</td>
<td>أ</td>
<td>-in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arabic short-long vowels and case endings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﺃ</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ﻛ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻏ</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ﻛ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺔ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ﻛ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻤ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ﻛ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻦ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ﻛ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻧ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ﻛ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Motivation and Goals: ‘The Search for Meaning’

In the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, the search for meaning disappeared from the agenda of the newly established corpus research (Teubert and Cermakova 2007; Stubbs 1996; McEnery and Wilson 2001). This thesis explores the ‘above’ and ‘beyond’ hidden meanings in the clause – the main facets of Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) – see section 3. 4. 1.

With respect to Arabic linguistics, this research represents the first attempt to combine the two main aspects of SFL. That is, this study explores how grammar works in practice. One way of doing this is to look above the clause at the phenomenon of coordination and subordination. A second way is to look beyond the clause at the phenomenon of possibility and necessity.

However, it must be noted that this is not the first study to question the syntactic phenomena of coordination and subordination in English and Arabic. This study builds on Dickins et al. (2002) and Othman’s (2004) accounts of coordination and subordination by analysing the two phenomena through adopting a corpus-based approach in order to explore the different prosodic meanings of coordination and subordination and their functional usage in English and Arabic.

The study also highlights some crucial issues regarding possibility and necessity with regards to their status as two basic elements in the study of modality – a major carrier of appraisal/evaluation. This thesis will argue that translations of the meaning of modality have not been documented as comprehensively as most researchers have assumed. The analysis will present various choices for translating possibility and necessity within two scales that summarise the different degrees of possibility and necessity in the two languages. The two scales indicate that both the semantic and the pragmatic
functions of these terms depend mainly on the grammatical features of the sentence.

This thesis also analyses the prosodic meanings of ‘synonymy’ at the collocational level in order to provide the most authentic translation possible. Moreover, this study will adopt a corpus-linguistic analysis, drawing upon data from two distinctly different languages – English and Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). It is the first study to analyse Arabic-English power-related collocational synonymy from the scope of the appraisal linguistic approach, as chapter seven will explain.

One of the most important goals of the current study is to provide some implications for translators, language tutors, and Arab learners of English as a second language. It reflects the extent to which collocation and semantic prosody of appraisal adjectives are really problematic in English-Arabic-English translation, especially if we consider dictionaries as reliable sources for denotational meanings.

The current study is concerned with how assumed synonymous words, like the power-related Arabic adjectives jaḥbār, qawī and qaṣīn, are not necessarily collocationally interchangeable, as their meanings can be entirely different and even contradictory. Therefore, this study aims to help dictionary users to understand the contextual restrictions of near synonyms, and thus to use dictionary information more effectively.

1.2 Methodology

Concordance tools will be used in order to investigate meanings above and beyond the clauses in the English and Arabic corpora. A concordance is a technique through which a researcher can search and organise data in order to obtain certain types of information. Teubert (2007: 140) defines ‘concordance’ as “a list of lines (texts) containing a node word, nowadays generated by computer as the principal output of a search of a corpus showing the words in its contexts and thus representing a sum of its usage”. A ‘node’ word is the selected word that appears in the centre of the screen. The concordance programme presents every instance of the selected word or phrase, together with the words that come before and after it (to the left and right). Al-Sulaiti (2004:
65) believes that concordancing is very useful and valuable: “A concordance programme became an essential tool for searching as it saves time and presents the data very neatly”.

1.3 Why These Corpora?

More Data is Better Data

As Partington (1998: 4) explains: “The sheer wealth of authentic examples that corpora provide enable dictionary compilers to have a more accurate picture of the usage, frequency and, as it were, social weight of a word or word sense”. A corpus has become an established tool for linguistic analysis. It can go far beyond individual experiences, providing powerful tools that can reveal the regularities of actual behaviour. The current study analyses the concordance lines of British National Corpus (BNC) and the Internet Corpus (I-EN) in English, on the one hand, and Al-Hayat (Al-H) and Arabic Internet Corpus (I-AR) on the other.

There are three main reasons for adopting these corpora. Firstly, the BNC is designed to represent as wide a range of the modern British English of the late 20th century as possible (see section 2.4). It holds around 100 million words. As Aston and Burnard (1998: 94) explain: “The BNC is a collection of over 4,000 samples of modern British English, both spoken and written, stored in electronic form and selected so as to reflect the widest possible variety of users and uses of the language”.

Secondly, the Al-Hayat Arabic corpus has 140MB of data, and has been updated to 50 million words. Moreover, Al-Hayat stands for high standards in Arab journalism. Al-Hayat is a newspaper, i.e. it contains a limited number of text types. Al-Hayat data have been distributed to seven subject-specific databases: general, car, computer, news, economics, science, and sport. Mellor (2005: 80) believes that:

*Al-Hayat* has an increasing importance... The Lebanese-Saudi *Al-Hayat* has regular, weekly supplements directed at different reader segments – young people, business, travel... and this type of news is also integrated in the daily paper. Moreover, the press is now regarded as a catalyst for raising public awareness on global issues.
Thirdly, while Partington (1998: 4) says that ‘there’s no “standard size” for corpora’, Thomas (2009: 191) reminds us that ‘size is related to purpose’. Corpora are much more useful and reliable in linguistic analysis when they are large. As Al-Sulaiti and Atwell (2003: 3) say: “In order to achieve a reliable result in most linguistic studies, the investigation has to be based upon a large corpus, which can be considered as balanced and as representative as possible of the linguistic community”. In addition, Channell (2000: 40) and Sharoff (2006: 435) justify the use of large corpora on the basis that many pragmatic phenomena cannot be visible from the study of single example. They make it clear that corpora can be reliable only if they are sufficiently large and varied.

In addition, the Internet corpora used in this study – whether in Arabic or English – cover more topics, and hence give a broader sample of language use. These corpora are also freely accessible and available for research. However, one problem in using Internet corpora – especially I-AR – is that it includes various colloquial and irrelevant hits (see the adj. *jabbaar* in chapter seven). It has more informal speech in comparison to well-controlled newswires, i.e. Al-H.

The following table lists the corpora used in the present study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of corpus</th>
<th>Source/material</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>British National Corpus</strong></td>
<td>A collection of over 4,000 samples of modern British English.</td>
<td>100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(BNC)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internet English (I-EN)</strong></td>
<td>Random queries to Google.</td>
<td>150m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Al-Hayat (Al-H)</strong></td>
<td>A collection from Al-Hayat newspaper data (1999-2001), compiled by the LDC, published in London under Saudi ownership.</td>
<td>50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internet Arabic (I-AR)</strong></td>
<td>Random queries to Google.</td>
<td>100m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The corpora used in the study.
In addition to the corpora mentioned in table 1, the study (mainly chapter 3 and 5) will also analyse data from *Story of Civilization* (SOC), the first 500 pages from the first volume *Our Oriental Heritage*. Will Durant's⁴ *The Story of Civilization* was translated into Arabic as *Qiṣṣat Al-Ḥadārah* in the 1940s and 1950s under the supervision of the Arab League cultural commissioner Ahmed Amin. The translators include such leading intellectuals as Zaki Naguib Mahmoud, Abdel-Hamed Younis and Mohamed Badran among others⁵.

### 1.4 Span and Statistics

Though a span of 3:3 or 4:4 is widely used by corpus linguists (Stubbs 2001: 29 and Elewa 2004: 102), Bartsch (2004: 69) states that:

> There’s no ideal span setting to the left and right of the search word…but it appears that for collocations across the phrase boundary, a span setting of up to 5 words to the left and right (denoted as 5:5) yields satisfactory results whereas for many collocations the span can safely be lowered to 3:3 … by delimiting the span setting, the amount of noise (i.e. irrelevant information) can be reduced to improve the quality of the statistical results.

Moreover, it is not only ‘the amount of noise’ mentioned in the above quotation that counts in favour of delimiting the span in this study to 3:0 or 3:3, but also that the nature of the structural pattern of the Arabic sentence does not usually exceed this span. As chapter seven will illustrate, the words modified in Arabic adjectival sentences, for example, are usually situated to the left of the adjective, unlike the case in English. Thus, I will work on flexible spans to match the Arabic expressions that might stretch over the average span. That is, I will start by analysing a span of one word to the left of the node and zero to the right of the node (1:0), in order to analyse the immediate left collocates (usually the appraised elements in the study). I will then widen the span to 3:0 and 3:3 when analysing any further collocates.

⁴ Will Durant was a philosopher with a holistic view of civilisation, and his open attitude towards other cultures and civilisations is one that contains lessons for modern doomsday theorists like Samuel Huntington and Francis Fukuyama. He was not trained as a historian but as a philosopher and his lifelong study of civilisations took him all over the globe. Will and Ariel Durant were awarded the Pulitzer Prize for the tenth volume.

The present study will also adopt log-likelihood statistics, which provide the most reliable method for highlighting words accurately, and have proved to be effective in corpus analysis (Rayson and Garside 2000: 1-6). Moreover, using log-likelihood scores provides a significant statistical result in the analysis of collocation. Anagnostou and Weir (2006: 1) describe log-likelihood as the "measure that was found to be the most robust and accurate for collocation identification". Petrovic (2007: 13) also confirms the reliability of the log-likelihood measure in collocation induction as follows:

Loglikelihood is a widely used measure for extracting collocations, often giving very good results. Dunning (1994) introduced the measure, using it for detecting composite terms and for the determination of domain specific terms.

Finally, McEnery et al. (2006: 217) consider themselves as 'lucky' to have such a statistic in the BNCWeb: “Once again, we are fortunate in that BNCWeb provides this statistic, and hence users do not need to resort to statistics packages like SPSS to calculate the LL score”.

Moreover, the researcher does not make use of other statistical tests, such as 'Mutual Information' (MI) as it is considered a statistical formula borrowed from information theory and depends on technical terms. Therefore, as Hunston (2002: 72) suggests, MI score "is not always reliable in identifying meaningful collocations".

1.5 Thesis Structure

This thesis is divided into eight chapters. Chapter two surveys the history of corpus linguistics and explains what a corpus can do, and what types of corpora will be used in this thesis. Chapter three discusses the link between corpus linguistics and Systemic Functional Linguistic theory (SFL). Whereas SFL is regarded as a theory of language, corpus linguistics is a method for investigating language. Both are complementary to each other, as they look at language from different angles. This chapter also sets out to apply SFL to 'Coordination' and 'Subordination', which belong to Halliday's parataxis and hypotaxis (above the clause).
Chapter four presents appraisal theory as an extension of Halliday's SFL. It also handles the area of emotion talk. Although it is commonly held that most linguistic studies do not analyse emotional meanings in a systematic way, SFL is regarded as an exceptional theory – one that is well suited to the study of emotion talk with its multi-functions of language (i.e. textual, ideational and interpersonal). 'Emotion Talk' is also an area that has been neglected, at least in Arabic Linguistics. While chapter three examines Halliday's 'above the clause', chapter four and chapter five correspond to Halliday's 'beyond or around the clause'. Chapter five discusses modality as a way of achieving appraisal. This chapter also explores the different meanings of English and Arabic modal verbs, particularly focussing on modals that indicate 'possibility' and 'necessity' in the English and Arabic languages.

Chapter six gives a brief account of the concepts of synonymy and collocation in English and Arabic. This chapter also highlights some of the problems that bilingual English-Arabic and Arabic-English dictionaries have in dealing with emotional adjectives. Chapter seven presents a corpus analysis of power-related appraisal emotional adjectives in English and Arabic. The analysis reveals some problematic areas concerning both Arabic and English translations in different dictionaries. This chapter also gives a snapshot of Arabic adjectives and how they differ from their English counterparts. Finally, chapter eight provides the conclusions of this thesis, and the implications that this work has for translators, learners, and language tutors.
Chapter Two

Corpus Linguistics

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will take a closer look at corpus linguistics. I will begin by describing the origin of the word 'corpus' and its different definitions in 2.2. Section 2.3 handles the history of Corpus Linguistics from the 1960s onward. I then present a brief overview of English and Arabic Corpus Linguistics in sections 2.4 & 2.5. Section 2.6 demonstrates the necessity of using the corpus-based approach in translation studies, and the relation between corpora and empirical data. I then outline the main features of the modern corpus in 2.7. The following two sections 2.8 & 2.9 then discuss the benefits and drawbacks of using corpora, as well as the different types of corpora available.

2.2 What is a Corpus?

‘Corpus’ is a Latin word that means ‘body’. Any collection of more than one text can be called a corpus, hence a corpus is any body of text. But when the term ‘corpus’ is used in modern linguistics, i.e. ‘corpus linguistics’, it refers to more specific connotations than this simple definition. Kennedy (1998: 1) states that a ‘corpus’, in the language sciences, is a:

body of a written text or transcribed speech which can serve as a basis for linguistic analysis and descriptions. Over the last three decades the compilation and analysis of corpora stored in computerized databases have led to a new scholarly enterprise known as corpus linguistics.

Other linguists⁶ have cited different, but compatible definitions of ‘corpus’. For example:

⁶ http://www.ims.uni-stuttgart.de/~schulte/Teaching/ESSLLI-07/Slides/intro.pdf
- Any collection of more than one text (McEnery & Wilson 2001).
- A large body of linguistic evidence typically composed of attested language use (McEnery 2003).
- A collection of electronic texts built according to explicit design criteria for a specific purpose (Atkins et al. 1992).
- A corpus is a collection of pieces of language that are selected and ordered according to explicit linguistic criteria, in order to be used as a sample of the language (Sinclair 1996).

However, this study will adopt Hunston’s (2002: 2) definition of ‘corpus’, in terms of both its form and purpose. First, linguists used the word ‘corpus’ to describe a collection of occurring examples of language. These examples can be a few sentences, a collection of written texts, or even tape recordings that have been collected for linguistic research. Then, after the rapid development of computer technology, the word ‘corpus’ came to also be used for any collections of texts that are stored and accessed electronically. Therefore, the information stored in electronic corpora is larger than the paper-based collections that were previously used to study different aspects of language. The purpose of corpora depends mainly on the type of data collected. For example, a corpus can be diachronic, pedagogic, specialised or general (cf. 2.10). Hunston believes that one purpose of a corpus is to put the texts in order so that they can be read. This feature distinguishes a ‘corpus’ from an ‘archive’. An archive is an unordered, unstructured collection of data, whereas a corpus is a principled, systematic, planned, and structured linguistic snapshot of language at a certain point in time (Leech 1991: 11; Hunston 2002: 2). However, Hunston makes it clear that preserving texts is not the primary purpose of a corpus. Instead, there is a linguistic purpose for collecting certain kinds of texts. Corpora have been used to discover patterns of usages and to support a particular theory of language.
2.3 The History of Corpus Linguistics

2.3.1 Chomskyan Approach (intuition) vs. Corpus Approach (empiricism)

Corpus linguistics is considered to be a new approach to language. It emerged in the 1960s, at the same time as Noam Chomsky made his contribution to modern language studies. Chomsky criticized corpus linguistics severely: “The corpus could never be a useful tool for the linguist, as the linguist must seek to model language ‘competence’ rather than ‘performance’” (McEnery and Wilson 2001: 6). His Syntactic Structures appeared in 1957, and while it became a widely discussed text, it was only the publication of his Aspects of the Theory of Syntax in 1965 that caused a revision of the standard paradigm in theoretical linguistics. With the increasing interest in language as a universal phenomenon, other linguists became more dissatisfied with the descriptions they found for the variety of languages they dealt with. They, in turn, criticised Chomskyan linguistics that does not accept experimentation or corpus evidence. Sinclair (2004: 2) claims that Chomskyan approach displays no interest in language beyond the level of the sentence, there is no recognition that authentic data is of any significance and there is no acceptance that studies of large corpora or real language in use play any part in descriptive theories of language. Most significantly, too, there is a clear sense that the analysis of meaning is not a primary purpose.

The first large-scale project to collect language data for empirical grammatical research was Randolph Quirk’s Survey of English Usage, which later led to what became the standard English grammar for many decades: A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language (Quirk et al. 1985). However, at that time, the survey did not consider computerising the data. This happened much later, in the mid-1980s, through Quirk and Greenbaum’s project known as the ‘International Corpus of English’ (ICE).7

7 http://www.ucl.ac.uk/english-usage/ice
There was a mixture of spoken and written data in Quirk’s survey, with about 500,000 words of spoken English out of a total of one million words. The spoken component was actually the first to be put on computer, by Jan Svartvik, and became the London Lund Corpus in the late 1970s. This was the first spoken corpus to be widely available for use, and was published as a book. This Survey was mostly interested in grammar rather than meaning, and it became increasingly difficult to find acceptance of this kind of data-oriented language research in the 1960s. Later, in the 1970s, this kind of research was taken up by a number of Scandinavian linguists, most of them based in Bergen, Lund and Oslo.

The Brown Corpus was the second data-oriented project in the 1960s, and was named after Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, where it was compiled by Nelson Francis and Henry Kucera. This corpus consists of one million words, taken in samples of 2,000 words from 500 American texts belonging to 15 text categories. The corpus was carefully organised and very easy to use. A similarly composed corpus of British English was the LOB (Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen). Later, both corpora were manually tagged with part-of-speech information. At that time it was hoped that these corpora would be able to answer questions in grammar and lexicon, but it was soon realised that a corpus of one million words could not contain more than a tiny fraction of vocabulary. When the Brown Corpus was compiled, and the proofreading was completed, it seemed that linguists lost interest in it, as it played a very small role in Anglo-Saxon linguistics (although it became a popular resource in European linguistics). The LOB Corpus was exploited in corpus studies, especially for grammar and, more importantly, for word frequency, but not for meaning.

Nelson Francis was the first person to apply the term ‘corpus’ to his electronic collection of texts. Teubert and Cermakova (2007: 53) point out that John Sinclair believes that this is how the new usage may have originated:

There is a story that Jan Svartvik tells about him [Nelson Francis] coming to London with a tape containing the Brown Corpus or part of it and meeting Randolph Quirk there in the mid sixties. Nelson threw this rather large and heavy container, as tapes were then, on
Quirk’s desk and said: ‘Habeas corpus’. Francis also uses corpus in the title of his collection of texts, i.e. the Brown University Corpus, and as such it is referred to in the OSTI Report. (Interview with John Sinclair in Krishnamurthy 2004)

The third and most important early corpus was English Lexical Studies, begun in Edinburgh in 1963, and completed in Birmingham. The principal investigator of this project was John Sinclair. He was the first person to use a corpus specifically for lexical investigation, and to use the concept of ‘collocation’ (introduced in the 1930s by Harold Palmer and A.S. Hornby in their Second Interim Report on English Collocation [1933], and then used by J.R. Firth in his paper ‘Modes of meaning’ [Firth 1957]) in this field of study. Sinclair’s project investigated the meaning of ‘lexical items’, a category that included collocation, on the basis of a very small electronic text sample of spoken and written language.

Compiling corpora, especially larger ones, posed a large number of problems and questions (mostly technical). For example, was there a corpus that could be said to represent the discourse? Was it possible to define the text types? How important was the size of a corpus? And finally, what was the role of special corpora (Teubert and Cermakova 2007; Stubbs 1996; McEnery and Wilson, 2001).

2.4 English Corpus Linguistics

Kennedy (1998: 13) suggests that there are three categories of English corpora:

a) Pre-electronic Corpora (biblical and literary studies, early dictionaries, etc.)

b) 1st-generation Major Corpora (Brown, LOB, LLC, Kolhapur, Willington, etc.)

c) 2nd-generation Mega-corpora (COBUILD, British National Corpus (BNC), Internet English Corpus (I-EN) British News Corpus, ICE-GB, American National Corpus (ANC), etc.)

Pre-electronic corpora emerged before the 1960s, when there was a number of corpus-based linguistic research projects that used the Bible as a corpus. Other
pre-electronic corpora relied on lexicography, grammatical, and/or dialect literary studies. Although the first generation major corpora held only one million words (or even less), they captured a variety of texts in various fields. However, these corpora were notably small for research analysis, especially in the field of semantic and lexical analysis. Later on, the rapid development of computer technology “made bigger corpora possible, so that by the 1990s corpora of 100 million words or more became available” (ibid: 46).

In this study, I will focus on the third category of Kennedy’s mentioned above, i.e. BNC and I-EN corpora (see chapter one). I-EN, a 150 million words internet corpus, is collected by Serge Sharoff, Leeds University. It holds random queries to Google.\(^8\) BNC, on the other hand, includes many different styles and varieties and is not limited to any particular field. The BNC corpus deals with modern British English, but not other languages used in Britain. However, both non-British English and foreign language words do occur in the corpus.\(^9\)

### 2.5 Arabic Corpus Linguistics

Arabic is a major world language. It is one of the six official languages of the United Nations and the mother tongue of more than three hundred million people. Yet, and in spite of the important status of the Arabic language, it does not receive much attention in the field of corpus linguistics. Khoja (2003: 1) argues that:

> Arabic is the official language of twenty Middle East and African countries, and is the religious language of all Muslims, regardless of their origin. It is therefore surprising that very little work has been done on Arabic corpus linguistics.

Al-Sulaiti and Atwell (2003: 1) agree with Khoja (2003) that the English language has received the greatest attention among the research community: “At present, corpus-based research in Arabic lags far behind that of modern European languages […] most studies on Arabic up to now have been based on rather limited data”.

---

\(^8\) See [http://wackybook.sslmit.unibo.it](http://wackybook.sslmit.unibo.it)

\(^9\) For more information on English corpora see: [http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/corpus/index.xml](http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/corpus/index.xml)
Similarly, Elewa (2004: 33) compares the situation of Arabic computational Linguistics with that of European languages:

Work in Arabic computing did not start as early as European languages. Attempts have been made, but due to some technical problems\(^\text{10}\) with Arabic script (orthography) and grammar there is far less development than in English and languages written with the Roman alphabet.

Since 1995, when the first Arabic newspaper was launched online www.ashargalawsat.com, the number of Arabic websites has dramatically increased: “By 2000 there were about twenty thousand Arabic sites on the web” (Abdelali et al. 2004). Accordingly, Arabic has become "an exciting – yet challenging – language for scholars because many of its linguistic properties have not been fully described" (Farghaly 2010).

The Gigaword Arabic Corpus is considered the most comprehensive archive of newswire text data, and has been acquired from Arabic news sources by the Linguistic Data Consortium (LDC) at the University of Pennsylvania. LDC is an open consortium of universities, companies, and government research laboratories. It creates, collects, and distributes speech and text databases, lexicons, and other resources for research and development purposes. Graff (2003) states that there are four distinct sources of Arabic newswire: (a) Agence France Press; (b) Al-Hayat News Agency; (c) Al-Nahar News Agency; and (d) Xinhua News Agency. All of these news services use Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). *Al-Hayat* is originally a Lebanese news service, and has been based in London during the entire period represented in this archive. Sometimes, it is referred to as a Saudi news service as its owners reside in Saudi Arabia.

There are other Arabic corpora, such as: Buckwalter Arabic corpus (1986-2003) by Tim Buckwalter, which consists of 2.5 – 3 billion words; Nijmegen Corpus (1996), by Nijmegen University, which consists of more than 2 million words; CLARA (1997), by Charles University, which consists of 50 million words.

---

words; and EA Parallel Corpus (2003), by the University of Kuwait, which consists of 3 million words.\footnote{For more information on Arabic Corpora see: \url{http://www.comp.leeds.ac.uk/eric/latifa/arabic}}

### 2.6 Corpus in Use

The study of corpora has emerged and revolutionised the study of language and its applications over the last few decades. This is largely the result of the continually improving accessibility of computers, which has changed corpus study from being a subject for specialists to one that is open to all. Consequently, the importance of corpora for researchers has increased, since corpora allow them to not only count categories and phenomena, but also to observe linguistic features that have not been noticed before (Hunston 2002: 1).

McEnery and Wilson (2001: 103) highlight the relation between corpora and empirical data. They believe that corpora and empirical data are strongly related:

> Empirical data enable the linguist to make statements which are objective and based on language as it really is rather than statements which are subjective and based upon the individual’s own internalised cognitive perception of the language.

They also believe that the use of empirical data implies the study of language varieties such as dialects, or earlier periods in a language. Therefore, the use of corpora has a basic importance for language studies. This research will focus on the roles that corpora play in linguistic studies (mainly in terms of syntax), as well as translation studies. Abdelali et al. (2004: 31) illustrate that: “A corpus to a linguist is very valuable because it allows statements to be made about language in a very convincing fashion”.

Hunston (2002) believes that the use of linguistic corpora in applied linguistics has expanded rapidly over the past twenty years for two reasons: first the advent of improved and more accessible systems of electronic storage and analysis, and secondly because of an ever-growing appreciation of the huge potential of corpus work.
Moreover, Baker (1995: 235) believes that the rise of corpus linguistics has had a substantial impact on the study of translation. She holds that corpus linguistics is important for translation studies because:

Large corpora will provide theorists of translation with a unique opportunity to observe the object of their study and to explore what it is that makes it different from other objects of study, such as language in general or indeed any other kind of cultural interaction. It will also allow us to explore, on a larger scale than was ever possible before, the principles that govern translational behaviour and the constraints under which it operates.

Similarly, Laviosa (1998: 101) and Tymoczko (1998: 1) highlight the value of corpus translation studies for enabling the researchers to retrieve vast quantities of data from a storage device: “more data than any single human being could ever manage to gather or examine in a productive lifetime without electronic assistance” (ibid).

Laviosa (ibid) agrees with Baker and Tymoczko on the necessity of using a corpus-based approach, and says:

A growing number of scholars in translation studies have begun to seriously consider the corpus based approach as a viable and fruitful perspective within which translation and translating can be studied in a novel and systematic way.

In the same way, Olohan (2004: 23) and Malmkjaer (2003: 119) draw attention to what corpus linguistics can do. They make it clear that the analysis of corpus data can make a contribution to the study of translation:

The use in translation studies of methodologies inspired by corpus linguistics has proved to be one of the most important gate-openers to progress in the discipline...(Malmkjaer 2003: 119 as cited in Olohan 2004: 23).

Yet, despite the great importance of corpora, Hunston (2002) states that a corpus can do nothing at all by itself, since it is just a store of used language. It does not contain new information about language, but provides packages of
data through the software. This kind of data in corpora can be manipulated through:

(a) Collocation  (b) Frequency  (c) Phraseology

‘Collocation’ is defined as the habitual, meaningful co-occurrence of two or more words (see chapter six for more details). ‘Frequency’ and ‘Phraseology’, are the other two aspects through which corpora can be analysed. The importance of using frequency in analysing corpora is that accurate frequency helps in identifying all possible differences between corpora. Following Flowerdew (2009: 394), frequency is used as a step towards the identification of meaningful units. Swain (1998: 66) points out that there are levels of 'noticing', one of which is that: "learners may simply notice a form in the target language due to the frequency or salience of the features themselves". For example, the use of the present perfect form of 'focus' has revealed that this tense is used when previous research is introduced or to set up a critical evaluation of this work marked by 'however' (Flowerdew 2009: 401). Through concordancing lines we can deal with a corpus, and observe regularities in use that remain unobserved when the same words and phrases are met in their normal contexts, and thus phraseology can be observed through concordances (Hunston 2002: 9).

Phraseology is referred to as the investigation of phrases. Phraseology differs from grammars in that it prefers syntagmatic patterns to paradigmatic ones. In other words, phraseology is not just a group of neat small lexical patterns. Phraseology is a pragmatic dimension of linguistic analysis that sets up related phrases and form meaning by their combination. Hunston (2006: 242) asserts that:

One of the key points about phraseology is that it is closely connected to meaning. Corpus-driven lexicology has indicated that where a word has two or more distinct meanings, each will tend to occur in a specific phraseology.

Therefore, the study of phraseology involves the identification of specific collocations and idioms. It considers the relation between the expression and the environments within which it has been created (Gledhill 2000: 202).
This study sheds light on the way ‘collocation’, ‘frequency’, and ‘phraseology’ are used to analyse grammar through corpora (mainly above and beyond the clause, which will be discussed in chapters three, four, five and seven).

2.7 Features of Corpora

There are four main characteristics of the modern corpus: (a) finite size, (b) machine-readable form, (c) sampling and representativeness, and (d) a standard reference. These features are discussed below.

(a) Finite size: The term ‘corpus’ tends to imply a body of text of a finite size, for example, one million words. However, this is not the case universally, as McEnery and Wilson (2001) point out. For example, at Birmingham University, John Sinclair’s COBUILD team have been engaged in the construction and analysis of a collection of texts known as monitor corpus. Sinclair’s team calls this type of corpus a ‘collection of texts’, rather than a ‘corpus’: “it is an open-ended entity. Texts are constantly being added to it, so that it gets bigger and bigger as more samples are added” (ibid: 29).

(b) Machine-readable form: Another important feature of a corpus is that it is almost always ‘machine-readable’. This was not the case in the early days of corpora, as the term ‘corpus’ could be used only in reference to printed text. Nowadays, things have changed, and the printed corpus has become the exception rather than the rule. Svartvik and Quirk (1980) provide an example of a printed corpus: a Corpus of English Conversation, which represents the original London-Lund corpus. The texts included in this corpus are also available in a machine-readable form in the London-Lund corpus. This corpus is regarded as one of the very few corpora available in book format.

McEnery and Wilson (2001: 64) state two advantages of machine-readable corpora over the original written or spoken format. The first and most important is that machine-readable corpora can be searched easily and through simple methods, which are not possible to use with the written format. For example, by using concordancing software, it may take a few minutes to extract all instances of a certain word. But a corpus book format would need to be read from cover to cover to obtain the required results. The second advantage is that
a machine-readable corpus can easily have additional information added to it, i.e. through the use of 'annotation'.

(C) **Sampling and Representative**: McEnery et al. (2006: 13) claim that being representative is another important characteristic to be added to the features of corpora. Representative is a feature that distinguishes a corpus from an archive (i.e., a random collection of texts). A corpus represents different text types of a particular language, whereas an archive does not. Sampling, on the other hand, refers to the techniques (i.e., how the text is selected). In order to achieve representativeness, we have to sample language. Sampling a corpus is essential since it is impossible to describe every single utterance or sentence in a given language. For a living language like English, it is notable that the total text population is huge, and the number of utterances is constantly increasing and theoretically infinite. Consequently, to analyse every utterance in such a language would be an impossible task. That is why McEnery and Wilson (2001) suggested the importance of building a sample of the language variety in which one is interested.

(D) **Standard reference**: having a standard reference for a language variety in a corpus is essential for corpus researchers. The advantage of a widely available corpus is that it provides a standard measurement for studies to follow. Thus the data in a corpus should be sampled in order to be maximally representative of the language variety under consideration.

### 2.8 Corpora: Benefits and Drawbacks

Stubbs (1996: 231) marks an interesting similarity between the period immediately following the invention of the microscope and the telescope, and the period after the invention of the computer. He says that the microscope and telescope allowed scientists to observe things that had never been seen before. In the same way, computers and software programs have allowed linguists to see phenomena and discover patterns that were not previously suspected. Hunston (2002: 20) cites Stubbs’ (1999) defence of the role of corpora, stating that:
Just as it is ridiculous to criticise a telescope for not being a microscope, so it is pointless to criticise corpora for not allowing some methods of investigation. They are invaluable for doing what they do, and what they do not do must be done in another way.

Stubbs (1999) concludes that the effect and power of corpus methods is no longer in doubt. The main argument in favour of using a corpus is that it is a more reliable guide to language-use than native speaker intuition is. For example, a native speaker language teacher is often unable to explain why a particular phrase is to be preferred in one particular context to another. Yet, and despite the usefulness of corpora in describing how a language works and what language can show about the context in which it is used, there are certain limitations of using corpora that should be considered. Hunston (2002: 22-23) has summarised these limitations as follows:

1- A corpus cannot give information about whether something is possible or not. A corpus can say whether something is frequent or not.
2- A corpus can show nothing more than the contents it has.
3- A corpus can provide researchers with evidence, but cannot give information.
4- A corpus masks some of the features of the texts by presenting concordance lines, in which the structure of the original is lost.

2.9 Types of Corpora

There are many types of corpora, and each type is designed for a particular purpose. The most commonly used corpus types are:

(1) Specialised Corpus

This type of corpus consists of a particular type of text, such as history/geography textbooks, academic articles on a certain subject, lectures, etc. The aim of this corpus is to represent a given type of text and analyse specific type of language, for example, the language of newspaper articles that deal with bringing up English children, or language taking place in a café. Some of the famous specialised corpora include the five million word Cambridge and
Nottingham Corpus of Discourse in English (CANCODE), and the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE).

(2) General Corpus

This type of corpus is much larger than a specialised corpus. Unlike the specialised corpus, it is made up of texts of many types. For instance, it may include written or spoken language, or both. Sometimes, this corpus is known as a reference corpus, as it can be used to produce reference materials for language learning or translation. It can also be used for the purpose of comparison with specialised corpora. The most famous general corpora include the British National Corpus and the Bank of English. Both of these corpora include a variety of sub-corpora from different sources.

(3) Learner Corpus

This is a collection of texts produced by the learners of a language. The main purpose of this corpus is to identify how learners’ language differs from that of each other and from the language of native speakers. One example of a learner corpus is The International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE), which has a collection of corpora of 20,000 words each.

(4) Pedagogic Corpus

This is very useful for teachers as it consists of, for example, all the course books and tapes that learners have used. It is also used to help learners by collecting all the words and phrases they have come across in different contexts.

(5) Historical or Diachronic Corpus

As its name suggests, this is a corpus of texts collected from different periods of time, and is used to trace the development of aspects of a language over time. One good example of a historical corpus of English is the Helsinki Corpus.

Baker (1995) makes another distinction between two further types of corpora: ‘Parallel Corpora’ and ‘Comparable Corpora’. While parallel corpora consist of original, source-language texts in a certain language and their translated versions in other languages, comparable corpora refer to texts in two languages that are similar in content, but are not translations. Comparable
corpora of varieties (such as: newspaper texts, novels, formal conversations, etc.) of the same language can be used to compare those varieties. Yet, comparable corpora of different languages can be used by both translators and researchers to identify differences and equivalences in each language (Hunston 2002; Baker 1995).

The corpora used in this study are general corpora since they consist of many types of texts. The aim of general corpora is to show language in its broadest sense. A general corpus contains language samples from a wide range of genres, including both fiction and nonfiction texts.

2.10 Conclusion

This chapter has given a brief account of the basic issues in corpus linguistics. I began this chapter by defining the term corpus, and then provided a brief review of the history of corpus linguistics. This chapter presented a brief discussion of the debate over the Chomskyan approach vs. the corpus approach. Features, forms, types, advantages, and disadvantages of corpora were then described.
Chapter Three

Translation between System and Corpus

3.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out to examine the relation between different (but related) trends that the thesis revolves around, i.e. corpus linguistics (CL) and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). The chapter aims to replace our traditional conceptions of grammar. In other words, instead of analysing syntactic patterns of coordination and subordination (for example, as governed by strict grammatical rules), this chapter will analyse the two syntactic phenomena as systematically structured through repeated patterns of use.

This chapter also provides insights concerning the relevance of theory and practice to translation (see 3.2). Section 3.3 explains to what extent SFL and CL are two complementary approaches. The relation between SFL and translation studies will be revealed in 3.4. I follow this by providing the reasons for adopting SFL in this study (see 3.4.1). The rest of the chapter is then dedicated to applying SFL to English and Arabic in the areas of adjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts.

3.2 Translation between Theory and Practice

Translation is sometimes claimed to be an ambiguous field of study as a result of the complexity involved in reaching a definitive conclusion about its meaning. Hewson and Martin (1991: 3) believe that ‘translation is an ill-defined term’. They add that a conclusive definition of translation is not attainable because:

It has never been made quite clear whether that word refers to the actual cognitive operations involved in the production of a translated text, or to some instrumental process meant to achieve the same result, or to a combination of both (ibid).
Larson (1991: 1) states that: “Good theory is based on information gained from practice. Good practice is based on carefully worked-out theory. The two are interdependent”. Therefore, ‘theory’ corresponds significantly to ‘practice’, and vice versa. EL-Shiyab (2000: 41) indicates the importance of combining the two approaches, as “theory of translation makes students of translation aware of language complexities; it gives them a sense of creativity and intellect”. Following Larson and EL-Shiyab, I believe that translation theory and practice complement each other effectively in understanding a text.

3.3 System and Corpus: A Happy Union

In Mishra’s (2009: 449) review of Thompson and Hunston’s work on CL and SFL, he makes it clear that both approaches are complementary:

Since SFL is essentially a theory of language, CL is essentially a method for investigating language, and both are concerned with naturally occurring language as text, they are complementary, if not productively synergic [...] If corpus linguists are simply those who focus on corpus data [...] then being an SFL corpus linguist is unproblematic.

Thus, while CL is a method that approaches language automatically, SFL is a theory that analyses text systematically. Following Thompson and Hunston (2000), Hoey (2003) highlights the interaction between CL and SFL. He argues that there is an explicit relation between the two approaches in that a lexical item is likely to occur with a certain semantic prosody, with certain syntactic functions, and in a particular position in a text. Hoey’s work provides ways of applying ‘choice’ in SFL.

3.4 SFL Approach to Translation Studies

Translation Studies was formerly dismissed as a second-rate activity. Munday (2001: 5) believes that “the study of translation as an academic subject has only really begun in the past fifty years”. It has been considered as a sub-discipline of other fields. Gradually, Translation Studies has become a discipline in its own

12 http://humanities.exeter.ac.uk/modernlanguages/postgraduate/taught/translation/research/
right, and it has been described as “a house of many rooms” (Hatim 2001:8; cited in Manfredi 2008: 28). Translation Studies has been interwoven with many other fields, such as SFL. Despite the fact that SFL’s role in Translation Studies has not been seriously tackled, SFL has proved itself to be a useful instrument for translation theory and practice. Taylor and Baldry (2001: 277) state that:

Interest in the role that systemic-functional linguistics might play in translation studies has never been feverish [has not been seriously tackled], though a number of articles have been written on the subject (Newmark 1988; Ventola 1994; Steiner 1996) [...] and seminars have been held and whole sections of conferences given over to the subject.

3.4.1 Why SFL?

SFL is a theory of grammar that was originally developed by Michael Halliday in the 1960s. As its name suggests, the theory is ‘systemic’ in that it looks at language as a “network of systems, or interrelated sets of options for making meaning” (Halliday 1994: 15). At the same time, the theory is described as ‘functional’ – which is radically opposite to Chomskyan ‘formal grammar’ – as its main concern is the practical functional contextualised usage to which language is put. Systemic functional grammar or systemic functional linguistics focuses on the lexical and sentence structure of language as well as how these interact largely with syntax (form), semantics (meaning) and pragmatics (use). Therefore, it describes the relationship between texts and their context of use.  

In this study I have chosen to use the Hallidayan model of SFL because its main linguistic core revolves around the concept of meaning-making. In the process of translating, the translator is inevitably engaging with the issue of meaning. Halliday (1985, 1994: 15) puts it as follows:

Grammar is the central processing unit of language, the powerhouse where meanings are created; it is hardly conceivable that the systems by which these meanings are expressed should have evolved along lines significantly different from the grammar itself.

13 https://sites.google.com/site/2011introling1/chapter-4-functional-grammar
Conveying meaning is the prime concern of a translator. The systemic functional approach views language as “a system of ‘meaning potential’”, i.e. “a resource for making meaning” (see Halliday 1978: 39; Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 23). In terms of meaning, Matthiessen and Halliday (1997) indicate three general directions of approach to any system of grammar: ‘from below’, ‘from around/beyond’, and ‘from above’, as seen in the figure below.

![Perspectives on a system as cited in Matthiessen and Halliday (1997)](image)

Figure 1: Perspectives on a system as cited in Matthiessen and Halliday (1997)

Figure 1 presents a wider perspective to the clause in English. ‘Below’ the clause indicates word classes and group functions from the phonological side, which falls outside the scope of this study. ‘Above’ the clause refers to the clause complexes and the type of relationships between clauses. The grammar is doing a lot of organisational work in the relationship between clause complexes – i.e. ‘taxis: parataxis and hypotaxis’ (although here we may enter murky waters between constituency and dependency). This type of clause will be handled in the next section (3.5). ‘Beyond/around’ the clause is concerned with the metaphorical mode of expressions that are represented in appraisal theory and modality (see chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7). This study will focus on these
two perspectives of clause, as they are very much related to the nature of translation.

Therefore, SFL is a theory that sets out to take a different perspective to the traditional concept of grammar. Manfredi (2008: 9) refers to the old notion of grammar as: "the die-hard myths surrounding the study of grammar that see it as a boring, or even elitist, enterprise, one that is basically meaningless". SFL theory provides a model within which semantics (meanings) and lexicogrammar (wordings) are typically related in foregrounding the choice of meaning. As Halliday (1973: 67) states:

In the study of language in a social perspective we need both to pay attention to what is said and at the same time to relate it systematically to what might have been said but was not. Hence we do not make a dichotomy between knowing and doing; instead we place ‘does’ in the environment of ‘can do’, and treat language as speech potential.

In Hallidayan functional grammar, three fundamental areas of meaning, called 'metafunctions', are identified: ideational, interpersonal and textual. Every specific function can be related to these general functions, and hence these broad functions are referred to as ‘metafunctions’ or ‘metalanguages’. The three metafunctions are concerned mainly with the meanings that we express in our language. These three areas of meanings are dealt with equally within the grammatical system as figure 2 illustrates below.

Figure 2: The mutual relation between Halliday’s metafunctions.

Each of these metafunctions relates to a certain type of meaning, as summarised by Thompson (2004: 30) below:

1. **Experiential/Ideational Function:** (representations) “We use language to talk about our experience of the world, including the worlds in our own
minds, to describe events and state the entities involved in them”. This ideational or experiential metafunction focuses mainly on the kinds of activities that are undertaken in the discourse. It looks at clauses as representations. Halliday identifies this metafunction as the ‘content function of language’ (2007: 183)\(^{14}\). It also involves the description and classification of the participants.

2. **Interpersonal Function: (exchanges)** “We also use language to interact with other people, to establish and maintain relations with them, to influence their behaviour, to express our own viewpoint on things in the world, and to elicit or change theirs” (Thompson 2004: 30). In other words, the interpersonal metafunction sets up the relationship between ‘text producer’ (writer) and ‘text consumer’ (reader). Halliday (ibid: 184) describes the interpersonal function as the ‘participatory function of language’. It involves the expression of attitudes and appraisal that are realised by mood and modality (see chapter 5).

3. **Textual Function: (messages)** “In using language, we organise our messages in ways that indicate how they fit in with the other messages around them and with the wider context in which we are talking or writing” (ibid). Halliday (ibid) indicates that both ideational and interpersonal meanings are ‘actualised’ in the textual function (see 5.7.5).

As mentioned earlier in this section, all of these three functions are relevant to each other. Halliday (1970: 145) points out that they have equal status:

The speaker does not first decide to express some content and then go on to decide what sort of message to build out of it…Speech acts involve planning that is continuous and simultaneous in respect to all the functions of language.

Consider the following example:

\(^{14}\)For more information see: www.cadaad.org/glossary/metafunctions
(1) [Adjunct: textual] However [Adjunct: interpersonal] unfortunately we cannot meet [Adjunct: experiential/location] at noon.\footnote{This example is quoted from http://minerva.ling.mq.edu.au/resource/virtual\ library/Glossary/sysglossary.htm}

Therefore, adjuncts can be experiential (circumstances), textual (conjunctives), or interpersonal (modal adjuncts or comment adjuncts).

In terms of the discussion so far, these are the three generalised categories of functions in which we can say things. However, the focus of the next section will be on ‘how we can say or describe things’, that is to say, the role of grammar in offering appropriate ‘wordings’ to express meanings. It is also important to make clear that the speaker does not go through these three metafunctions in successive steps. These three broad functions of our language use usually occur at the same time, whether consciously or unconsciously. Thompson (2004: 31-32) explains that:

We unpack the choices for analytical purposes, but the choices are usually all made – consciously or, in the main, unconsciously – at the same time. There are times when the process may become more staged and more conscious; for example, in redrafting written text I sometimes find myself deciding that a new starting point will make the sentence fit in more clearly, which may mean that I also have to alter the wording in the rest of the sentence. But typically a functional description brings to light and separates closely interwoven decisions that we are not aware of making about how to word what we want to say.

By unpacking the different choices of meaning, we can decide which choice matches which meaning, either in the same language or when translating to another language.
3.5 Enacting Systemic Functional Linguistics: (Above the clause)

3.5.1 Coordination (disjuncts) and Subordination (adjuncts): An Introduction

As was noted in Chapter one, this is not the first study to analyse coordination and subordination. In a study on coordination and subordination in English and Arabic, Othman (2004) recommends the use of large computerised corpora: “In longer research projects, more extended texts could be surveyed and analysed through the use of massive amounts of computerised collections of texts that are currently available on the Internet”. In this study, I will adopt Othman’s recommendation, and apply the analysis to large corpora in English and Arabic. I will focus on English and Arabic as two distinct languages in their preference for syntactic relations, most importantly in their use of subordination and coordination.

In other words, this chapter considers syntactic and denotative similarities and differences between English and Arabic in respect of junction. The chapter aims to show how these two syntactic relations, i.e. subordination (adjuncts) and coordination (disjuncts) are used in English and Arabic. In order to do this, I shall use original English texts (I-EN and BNC) and original Arabic texts (I-AR and Al-H). The analysis will also depend mostly on translated data from SOC.

Before analysing these two syntactic features, I will give a brief introduction to English and Arabic adverbials in general, following Quirk et al. (1985) – the currently most widely used grammar of English – and Huddleston and Pullum (2002) as well as Hasselgard’s (2010) classification of the English adverbials. On the other hand, Ryding (2005) and Beeston’s (1970) classification of the Arabic adverbials will be studied.

3.5.1.1 Why adverbs?

Jackendoff (1972: 47) asserts that "The adverb is perhaps the least studied and most maligned part of speech". A similar complaint has been voiced by Chomsky (1965: 219) who noticed that "adverbials are a rich and as yet
relatively unexplored system, and therefore anything we say about them must be regarded as quite tentative". In contrast to the other major parts of speech (i.e. nouns and verbs), adverbs have a much less homogeneous, consistent and a standardized category. Quirk et al. (1985: 438) comment on the status of adverbs as:

Because of its great heterogeneity, the adverb class is the most nebulous and puzzling of the traditional word classes. Indeed, it is tempting to say simply that the adverb is an item that does not fit the definitions for other word classes.

Vendler (1984:304-6) agrees with Quirk et al. (ibid) and illustrates further the 'great heterogeneity' of adverbs and how they serve many functions in language:

a. He rang the bell LOUDLY (event)
b. He danced GRACEFULLY (manner)
c. He solved the problems EASILY (facility)
d. He spilled the tea ACCIDENTALLY (moral)
e. He applied LATE (timing)
f. STUPIDLY, he quit his job (sentence)
g. HOPEFULLY, he'll not return (illocutionary)

Given this diversity of meaning, adverbs are regarded as both motivating and interesting linguistic phenomenon in their own right.

Despite the fact that adverbs are very common in both spoken and written discourse, Ryding (2005: 276) asserts that adverbs in Arabic have not received much attention from linguists compared to the other major classes like nouns and verbs. Furthermore, Cowan (1964: 63) and Badawi et al. (2004: 56) observe that few Arabic words are intrinsically adverbs and, accordingly, Cowan describes the Arabic language as 'exceedingly poor in adverbs', while Badawi et al. express the class of pure adverbs in Arabic as 'extremely small'.

On the other hand, Haywood and Nahmad (1962: 426) not only regard Arabic as rather poor in adverbs, but also they assert that "Arabic has no adverbs, properly speaking" (emphasis in original). However, they clarify that this lack is due to the intrinsic flexibility and expressiveness of the language.
Similarly, Al-Shurafa (2005: 85) argues that "Adverbs and adverbials have not been given much attention in the field of linguistics in Arabic compared to the quite rich literature in other languages such as Germanic and Romance". Finally, adverbials – probably better than any other grammatical categories – illustrate the interdependency between grammar and meaning (Hasselgard 2010: 20) – one major aim of this thesis (see Chapter 1).

### 3.5.2 Adverbs and adverbials

Adverbs and adverbials are very closely related terms. However, Hasselgard (2010: 14) asserts that a basic distinction should be drawn between adverb and adverbial as "There is some vacillation in English grammars as to the use of the terms *adverb* and *adverbial*, presumably because many studies of adverbials, e.g. Jacobson (1964) and Ernst (2002), have focused on adverbials realised by adverbs". In other words, adverbs are adverbials, but adverbials are not necessarily adverbs, i.e. adverbials can take a number of forms and can be found in a range of locations within a sentence (see figure 3).

While an adverb is generally recognised as a single word class like nouns, verbs and adjectives, an adverbial is a syntactic clause element like subjects and objects. According to Quirk et al. (1985: 445), adverbs tell us how, when, where and to what degree something is happening. Adverbs constitute a heterogeneous word class, i.e. they function in a variety of ways at phrase level. For example, an adverb can modify an adjective (*very accurate*), it can be used to modify an adverb (*rather quickly*), it can form the headword of an adverb phrase (*luckily for him*).

As for Arabic grammar, it is important to draw attention to the fact that traditional as well as Arab grammarians do not make a distinction between adverbial - as a syntactic clause element – and adverb – as a word class, i.e. they do not consider the different realizations of functional adverbials as English grammarian do. Mukattash and Kawar (1997: 1751) say that:

This is due to the fact that, in their endeavour to classify language categories formally, in particular according to inflections, they group together elements/categories that are only superficially similar but functionally different. Another consequence of their reliance on inflections as a criterion for classification was their inability to group
together the different realizations which a certain function (e.g. adverbial) may have.

The functions of Arabic adverbials compared to their English counterparts will be illustrated later in the following sections.

According to Quirk et al. (1985) and Hasselgard (2010), the three main categories of adverbials are distinguished on the basis of syntactic and semantic features (see 3.5.3 and 3.5.4).

---

**Figure 3**: Adverbs and adverbials as illustrated by Seely (2006).

### 3.5.3 Syntactic functions of adverbials

As shown in figure 3 above, there are three broad categories of adverbials: adjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts. However different labels for adverbial categories have been recognized by different linguists as shown in figure 4 below.
The above figure shows that three categories of adverbials have been classified in terms of their centrality or peripherality\(^\text{16}\) (‘adjunct’ as most integrated and ‘disjunct’ as least integrated). Quirk et al. (1985: 1068) have labeled the most integrated category as adjunct. Halliday (1994), Hengeveld (1997) and Biber et al. (1999) state corresponding terms, namely – in order – experiential adjunct, representational satellite and circumstance adverbials. However, the definitions of these categories do not contradict Quirk et al.’s (1985). This category includes adverbials that add information or tell circumstances about the action in the clause such as when, where, how or why an activity took place. Examples of these adverbials are *in July, next to the window, quickly, because of the rain*, etc.

The second category represents those adverbials that have a superordinate role in relation to the sentences and convey the speaker's comments on what is being said (content) or on how it is being said (style) (Biber et al. 1999: 764). The labels which reflect this category are disjunct, interpersonal adjunct, interpersonal satellite and stance adverbials as shown in figure 4. Adjuncts and disjuncts are regarded as two basic functions of adverbial clauses (Quirk et al. 1985: 1048). Mondorf (2004: 77) also asserts that adverbial

---

\(^{16}\) Subjuncts – as a subclass of adverbials – have been disregarded here as they are not relevant to the subsequent analysis. Quirk et al. (1985: 1069) describe subjuncts as generally not realised by clause except viewpoint subjuncts.
clauses function predominantly as adjuncts, which are central in the clause structure, and disjuncts, which are peripheral to the clause structure.

Finally, the third category indicates those linking adverbials that are considered to be the least integrated in the clause and serve a connective function. Examples of this category are: firstly, secondly, however, furthermore, etc.

The present study will concentrate on Quirk et al.'s labels for adverbials as being the most comprehensive and related to the study. Moreover, since this study adopts a functional perspective (see 3.4.1), this chapter will also focus on Halliday's labels that reflect the integration of adverbials as shown in figure 4. This section provides a general introduction to the three major categories of adverbials in English and Arabic, i.e. adjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts.

3.5.3.1 Adjuncts in English and Arabic

Al-Jayrudy (2011: 95) states that adjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts are defined similarly in Arabic and English. In Quirk et al.'s (1985: 1070-1074) view, adjuncts indicate circumstances of the situation in the main clause and add information about the action happening. In the same way, Abdul Fattah (2010: 43) describes adjuncts in Arabic as elements that add extra adverbial information of different types. He also states that adjuncts are realized by nominal or prepositional phrases in any type of Arabic clauses (see current section, adjuncts in Arabic). The adverb is called adjunct when it is integrated into the flow of a sentence.

Quirk et al. (1985: 1070 - 1074) and Hasselgard (2010: 99) assert that adjuncts can be divided into two main groups: predicational adjuncts and sentential adjuncts as shown in figure 5 below.
As shown from figure 5 above predicational adjuncts are either obligatory or optional. They resemble direct objects and subject complements in providing complementation to the verb. Obligatory predicational adjuncts are placed in end position and can be presented by a prepositional phrase as in example 2.

(2) "even when they live mainly on cereals, vegetables and milk" (SOC, 9)

or an object as shown in example 3 below:

(3) "he does not love society so much as he fears solitude" (SOC, 21)

An optional predicational adjunct, on the other hand, and as its name suggests, is optional, since its presence or absence does not affect the grammaticality of the clause. See examples 4, 5 and 6.

(4) It plays.

(5) It plays a large role.

(6) "it plays a large role in the code of Hammurabi" (SOC, 27)

Therefore, predicational adjuncts (obligatory or optional) are generally postverbal, i.e. they occur most naturally in the predicate (cf. Hasselgard 2010: 124).

Sentential adjuncts, on the other hand, are always optional, i.e. they do not depend on the verb/predication in the clause. They may occur initially or
finally (Quirk et al. 1985: 511-512; Hasselgard: ibid) as examples 7 and 7a illustrate below.

(7) "From the bamboo, he made shafts, knives, needles and bottles; out of branches he made tongs, pincers and vices..." (SOC, 12)

(7a) He made shafts, knives, needles and bottles from the bamboo; he made tongs, pincers and vices out of branches.

In the terms of Quirk et al. (1985), the underlined elements in both versions of examples 7 and 7a indicate the two kinds of sentence adjunct, i.e. subject related as in 7 and object related as in 7a. In both examples the adjunct has span over the whole clause and not just the predication. Crompton (2006: 246) believes that such variation is meaningful at a level that is larger than the clause, i.e. the discourse.

Similarly, Quirk et al. (ibid: 512) conclude that initial sentence adjuncts have: "The potentiality to relate to the whole sentence, even where the sentence comprises two coordinate clauses, while the same E-placed [end-placed] adjunct will normally be interpreted as predicational and hence related only to the clause in which it is placed". In addition, Quirk et al. illustrate their view by providing the following example:

(8) In Australia, he travelled a great deal and eventually settled down.

(8a) He travelled a great deal and eventually settled down in Australia.

Therefore, the difference between sentential adjunct and predicational adjunct lies in their relative freedom to occur at the beginning or at the end. In other words, sentential adjuncts have a more peripheral nature than predicational adjunct.

In much the same way, adjuncts in Arabic sentences (i.e. nominal or verbal) may occur initially, medially or finally such as 'at Boghaz Keui' in the following examples:

"اتخذ الحيثيون عاصمتهم عند بوغاز كوي" (SOC, 606)

ittakhadha al-ḥaythiyūn ʿāšimatahum ʿinda būghāz kūy
they made The Hittites their capital at Boghaz Keui

"The Hittites made their capital at Boghaz Keui".

(SOC, 286)
In the view of Al-Jayrudy (2011) and Abdul-Raof (1998), Arabic, unlike English, has a relatively free word order which allows different elements (i.e. verbs, subjects, complements and adjuncts) to occupy different positions in the sentence. Adjuncts, as illustrated in examples 9, 9a and 9b above, can occupy any position in Arabic verbal or nominal sentences. However, they occur most commonly at the end of the sentence as in example 9.

Furthermore, adjuncts in Arabic fall into two main categories, i.e. optional and obligatory as shown in figure 6 below.

**Figure 6: Abdul-Raof’s (1998) classification of adjuncts in Arabic.**

Adjuncts, according to Abdul-Raof (1998: 71) and Quirk et al. (1972: 268-69) are integrated in the flow of the clause to at least some extent. The more movable an adverb is (i.e. optional), the less it is tied to the structure of the clause. By contrast, the more fixed an adverb is (i.e. obligatory), the more it is integrated in the sentence. Accordingly, Abdul-Raof (1998: 71) differentiates between two main types of adjuncts in Arabic; namely, optional and obligatory adjuncts as shown in figure 6 above.
Optional adjunct refers to adverbials of setting that includes temporal, locative, or manner as illustrated in the following examples.

1) Temporal adjunct:
Temporal adjunct refers to time-related adjuncts that indicates when, how long, or how frequent the action or state happened as shown in example 10.

"ولما تحرروا من حكم مصر، أضحوا سادسة البحر الأبيض المتوسط" (SOC, 619)

and when they liberated from rule
Egypt became masters
The Mediterranean

"and when they liberated themselves from Egypt, they became masters of the Mediterranean" (SOC, 292)

2) Locative adjunct:
Locative adjuncts show a certain location as illustrated in example 11.

"سیر حملة الى بلاد النوبة ليفتح ما فيها من مناجم الذهب" (SOC, 431)

he sent an expedition to Nubia to tap the gold mines there
"He sent an expedition to Nubia to tap the gold mines there."

(Optional adjuncts are underlined in these examples.)
3) **Adjunct of manner:**

Adverbials of manner represent a type of adjunct which characteristically qualifies the sense of a verb as 'so vigorously' shadidan 'anīfan in example 12 below.

"حيث ينمو الإنسان شديدا عنيفا" (SOC, 617)

where grows the man so vigorously

"where the man grows so vigorously"

(SOC, 291)

The optional adjuncts which occur in examples 10-12 are structurally dispensable, i.e. if removed; it will not influence the remainder of the sentence except to remove from it some supplementary information. Abdul-Raof (1998: 72) concludes that optional adjuncts "are not part of completing the sense of the statement, i.e. their deletion would not cripple the meaning of the sentence due to the fact that they are not verb-dependent constituents". Enkvist (1976: 55) agrees with Abdul-Raof's previous view of adverbials of setting and asserts that they "do not describe features essential to the action itself, or features necessary implied by the verb".

However, if optional adjuncts are mobile, obligatory adjuncts are not that flexible as they are linked directly to the verbal constituent (i.e. in verbal sentences) or to the rhematic constituent (i.e. in nominal sentences) even when they occur initially (Abdul-Raof 1998 and Al-Jayrudy 2011) as the following examples illustrate.

a) **Obligatory adjunct in verbal sentences:**

"و قد اضطرتهم هذه الجبال إلى العيش على ظهر البحار" (SOC, 619)

wa qad 'iḍṭarrathum hādhīhi al-jibāl ilā
they were compelled those mountains to
al-'aysh 'alā zahr al-bīḥār
live on the water
"Those mountains compelled them to live on the water"
(SOC, 292)

"أدرك (الإنسان) فكرة اختزان الطعام للمستقبل" (14)
(SOC, 18)

adraka al-'insān fikrat ikhtizān
he conceived Man notion laying up
al-ṣa‘ām li-imustaqbal
the food for the future

"(Man) conceived the notion of laying up food for the future"
(SOC, 9)

(b) Obligatory adjuncts in nominal sentences:

الحق أنكم أبها البيض قد بلغتم الغاية في حسن المذاق" (15)
(SOC, 23)
al-ḥaqq annakum ayyuhā al-bīḍ qad balaghtum
really you whites have reached
al-ghāyah fi ḫusn al-madhāq
the target dainty

"You whites are really too dainty" (SOC, 11)

السنجاب الذي أدخر البندق لوجبة أخرى أخرى (16)
(SOC, 11)
al-sinjāb al-ladhī iddakhara al-bunduq li-
the squirrel that gathered nuts for
wajbah ukhrā
feast another

"The squirrel that gathered nuts for a later feast"
(SOC, 6)
Hence, and as shown from examples 13 - 18, obligatory adjuncts (or adverbs of specification) function as verb complements.

Quirk et al. (ibid: 504) and Hasselgard (2010: 20) list some features – mainly syntactic – that are not absolute criteria of adjuncts, but rather, characteristics that hold for most adjuncts. Therefore, an adjunct can:

(i) be the focus of a cleft sentence (It was down the road that they walked);
(ii) serve as the focus of alternative interrogation or negation (Did they walk down the road or through the park?);
(iii) be focused by a ‘focusing subjunct’ (1985: 504) (They walked just down the road);
(iv) come within the scope of predication ellipsis or pro-forms, (They walked down the road, and so did I.);
(v) be elicited by question forms (A: Where did they walk? B: Down the road.).
However, as mentioned earlier, some adjuncts\textsuperscript{18} do not fit perfectly the above features, and that "borderlines between classes of adverbials are fuzzy" (Quirk et al. 1985: 505).

### 3.5.3.2 Disjuncts and conjuncts in English and Arabic

Disjuncts, also known as modal comment adjuncts (Halliday 2004), are evaluative devices. In other words, disjuncts are defined as a word or a group of words expressing the speaker or writer’s evaluation or judgement of the truth of the utterance (ibid). This type of evaluation can be either on the style or content of the communicative event as illustrated in figure 7 below.

![Disjuncts in English](image)

**Figure 7: The subcategories of disjunct (Quirk et al. 1985: 615)**

Quirk et al. (1985: 1072) made a distinction between style disjuncts and content disjuncts: "The style disjuncts implicitly refer to the circumstances of the speech act, while the content disjuncts refer to the content of the matrix clause". In other words, style disjuncts have the primary function of commenting on the style or form of the utterance (i.e. how it is said). They often show how the speaker is speaking or how the utterance should be understood (ibid). Content

\textsuperscript{18}Some adjuncts do not meet these criteria, e.g. indefinite frequency adjuncts, i.e. adjuncts of usuality (e.g. usually, normally, generally); see further Hasselgard (2010: 34) section 2.5
disjuncts, on the other hand, comment on the content of the utterance (i.e. what is being said).

As shown in figure 7, Quirk et al. (1985: 615 -16) subclassify style disjuncts and content disjuncts as follows:

1) Style disjunct
   A) Respect style:
   Most common respect adverbials include: generally, strictly, literally, figuratively and metaphorically. For example:
   (19) "Such ancient messes are now generally known" (SOC, 98)
   B) Modality and manner style:
   This type of disjuncts include: honestly, seriously, frankly, truthfully, candidly, flatly, truly, roughly, in short, simply. For example:
   (20) "(they) rested their rule frankly on the superiority of their guns"
   (SOC, 482-483)

2) Content disjunct
   C) Truth of condition:
   Following Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 182-83), this type of content disjunct is related to 'certainty', while the other content type; i.e. value judgement is related to 'evaluation'. Truth of condition - also known as 'degree of truth disjuncts' – "present a comment on the truth value of what is said, expressing the extent to which, and the conditions under which, the speaker believes what he is saying is true" (Quirk et al. 1985: 620). These disjuncts express conviction (e.g. apparently), a speaker judgement on the truth value of the proposition (e.g. really), or a degree of doubt (e.g. undoubtedly) as examples 21 and 22 illustrate below.
   (21) "Akbar, in the sixteenth century, introduced into India the game of polo, which had apparently come from Persia"
   (SOC, 501)
   (22) "Only the murder of a Brahman was really murder"
   (SOC, 486)
D) Value judgement:
These disjuncts express or convey an evaluation of an utterance and include such items as fortunately, hopefully, rightly, wisely, sensibly, cleverly.
(23) "Half the empire waited hopefully for Ashoka’s death"
   (SOC, 449)

Disjuncts, as shown in examples 19-23, usually occur in medial position. However, they may also occur in other locations such as the beginning of the clause, examples 24 and 25, or in final position, examples 26 and 27 below.

(24) "Apparently, the first form of art is the artificial coloring of the body" (SOC, 84)

(25) "Of course, we can only guess at the origins of this wonderful toy"
   (SOC, 76)

(26) "… and his promised bride, who had watched the ceremony carefully, rejected him scornfully"
   (SOC, 75)

(27) "…all the world smiled incredulously"
   (SOC, 91)

Since style disjuncts are arguably parenthetical and are not of direct concern in this study, content disjuncts (with its two main subcategories) will be the focus of the next two chapters: chapter four is mainly about appraisal discourse and the evaluation of utterances which correspond to value judgements of content disjuncts, while the second subcategory of content disjunct, i.e. truth of condition is related to un/certainty, a central point in chapter 5. Greenbaum (1992) asserts that the most common content disjuncts are those expressing degrees of certainty and doubt about what is being said.
Like disjuncts in English, Al-Jayrudy (2011: 95) defines Arabic disjuncts as "an evaluative device which expresses the attitude of the speaker/writer to the form or content of the communicative event". The most familiar disjuncts in Arabic are: 

لا شك أنه undoubtedly, 

بصراحة frankly, 

باختصار briefly, 

في الحقيقة in fact, 

و من جهة أخرى on the other hand,


Although disjuncts like بصراحة (or في صراحة) frankly and في الحقيقة in fact 'in fact' prefer initial position in Arabic sentences (Abdul-Raof 1998 and Al-Jayrudy 2011), they can occur medially without affecting the sentence structure, as in examples (28-30):

"منشتوسو ملك (أكد) أعلن في صراحة أنه يغزو بلاد عيلام ليستولي على ما فيها من مناجم (28)"

الفصة"

(SOC, 278)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manishtusu</th>
<th>malik</th>
<th>akad</th>
<th>a'lan</th>
<th>fi sarāḥah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>annahu</td>
<td>yaghzū</td>
<td>bilad</td>
<td>'ilām</td>
<td>li-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that he</td>
<td>invading</td>
<td>cities</td>
<td>Elam</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yastawli</td>
<td>'alā</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>fi hā</td>
<td>min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get control</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>in it</td>
<td>from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manājim</td>
<td>mines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"King Manishtusu of Akkad announced frankly that he was invading Elam to get control of its silver mines" (SOC, 126)
"Among several primitive peoples the word for god actually meant "a dead man" (SOC, 63)
(34) * It is since they had to work that the poorer women retained their freedom.

(B) Only adjunct clauses can be the focus of negation:

(35) The poorer women didn’t retain their freedom because they had to work, but because they never give up.

(36) * The poorer women didn’t retain their freedom since they had to work, but since they never give up.

(C) Only adjunct clauses can be the focus of ‘focusing subjects’, e.g. only, just, simply and mainly:

(37) The poorer women retained their freedom only because they had to work.

(38) * The poorer women retained their freedom only since they had to work.

(D) Only adjunct clauses can answer a WH-question formed from the matrix clause:

(39) Why did women retain their freedom? Because they had to work.

(40) * Why did women retain their freedom? Since they had to work.

(E) Only adjuncts can be the focus of a question:

(41) Do poorer women retain their freedom because they have to work, or because they never give up?

(42) * Do poorer women retain their freedom since they have to work, or since they never give up?

Thompson and Zhou (2000: 121-141) claim the conjunctive function of disjunct: "disjuncts are not just concerned with exhibiting attitudes, but play an important cohesive function; they are thus more properly 'conjuncts with attitudes'". Finally, Dickins (2010:1089) suggests that the distinction between disjunction and coordination is based on a semantic criterion and not a syntactic one: "there is no syntactic distinction in English between disjunction and coordination. The disjunction–coordination distinction is rooted principally in meaning differences between different kinds of elements".
Like disjuncts, conjuncts are not integrated in the flow of the sentence, i.e. they are peripheral to the clause to which they are attached. Accordingly, conjuncts are more similar to disjuncts than adjuncts. While the scope of disjuncts is the sentence in which they appear, conjuncts are "items whose function is to connect words and other constructions" (Crystal 2008: 101).

Similarly, Al-Jayrudy (2011: 95) asserts that conjuncts are defined in the same way in English and Arabic: "Conjuncts حروف العطف are defined as connective devices that link together two words, clauses or paragraphs" (ibid). Most common conjuncts in Arabic are و wāw and، ثم then، أو or، لكن lākin/lākinna but. They function as connectors and almost always indicate a shift between ideas:

جاء "أكبر" فرفع ضريبة الأراضي إلى ثلث المحصول، لكنه لقاء ذلك ألغى كل صنوف الضرائب الأخرى.

(SOC: 1030)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>came</th>
<th>Akbar</th>
<th>raised</th>
<th>land-tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>one-third</td>
<td>the harvest</td>
<td>but he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for this</td>
<td>abolished</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exaction</td>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Akbar raised the land-tax to one-third, but abolished all other exaction" (SOC, 480)

The example above shows that lākinna, and also English but, is a conjunct, and as such has "the function of conjoining independent units rather than one of contributing another facet of information to a single integrated unit" (Quirk et al. 1985: 631). Broadly speaking, and following Rudolph (1996: 244), but is the prototypical and most frequent adversative conjunction in English; it is characterized by a "high frequency and wide range of semantic application" (ibid).
The chapter will discuss the grammatical and semantic differences between the coordinators لكن lākin and لكنna together with أما ammā, بل bal, إلآ/غير/سوى siwā/ghayr/illā which are all roughly synonymous with the English coordinator but.

Many linguists [e.g. Lakoff (1971), Horn (1985, 1989), Schiffrin (1989), Blakemore (1989, 2000)] have distinguished between two general uses of but in English: 'denial of expectation' use, also known as 'counterexpectational' use, illustrated in 44 and 'contrast' use, also known as 'semantic opposition' use, illustrated in 45:

(44) "The natural man was violent and greedy; but he was also kindly and generous" (SOC, 54)
(45) "The king died, but the god lived" (SOC, 234)

The use of but in 44 indicates that the hearer expected to have obtained the proposition in 46 from the proposition in the first clause:

(46) The natural man is not generous and kindly.

In other words, the assumption offered in the first clause in 44 is that the natural man is not supposed to be kindly and generous. Nevertheless, this assumption is denied by the conceptual content in the but-clause 'he was also kindly and generous'. Schiffrin (1989) and Blakemore (1989) refer to this type of denial as a direct denial, i.e. the contradiction is performed explicitly. The other type of denial but is referred to as indirect denial where the propositional content of the but-clause does not contradict the assumption in the other clause, but rather the implicature implicated in the preceding clause, i.e. the contradiction in the but clause is implicit as illustrated in 47:

(47) It is raining outside but the boys need to play.

Therefore, the indirect contrast between the two segments in 47 indicates that the boys might be expected not to be able to play outside because of the rain.

The contrast but, on the other hand, is defined as merely expressing contrast between two situations (Quirk et al. 1985: 1088) as illustrated in 45. Blakemore (1989: 17) claims that the contrast case of but involves a different interpretation from that of denial but. In other words, the semantic opposition
use of *but* in 45 lacks an expectation that is denied. The sentence can be interpreted as simply expressing the two propositions that 'the king died' and 'the god lived'. Thus, there is an antonymic pair: *died* and *lived* which functions as two predicates for two different subjects, i.e. the king and the god.

However, it seems that these two meanings of *but* are closely related, they are often mixed. I think in all cases one has fuzzy boundaries with core (prototypical) interpretations and peripheral interpretations. This is discussed in more detail in this section.

According to Lakoff's (1971: 132-134) distinction of the use of *but* into the semantic opposition *but* and the denial of expectation *but*, I argue that some semantic constituents do not fit so neatly into any of this two-way distinction. Like Horn (1985) and Toosarvandani (2012), I argue that although the distinction highlighted in 44 and 45 is not realized lexically in languages like English, it brings about the differences in distribution that distinguish *lākin*, *lākinna*, *bal*, *ammā* in Arabic as shown in figure 8.

After excluding unrelated 'buts' (e.g. *tribute*, *contribute*, *contribution*, *distribute* and *butchers*) from SOC English text, the analysis reveals 802 records of *but*. In addition, data from SOC show that there are seven different lexical items corresponding to different types of *but* as illustrated below:
(A) Direct counterexpectational (denial) *but: lākinna and lākin*

Figure 8 shows *lākinna* as the most adversative connective in SOC, while *lākin, bal, ammā, wa/fa/thumma, siwāl/ghayr illā, illā anna/ghayr anna* are obviously less frequent connectives for *but*. According to Wright (1996: 334C), one of the typical features that characterize *lākin* and *lākinna* is 'to rectify or amend the preceding statement'. Consider the following examples:

(48) *وهنود أمريكا الشمالية تصوروا إلها لكنهم لم يعبدوه* (SOC, 130)

*wa hunūd amrika al-shamaliyah taṣawwarū ilāhan and Indians The North American conceived a god*

*lākinnahum* lam ya‘budūh

*but they* not worship him

"The North American Indians conceived a god, **but did not worship him**" (SOC, 56-57)

(49) *وقد كان الفقير يتزوج من زوجة واحدة، لكنه كان ينظر إلى ذلك نظرته إلى وصمة العار.***

(SOC, 91)

*wa qad kāna al-faqīr yatazawwaj zawjah was the poor marry wife*

*lākinnahu kāna ya‘nūr ilā* one but he looked at

*naẓratahu ilā waṣmat* that his look at condition

al-‘ār

*shamefulness*

"The poor man practised monogamy, **but he looked upon it as a shameful condition**" (SOC, 39-40)

(50) *فهذه البدايات هي أسرار التاريخ ... لكننا يستحيل أن نعلم عنها علم اليقين***

(SOC, 17)

*fa hādhīhi al-bidāyāt hiya asrār*
these beginnings are mysteries
al-tārikh lākinnanā yastaḥil an
the history but we impossible that
naʾlam ʿannā ʿilm al-yaqīn
know that it knowledge certainty

"such beginnings are the mysteries of history, about which we may believe and guess, but cannot know" (SOC, 8-9)

On account of its status as a coordinating conjunction, but forms a conjoined proposition. In the examples above but is used to connect two distinct illocutionary acts. For example, the assumption in the first clause in 48, 49 and 50 is explicitly denied by the propositional content in the but clause. In other words, the propositions communicated in the but/lākina clause, i.e. 'the North American Indians did not worship the God they conceived' in 48, 'the poor man who looked upon monogamy as a shameful act' in 49 and 'the mysteries of history that we know nothing about' in 50, deny and replaces the hypothesis in the preceding clause.

The other translations of but (see figure 8) will not be accepted as a substitute of the direct denial but. Consider example 48 illustrated below with a different alternate of lākina:

*(48a) The North American Indians conceived a god, bal did not worship him.
*(48b) The North American Indians conceived a god, ammā did not worship him.
*(48c) The North American Indians conceived a god, illā anna did not worship him.
*(48d) The North American Indians conceived a god, siwā did not worship him
(48e) The North American Indians conceived a god, thumma/wa did not worship him.

Only (48e), which represents the indirect denial but, can be accepted in the place of the direct denial lākinna, while the corrective bal, semantic opposition ammā, topic comment illā anna and the exceptive siwā cannot. Since thumma and wa in (48e) represent the indirect denial sense of but, they can be used
without any significant change in meaning. However, they do not reflect the same strong adversative emphasis of \( \text{lākinna} \).

According to Dickins and Watson (1999), the most common word order that typically occurs with \( \text{lākinna} \) is: \( \text{lākinna} \) + subject + verb (where the subject is usually a pronoun suffix). Consider example 53 below in which \( \text{lākinna} \) is followed by the pronoun suffix \( \text{hum they} \) that is related to the previous noun al-nās men.

\[
\text{mithla} \quad \text{hā-ulā' al-nās yajma'ūn tharwah}
\]

such those the men accumulate wealth

\[
\text{lākinnahum} \quad \text{yansūn funūn al-ḥarb wa}
\]

but they forget arts the war and

mashā‘irihā

sentiments

"such men accumulate wealth, but they forget the arts and sentiments of war" (SOC, 24)

Generally, this structure does not indicate any emphasis on the propositional context. However, this structure may also occur without a reference to a previously mentioned noun as in example 50 before, where \( \text{lākinna} \) but we is not preceded by \( \text{نحن} \) naḥnu (we, people, one, etc.) as the context is obviously clear to determine that. This kind of structure might be emphatic to some extent in a particular context as in 50 where the writer emphasizes the fact that it is impossible to discover the mysteries of history.

Occasionally, \( \text{lākinna} \) + pronoun suffix occurs with a following prepositional phrase as in \text{min al-ja'iz it is possible} that functions as an adverbial phrase. For example:

\[
\text{wa qad yakūn hādhā mawlī'an li-}
\]

and is this situation for

\[
\text{SOC, 242}
\]

\( \text{wa qad} \) yakūn hādhā mawlī'an li-

and is this situation for
"This is doubtful enough; **but** it is possible that writing..." (SOC, 104-105)

Such a structure does not usually show a greater tendency towards emphaticness.

In other cases, *lākinna* might occur at the beginning of a new paragraph and be followed by a noun+ pronoun suffix, e.g. *āyatahu* 'his achievement' as in 53 below.

(53)

لكن أيته العظمى هي النار

(SOC, 219)

*lākinna* āyatahu al-ʿuzmā hiya al-nār

But his achievement the great is the fire

"**But** his great achievement was fire" (SOC, 95-96)

This example involves some contrast with the previous paragraph in which the writer summarizes the many achievements of Paleolithic man: "he made himself a varied assortment of weapons and tools: polishers, mortars, axes, planes, scrapers, drills, knives, etc." The writer uses *but* here to contrast all the previous achievements with the greatest one, i.e. *fire*, which is to be given in this paragraph starting with *lākinna* as shown in 53. Usually, when *lākinna* is followed by a noun, it indicates more emphasis than examples in which *lākinna* is followed by a pronoun suffix. However, Dickins and Watson (1999) note that emphaticness is not a guarantee of the combination *lākinna* + noun.

In addition, it is common for *lākinna* to be followed by a separate pronoun indicating emphasis. For example:
وكذلك قد تجد بعض حالات الحب في غيرها من الشعوب البدائية. (SOC, 98)

إذن لنا بالزواج بعضاً من الحالات النادرة التي تصادفها لا شأن لها بالزواج

wa kadhālika qad tajid baʿḍ ḥālāt al-ḥubb
and also find some instances the love

fi ghayrihā min al-shuʿīb al-bidāʾiyyah lākinnna
in other from the peoples the primitive but

ḥādhihi al-ḥālāt al-ḥādirah al-latī tuṣādiruhā
these the instances rare that come upon

lā shaʿna laḥā bi-al zawāj
have nothing to do with marriage

"among other primitive peoples we come upon instances of love, but usually these attachments have nothing to do with marriage" (SOC, 43-44)

Here the phrase ḥādhihi al-ḥālāt these instances has a link with the previous phrase baʿḍ ḥālāt al-ḥubb instances of love.

Lākin is the lightened form of lākinna. While lākin is very rarely used in MSA, lākinna is almost absent from spoken Arabic. Lākin is typically used rather than lākinna before vocative case as ʿaḍ yā. For example:

(55) وَلَنْ يَا أَخَانَا اِذَا ما بَدَتْ لَنَا بْوَادِ مِجِينَهُ

wa lākin yā akhānā idhā mā badat
and but our brother if appeared

lanā bawādir majī'ah
to us signs his coming

"But, brother, when the signs of his coming appear" (SOC, 432-433)

Lākin, but not lākinna, can also occur at the beginning of a new paragraph, preceding conditional ʿan in if:
ولكن إن كان ذلك كذلك

(SOC, 927)

wa lākin in kāna dhālik kadhalik
and but if was this so

"But if this is so" (SOC, 435)

And before a question word:

(SOC, 917)
lākin mādhā naṣna’ law taḥattamat
but what we do if should
'alaynā ru'yatihunna
on us their observation

"But if we should see them, what are we to do?" (SOC, 431)

and in most cases before adverbs:

(SOC, 832)
lākin rubbāmā kāna hādhā al-ishtiqāq
but perhaps was this the derivation
al-mabnī ‘alā al-naz‘ah al-waṣāniyyah
the built on desire patriotic

"but perhaps this patriotic derivation" (SOC, 397)
Interestingly, data from SOC show a significant difference between lākin and lākinna. Lākin occurs 39 times whereas lākinna occurs 377 times. On the other hand, data from I-AR and Al-H show different distributions of the top ten collocates of lākin and lākinna. Consider tables 2 and 3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>LL score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لكن هذا lākinna hādha 'this'</td>
<td>3307</td>
<td>2034.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن لا lākin la 'no, not'</td>
<td>3394</td>
<td>1806.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن هناك lākin hunāka 'there'</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>1606.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن ليس lākin laysa 'not'</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>1556.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن ما lākin mā 'what' Qw</td>
<td>2960</td>
<td>1447.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن إذا lākin idhā 'if'</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>923.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن هذه lākinna hādhihi 'this'</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>923.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن هل lākin hal 'Q w'</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>882.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن مصادر lākinna ma'sūdir 'sources'</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>768.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن هذه lākinna hādhihi 'this'</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>553.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن ذلك lākinna dhālika 'that'</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>539.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن هناك lākin hunāka 'there'</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>522.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن ما lākin mā 'what' QW</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>351.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن المشكالة lākinna al-mushkilah 'the problem'</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>323.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن ليس lākin laysa 'not'</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>305.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن يبدو lākin yabdū 'seem'</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>271.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن السؤال lākinna al-su'al 'the question'</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>253.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن مصدر lākinna ma'daran 'a source'</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>226.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The top ten collocates of lākin and lākinna in I-AR corpus with a span window 1:0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>LL score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لكن مصدر lākinna ma'sūdir 'sources'</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>768.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن هذه lākinna hādhihi 'this'</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>553.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن ذلك lākinna dhālika 'that'</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>539.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن هناك lākin hunāka 'there'</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>522.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن ما lākin mā 'what' QW</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>351.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن المشكالة lākinna al-mushkilah 'the problem'</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>323.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن ليس lākin laysa 'not'</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>305.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن يبدو lākin yabdū 'seem'</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>271.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن السؤال lākinna al-su'al 'the question'</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>253.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكن مصدر lākinna ma'daran 'a source'</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>226.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The top ten collocates of lākin and lākinna in Al-H corpus with a span window 1:0

Since I-AR corpus includes colloquial speech, and as noted earlier, lākin is hardly used in MSA, lākinna has only three collocates among the top ten collocates in I-AR. On the other hand, Al-H corpus (and SOC) involves MSA rather than colloquial Arabic. Accordingly, the collocates of lākinna are significantly higher than lākin as seen in table 3. Moreover, tables 2 and 3

19 Joint frequency refers to the number of times the collocation occurs in the corpus.
present the most common occurrences where *lākin* rather than *lākinna* is used, i.e. before question words, verbs, negatives and conditional phrases which are typically revealed by SOC analysis as well.

(B) Corrective *but*: *bal*

As its name suggests, corrective *but*, is usually used to correct previous assumptions in discourse. Consider the following examples:

(59)

Fal-zωāj 'inda al-rajul al-bidā'ī
the marriage for the man the primitive
lā yunẓar 'ilayhi 'alā
not looked at it upon
asās al-tanẓīm al-jinsī *bal*
basis license sexual but
‘alā annahu ta'awun iqtiṣādī
on it is cooperation economic

"The primitive male looked upon marriage in terms not of sexual license *but* of economic cooperation" (SOC, 44)

(60)

Bēda lā yūd al-ra‘is qaṣīyan ḫāḥīyan

Bi-hādhā lam ya‘ud al-ra‘īs qaṣīyan
So not become the chief a judge
wa kafā *bal* aṣbaḥa ilā
and just *but* become in
jānib dhālīka musharri‘an yasinnu al-
qawānin
laws

---

20 In this example there are three words ending in َّ. According to the transliteration system adopted in this study (The American Library Association - Library of Congress (ALA-LC), this letter is romanized ī, and not īy, without regard to the presence of ْ shaddah. See: www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/romanization/arabic.pdf, p. 3
"So the chief becomes not merely a judge but a lawgiver" (SOC, 28-29)

In 59 and 60, the writer corrects the assumption in the first clause: the writer illustrates that primitive man did not regard marriage in terms of sexuality, but rather in terms of economic cooperation in 59. Similarly, in 60, the writer corrects the idea that the chief is no longer considered as a mere judge, but he is a lawgiver at the same time.

Obviously, in both examples, bal clause does not involve any sense of expectation that is denied. In other words, the main function of the bal-clause is not to reject any contextual expectation that is previously mentioned, but rather to correct the propositional content in the first clause.

According to Toosarvandani (2012), the corrective use of but bal is typically characterised by rejection-rectification pattern, i.e. the corrective but clause requires a previously mentioned rejected assertion in the first clause and a rectification or a replacement of an assumption in the second clause. Thus in the first clause in 59, the writer rejects the idea that primitive man considers marriage in terms of sexual license and in the second clause he provides a rectification which entails that the concept of marriage is based on economic cooperation and not sexuality. Equally, in 60, there is a rejection of considering the chief as a mere judge in the first clause which is rectified by the but clause.

Therefore, in most cases, there is a typical pattern of corrective but, i.e. the presence of negation - underlined in the examples - (which represents rejection) in the first clause and an assertion (which represents rectification) in the second clause. This pattern with the form 'not X but Y' is to offer, as Horn (2001:402) puts it, "a straightforward way to reject X (on any grounds) and to offer Y as its appropriate rectification".

(C) Semantic opposition (contrast) but: ammā

In Arabic, the particle ammā is often used before the topic "in order to mark it as emphatically contrasted with some other entity" (Beeston 1970: 65). Consider the following examples:

(61) 

ومن كانت من النساء ذات جمال وتناسب في الأعضاء، لا تلبيث أن تعود إلى دارها، أما المشوهات فيبقى في الهيكل زمناً طويلاً.
(SOC, 507)

wa man kānāt min al-nisā’
and those were from women
dhāta jamāl wa tanāsub fi
with beauty and symmetry of
al-‘a’dā’ la talbithu an ta‘īd
organs soon that return
ilā dārihā ammā al-mushawwahāt
to her house but the deformed
fayabqīn fi al-haykal zamanān ẓawīlan
stay in the temple time long

"Those that are endowed with beauty and symmetry of shape are soon set free; but the deformed are detained a long time" (SOC, 245)

(62)

فقد كان موسى من رجال السياسة المتصفين بالصبر والأناة، أما يشوع فلم يكن إلا جندياً فظا

(SOC, 639)

fa qad kāna Musā min rijāl al-siyāsah
he had been Moses from men policy
al-muttaṣifān bi- al-ṣabr wa al-anāh
characterized by the patience and endurance
ammā yashī’u fa lam yakīn illā
but Joshua not was except
jundiyyān fazzan
warrior blunt

"Moses had been a patient statesman, but Joshua was only a plain, blunt warrior" (SOC, 302)

(63)

فللرجل أن يتزوج بأكثر من واحدة، أما المرأة فكانت تختص ب الرجل واحد

(SOC, 710)
fa lilrajul  an  yatazawwaj  bi-akthar  min
as for man  that  he marries  to more  than
wāḥidah  ammā  al-mar'ah  fa kānat
one  but  the woman  she was
(takhtas)  bi-rajul  wāḥid
confined  to man  one
"the man might have many wives, but the woman was confined to one man"
(SOC, 337)

In the previous examples ammā indicates a contrast between two states of affairs as illustrated earlier in 45. While, example 61 shows a contrast between beautiful women and deformed women, 62 presents a contrast between Moses as 'a patient statesman' on one hand and Joshua as 'a plain, blunt warrior'. Similarly, there is a contrast between man and woman in 63.

Crucially, ammā clauses are typically characterized by involving an antonymic pair. Unlike the denial lākinna, the semantic opposition ammā refers to a contrastive relationship between two propositions as shown in the examples above; they obviously lack a direct expectation that is denied. In most cases in SOC, the semantic opposition ammā clauses are obviously predicated of different individuals, since they cannot share the same subject without following a contradiction (Toosarvandani 2012). Examples of antonymic pairs of semantic opposition ammā in SOC are: law and custom p. 61, dogs and women p. 80, present days and old days p. 127-128, Napoleon and Champollion p.207, adultery in the man and adultery in the woman p. 287, the grave of Tutenkh Amon and the tomb of Seti p. 314, eastern side and western side p. 315, man and woman p. 710, the good soul and the wicked soul p. 787, Pearls and turquoise p. 803.

(D) Indirect denial but: wa, fa, thumma
wa, fa and thumma are considered the three basic connectors in MSA. In other words, while English has three basic coordinators, i.e. and, or, but, Arabic has wa, fa, then and thumma. In addition to these coordinators, Arabic also has aw or, and lākin/lākinna but as main coordinators. Mohammed (1993: 84) explains that the difference between fa and thumma lies in the time gap between two actions:
(a) [dhahaba] bitar **wa** karin ila (al-sūq)

Peter **and** Karen [have gone] **to** (the market).

(b) dhahaba bitar **thumma** karin

Peter **has gone, then** Karen.

(c) [dhahaba] bitar **fa** karin

Peter **[has gone]**, **then** Karen.

In (a) there is no specific temporal sequence – Karen could have gone before or after Peter, or they could have gone together. There is also an expectation that Peter went first. But in (b) and (c) ‘Peter’ has gone before ‘Karen’. The only difference is that the time gap in example (c) is less than it is in (b).

Thus, and because **wa** is regarded as the simplest of all connectives and the most common conjunction that connects one event with another, it is particularly striking - for English and Arabic speaker - to find cases in which **wa and** is translated into **but** (Dickins and Watson 1999). The analysis shows that **wa** is not a mere plus sign, i.e. a part of **but**'s meaning is essentially in common with **wa and**. Consider the following examples:

(64)

 إلا أن الحياة مسرح له مدخل واحد و مخارج عدة.

(SOC, 1076)

illā anna  al-ḥayāḥ  masraḥ  lahu
however  the life  stage  it has
madkhal  wāḥid  **wa**  makhārij
entrance  one  but  exits
‘iddah
many

"Life is a stage with one entrance, **but** many exits" (SOC, 501-502)
(65)


dawr211 yamāḏī wa dawr
one generation passes away but generation
yajī‘ wa al-arḍ qā’imah ilā
comes but the earth abides for
al-abad ever

"One generation passes away, and another generation comes; but the earth abides forever" (SOC, 347)

(66)

wa kāna karīman yunfiq al-amwāl
and he was generous expends the money
al-ṭā’ilah ỉṣsanān al-yabbahu al-nās
vast in alms loved him people
jamī‘an wa khuṣūṣan al-ṭabaqāt
all but especially classes
al-dunyā
low

"He was generous, expending vast sums in alms; he was affable to all, but especially to the lowly" (SOC, 467)

21 As mentioned previously, 'the sakkin taslam' approach is adopted in this study as a transliteration approach in Arabic (see, p. xii)
Though being additive is the most frequent function of *wa*, it can be used to signal other functions, e.g. indirect denial. Examples 64 – 66 introduce *but* as a typical conjunct that must be analysed with reference to the context. On the basis of the first clause in 64, 65 and 66, the propositional content in the second clause does not include any explicit contradiction or unexpectedness with the assumption offered in the first clause. In other words, the indirect denial *but* in these examples conveys a subtle contrast between 'one entrance' and 'many exits' in 64, 'passes away' and 'abides forever' in 65 and between 'to all' and 'to the lowly' in 66. The following examples illustrate the indirect denial *thumma*:

(67) 
إهبط إلى الناس وقل لهم يسلخوا جلودهم حتى يتخلصوا من الموت، ثم أنبئ الثعابين أن موتها منذ اليوم أمر محتوم

(SOC, 132)

ihbić ilā al-nās wa qul

الذي إلى الناس وقل لهم يسلخوا جلودهم حتى يتخلصوا من الموت، ثم أنبئ الثعابين أن موتها منذ اليوم أمر محتوم

(SOC, 132)

lahum yaslухū julūdahum ḫatta yatakhallāsū

them to cast their skins so they get rid

min al-mawt thumma 'unbi' al-tha‘ābīn

of the death but the serpents

anna mawtahā mundhu al-yawm amrun maḥtūm

their death henceforth something inevitable

"Go down to men and tell them to cast their skins; so they shall avoid death.

But tell the serpents that they must henceforth die" (SOC, 57)

(68) 
إذا اتهم رجل آخر بجريمة (يعاقب عليها بالإعدام) ثم عجز عن إثباتها حكم على المدعي نفسه بالإعدام

(SOC, 471)

idhā ittahama rajul ākhar bi-jarimah

if accused a man another with a crime

yu‘āqab ‘alayhā bi- al-i‘dām thumma ‘ajaza ‘an

capital but cannot that

ithbātihā ḫukima ‘alā al-mudda’ī nafṣahu

prove it has been judged on the accuser himself
"If a man brings an accusation against a man, and charges him with a (capital) crime, but cannot prove it, the accuser shall be put to death" (SOC, 471)

thumma in 67 and 68 can be interpreted as a connector that involves temporal or logical sequence or both, which is the basic function of thumma in MSA (Dickins and Watson 1998). In this sense it is most naturally translated as English then. In 67 there is a kind of logical sequence: first, ‘tell men to cast their skins’ then, ‘tell the serpents that their death is something inevitable’. Similarly, in 68 there is a logic consequence in the events, i.e. to accuse someone with a capital crime, then being unable to prove it. However, there is another interpretation that denotes a sense of an indirect denial in both examples. In 67 and 68 but cannot be construed in its direct denial of expectation sense, but rather it has and as part of its meaning.

fa, as is noted earlier, is usually known as an Arabic conjunction that links ideas or events. Less commonly, fa may also be translated as but. However, there are different semantic functions of fa: sequential fa which indicates a consecutive relation between two events. (as in example C mentioned earlier ‘dhahaba bītār fa karin’, adversative fa which denotes a contrast between two clauses e.g. da‘awtu (ṣadiqati) fa {lam ta‘ti} I invited (my friend) but {she did not come} and causal or explanatory fa which example 69 illustrates below.

(69)

wa lam yakun abadan yahtamm li-ghadihi
he never cares about the morrow
fa kāna yaktafī bi-al-zād
but he was content with food
yuqaddimahu lahu aḥad
introduced to him one

(SOC, 913)

66
"He took no thought for the morrow, but was content to be fed by some local admirers" (SOC, 429)

In this example, fa is referred to as explanatory فاء السببية, i.e. the second clause is a reason for the first one. The second clause explains the reason why the man did not care about or think of the morrow.

(E) Topic comment but: illā anna/ghayra anna/'alā anna

In MSA, it is quite common for concessive clauses to occur in initial position. Kinberg (1985: 389) notes that MSA is "a rich stock of conjunctions to introduce these clauses". Examples of these conjunctions are illā anna, ghayra anna and 'alā anna:

(70)

(71)
"But copper by itself was soft" (SOC, 103-104)

(72)

على أن اليهود كانوا ألقى أجناس الشرق الأدنى غير النقاء

(SOC, 641)

'alā anna al-yahūd kānū anqā ajnās
but Jews were the purest genus
al-sharq al-adnā ghayr al-naqiyah
the east the near not the pure

"But the Jews were the purest of all" (SOC, 302-303)

Generally, it is felt that such concessive clauses in 70, 71 and 72 are independent clauses rather than dependent ones. They are regarded as topic clauses of a topic-comment construction denoting a sense of contrast with a previous sentence or paragraph. For example, in 70 'prices were correspondingly low' is put in contrast with 'wages were modest'. The other clause in 71 occurs as a topic comment at the beginning of a new paragraph. The writer comments on a previously mentioned idea in the preceding paragraph in which he describes the status of copper and its influence in creating new cultures: 'Perhaps it was because the Eastern Mediterranean lands were rich in copper that vigorous new cultures arose'.

(F) Exceptional but: siwā/ghayr/illā

Exceptional but is a distinct lexical item, since it has a very different syntax and semantics from any of the other uses of but considered in the text. For example:

(73)

ولم يبق من هذا البهو سوى عمود واحد

(SOC, 807)

wa lam yabqa min ādhā al-bahw
nothing remained of this the building
siwā ‘āmūd wāḥid
but  pillar  one
"nothing remains of it but one pillar" (SOC, 379-380) (74)

وَلَمْ يَجْزَى لَهُ أَيَّ ضِرْبٍ مِّنْ ضَرُّبِ الرِّمَابِ غَيْرِ المَاءِ
(SOC, 1043)

wa lam yakun  yajūz  lahu  ayy
and it was not allowed to him any
ḍarb min  ḍūrub  al-sharāb  ghayr  al-mā’
kind of kinds the drink but water

"He was to drink nothing but water" (SOC, 486-487) (75)

وَلا يَشْرِبُونَ إِلَّا المَاءِ
(SOC, 793)

wa ḍā ḍūrubūna  illā  al-mā’
and not they drink but the water

"and drinking nothing but water" (SOC, 373-374)

According to Abu-Chacra (2007: 282),  illā , ghayr , siwā and  mā’ ‘adā  are the most common particles used to convey the sense 'except (for)'. In addition, he classifies an exceptive sentence into four basic elements:

a. the predicate, expressing the action or situation to which the exception refers;

b. the first noun,  множественное число , i.e. (the set) from which the exception is made;

c. the subtractive or exceptive particle  أداة الأستثناء , i.e. the excepted or excluded member.

d. the second noun,  عدد , i.e. the excepted or excluded member.

For example, in 75,  lā yashrab  is the predicate which denotes the action 'drinking',  īn is a pronoun suffix 'they' which presents the second element,  illā except or but  is the exceptive particle and  al-mā’ water  is the excluded member. In most cases in SOC, there is a typical pattern that characterizes the exceptive sentence, i.e. a negative particle (e.g.  lam and  lā in 73, 74 and 75) that usually precedes the predicate + exceptive particle + excluded member. It is the most

22 While  illā , ghayr , siwā occur 54 times in SOC,  mā’adā occurs only 3 times.
normal word order with exceptive sentences. With exceptive sentence, the emphasis is usually on the excluded member.

**(G) Zero but:**

There are 29 instances where *but* disappears from the English text in SOC and appears in its Arabic translation text. In most cases, the writer uses a comma in the place of zero *but*. In these cases the deletion of *but* does not yield any significant change in meaning. However, it is remarkably unacceptable to delete the zero *but* from the Arabic text. The following three cases are examples of zero *but* triggering the use of *lākinna, lākin and bal*:


(76)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ليست المدنية البريطانية وليدة الرجل الإنجليزي ولكنها هو صنعتها} \\
\text{laysat al-madaniyyah al-brīṭāniyyah} \\
\text{does not the civilization the British} \\
\text{walidah al-rajul al-injilizī} \\
\text{made by the man the English} \\
\text{wa lākinnahu huwa ṣanī'atuhā} \\
\text{and (but he) he}
\end{align*}
\]

"The Englishman does not make British civilization, it makes him" (SOC, 3)

(77)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{إن الكاهن لم يخلق الدين خلقاً} \\
\text{inna al-kāhin lam yakhliq} \\
\text{that the priest not create} \\
\text{al-dīn khalqan lākin} \\
\text{the religion creation (but) he used it} \\
\text{li- aghraṣīhi faqāt} \\
\text{for his purposes only}
\end{align*}
\]

"The priest did not create religion, he merely used it" (SOC, 68)

(78)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ذلك لأن الصيد لم يكن سبيلاً إلى طلب القوت وكفى} \\
\text{dhālika li'anna al-ṣayd lam yakun sabilan} \\
\text{that because the hunting was not a quest}
\end{align*}
\]

(SOC, 14)
ilā ṭalab al-qīt wa kafā
for requesting the food only

bal kāna kadhālika ḫarban
(but) it was also a war

yurād bihā al-tāmaʾninah wa
for with it the security and

al-siyādah
mastery

“For hunting was not merely a quest for food, it was a war for security and mastery” (SOC, 7)
(H) Evaluative *but: ammā, lākinna and lākin*

Since semantic opposition *but* ammā and the denial of expectation *but* lākinna/lākin convey the speaker’s expectation of an event, *but* can be regarded as being an appraisal or evaluative conjunction (cf. Bednarek's (2008) concept of appraisal in ch. 4). Due to its status as a coordinating conjunction, *but* is commonly used by speakers to convey evaluation implicitly. In this particular evaluative sense, *but, ammā, lākin* and *lākinna* assume "a common ground between reader and writer in terms of what is expected or unexpected" (Thompson and Hunston 2000: 9). Quirk et al. assert the pragmatic-evaluative function of *but* that depends basically on "our presuppositions and our experience of the world" (Quirk et al. 1985: 935).

Although it is generally agreed that *but* has a contrastive meaning, the analysis has revealed that each type of *but* imposes a different translation. The different lexical items that correspond to *but* support Rudolph's (1996: 244) argument that *but* is a typical adversative conjunction that is characterized by a "high frequency and wide range of semantic application". *But*, as a textual cohesive conjunct (Halliday: 1994), provides linking relations between one sentence and another. In other words, the translation of the coordinator *but* into Arabic depends largely on its interaction with the discourse context.

3.5.4 Semantic functions of adverbials

To list all possible semantic roles of all adverbials is considered "an enormously difficult task due to the semantic complexity of each and every adverb" (Coll 2009: 28). Following Quirk et al. (1985), Hasselgard (2010: 23) relates the semantic functions of adverbials with the position they occupy in a sentence. Hasselgard (ibid) argues that due to the wide range of meanings that adverbials cover, several categories of these adverbials can be recognized. He classifies the semantic categories of adverbials into space, time, manner, degree, contingency and respect. On the other hand, Ryding (2005: 277) classifies the semantic function of adverbials in Arabic into four major groups: place, time, degree, and manner. Nevertheless, he asserts that "There are also some important categories that do not fall within these four groups, but which have key functions in Arabic such as adverbial accusatives of cause or reason" (ibid).
The focus of the present study is limited to reason, degree and modal adverbials. The discussion of the semantic function of adverbials will span three chapters as illustrated below:

- Reason adverbs ——— chapter 3
  (adjunct because and disjunct since)
- Degree adverbs ——— chapter 4
  (Value judgement of content disjunct, e.g. extremely, totally)
- Modal adverbs\(^{23}\) ——— chapter 5
  (Truth of condition of content disjunct, e.g. rubbamā perhaps/may, ħatman/lā budda anna certainly/must)

I will thus not venture into a discussion of other classifications. A few words need, however, to be said on the other semantic functions of adverbials\(^{24}\).

### 3.5.4.1 Space adverbials

Space adjuncts, also known as locative or place adjuncts, indicate location, motion/direction or distance. They usually describe where something happens (location/position) or where to/from (direction). Consider the following examples:

(79) without looking at anyone, she went to the door, opened it, and let it close softly behind her. (Direction)
    (BNC, A6N, Amongst women, W fict prose, 1990)

(80) Anderson seemed to be the only person at home. (Position)
    (BNC, A0N, King Cameron, W fict prose, 1991)

(81) I don't think we can go that far. (Distance)
    (BNC, C8D, Black justice, W fict prose, 1988)

As seen from the examples (79- 81), spatial adverbials are typically elicited by the questions where to/from (direction), where (position), or how far

---
\(^{23}\) Though chapter 5 is mainly about modal verbs (e.g. must and may), they are most commonly translated into Arabic as adverbs, phrases or verbs (e.g. ħatman, mina al-mu’akkad and rubbamā).
\(^{24}\) These semantic functions of adverbials are considered the most commonly used in English and Arabic (see Ryding 2005).
In addition, most place adverbials are prepositional phrases; however clauses and noun phrases are frequently used:

(82) We are a long way from Egypt.

(BNC, CCE, Enemy territory, W religion).

3.5.4.2 Time adverbials

Time adverbials indicate events and states in time and denote their duration or frequency (Hasselgard 2010: 25). They are generally recognized by the questions when (time position), (for) how long (time duration) or how often (time frequency) as illustrated in the examples below:

(83) Telephone me this evening at the theatre. (Time position)

(BNC, ACE, Willoughby's phoney war, W fict prose, 1991)

(84) Government ignored all warning signs for years. (Time duration)


(85) If you pay your employees weekly,...(Time frequency 'definite')


(86) He usually calls them horses' doovers. (Time frequency 'indefinite')

(BNC, A0D, A classic English crime, W fict prose, 1990).

The examples above demonstrate the major types of time adverbials. Example 83 shows a point or a period in time as in 'this evening'. Time duration indicates a stretch of time. It tells us how long something has been happening as illustrated in 84. Time frequency, on the other hand, can be divided semantically into: 'definite frequency' in which the period of time is explicitly mentioned as in example 85 and 'indefinite frequency' in which the period of time is not explicitly expressed as in 86.

Abu Chacra (2007: 299) asserts that adverbs, in Arabic grammar, are classified semantically into:

(A) Adverbs of place, ظرف مكان, "envelope/container of place" (answer the question: أين ayna, 'where’?)

(B) Adverbs of time, ظرف زمان, "envelop/container of time" (answer the question: متى matā 'when'?).

Ryding (2005: 288) classifies place adverbials into:
1- One-word adverbs of place

Examples of this type are: هنا hunā 'here', هناك hunāka 'there' and حيث haythu 'where' or 'in which'. Like 'here' and 'there' in English, hunā and hunāka are locative pronouns; they indicate degree of remoteness from the speaker.

\[ (SOC: 7) \]
wa yazallūna mumsikin bihi hunāka fi rifq
and still held them there gently
"and gently held them there" (SOC: 6-7)

The adverb hunāka 'there' is used figuratively, in addition to indicating relative distance, to denote 'there is' or 'there are'. هناك hunālika '(over) there' is usually used as a variant of hunāka indicating a slightly greater, actual or figurative distance.

\[ (SOC, 11) \]
laysa hunālika mā yuthbit qaṭ’an annahā nasha’at
no there is surety that arose
"there is no surety that the custom arose" (SOC: 11)

حيث haythu is a connective adverbial of place, indicating 'where' or 'in which'. Like hunāka it can be used actually or metaphorically:

\[ (SOC: 2) \]
wa hiya tabda’ haythu yantahī al-īḍṭirāb wa al-qalaq
It begins where end chaos and insecurity
"It begins where chaos and insecurity end" (SOC: 1)

2- Accusative adverbial of place

Adverbs of place are usually marked with the indefinite accusative in order to indicate direction or location. For example:
"Did you go right or left? (Ryding 2005: 289)

3- Locative adverbs or semi-prepositions

As their name suggests, locative adverbs are usually nouns of location marked with the accusative case (like adverbs of time) and include adverbs, such as: تحت tahta under, فوق fawqa on/upon, أمام amama in front of, خلف khalfa behind:

ظلت مكانها تحت الماء (91)

(SOC, 226)

ةَلَّتَةَ لِمَكَانُهَا لَيْلَةٌ" (SOC, 98-99)

قد بنى فوقها قرى صغيرة (92)

(SOC, 226)

قَدْ بَنَىَ فَوْقَهَا قُرُّاتٍ صَغِيرَاتٍ "small villages had been built upon them" (SOC, 98-99)

Although these adverbs are semi prepositions, i.e. they are very close to the class of prepositions in meaning and function, "these words are of substantive (usually trilateral root) origin and may inflect for genitive case if they are preceded by a true preposition" (Ryding 2005: 290). For example:

و الأرض من تحت أقدامها (93)

(SOC, 385)

وَ الْأَرْضُ مِنْ حَتَّىٰ أَقْدَامِهَا "The earth lay beneath her feet" (SOC, 197-198)
4- Phrasal adverbs of place

Usually this kind of adverbial expression occurs in the form of prepositional phrases:

أرواح خبيثة تحوم في الهواء (94)

(SOC, 779)

arwālī khabīthah talīm fī al-hawā'

spirits evil hovered in the air

"evil spirits hovered in the air" (SOC, 367-368)

Like adverbials of place, according to Ryding (2005: 290), adverbials expressions of time fall into four categories: basic adverbs, single nouns and adjectives in the accusative, compound time demonstratives and phrases.

1- Basic adverbs of time

These adverbials refer to particular points in time and they do not change their basic form for case or definiteness. Most common of these adverbs are: أَمَسْ ams yesterday, الآن al-ān now, بعد ba’du yet, still, ثم thumma after that, then. For example:

‘udtu min al-askandariyah ams
I returned from Alexandria yesterday

"I returned from Alexandria yesterday"

ams is such a flexible adverb of time, i.e. it is often inserted in final position or prior to a longer phrase, but it does not occur initially (Ryding: ibid).

2- Time nouns and adjectives in the accusative

Particular time nouns are marked for the accusative. They are classified into: definite and indefinite accusative:

اليوم الأحد (96)

al-yawm al-aḥad
today Sunday

"Today, Sunday" [definite]
"Such courts were not always judgment seats" (SOC, 27-28) [indefinite]

3- Compound time adverbials

In Arabic grammar there is a group of compound words of which the first element is an adverbial of time. Compound time adverbials are equivalent in meaning to a locative demonstrative phrase, e.g. أَنذاك inadhaх at that time, يومذاك yawma dhaх that day, عامذاك 'ama dhaх that year. Compound expressions are another example of compound time adverbials, e.g. بعدئذ ba'daidhin after that, later, يومئذ yawmaidhin on that day:

(98)

أصبحت الفدية بعدئذ العقوبة الوحيدة

(SOC, 469)

اَشْباَحُت الْفِدْيَةُ بَعْدِئْذَ الْعَقْوَةَ الْوَحْيَةَ

it became the fine later the punishment

al-waṣīdah

the sole

"and later the fine became the sole punishment" (SOC, 230-231)

4- Adverbial time phrases

Adverbial time phrases usually occur in the indefinite accusative form for an expression of time in general, e.g.

(99)

هو يعمل ليلا و نهارا

(SOC, 63)

wa lam takun hādhihi al-mašākim dā'imān

were not such the courts always

majālis taqīdī kamā yaqīdī

seats judges (v.) as judges (v.)

al-quṭāh

the judges (n.)

"Such courts were not always judgment seats" (SOC, 27-28) [indefinite]
A demonstrative pronoun can also be used with the accusative for specific expressions of time and it acts as the first term of an ījāfah:

وذلك بحذف هذا اليوم الزائد

(SOC, 352)

wa dhālika bi- ḫadhfi hādhā al-yawm

and that by omitting this the day

al-zā‘īd

the extra

"by omitting this extra day" (SOC, 180-181)

Al-hawary (2011: 148) states that a few words can be used either as adverbs of time or adverbs of place, depending on the word following them.

Among these adverbs are: قبل qabla before, بعد ba’da after, عند ‘inda at. Consider qabla in the following two examples:

ذهبت إلى الأهرامات قبل غروب الشمس

dhahabtu ilā al-ahrāmāt qabla

I went to the pyramids before sun set

"I went to the pyramids before sunset" (adverb of time)

رأيتها في بناءة قبل مكتب البريد

ra’aytuhā fi bināyah qabla

I saw her in a building before

maktub al-barid

the post office

"I saw her in a building before the post office" (adverb of place)

3.5.4.3 Reason adverbials

According to Quirk et al. (1985: 484), cause and reason are distinct categories. Whereas cause "is concerned with causation and motivation seen as established with some objectivity, reason involves a relatively personal and subjective assessment". However, Hasselgard (2010: 27) and Ryding (2005:
Hasselgards justifies his claim by providing the example below:

(103)Our project is not getting very far very fast **as we can't understand this Spanish guy** (Hasselgard 2010: 28)

Hasselgards (ibid) illustrates that in the above example, the underlined segment conveys an assessment and an objective fact at the same time. Therefore, and following Hasselgard (2010) and Ryding (2005), in order to avoid confusion, cause and reason are used interchangeably in this study.

Following Quirk et al. (1985: 484), Hasselgards (ibid) highlights another distinction between adverbs of result and adverbs of purpose. He illustrates that the relation between 'result' and 'purpose' is very close. While purpose adverbials denote an intended effect of the action, result adverbials refers to the actual outcome, whether it is intended or not. In other words, the difference between result and purpose lies in the fact that, while purpose adverbials are usually 'non-factive', result adverbials are factive.

On the other hand, there is a slight affinity between 'purpose' and 'reason'. Consider the following example:

(104)"He married several of his daughters, so that they too might have splendid children" (SOC, 214)

The purpose of marriage in 104 is probably also the father's reason for doing it. Reason adverbials provide information about why things occur, while purpose adverbials indicate for what purpose they are done. In general, reason adverbials denote a present or past state of affairs, while purpose adverbials denote a non-factive nature, i.e. they indicate an unrealized or unknown future.

Ryding (2005: 296) refers to the adverbial accusative of cause or reason as المفعول لأجله al-maf’ūl li-ajlihi. He explains that in order to indicate the reason or purpose of an action, the indefinite accusative is used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>buḥiṭha</th>
<th>taṭwir</th>
<th>al-‘ilāqāt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>was discussed</td>
<td>development</td>
<td>the relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>khidmatan</strong></td>
<td>li-maṣlaḥatihimā</td>
<td>al-mushtarakah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in order to serve</td>
<td>their (two) interest</td>
<td>shared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Development of relations was discussed in order to serve their (two) shared interest" (Ryding 2005: 297)

According to Beeston (1970: 87) an adverbial, in general, is:

inappropriate for Arabic, because the function which one needs to describe is that of amplifying a predicate, irrespective of whether the latter be expressed with or without a verb. But if this is allowed for, the term has a practical usefulness in distinguishing two kinds of amplification, the 'object' and the 'adverbial'.

However, Beeston (1970) and Ryding (2005) did not clarify the different ways of expressing the meaning of reason adverbials in Arabic corresponding to their English counterparts (mainly, since and because).

Therefore, and since reason adverbials are most commonly introduced by the subordinator because and since, the study will focus on because (as an adjunct subordinator) and since (as a disjunct subordinator) as well as their Arabic counterparts لئن li‘an, لأن li‘anna, ل لما lammā, and إذ idh. The problem with li‘an is that although it is formally like li‘anna, it does not, typically at least, mean the same thing (see figure 9). In addition, li‘an and li‘anna will be compared to other two subordinators, i.e. idh and lammā which are relatively close in meaning. Although these lexical junctions appear as synonyms, the analysis reveals distributional differences in their usages.

![Figure 9: Distribution of the Arabic translations of since in SOC](image-url)
After excluding unrelated occurrences of since (e.g. **sincere**) from SOC corpus, the analysis reveals 84 records of *since*. Typically, as shown in figure 9, *since* is most commonly translated as لَمْما *lammā* which has the sense of *when, while or as* in English. It is interesting to note also that in all cases when *since* is translated as *lammā* it is followed by *kānā/kānat/kānū* which means *he/she was, they were*. Like *lammā* in SOC, *lammā kāna* has the highest frequency in both Al-H and I-AR corpora, it occurs 446 times in Al-H with 467.93 LLS and 3579 times in I-AR with 3099.67 LLS.

In other cases when *lammā* is preceded by particles or conjunctions, e.g. *wa and* (as in the following example), *fa as in example 109 or li’anna because in 111, kānā/kānat* are still following *lammā* in its construction:

- *wa lammā + kānā/kānat + n.*

---

(106)

ولما كانت الكفايات البشرية والموارد الطبيعية موزعة على الأرض في غير مساواة، فقد ترى شعباً من الشعوب قادراً على إنتاج أشياء معينة لا يكلفه إنتاجها ما يكلف جيرانه

(SOC, 33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>wa lammā</strong></th>
<th><strong>kānāt</strong></th>
<th><strong>al-kifāyāt</strong></th>
<th><strong>al-basharīyah</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and since</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>skills</td>
<td>the human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa al-mawārid</td>
<td>al-ṭabī‘iyyah</td>
<td>muwazza‘ah</td>
<td>‘alā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>are distributed</td>
<td>on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-arḍ</td>
<td>fi ghayr musāwāh</td>
<td>fa-qad tarā</td>
<td>you may find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land</td>
<td>unequally</td>
<td>qādiran</td>
<td>able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sha‘ban</td>
<td>min al-shu‘īb</td>
<td>qādiran</td>
<td>able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>among peoples</td>
<td>certain</td>
<td>able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘alā</td>
<td>intāj</td>
<td>ashyyā‘</td>
<td>mu‘ayyanah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>produce</td>
<td>articles</td>
<td>certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lā yukallifuhu</td>
<td>intājuhā</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>yukallif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not cost</td>
<td>its production</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jīrānahu</td>
<td>its neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Since human skills and natural resources are diversely and unequally distributed, a people may be enabled, to produce certain articles more cheaply than its neighbours” (SOC, 15)

- *wa lammā + kāna+ separate pron.*

(107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wa lammā</th>
<th>kāna</th>
<th>hadhihi</th>
<th>al-ghāramāt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>since</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>these</td>
<td>fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aw</td>
<td>al-ta'wiḍāt</td>
<td>al-latī</td>
<td>tudfa’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>compositions</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ijtīnāban</td>
<td>li-ltha’r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to avert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>revenge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Since these fines or compositions, paid to avert revenge" (SOC, 27-28)

As can be seen from 106 and 107, a separate noun or pronoun can be used after the pattern *lammā + kāna*. A verbal sentence can also follow the same pattern as in 108. Most commonly for the construction *lamma + kāna* is to be followed by another clause that is headed by *fa qad kāna* or *fa inna* (marked with italic in 106, 108 and 111) to form a conditional-response pattern:

- *wa lammā + kāna + V......faqad kāna*

(108)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wa lammā</th>
<th>kāna</th>
<th>yu’had</th>
<th>ilā</th>
<th>al-um</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>since</td>
<td>it was</td>
<td>entrust</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>the mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bi-adā’</td>
<td>mu’zam</td>
<td>mā taqtaqihi</td>
<td>al-‘ināyah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to fulfil</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>what is required</td>
<td>the care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bi-al-abnā’</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>khadāmāt</td>
<td><em>fa qad kāna</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with children</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>functions</td>
<td><em>it was</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Since it was the mother who fulfilled most of the parental functions, the family was at first organized" (SOC, 30-31)

\(fa \ lammā + kāna/kānat\)

Infrequently, \(fa\) can precede \(lammā\) without any significant change in meaning or function, it acts typically like the coordinator \(wa\ and\) in this type of structure. For example:

(SOC, 109)

"Since old and basic customs represent a natural selection of group ways..."

(SOC, 48)

Obviously, the usage of \(lammā\) is different than that of \(li’anna\), i.e. \(lammā\) cannot be used instead of \(li’anna\) as each of them has a different construction and a different meaning, i.e. \(lammā\) denotes the meaning of \(when\) and involves a response-conditional pattern, whereas \(li’anna\) corresponds to \(because\) in English. However, if the second clause is substituted for the first, \(lammā\) (with its commonly used pattern) can be used in the place of \(li’anna\) as in 110 and 110a.
- *li’anna* (110)

> إنه طفل بغير والد لأن الفتاة لم تتزوج (SOC, 71)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>innahu</th>
<th>ʿtifl</th>
<th>bi-ghayr</th>
<th>wālid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it is</td>
<td>a child</td>
<td>without</td>
<td>a father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>li’anna</em></td>
<td>al-ʿfatāh</td>
<td>ʾlam</td>
<td>tatazawwaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>since</td>
<td>the girl</td>
<td>does not</td>
<td>marry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"there was no father, since the girl was unmarried" (SOC, 30-31)

(110a)

و لما كانت الفتاة غير متزوجة، فإن الطفل ليس له والد

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wa lammā kānat</th>
<th>al-ʿfatāh</th>
<th>ghayru mutazawwijah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>since she was</td>
<td>the girl</td>
<td>unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa inna</td>
<td>al-ʿtifl</td>
<td>laysa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is</td>
<td>the child</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lahu</td>
<td>wālid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
<td>a father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Since the girl was unmarried, there was no father"

*li’anna (ḥu) + lammā + kāna*

It is also accepted for *li’anna* and *lammā* to occur consecutively without affecting the response-conditional pattern of *lammā*. For example:

(111)

لأن الحب أمر ليس له وجود لأنه لما كانت العلاقة الجنسية أمرًا مباحًا قبل الزواج، فإن عاطفة الرجل لا تجد من السدود ما يختزنها

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>li’anna</th>
<th>al-ḥubb</th>
<th>amr</th>
<th>laysa lahu wujūd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>because</td>
<td>the love</td>
<td>something</td>
<td>not existed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>li’annahu</em></td>
<td><em>lammā</em></td>
<td>kānat</td>
<td>al-ʿilāqah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because since it was the relation
al-jinsiyah amran mubāḥan qabla al-zawāj
the sexual something legal before the marriage
fa inna 'ādīfat al-rajul lā tajid min
it is passion the man cannot find of
al-sudūd mā yakhtazinuhā
the dams what hold it

"affection is altogether out of the question. Since premarital relations are abundant in primitive society, passion is not dammed up by denial" (SOC, 39)

- **mundhu**

In all cases (in SOC) in which *since* is translated into *mundhu*, it represents a temporal conjunction and not a causal one. It is commonly for *mundhu* to be followed by a noun or a verb as in 112 and 113 below:

- **mudhu + n.**

*labithat ḥayāt al-insān al-raʾisīyah*

*stayed life the man the basic*

*min ḥaythu al-iqtiṣād wa al-siyyāsah*

*from the economy and the policy*

*'alā sūrah wāḥidah lā takād tataghayyar fī jawharīhā*

*the same had remained essentially*

**mundhu**

*al-ʾasr al-ḥadith*

*since neolithic*

"the basic economic and political life of man had remained essentially the same since neolithic days" (SOC, 399-400)

- **mudhu + V.**
"Doubtless much material progress had been made since the establishment of the Aryan rule in India" (SOC, 422)

A common construction in MSA is to follow mundhu with zamanin tawil long time:

- mundhu + zaman

"But it has long since corrupted the Master's doctrine" (SOC, 437-438)

In MSA, the conjunction idh is typically used as a discourse marker of clarification or causation. However, there are only 5 instances of idh in SOC. Like lammā, idh/idhā has typically the same construction, i.e. conditional-response pattern: (wa) idh/idhā + V. (kāna)...fa qad (kāna) particularly when idh occurs in initial position. Thus, unlike lammā – that usually occurs in initial
position – (see examples 106-109 and 110a), *idh* may occur initially or in the middle of the sentence, but of course not in final position. Examples are:

(115)

wa ʾidhā kāna taḥta sullānihi mulūk
Since under his control kings

yaʾtamīrīn bi-amrihi fa qad kāna al-furs yulaqqībūnahu
were vassal to him they were the Persians entitled him

malik al-mulūk King of Kings

"Since lesser kings were vassal to him, the Persian ruler entitled himself "King of Kings" (SOC, 359)

(116)

wa ʾidhā al-khāṣṣa ṭūlūna fī khārij al-ḏurr min al-abāb
Since stone was scarce, these palaces were mostly of brick" (SOC, 132-133)

• *idh* in the middle of the sentence

(117)

أما السراري فكن أكثر من غيرهن حرية، إذ كان للنساء في جميع الأوقات سلطان قوى في بلال الملك

(SOC, 797)

ammā al-sarārī fa-kunna akthar
But concubines they were more
min ghayrihinna ISOString they freedom since
than the others freedom since
kān li-Inisā' fī jami'
were for women in all
al-'awqāt sulṭān qawī fī
times balāṭ al-mulūk

"Concubines had greater freedom, since they were powerful at the court"
(SOC, 375)

Contrary to figure 9, the distribution of the Arabic translations of because in SOC reveals the high frequency of li’anna over lammā, i.e. lammā shows the highest frequency in the translation of since and the lowest frequency in the translation of because as shown in figure 10 below.

![Figure 10: Distribution of the Arabic translations of because in SOC](image)

It is common for li’anna to be followed by a pronoun suffix that refers to a previously mentioned noun. A separate noun or verb may also follow li’anna without having a pronoun suffix in the middle. Examples are:

- li’anna + pronoun suffix + v.
Agriculture is forbidden to the Jain, because it tears up the soil and crushes insects or worms" (SOC, 421)

- *li'anna* + pronoun suffix + n.
"it is not because these are history, but because they are an essential part of Hindu literature" (SOC, 422-423)

- li’anna + n.

(120)

لأن قانون "كارما" يتطلب حالات جديدة من التقمص للروح
(SOC, 910)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>li’anna</th>
<th>qānūn</th>
<th>Karmā</th>
<th>yataṭallab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>because</td>
<td>law</td>
<td>Karma</td>
<td>demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥālāt</td>
<td>jadidah</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>al-taqammuṣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cases</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>reincarnation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of soul

Because the law of Karma demands new reincarnations in which the soul may atone (SOC, 427)

- bi-sabab + n. + pron. suffix

The analysis of SOC reveals just one example of li-sabab as a translation of because. The pattern (Because + of) is usually translated into bi-sabab and not li’anna, lammā or idh

(121)

فهو لن يفرق بينهم بسبب اختلافهم في العقيدة
(SOC, 954)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fa-huwa</th>
<th>lan</th>
<th>yufarriq</th>
<th>baynahum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>will not discriminate</td>
<td>among them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bi-sabab</td>
<td>ikhtilāfihim</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>al-‘aqidah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of</td>
<td>their diverse in</td>
<td>creeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"he will not discriminate against any of them because of their diverse creeds"
Like lammā in figure 9, figure 10 shows lammā as dramatically low. There are just two examples of lammā corresponding to because:

Unlike lammā in figure 9, figure 10 shows lammā as dramatically low. There are just two examples of lammā corresponding to because:

Because the roads were poor and communication difficult, it was easier to conquer than to rule India” (SOC, 482)
and because started Jews commit whoredom ma'a banāt mu'āb qāla with daughters Moab said li-Mūsā to Moses

"Because the Jews "commit whoredom" with the daughters of Moab, he bids Moses:" (SOC, 310-311)

Here, in 123 and 124 it seems that because is a typical adverbial adjunct that is subordinated to a verb phrase or part of a verb phrase, whereas in the case of the content disjunct since (see examples under figure 9), it appears that since is subordinated to the entire content of the main clause. Therefore, in 123 and 124 because and since cannot be substituted without any difference. In both examples, lammā occurs initially - in the first example, it occurs at the beginning of a new paragraph, in a new chapter. There is another lexical word that has been excluded from the analysis as it has a different meaning and function, i.e. limā (which has the same written form as lammā). limā (li + mā) that means as to or for.

- idh + v. (kāna)

All the examples in SOC show idh as a particle that is most commonly followed by (kāna/ kānat/ kuntu) 'was/ were' except one example when it is followed by a verb in the present tense, i.e. tarā see, p. 189 (125)

SOC, 120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kāna</td>
<td>was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-insān</td>
<td>man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-bidā’ī</td>
<td>primitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qāsiyan</td>
<td>cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>īyatman alayhi</td>
<td>he had to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an yakūn</td>
<td>to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idh kāna</td>
<td>because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kadḥāli</td>
<td>like that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Primitive man was cruel because he had to be" (SOC, 52-53)
\-li- + n. + pron. suffix

li- is a preposition (a prefix) that means due to, in order to or because (of). However, it does not involve any sense of emphaticness like that of li'anna. In general, adverbs of cause in Arabic can be expressed by means of a preposition followed by a phrase or a sentence. For example:

(126)

وذلك بأن يكون الإنسان قد عَبَدَ الحيوان لِقوته

(SOC, 143)

wa dhālika bi-an yakīn al-insān qad ‘abada
and that by being Man prayed to
al-ḥayawān li-ṣuwwatihi
the animals because its power

"Men prayed to animals because the animals were powerful" (SOC, 62-63)

Though li'an and li'anna have the same written form, i.e. لأن, the analysis reveals a remarkable difference between them as illustrated in figure 11 below:

Figure 11: Distribution of li'anna and li'an in SOC

Figure 11 shows the predominance of li'anna over li'an in the SOC corpus. The causal conjunction li'anna proved to be the most probable equivalent of
because, whereas *li’an* is most commonly a translated as *to*. Like the SOC corpus, the Al-H corpus shows a significant occurrence of *li’anna* over *li’an* in the top ten collocates as shown in table 4 below.

### Table 4: The top ten collocates of *li’an* and *li’anna* in the Al-H corpus with a span window 1:0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>LL score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>li’anna dhālika</em> ‘that’</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>598.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>li’anna hunāka</em> ‘there’</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>346.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>li’anna hādihi</em></td>
<td>416</td>
<td>202.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>li’an takūn</em> ‘to be’ fem.</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>150.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>li’an yakūn</em> ‘to be’ m.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>118.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>li’anna kull ‘all’</em></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>102.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>li’anna ma ‘what’</em></td>
<td>312</td>
<td>80.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>li’anna m’am ‘most’</em></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>li’anna isra’il ‘Isra’il’</em></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>75.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>li’an aḥadan ‘someone’</em></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the syntactic point of view, the typical structure of *li’an* appears to be: (*li’an* + V.). Data from SOC show that the 9 examples of *li’an* are followed by 9 verbs in the present tense: (*taj’al*, p. 266; *yarudd*, p. 266; *yatamid*, p. 327; *takūn*, p. 342; *tanāl*, p. 372; *tuhājim*, p. 560; *tabqā*, p. 660; *yakūn*, p. 769; *yumaththil*, p. 780). In all these examples – except two that have no translation – *li’an* is translated as the English preposition *to*. That is why *li’an* is absent from figures 9 and 10.

### 3.6 Conclusion

This chapter addressed some basic issues in the relation between CL and SFL, including a brief review of SFL and translation studies. As an example of applying SFL in both English and Arabic, the chapter handled the phenomenon of coordination by analyzing co-ordinating conjunctions (e.g. *but*) and the phenomenon of subordination by analyzing subordinating conjunctions (e.g. *because* as an adjunct and *since* as a disjunct) - also referred to as co-ordinators and subordinators respectively.

The chapter has provided a brief introduction to the English and Arabic junctions in general and focused on adjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts. Throughout the English and Arabic corpora, some crucial differences in the use
of adjuncts and disjuncts have been explored. Although *because* and *since* as well as their Arabic counterparts: *li'an, li'anna, lammā* and *idh* have the same argumentative behaviour, the analysis reveals distributional differences.

SOC data were shown to cast doubt on dictionary translations of *since*. Though *Al-Mawrid*\(^{25}\) does not provide *lammā* as a possible translation of *since*, SOC analysis shows *lammā* as the most frequent translation of *since*. In the case of *but*, the study focused on conjunctive (i.e. direct/indirect denial, corrective, semantic opposition) and non conjunctive (i.e. exceptive *but*) uses of *but*.

\(^{25}\) See *Al-Mawrid: A Modern English-Arabic Dictionary*, p. 857
Chapter Four

Appraisal Theory: An Overview

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of Appraisal Theory, serving as an introduction to the next chapter. It therefore omits some of the details of Appraisal Theory that fall outside the scope of this study. Section 4.2 defines the word ‘appraisal’ as a notion within SFL. Then, the reason for adopting Appraisal Theory is illustrated in 4.3. Appraisal in SFL is discussed in 4.4, and the relation between Appraisal Theory and Emotion Talk is explained in 4.5. Section 4.6 displays the basic systems for appraisal, as adopted from Martin and Rose (2003: 22). Special focus will be given to the gradable values of Appraisal in Arabic in 4.6.5. Degree adverbs in English and Arabic will be discussed in 4.6.5.1. Finally, a conclusion to the whole chapter will be provided in 4.7.

4.2 What is Appraisal?

Macken-Horarik (2003: 285) defines ‘appraisal’ as: “the label within SFL for a collection of semantic resources for negotiating emotions, judgments and valuations”. ‘Appraisal’ or ‘Evaluation’ is a concept that has many heterogeneous applications in different disciplines. Numerous studies (even within the field of linguistics) have used the term ‘evaluation’ in many diverse ways [Hunston and Thompson (2000), Martin and White (2005)]. Hunston and Thompson (2000: 2) briefly discuss the variety of terms related to language expressing opinions. Examples of these labels are: Affect (Besnier 1993); and Attitude (Halliday 1994 and Tench 1996). Both of these labels deal with the perspective of the language user (i.e. the different attitudes of the people using the language).

26 In this study, ‘appraisal’ and ‘evaluation’ are used interchangeably.
However, despite the different terms used to express the personal perspective, all the above approaches share the broad approach of describing language in use. In addition to these labels, there are three connected terms that deal with the speaker’s/writer’s opinions in evaluating a text. Martin (2000) talks of Appraisal, Conrad and Biber (2000) use the term Stance, and Hunston and Thompson (2000) adopt the term Evaluation. In this study, I will stick with the terms Evaluation and Appraisal for two reasons: first, Evaluation is a vast term that covers the speaker’s/writer’s expressions of attitudes, feelings, and values towards impressions or judgments on propositions that he or she is talking about. Since the term Evaluation is used in analysing lexical expressions of the speaker or writer’s emotional attitude, it is, to a large extent, equivalent to Martin’s appraisal stance and Conrad and Biber’s attitudinal stance. Another important reason for adopting the term is for: “its syntactic and morphological flexibility: not only does it express a user-orientation in terms of the two perspective mentioned earlier (it is the user who evaluates), but it also allows us to talk about the values ascribed to the entities and propositions which are evaluated” (Hunston and Thompson 2000: 5).

4.3 Why Appraisal Theory?

Thompson (2004: 75) highlights the importance of appraisal with respect to the meaning of any text:

With appraisal (or ‘evaluation’), we are even on the edge of grammar: much of appraisal is expressed by lexical choices and there are few grammatical structures that can be seen as having evolved with a primarily evaluative function…it is important to note that appraisal is a central part of the meaning of any text and that any analysis of the interpersonal meanings of a text must take it into account.

Moreover, Appraisal Theory is generally regarded as an area of study that has not been fully captured by SFL scholars (see Granlund 2007, Bednarek 2008, and Pavlenko 2008). Another interesting thing about appraisal is that it is treated as questionable, i.e. it is an area that is left open to negotiation since it is concerned specifically with the language of emotion, attitude, and evaluation.
4.4 Situating Appraisal in SFL

As was mentioned in chapter one, Appraisal Theory is a further development of the Hallidayan framework of SFL. Martin and Rose (2003: 22) describe appraisal as “a system of interpersonal meaning”. Martin and White (2005: 33) locate appraisal as an “interpersonal system at the level of discourse semantics”. Following Martin and White, Granlund (2007: 9) identifies the position of Appraisal Theory within SFL as follows:

Appraisal theory belongs to the interpersonal metafunction of Systemic Functional Grammar. While the ideational metafunction looks at propositional content, and the textual metafunction looks at text structure, the interpersonal metafunction…takes the interactional parts of language into consideration. It looks at how reader/listener and writer/speaker interact and negotiate meaning. The interpersonal metafunction concentrates on mood, tense, polarity, and evaluation, and looks at what meanings are expressed through these elements.

Like SFL, Appraisal Theory is concerned with language in use, rather than language structure. It investigates the context as well as the whole communicative situation. In other words, ‘appraisal’ is essentially concerned with expressions and reactions of personal views, and hence it is part of the interpersonal metafunction.

4.5 Appraisal Theory and Emotion Talk

Bednarek (2008: 13) highlights the importance of Appraisal Theory as “specifically suited to the analysis of emotion talk”. It accounts for the expression of our emotional responses. In much the same way, Coffin (2002: 505) believes that “Appraisal systems are the semantic resources used to negotiate ‘emotions’”. Pavlenko (2008: 197) asserts that the study of emotional talk has not received much attention from linguistic scholars:

Most models of linguistic structure do not account for emotional meanings in a systematic way. One exception worth mentioning, however, is Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL; Halliday,
1985/1994) with its broad division of functions into the textual, ideational and interpersonal metafunctions.

Bednarek (2008:12) differentiates between ‘Emotion talk’ and ‘Emotional talk’. While ‘Emotion talk’ signals the linguistic expressions that indicate the speaker’s and others’ emotions, ‘Emotional talk’ is more specific, denoting only the speaker’s own emotions. This study (mainly chapter seven) will deal with ‘Emotion talk’ as a general notion, since it deals with all possible linguistic environments that surround the core meanings.

Martin and White (2005: 46-9) group emotions into three main sets: unhappiness, in/security and dis/satisfaction. The unhappiness set is concerned with emotions that have to do with ‘affairs of the heart’, which include sadness, happiness, hate, and love. It is the first thing that comes to our mind when we think about emotions. The in/security group deals with our feelings of peace, fear, confidence and trust including people who share the same feelings with us. Dis/satisfaction covers the feelings that result from the activities we do. It has to do with achievement and frustration.27

4.6 Basic Systems for Appraisal

Martin and Rose (2003: 22) identify three main dimensions for appraisal: Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation (see Figure 12). The three options can be presented in the following three questions:

1. What are our attitudes? [Attitude]
2. What are the ways in which these attitudes are sourced? [Engagement]
3. How are these attitudes amplified/graded? [Graduation]

27 For more information see: http://us.macmillan.com/emotiontalkacrosscorpora
The following sections will illustrate these questions more precisely.

4.6.1 Attitude (ways of feelings)

Attitude is concerned with evaluating things (*appreciation*), people’s characters (*judgement*), or people’s emotions (*affect*). These are the three basic kinds of ‘attitude’ regarding the object of appraisal. See examples below:

- I feel bored (*affect*).
- He is a boring speaker (*judgement*).
• It is a boring speech (appreciation).

However, we have to be aware, from the very beginning, that the above appraisal categories are not always as clear-cut as they look. Consider the following example:

(127) Susan has a charming dress.

This example could be interpreted either as appraising Susan (judgment) or her dress (appreciation). Similarly:

(127a) This film disturbs me

could be seen as appreciation of the film, or as affect (my feeling of being disturbed). Thus, it is usually very tricky to pin down precisely what is being appraised. This applies to Arabic as well. Sentence 127a is translated into Arabic as:

(127b) هذَا الفِيلْم يَزْعِجْنِي

this the film disturbs me

The above examples (127,127a and 127b) indicate explicit examples of appraisal, which are, to use Thompson’s (2004: 77) term, inscribed appraisal. This type is usually fairly easy to recognise. Thompson distinguishes between inscribed and evoked appraisal. While inscribed appraisal refers to direct evaluation, evoked appraisal occurs when the speaker evaluates something indirectly intending to highlight an attitude (see example 130 below).

Expressing feelings, i.e. ‘affectual values’, can be either positive or negative, depending on our reading position. Martin (2003: 172) highlights this distinction, as well as the ‘crisis point’ of inscribed and evoked evaluation. The examples below illustrate this distinction.

(128) Fortunately, he dropped the ball when he was tackled.
(129) *Unfortunately, he dropped the ball when he was tackled.*

(130) He dropped the ball when he was tackled.

Obviously, we feel confident about interpreting the attitude in terms of polarity, i.e. positive or negative, as in 128 and 129. Sentence 128 is introduced by an explicitly positive adverb, *fortunately*, whereas 129 has an initial inscribed negative appraisal adverb, i.e. *unfortunately*. However, in 130, both negative and positive indicators are omitted. In this case, the reader/hearer's evaluation is regarded as *evoked appraisal*. Martin (2003: 172) asserts that: “How we feel about what happens depends of course on our reading position”. So, in 130, if the player dropping the ball is not in our team, we will have a positive feeling. If the player is playing in our own team, our feelings would be the other way round. Such examples cannot be investigated using corpus evidence as it depends mainly on the speaker's intention.

All subtypes of attitude, i.e. *affect, judgment* and *appreciation* involve positive or negative feelings (see Martin 2003: 174, and Page 2003: 213). In addition, *judgment* and *appreciation* can be analysed as ‘institutionalisations of affect’. Martin (ibid: 173) explains this relation as: “JUDGMENT as AFFECT recontextualised to control behaviour (what we should and should not do), APPRECIATION as AFFECT recontextualised to manage taste (what things are worth)”. This relation, which ties up the three subtypes of attitude, is outlined in figure 13 below:
Feeling institutionalised as Ethics/morality (rules and regulations)

Feeling institutionalised as aesthetics/ value

(criteria and assessment)

Figure 13: JUDGMENT and APPRECIATION as institutionalised AFFECT (from Martin 2000: 147)

The above figure outlines the ways of thinking about types of attitudes as suggested by Martin (2000). The figure reflects the ‘prosodic’ nature of attitude. The interpersonal meanings are prosodically realised in the sense that they provide a kind of confirmation of implied evaluation. While affect is concerned with the emotion experienced by the speaker (as in love, want), judgment focuses on the person’s social, behavioural, and moral assessments (as in bad, good, cool). Appreciation construes the aesthetic attributes related to a text, performances, or natural phenomenon (as in beautiful, lovely). Martin (2003: 173) summarizes the relation between affect, judgment and appreciation as follows:

Each type of attitude involves positive or negative feeling, and that JUDGMENT and APPRECIATION might be interpreted as institutionalizations of AFFECT which have evolved to socialize individuals into various uncommon sense communities of feeling - JUDGMENT as AFFECT recontextualized to control behaviour (what we should and should not do), APPRECIATION as AFFECT recontextualized to manage taste (what things are worth).
As indicated earlier in this section, both affect and judgment share the criterion of polarity. However, unlike affect, judgments differ between personal and moral judgments, as the following figure shows:

![Diagram of judgments]

Figure 14: Main types of judgments.

As seen from the above figure, judgment involves parameters for human behaviours according to social norms. Martin and Rose (2003: 28) classify judgment in terms of two dimensions: personal and moral. Both can be positive (P) or negative (N). With personal judgment, one may (explicitly or implicitly) admire or criticise the attitude of others. Both categories can be gathered in one example:

(131)

I can't explain the pain and bitterness in me when I saw what was left of that beautiful, big, strong person

(Martin and Rose: ibid).

In the above example, a criticism is implied by the speaker, Helena, when she says how she felt about seeing what was left of her lover. Similarly, moral judgment can be interpreted positively (when praising a person's good attitude) or negatively (when condemning unfavourable behaviours) [see chapter seven].
4.6.2 Engagement (sources of attitudes)

Voloshinov (1995: 139) identifies *Engagement* as essentially dialogic, where the appraiser "responds to something, affirms something, anticipates possible responses and objections, seeks support, and so on". This can be achieved through *monogloss* or *heterogloss*. Martin and Rose (2003: 44) use the term *monogloss* to indicate a ‘single voice’ (where the only source of attitude is the author or the writer), and *heterogloss* to refer to ‘different voices’ (where the source of the appraisal attitude is not the author him/herself).

Following Bakhtin (1981), Voloshinov (1995), and White (2002), Granlund (2007) considers two ways of looking at engagement. The first is “the truth-functional approach”, which Martin and Rose (ibid.) term as ‘monogloss’. This approach considers the evaluative elements that reflect the speaker's degree of assurance to the truth of propositions: how much confidence the speaker has about a particular event.

The other approach, i.e. ‘heteroglossic’, is also known as the ‘Bakhtinian approach’. This approach indicates the importance of the role that the reader has in discourse (see Bakhtin 1981). It does not just look at engagement with a text individually, but also takes the reader’s opinions and emotions into account. Martin and White (2005) explain the role of the heteroglossic perspective as follows:

> The heteroglossic perspective emphases the role of language in positioning speakers and their texts within the heterogeneity of social positions and world views which operate in any culture. [...] Thus every meaning within a text occurs in a social context where a number of alternative or contrary meanings could have been made (Martin and White 2005, cited in Granlund 2007: 17).

At this point, ‘modality’ can serve as a good example of both approaches of *Engagement*. Consider the following examples:

(132) David *may* arrive tomorrow.
(133) David *must* arrive tomorrow.
According to the monoglossic view, examples (132) & (133) refer to the possibility (132) and necessity (133) of David’s arrival. However, under the heteroglossic view, the two sentences have nothing to do with doubt or certainty regarding the truth of the propositional content. The two sentences represent two different ways of opening up negotiation. The speaker/writer tries to be less categorical. While using *may/must* encourages negotiation, avoiding them closes the negotiation down. Bakhtin (1981: 427) describes the monoglossic approach as ‘undialogised’. It is recognised as ‘bare assertions’ e.g. ‘it’s boring’ (see White 2005).

### 4.6.3 Graduation (the semantics of scaling)

Graduation is the third dimension within the appraisal system. It is a dimension that has to do with the grading of the feelings themselves. In this section, special focus will be given to graduation for two reasons. First, graduation is a general feature of both attitude and engagement. Martin and White (2005: 136) state that: “The semantics of *graduation* [...] is central to the appraisal system. It might be said that *attitude* and *engagement* are domains of graduation which differ according to the nature of the meanings being scaled”. So a strong and defining feature of all attitudinal meanings is their gradability. In other words, it is a general characteristic of *affect, judgement* and *appreciation* that they are gradable in the sense that their ‘volume’ can be turned up or down depending on how intensely we feel.

Another reason for adopting ‘graduation’ is that it is a distinctive feature of adjectives (see powerful/less adjectives in chapter seven). Quirk et al. (1985: 435) argue that “All dynamic and most stative adjectives are gradable”.

### 4.6.4 Graduation: thump up and thump down

As indicated previously in Fig. 12, Graduation operates across two axes of gradability or scalability, i.e. *up-scaling* (thump up) and *down-scaling* (thump down). In other words, Graduation is concerned with adjusting the degree of appraisal – how strong our feelings are, and how to turn the ‘volume’ of our emotions up and down. This kind of graduation is called *force*, and it involves
the use of intensifiers, i.e. boosters or maximisers (e.g. very, really, extremely, absolutely), as well as hedges or downtoners (e.g. kind of, sort of, somewhat, slightly, rather). Quirk et al. (1985: 435) state that: “Gradability is also manifested through modification by intensifiers, i.e. adverbs which convey the degree of intensity of the adjective: very tall, so beautiful, extremely useful”. In terms of force and focus, Martin and Rose (2003: 38) argue that while force refers to resources for adjusting the volume of gradable items, focus refers to resources for turning something intrinsically non-gradable into gradable. Consider the examples below.

(134) He is a teacher. [non-gradable focus]
(135) He is a real teacher. [gradable: sharpening]
(136) He is a kind of teacher. [gradable: softening]

It is obvious from the examples above that focus is mainly concerned with ‘sharpening’ or ‘softening’ categories of things or people’s attitudes. In 134, a teacher in itself is not amplified, i.e. it is non-gradable. However, when it is modified by the booster real, as in 135, or the hedge kind of, as in 136, it turns the type of profession into a graded one. However, in the case of force, the appraised item is already graded, as the examples below explain.

(137) He is happy. [gradable force]
(138) He is absolutely happy. [volume up]
(139) He is fairly happy. [volume down]

The emphasiser, absolutely, as well as the downtoner, fairly, serves to enhance and give additional force to the adjective happy in (138 and 139).

4.6.5 Graded Values of Appraisal in English and Arabic: Degree Adverbs

Quirk et al. (1985: 589-591) present a degree scale of intensifiers - also referred to as adverbs of degree. The intensifying scale has two far ends: 'amplifiers',
which denote the high end of the scale and 'downtoners' which denote the low point as illustrated in figure 15 below.

Figure 15: Subtypes of intensifiers (from Quirk et al. 1985: 590)

Amplifiers, also described as the category that is basically concerned with the semantic category of degree, can be further subdivided into two main subcategories, i.e. 'boosters' which indicate "a high degree, a high point on the scale", but without reaching the extreme end of the scale and 'maximizers' which denote "the upper extreme of the scale" (Quirk et al. 1985: 591). Quirk et al. note that the distinction between these two subcategories is not a hard one:
the distinction between maximizers and boosters is not a hard and fast one. In particular, when maximizers are in the middle position they often express a very high degree, whereas when they are in the end position they are more likely to convey their absolute meaning of extreme degree.

However, the criteria governing the use of maximizers and boosters are far from being obvious (see Bolinger 1972). Altenberg (1991: 129) provides a criterion to illustrate the basic difference between maximizers and boosters, i.e. their different attitudes towards the gradability of the intensified item:

Since maximizers express an absolute degree they are typically used to modify 'non scalar' items, i.e. items that do not normally permit grading (e.g. empty, impossible, wrong) or already contain a notion of extreme or absolute degree (e.g. disgusting, exhausted, huge, marvellous, etc.). Boosters (and most other intensifiers), on the other hand, typically modify 'scalar' items, i.e. that are fully gradable (cf. very beautiful/*completely beautiful and *very enormous/absolutely enormous)

In addition, amplifiers may be used in various syntactic constructions (see section 3.5.3.2 content disjuncts). Quirk et al. (1985: 595) state that in most cases amplifiers occur before the element they intensify (e.g. extremely different situation). However, as subjuncts they may also occur after the intensified word (e.g. I was extremely lucky…) or at the end of the clause (e.g. we did this completely).

Since the amplifiers included in the study are restricted to degree adverbs, extremely and totally have been selected from Quirk et al.'s (1985: 445) lists of maximizers and boosters. The analysis will focus on the most common syntactic constructions of extremely and totally together with their collocational restrictions.

Being a type of adverb, amplifiers (maximisers/boosters) - as noted earlier in chapter 3 - have been neglected in the field of Arabic linguistics (see 3.5.1.1). As far as degree adverbs are concerned in this study, Ryding (2005: 277) asserts that degree adverbs should constitute a substantial group of their own. In Arabic, as noted by Ryding (ibid), degree adverbs can be used in various syntactic constructions, the most common being:

A) Basic adverbs of degree
   1. فقط faqaţ 'only, solely'
faqaṭ is the most typically used expression of limitation in Arabic. faqaṭ is an adverb of degree that is invariable in form and accordingly, it ends with sukūn. In addition, faqaṭ is an adverb that occurs most commonly at the end of the phrase or clause it modifies (Ryding 2005: 278).

I watched a film one only
"I watched one film only"

B) Degree nouns and adjectives in the accusative

1. جَدٌّ jiddan 'very'

Like faqaṭ, the form of jiddan is invariable. jiddan takes the accusative case ending an. This adverb occurs very frequently in written Arabic and usually-unlike very in English- it occurs after the phrase it modifies. For example:

I watched a film one only
"I watched one film only"

"a very nice boy"

2. كَثِيرٌ kathīran 'much, a lot, greatly, a little bit, a little

I ate a lot
"I ate a lot"

I did not see my son for a long time and I miss him greatly"
3. تمامًا *tamāman* 'exactly, completely, totally'

**It must support the agreement completely** (Ryding 2005: 279)

4. خصوصًا *khsūṣan* 'especially'

**especially in what relates to policy**

5. مطلقا *muṭlaqan* 'absolutely'

**He absolutely cannot sleep**

C) Adverbial phrases of degree

These types of adverbial degree usually include two or more words. Ryding (2005: 280) provides examples of the most common types:

1. بالضبط *bi-al-ḍabt* 'exactly, precisely'

**This is exactly what I said.**
2. **bi-kathīr** 'by a great amount, much'

This type of adverbial phrase is usually used with comparison or contrast sentences. For example:

> يبدو أن هذا الكتاب أرخص بكثير من غيره (149)
> 
> 
> 
> "This book seems much cheaper than others"

3. **lā siyyamā** 'especially, particularly'

*lā siyyamā* is a phrase that literally means 'there is nothing similar', e.g.

> لاسيما هذه الأيام (150)
> 
> "especially these days"

4. **lilghāyah** 'extremely, to the utmost'

*lilghāyah* is an adverbial phrase of degree that means *extremely*.

> كانت النتيجة سيئة للغاية (151)
> 
> "The result was extremely bad"

Therefore, as shown from the above example, Ryding (2005: 277-280) classifies *lilghāyah* under adverbial phrases of degree, while *tamāman* under degree nouns and adjectives in the accusative.

In section 4.6.5.1, I will focus on this neglected issue in Arabic linguistics. In order to do so, I adopt the Martin and Rose (2003) taxonomy of graduation and explore how far it is applicable to the Arabic language. In the case of Arabic, I have combined *force* and *focus* as I believe they are closely related since sharpening words (e.g. *tamāman* and *lilghāyah*) can be used as tools or devices for turning the volume up. At the same time, softening words...
(e.g. naw’an mā and taqrīban 'approximately') are used to turn the volume down (see the following figure).

4.6.5.1 Extremely, totally, lilghāyah and tamāman

This section is concerned with the examination of the meaning and use of four maximisers of degree adverbs, i.e. extremely, totally and their Arabic counterparts, lilghāyah and tamāman. These adverbs, though regarded as synonyms in English and Arabic, are not identical in meaning and accordingly they are not interchangeable in all contexts. The analysis focuses on the collocations of the four adverbs and their connotations in identifying the differences between them. Following Bolinger (1972: 18), the most important
reason for studying degree adverbs lies in their unsettled nature. Johansson (1993: 46) points out that the unsettled nature of degree adverbs has led to the fact that the collocational behaviour of adverbs – in general – is particularly difficult to grasp:

Adverbs are no doubt the most heterogeneous of the traditional word classes. Syntactically, the patterns of co-occurrence are less marked than for other classes of lexical words.

Hence, I consider the study of such a phenomenon to be very useful as it explores the implicit meanings involved. Lakoff (1972: 195) illustrates this as “some of the most interesting questions are raised by the study of words whose meaning implicitly involves fuzziness” (Lakoff: ibid as cited in Channell 1994: 11).

Another reason for selecting this group of adverbs is that they are dictionary synonyms\textsuperscript{28}, i.e. ‘near synonyms’ (see chapter six). This section explores whether or not they are real synonyms by using corpus analysis. In order to investigate the degree of dis/similarity between \textit{extremely} and \textit{totally} as well as \textit{tamāman} and \textit{ilîghāyah}, one hundred concordance lines will be examined together with a statistical analysis of the most frequent collocates of the four degree adverbs under discussion.

I will use a span of one word to the left of the node and zero to the right of the node, i.e. (1:0), in order to analyse the immediate left collocates of \textit{extremely} and \textit{totally} as well as \textit{tamāman} and \textit{ilîghāyah} as shown in tables 5, 6, 8 and 9.

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Very} is translated as \textit{tamāman} and \textit{ilîghāyah} in AMMD (p. 1029), and EMD (p. 813), together with \textit{jiddan}. Both dictionaries present these words as synonyms without further guidance.
It was immediately noticeable that *extremely* collocates regularly with adjectives expressing 'difficulty and complexity'. These adverbs include difficult, hard, complex. As can be seen from table 5, the collocation *extremely difficult* has the highest score in BNC. It occurs 487 times in BNC with LLS of 1215.82 and it has the second highest score in I-EN.

Another particular feature of this intensifier is that it occurs with lexical items that are 'important, valuable and of certain 'influence'. These include important, useful, valuable, valuable, expensive, concerned, curious, effective, impressed, and helpful. (see extremely important in BNC and I-EN, table 5). On the other hand, totally useless, disabled, unnecessary are infrequently used in I-EN.

In addition, extremely - with its hyperbolic tone - appears with adjectives that belong to 'power and reliability' (e.g. powerful, strong, robust, reliable, courageous). Usually, extremely has a kind of powerful nature whilst totally does not (see totally dependent amongst the top ten collocates in table 6). Furthermore, extremely tends to go with adjectives that indicate 'deep/condensed' items (e.g. condensed, deep, detailed, and centralised).

To some extent, there is a reasonable balance between 'favourable' and 'unfavourable' items amongst extremely's collocates. For example, useful, well,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>I-EN</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>1215.82</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>1404.98</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>529.73</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>1290.12</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td>314.52</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>558.20</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rare</td>
<td>307.32</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>513.71</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>296.87</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>rare</td>
<td>508.33</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>213.82</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>useful</td>
<td>465.07</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>178.83</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>325.47</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex</td>
<td>145.33</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>273.10</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>142.45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>dangerous</td>
<td>241.85</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular</td>
<td>138.08</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>211.80</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: The top ten collocates of *extremely* in BNC and I-EN
valuable, popular, comfortable, successful, etc. against dangerous, hard, difficult, painful, risky).

There does not seem to be any particular collocational restriction in relation to personal/impersonal sentences or animate/inanimate subjects. In other words, extremely and totally occur with both personal (e.g. 152 &155) and impersonal sentences (e.g. 153& 156) as well as modifying animate (152 & 155) and inanimate objects (e.g. tiring day in 154 and different attitude in 156). Consider the following examples:

(152) "They were extremely aggressive" (I-EN, interview with Virginia Trioli, http://www.crikey.com.au/media/2002/02/17-triolireith.print.html)
(153) "There are other extremely rare complications" (BNC, A0J, Health promotion and education leaflets, natural sciences, 1991)
(154) "I realized an extremely long and tiring day" (BNC, A0F, Part of the furniture, W fict prose, 1991)
(155) "You're totally beautiful"(BNC, A0L, Jay loves Lucy, W fict prose, 1991)
(156) "It's a totally different attitude" (BNC, A4X, world affairs, W newsp, 1989)

Occasionally, extremely collocates with items that indicate 'luck', e.g. lucky and fortunate. The following table shows totally's top collocates in BNC and I-EN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>I-EN</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>different</td>
<td>800.43</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>different</td>
<td>739.94</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>186.06</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>268.31</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unacceptable</td>
<td>181.09</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>unacceptable</td>
<td>192.86</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>155.40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>unrelated</td>
<td>176.56</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unexpected</td>
<td>124.37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>ignore</td>
<td>176.41</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignore</td>
<td>119.07</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>131.75</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrong</td>
<td>113.73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>unaware</td>
<td>114.63</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suitable</td>
<td>100.68</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>111.00</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destroy</td>
<td>97.96</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>wrong</td>
<td>88.71</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of</td>
<td>89.42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>honest</td>
<td>83.21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: The top ten collocates of totally in BNC and I-EN
It is obvious that *totally*, but not *extremely*, tends to occur with adjectives that have the negative prefix *un/in/ir* [e.g. in BNC, *unacceptable* (61 occurrences and 181.09 LLS) *inadequate* (59 occurrences and 155.40 LLS)]. There are also instances of *unexpected, unsuitable, unaware, unnecessary, unrelated irrelevant, and irresponsible*. Other examples are found in figure 17 below.

![Figure 17](image)

*One more important sub-group consists of items expressing unfavourable items. In other words, though totally can collocate with positive items (like *honest, suitable, agree*), totally was found to premodify more items – than extreme's collocates – expressing negative attitude, e.g. *ignore, destroy, commit, wrong, confuse, lose*. In BNC, for example, there is completely sensitive, but not *extremely insensitive* and totally insensitive, but not totally sensitive. In addition, in I-EN, we can find totally unsuccessful but not totally successful, while in BNC there is extremely successful, but not extremely unsuccessful.*

*Totally, was also found as an intensifier of slang words for good, okay, e.g. cool, awesome. There are also instances of totally associates with bogus, suck, fuck, freak. Totally collocates with another group of lexical item that belongs to 'changes and differences' more than similarities. For example, while totally different has the highest collocate in BNC and I-EN, there is not a single instance of extremely different in the collocational items of BNC or the concordance lines under analysis. There is only one example in the concordance lines of I-EN: "would be extremely different". Perhaps also the*
collocation *totally new* (139 occurrences in I-EN and 111.00 LLS) can be classified under the group 'changes and differences'.

Although there are 5 occurrences of *totally agree* in the 100 concordance lines of I-EN, *totally* appears with 'opposite and rejecting' items, e.g. *against, anti, disagree, contradict, oppose, reject, opposite, unacceptable.*

It is also noticeable that *totally*, but not *extremely*, can be followed by a verb. For examples:

(157) "When he *totally cut* the scene" (BNC, A12, A ballet-maker's handbook, W non ac humanities art, 1991)

(158) "which made him *totally accept* his mission" (BNC, A3F, social science, W newsp, 1989)

(159) "which he *totally supported*"


(160) "He *totally rejects* her"


On the other hand, the concordance lines of BNC and I-EN do not show any examples of *extremely + verb*. The pattern (*totally + v.*) is more frequently used in I-EN than BNC.

Infrequently, *totally* may occur in final position, e.g.

(161) "on which the staff come to rely *totally*" (BNC, AOC, Caterer and Hotelkeeper, W misc., 1991)

Unlike *extremely*, it is even possible for *totally* to go with a preposition, e.g. *with, at, to, out of, against, beyond*:

(162) "She *adored* him and tied her life up *totally with* his" (BNC, A0L, Jay loves Lucy, W fict prose, 1991).

(163) "So I was *totally at* her mercy"


*Totally*, but not *extremely*, collocates frequently with words expressing 'absence or lacking something' (e.g. *accentless, bald, devoid, groundless, ignored, invisible, painless, out of, lacking, blind*). Sometimes when *totally* is – infrequently – followed by a positive quality, e.g. *settled*, it is preceded by the negative particle *not*, i.e. in this particular case, *totally* is an intensifier that rarely intensifies 'good' qualities, but often negates them, as in the following example:

(164) "Her position had improved but was *not totally settled*" (BNC,
However, this is not always the case. A positive item can follow *totally* without any previous negative particle, e.g.

(165) "he developed a *totally* new technique for studying" (BNC, A1W, world affairs, W newsp, 1989)

The occurrences of collocational restrictions and syntactic constructions of *extremely* and *totally* are summarised in table 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocational restrictions &amp; syntactic constructions</th>
<th>extremely</th>
<th>totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>absence</td>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>![✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favourable items</td>
<td>![✓] ![x]</td>
<td>![✗] ![✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficult items</td>
<td>![✓] ![x]</td>
<td>![✗]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power</td>
<td>![✓] ![x]</td>
<td>![✗]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes &amp; differences</td>
<td>![✗] ![x]</td>
<td>![✓] ![✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposing</td>
<td>![✗] ![x]</td>
<td>![✓] ![✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luck</td>
<td>![✓] ![x]</td>
<td>![✗] ![x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high interest &amp; importance</td>
<td>![✓] ![x]</td>
<td>![✗] ![x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in/animate</td>
<td>![✓] ![x]</td>
<td>![✓] ![✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slang words</td>
<td>![✗] ![x]</td>
<td>![✓] ![✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>im/personal sentences</td>
<td>![✓] ![x]</td>
<td>![✓] ![✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final position</td>
<td>![✗] ![x]</td>
<td>![✓] ![✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before v.</td>
<td>![✗] ![x]</td>
<td>![✓] ![✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before prep.</td>
<td>![✗] ![x]</td>
<td>![✓] ![✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before negative prefix <code>un/in/ir</code></td>
<td>![✗] ![x]</td>
<td>![✓] ![✓]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: The distribution of *extremely* and *totally* according to their collocational restrictions and syntactic constructions

Like *totally* and extremely, *tamāman* and *ilghāyah* will be analysed in terms of their collocational restrictions as shown in tables 8 and 9 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocates</th>
<th>I-AR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Al-H</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLS</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td></td>
<td>LLS</td>
<td>Joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mukhtalif</strong></td>
<td>different</td>
<td>1238.34</td>
<td>666</td>
<td><strong>mukhtalifah</strong></td>
<td>different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'aks</strong></td>
<td>opposite</td>
<td>750.62</td>
<td>366</td>
<td><strong>marfuул</strong></td>
<td>unaccepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mughayir</strong></td>
<td>different</td>
<td>348.93</td>
<td>128</td>
<td><strong>ya'rif</strong></td>
<td>he knows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>wadih</strong></td>
<td>obvious</td>
<td>298.95</td>
<td>187</td>
<td><strong>al-wadih</strong></td>
<td>the obvious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>yakhtalif</strong></td>
<td>differ</td>
<td>256.20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td><strong>radiyah</strong></td>
<td>satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>takhtalif</strong></td>
<td>differ</td>
<td>176.67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td><strong>al-wadih</strong></td>
<td>obvious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>khalin</strong></td>
<td>empty</td>
<td>166.71</td>
<td>94</td>
<td><strong>yatanaqad</strong></td>
<td>oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>muqtani'</strong></td>
<td>convinced</td>
<td>145.33</td>
<td>62</td>
<td><strong>tudrik</strong></td>
<td>realize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>naqiql</strong></td>
<td>opposite</td>
<td>144.28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td><strong>mukhtalif</strong></td>
<td>different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>marfuул</strong></td>
<td>rejected</td>
<td>136.98</td>
<td>58</td>
<td><strong>na'rif</strong></td>
<td>we know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: The immediate left top ten collocates of *tamāman*

Obviously, the first interesting thing to notice about the intensifier *tamāman* is that it collocates with words that denote ‘differences and changes’ – which is very similar to its counterpart, i.e. *totally*. As shown in table 8 *mukhtalif* and *mukhtalifah* 'different' have the highest collocate in I-AR as well as Al-H. *tamāman* occurs mostly with adjectives and verbs (whether in the masculine form or in the feminine form) that mean ‘different’ or ‘to differ’ [e.g. *mughayir* (sing. masc. adj.), *mukhtalif* (sing. masc. adj.), *mukhtalifah* (sing. fem. adj.), *yakhtalif* (sing. masc. v.), *takhtalif* (sing. fem. v.) – they are underlined in table 8.
Table 8 also shows that tamāman is a kind of intensifier that prefers to highlight lexical words that indicate 'opposites', i.e. 'aks 'opposite' (n.), naqi'īd 'opposite' (n.), marfuḍ (sing. masc. adj.) and yatanāqaḍ (sing. masc. v.). In addition, tamāman modifies items that denote 'knowledge and realization', e.g. ya'rif 'he knows', na'rif 'we know' and tudrik 'she/it realizes' as shown in the top ten collocates in Al-H corpus in table 8.

Like totally, tamāman goes with another sub-group that refers to 'absence'. As shown in table 8, tamāman collocates with khālin (sing. masc. adj.) 'empty'. Moreover, in the concordance lines of Al-H and I-AR corpora, there are more instances of items that denote absence or lacking something, e.g. gha'bah 'absent', khāliyah 'empty' (sing. fem. adj.), mūliyat 'had been erased' nusiyat 'had been forgotten', āmā 'blind', ba'idah 'unrelated' (as in unrelated concepts), nāqi's 'incomplete', ma'zīl 'isolated'.

Table 8 does not provide enough evidence of the unfavourable tendency of tamāman; the concordance lines show a mixture of favourable and unfavourable collocates. However, like totally, tamāman is likely to modify negative objects more than positive ones. In other words, in most cases, tamāman intensifies the negative attitude towards unfavourable items; it collocates with negative adjectives like: khāji 'mistaken', marfūḍ 'unaccepted', ājiz 'unable', āmā 'blind', mu'timah 'dark', munhārah 'collapsed', mudammar 'damaged', gharib 'eccentric', ghāmiyūd 'ambiguous', mutakhallifah 'undeveloped'. It also modifies unfavourable nouns and verbs like: ār 'shame' and dhull 'humiliation', tafshal 'it fails'. Infrequently, tamāman collocates with positive items, e.g. wādih 'obvious' (see table 8), matīnah 'strong', sahīh 'right'.

In most examples, the pattern (tamāman + ك ka / كما kamā / مثل mithla / مثلما mithlamā 'as/like') is used in the concordance lines of tamāman. For example:

(Lughatayn Mukhtalifatayn) (Al-H, PIJ, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ar</th>
<th>fa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lughatayn</td>
<td>mukhtalifatayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two languages</td>
<td>different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamāman</td>
<td>totally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka</td>
<td>al-'arabiyah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa</td>
<td>wa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as the Arabic and al-fārisiyah
"Two totally different languages as Arabic and Persian"

In this example, the meaning of tamāman is accompanied by other shades of meaning, i.e. resemblance and comparison. Sometimes, when tamāman is followed by a 'likening particle' – mentioned above – it can be interpreted as totally or exactly, depending on the propositional content. Consider the following example:

(167)

و أنت وحيدك الآن تماماً كما كنت دائماً

(Al-H, BFHB, 2000)

wa anta waḥdaka al-ān
and you alone now

tamāman kamā kunta
totally/exactly as you were
dā’iman always

In this example, the translation of tamāman depends on its position in the sentence, i.e. if tamāman lies at the end of the first clause (wa anta waḥdaka al-ān tamāman) and in this case tamāman intensifies waḥdaka 'being alone', it is translated as: "and now you are totally alone as you always were". The other interpretation is that when there is a kind of pause after the first clause and tamāman comes at the beginning of the second clause: "and now you are alone...exactly as you always were" and in this case tamāman intensifies what follows: (tamāman kamā kunta dā’iman) 'exactly as you always were'. So the translation relies on whether tamāman intensifies what is before 'totally' or what is after 'exactly'.

Another typical construction is (tamāman + prep., e.g. من min/ عن ‘an ‘from’, في fi ‘in’, ب bi/ مع ma’a ‘with’)

(168)

و هي تختلف تماماً عن محطة تلفزيون أم بي سي

(Al-H, FVJ, 2000)
Frequently, \textit{tamāman} occurs in final position. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Arabic adverbs, unlike English ones, usually intensify the item before them (see examples 169 and 170).

\begin{quote}
و كانت كل هذه المشاريع شرعية تماما (169)
\end{quote}

(Al-H, RJM, 2000)

\begin{quote}
wa kānat kull ħadhihi al-mashāri‘
and were all these projects
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
shar‘iyah tamāman
legal totally
\end{quote}

"and all these projects were totally legal"

\begin{quote}
فالخيار متروك له تماما (170)
\end{quote}

(Al-H, EES, 2000)

\begin{quote}
fa al-khiyār mattrīk lahu tamāman
so the choice is left for him totally
\end{quote}

"So it is totally for him to choose"

Regarding inanimate objects and im/personal sentences, \textit{tamāman} typically occurs with both animate (see underlined items in 171) and inanimate (as in 170) objects. 171 is an example of \textit{tamāman} with a personal subject.

\begin{quote}
سترينه انسان آخر تماما (171)
\end{quote}

(I-AR, \url{http://www.halfcup.net/mag/?p=32})

\begin{quote}
sataraynahu insān ākhar tamāman
you will see him man another totally
\end{quote}

"you will see a totally different man"
Table 9: The immediate left top ten collocates of *lilghāyah*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocates</th>
<th>I-AR LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>Collocates</th>
<th>Al-H LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>صعبِ sā'b</td>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>1106.9</td>
<td>صعبة sayyi'ah</td>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>207.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مهم muhim</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>653.34</td>
<td>مهم muhim</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>113.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سيء sayyi'</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>417.65</td>
<td>خطير khaṭīr</td>
<td>dangerous</td>
<td>87.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خطير khaṭīr</td>
<td>dangerous</td>
<td>321.57</td>
<td>صعبِ sā'b</td>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>87.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>محدود maḥdūd</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>311.11</td>
<td>صعبة sayyi'ah</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>81.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بسيط basīṭ</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td>277.87</td>
<td>صعبِ sā'b</td>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>80.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جيد jayyid</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>219.13</td>
<td>مهمة muhimah</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>64.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هام hām</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>183.89</td>
<td>إيجابية ijābiyyah</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>55.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حساس ḥassas</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>162.79</td>
<td>محدودة maḥdūdah</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>53.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>معقد mu'aqqad</td>
<td>complex</td>
<td>162.10</td>
<td>صناعة ʿa'īlah</td>
<td>verysmall/ minor</td>
<td>53.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (9) shows the other appraiser intensifier, *lilghāyah*, which tends to place emphasis on collocates that are obviously different than the previous collocates of *tamāman*. *lilghāyah* occurs - almost equally - with both positive (e.g. جيد jayyid 'good' and بسيط basīṭ 'simple') and negative (e.g. سيء sayyi' 'bad' and معقد mu'aqqad 'complex') items. The strongest collocate of *lilghāyah* appears to be صعبِ sā'b 'difficult' (sing. masc.) in I-AR, which has the highest LLS of 1106.9. Similarly, the most frequently used collocate in Al-H corpus is صعبة sayyi'ah 'difficult' (sing. fem.) as shown in table 9. While *tamāman* (table 8) has shown to be an intensifier of nouns, verbs and adjectives, *lilghāyah* amplifies only adjectives (see table 9). However, there are instances in the concordance lines where *lilghāyah* intensifies verbs, e.g.

(Al-H, DIX, 2000)

wa  ناحترمهم لغاية  \(172\)

"and we extremely respect them"
Unlike *tamāman*, the analysis of the concordance lines reveals that *lilghāyah* qualifies emotional words like حساس *ḥassās* 'sensitive' that occurs 74 times in I-AR and has LLS of 162.79. It also occurs with other emotional lexical items, such as مسرور *masrūr* 'happy' (LLS = 42.66 and J=17), and مقلق *muqliq* 'worrisome' (LLS = 43.08 and J = 16).

In contrast with *tamāman*, there is only one example in Al-H and I-AR where *lilghāyah* is followed by *kamā* 'as':

ان أسعار الفنادق رخيصة للغاية كما هو الحال في كل الفنادق الشعبية (173)
(Al-H, HNX, 2000)

*inna* asْ'ār al-fanādiq rakhiyāh
it is prices the hotels cheap

*lilghāyah* kamā huwa al-ḥāl
extremely *as* it is the case

*fi* kull al-fanādiq al-sha'biyāh
in every the hotels the public

"The prices of hotels are extremely cheap as in every public hotel"

Like *tamāman*, *lilghāyah* is commonly used in final position:

و أجد ذلك مشجعا للغاية (174)
(Al-H, FRY, 2000)

*wa* ajidu dhālika mushajji‘an
and I find this encouraging

*lilghāyah*
extremely

"and I consider this extremely encouraging"

The concordance lines of Al-H and I-AR present *lilghāyah* as frequently used with prepositions, e.g. من *min* 'from', عن *‘an* 'about', في *fi* 'in', على *‘alā* 'on/for'. For example:

كما تحدث في شكل ايجابي للغاية عن حسان حطاب (175)
(Al-H, FQW, 2000)

*kamā* taḥaddath *fi* shakl
also talked in a way
ijābī līlghāyah ‘an Ḥassān
positive extremely about Hassan
Ḥattāb
Hattab

"Also he talked in an extremely positive way about Hassan Hattab"

In respect of inanimate objects and impersonal subjects, both corpora contain a variety of examples of both sub-groups. Sentences with the adverb of place هناك "there is' present an impersonal subject in Arabic:

(Al-H, JXQ, 2000)
hunāka iqbāl shadid līlghāyah
there is a demand strong extremely
‘ālā al-dhahab al-baḥrīnī
for the gold the Bahranian

"There is an extremely strong demand for Bahranian gold"

With its hyperbolic tone, līlghāyah intensifies, in general, objects that represent the utmost degree or point, e.g.

(Al-H, DFS, 2000)
khasā’ir fādiḥah līlghāyah
damages catastrophic extremely

"extremely catastrophic damages"

Obviously, if tamāman were substituted for līlghāyah in this example, it would not indicate the same extreme degree as līlghāyah.

A summary of the most common occurrences of collocational restrictions and syntactic constructions of tamāman and līlghāyah is provided in table 10 below.
Collocational restrictions & syntactic constructions | tamāman | lilghāyah
---|---|---
changes & differences | ✔ | ✗
difficulty & importance | ✗ | ✔
emotional items | ✗ | ✔
absence | ✔ | ✗
favourable items | ✔ | ✗ | ✔ | ✗
hyperbolic tone | ✗ | ✔
opposing items | ✔ | ✗
inanimate/im/personal | ✔ | ✔
before likening particles | ✔ | ✗
before prep. | ✔ | ✔
final position | ✔ | ✔

Table 10: The distribution of tamāman and lilghāyah according to their collocational restrictions and syntactic constructions

Though Arabic and English are very different languages, the analysis reveals remarkable similarities with respect to degree adverbs. Thus, while totally different is frequently used in BNC and I-EN, its Arabic equivalent mukhtalif tamāman is commonly used in Al-H and I-AR. In addition, there is an obvious similarity between the occurrences of extremely difficult and sa'b lilghāyah. The following table will sum up more similarities and differences between totally and tamāman as well as extremely and lilghāyah. Thus, table 11 will combine tables 7 and 10 together in order to outline when these pairs can be possible translations of each other and when they cannot.
### Table 11: Dis/similarities between totally & tamāman and extremely & lilghāyah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>points of dis/similarities</th>
<th>totally/tamāman</th>
<th>extremely/lilghāyah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>changes &amp; differences</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulty &amp; importance</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favourable items</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyperbolic tone</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposing items</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>im/personal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before prep.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final position</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Keynote to table 11: ✓ = Both items share the same collocational restriction.
★ = Both items do NOT share the same collocational restriction.
✗ = One item shares the collocational restriction, while the other does not.
4.7 Conclusion

An outline of the main subtypes of ‘appraisal’ has been presented in this chapter. Appraisal theory subcategorises evaluative resources into three broad semantic domains: *Attitude*, *Engagement* and *Graduation*. However, it is important to note that these three options of appraisal operate in parallel. In other words, they are all selected at the same time, since expressing an attitude requires a degree of intensification and an identification of its source.

The analysis reveals that *extremely*, *totally*, *tamāman*, and *lilghāyah* tend to be collocationally restricted to a semantic class of items. Though *mukhtalīf lilghāyah* ‘extremely different’ looks possible for the native speaker of Arabic, the corpus analysis reveals that it is much more normal to say: *mukhtalīf tamāman*, a fact that even the native Arabic speaker might not be aware of.

It should also be emphasised that, in terms of modality, Martin and Rose (2003: 48) have introduced appraisal in relation to *Graduation* (amplification) and, at the same time, it is discussed as a subcategory and a source of *Engagement*, which is the second dimension of appraisal – see chapter 5.
Chapter Five

Modality in English and Arabic

5.1 Introduction

As indicated in the previous chapter, ‘modality’ is a device for achieving appraisal. Whereas Fairclough (2003: 164) regards appraisal as an author’s commitment to "what is desirable or undesirable", he refers to modality as an author’s commitment to "what is true and what is necessary". As Thompson (2004: 75) explains: “In discussing modality, we have moved from strictly grammatical issues (e.g. modal operators functioning as finite) towards areas which are more difficult to pin down in structural terms”.

This chapter starts by laying out some general background on modality by clarifying its scope and definition (see 5.2). It also explores the different meanings of English and Arabic modal verbs, with special focus on modals that indicate ‘possibility’ and ‘necessity’ in the English and Arabic languages and, in turn, on the two main categories of modality that deal with possibility and necessity: epistemic and deontic. ‘Possibility’ and ‘necessity’ receive this focus because they have attracted much attention and discussion in the field of translation. In addition, the relation between modality and auxiliaries is explained in this section. 5.3 then handles the criteria of English modals. In 5.4, two different theoretical approaches to the English modals are introduced. A survey of some of the most important studies of English modals is provided in 5.5, followed by a short survey of Arabic modal studies in 5.6. The aim of this chapter is to deal with the principal issues involved in the translation of English modal auxiliaries into MSA. I will use simple and general examples to illustrate the function and semantics of English modal auxiliaries.

5.2 The Scope and Definition of Modality

Being both a philosophical and a linguistic concept, modality has been a constant focus of study since Aristotle. The body of work on modality by
linguists and philosophers provides evidence of the continuing interest it still attracts, as well as the study that it still requires. Lyons (1981a: 235-6) argues that much work in semantics and pragmatics has serious defects because there is not sufficient focus on the concept of modality. He also highlights the importance of modality in interpreting the syntax of languages. The grammatical structure of any language is strongly related to the notion of ‘subjectivity of utterance’, which is a crucial issue in modality (ibid: 241).

Perkins (1983:1) and Palmer (1990: 2) believe that it is not easy to provide a simple and clearly definable definition of modality. Hermeren (1978: 9) states that the difficulty of finding a satisfactory definition of modality emerges from the fact that the term ‘modality’ has been employed in the tracing of many different languages. Palmer (1979: 4) describes modality as a ‘semantic’ term and says: “…I shall use it in this book to refer to the meaning of the modals. It is not necessary to define precisely what kinds of meaning are involved. We take the formal category as our starting point, and it is sufficient for our purpose that the meanings involved are such as to justify characterising them as ‘modality’’. Palmer points here to the categorical approach that he adopts in the study of modality. Coates (1983: 9) refers to Palmer’s strategy as a monosemantic approach (see 5.4).

In this thesis, the term ‘modality’ is concerned with the grammatical and semantic concepts that are marked by English modal verbs, but not with modality as a general notion. The relation between modals and modality is a relation between grammatical form and content (or meaning) as “it is clearly one of those semantic-syntactic categories” (Palmer 1979: 1).

It would be unsatisfactory, perhaps even impossible, to study modality under a purely formal, syntactic approach without understanding the semantic characteristics that modality implies. At the same time, a purely semantic study of modality cannot be regarded as a sufficient approach on its own. It is sometimes argued that the semantic features of the language being described fundamentally depend on the formal/grammatical features of that language, and thus the formal analysis is held to be more basic in the study of modality. So, both form and meaning must be considered (Jespersen 1924: 56; Palmer 1979: 2).
Despite believing in the vital role of semantics in any study of language, Perkins (1983: 19) highlights the importance of analysing the syntactic elements for a full understanding of a language:

Discussion of modality in linguistics has, therefore, been concerned almost exclusively with the syntactic class of modal auxiliary verbs, or ‘modals’, which constitutes the only formally coherent class of modal expressions in English.

A modal verb is a type of auxiliary verb that is used to mark modality. There are four types of auxiliary verb in English: be, have, do, and modals. An auxiliary verb is also called a ‘helping verb’, a ‘display helper verb’, or a ‘verbal auxiliary’. It is used to give further semantic and syntactic information about the main or full verb following it. There is a syntactic difference between an auxiliary verb and a full verb – that is, the grammatical functions of auxiliary and full verbs are dissimilar. In English, there are verbs that can be regarded as either auxiliary or full verbs, such as ‘be’ (I am teaching a lesson) vs. (I am a teacher). Sometimes the function of ‘be’ is ambiguous whether it is auxiliary or not – for example, “the ice-cream was melted” could mean either “Someone/something melted the ice cream” (in which ‘melt’ would be the main verb), or ‘the ice-cream was mostly liquid’ (in which ‘be’ would be the main verb).

I will not go into any further details, as the present study does not concern auxiliaries in general. The aim here is to show the relation between modality and auxiliaries.

5.3 Criteria for identifying modals

Palmer (1979: 180; 1990: 201), Hermeren (1978: 59) and Coates (1983: 4) point out further reasonable grounds for distinguishing between auxiliary and main verbs. Yet, as Palmer (1979: 181) describes the situation, there is no clear dividing line between them if we rely solely on semantic or grammatical characteristics:

It is, then, perfectly reasonable to adopt the purely formal characteristic of the ‘NICE’ properties to divide the dubious,

30 For more details about modality and auxiliaries see:
indeterminate cases and to use to determine otherwise important but ‘fuzzy’ distinctions. In this sense, the ‘NICE’ properties are not the basic reasons for distinguishing auxiliary and main verb; these are to be found elsewhere. But, they clearly provide the final test for the decision (Palmer 1979: 181).

Palmer (1979) adopts the acronym ‘NICE’ from Huddleston (1976: 333), which stands for ‘Negation, Inversion, Code, Emphasis’. In what follows, I will briefly outline the NICE properties of English auxiliaries and relate them to modal meanings and expressions in Arabic.

a. Negation
In English, negation occurs after the modal verb, the negative marker not cannot follow a main verb, e.g. "You must not play". In Arabic, it is unacceptable, in such cases, to put the negative marker lā after yajibu, cf. yajibu lā tal'ab. However, in a particular case, lā can follow yajibu but not immediately, i.e. they are separated by an (that in English). Thus the negation pattern in the case of the modal verb yajibu can be (lā + yajibu) or (yajibu + an + lā).

b. Inversion
In the construction of interrogative sentences in English, modal verbs can be inverted without do, e.g. "may I go?". On the other hand, in Arabic, the modal adverb rubbamā – an equivalent to may – cannot take an initial position in interrogative sentences.

c. Code
Another characteristic of modal verbs in English is 'code', which often has the pattern '...and so'. The verb phrase may be ellipted and picked up by a modal verb, e.g. "she can sing and so can her daughter". In Arabic, the pattern '...and so can' can be substituted by wa kadālika 'and also' followed by ibnatuhā 'her daughter' without repeating the modal verb.

d. Emphasis
Putting emphasis on modal verbs is the fourth characteristic of NICE, e.g. "I CAN do it". However, this criterion is not commonly found in MSA.

Coates (1983: 4) comments on Huddleston’s four criteria: “they very clearly draw a dividing line between auxiliaries and main verbs, a line which would be far from clear if we tried to use semantic characteristics”. In addition to
these four criteria, Coates adds three more characteristics that are specifically ‘modal’ ones:

- No -s form for third person singular (cans, musts).
- No non-finite forms (to can, musting).
- No co-occurrence (may will).

Hermeren (1978: 60), on the other hand, divides the criteria of modality into two types: morphological criteria, which are concerned with (potential) inflectional and derivational changes in the word; and syntactic criteria, which include the relationship of a word with other words in the context. An asterisk (*) is used to indicate that a word is unacceptable.

- **Morphological criteria:**
  
  (1) The lack of the –s marker of the third person singular present tense:
  
  a. (He/she) may play; cf. *(He/she) mays play
  
  The absence of an –s form is thus a remarkable feature of a modal.

  (2) The lack of non-finite forms – i.e. the infinitive, the present and past participle:
  
  a. *(To) may vote is one of the school regulations; cf. to be allowed to vote is one of the school regulations.
  
  Palmer (1974:19) refers to the modal verbs ‘to will’ and ‘to shall’ as being a ‘linguistic joke’.
  
  b. *(He) (is canning) swim skillfully; cf. He can swim skillfully.

  (3) Modals have contracted negative forms with (n’t):
  
  a. He can’t sleep; cf. *He wantn’t (to) sleep. vs. He doesn’t want to sleep.
  
  Palmer (1974: 21) points out that there is a slight problem with ‘may’. The negative form (*mayn’t) cannot be used and instead (may not) is used.
  
  b. *(She mayn’t stay; cf. she may not stay.

  (4) The absence of nominals:
  
  a. *David’s can-ness. *David’s can-ity; cf. David’s ability.
• **Syntactic criteria:**

(1) Modals are stressed to indicate what Palmer’s (1974: 24-5) refers to as ‘emphatic affirmation’. Emphatic affirmation is marked by the accent upon the modal verb without using the syntactic construction ‘do’:

a. I cán swim. (You are wrong to think I cannot.)

b. *I do can swim; cf. I DID swim. (You are wrong to think I did not.)

(2) Palmer (1974: 22) regards inversion as an important test of an auxiliary, i.e. whether the auxiliary can come first before the subject. In this case, interrogative sentences are considered the most common type involving inversion without ‘do’ periphrasis.

a. Should children play outside?; cf. Do children need to play outside?

(3) Modal verbs do not occur in an imperative form:

a. *Should listen; cf. listen! Do listen.

(4) Modal verbs appear in initial position in the verb phrase, regardless of how much they are expanded:

a. *Sonia may dare to want to come now. *Sonia wants to may leave the room; cf. Sonia wants to be permitted to leave the room. *She does have left the room (Hermeren, 1978: 63).

Modals can also stand independently, and the rest of the phrase can be deduced from the context, e.g. ‘May the boys play outside?’ ...‘Yes, they may’. In this context, it is known that the rest of the sentence is ‘play outside’.

(5) Modals do not occur successively:

a. *The girl should can visit the museum; cf. b. she should be allowed to visit it.

(6) Modals always come before the infinitive (including ‘be’ and ‘have’) without the infinitive (to):

a. He should finish by August; cf. *He might to have to finish by August.
Finally, Hermere (1978: 62) and Quirk et al. (1972: 84) state that modals like shall, will, can, and may are present forms, and have past forms should, would, could and might.

a. The baby may cry now. The baby might cry now; cf.

   The baby has to cry now. The baby had to cry now.

However, there are problems for Heremeren and Quirk et al.’s claims regarding the present and past forms of modals, especially with shall and should. For example, ‘I should go to Paris’ is not the past form of ‘I shall go to Paris’ as ‘should’ indicates obligation and cannot be analysed as the past form of ‘shall’ in this context. Hermeren also believes that ‘must’ does not have a special past form. For example, in direct speech we can say:

b. He says: “I must go”; and he said: “I must go”

Hermere (1978: 63) concludes that ‘shall, should, will, would, can, could, may, might and must are often referred to as ‘central’ modals when they share the above criteria. On the other hand, modals like dare, need, have, and used to are regarded as ‘marginal’ modals. Both these terms were later used by Mindt (2000: 116) in his classification of English modals (see 5.5.6).

5.4 Theoretical Considerations

Grammarians are divided into two groups as far as ‘modal verbs’ or ‘modals’ are concerned: ‘joiners’ and ‘splitters’. The first group believes that the meanings of ‘modal verbs’ (e.g. must) are explained as pragmatic variations of one basic concept. The second group (splitters) split each modal verb into many different senses.

Coates (1983: 9-10), accordingly, classifies the study of English modals into two approaches: ‘monosemy’ versus ‘polysemy’. The classification is based on the type of approach adopted by the writer: a monosemantic or polysemantic approach. The best known representatives of the monosemantic approach are Joos (1964) and Ehrman (1966), who emphasise a ‘basic meaning’ for each modal. This meaning should be connected to all functional uses of a modal and, hence, the monosemantic strategy separates itself implicitly from a strict
categorical model. That is why the monosemantic approach is called a ‘non-categorical approach’. On the other hand, the polysemantic approach is considered to be a ‘categorical approach’ as it deals with distinct categories. Leech (1969, 1971) and Palmer (1974, 1979) provide good examples of this approach.

Coates holds that neither of the two approaches are ‘wholly satisfactory’ because of the problems with which Ehrman (1966) and Palmer (1979) struggle: “Ehrman has difficulty in assigning a basic meaning to MAY and is forced to postulate ‘a continuum characterised by two dimensions of meaning’ (22); she frankly acknowledges defeat with SHOULD (59)” (Coates 1983: 9). On the other hand, Palmer (1979: 40), who applies a categorical approach, admits that ‘the overall picture’ of the modals is extremely ‘messy’ and ‘untidy’.

To clarify, it is not the aim of this thesis to adopt or exclude a monosemantic or a polysemantic approach. However, the analysis of data (modals) indicates that a combination of both categorical and non-categorical approaches cannot be avoided in order to achieve a satisfactory description of the modals.

5.5 A Survey of Some of the Most Important Studies of the English Modals

A number of linguists have studied English modals with special emphasis on the semantic and the syntactic aspects of these modals. It is useful to highlight early contributions from distinguished linguists on the study of modality. This survey will provide both background and support for the corpus-based approach adopted in this study.

5.5.1 Aristotle (350 B.C.)

In considering English modals it is useful to go back to the philosophical views of Aristotle on modality as this represents the first written account of this subject. Aristotle’s main concern was the interpretation of ‘necessity’, ‘possibility’ and ‘impossibility’, and the relation between them. These three dimensions form the foundation of modal logic, which is considered to be one of
the central branches of logic (Perkins 1983: 6). In addition, it must be clear that the study of modality is connected to the study of logical proof and, accordingly, to the study of the foundations of mathematics. This kind of relevance rises from what Von Wright (1951: 4) called, “the case of the intuitionist approach to the foundation problems”.

In this research, I will leave aside ‘modality’ as a central issue in the study of ‘intuitionist logic' in philosophy, and focus on modality as a major concept in linguistics.

5.5.2 Jespersen (1924)

Jespersen (1924) was the first scholar to present a list of sub-categories of attitude. He classified them into two major sections, the first set containing an element of will, and the second containing no element of will.

1. **Containing an element of will**
   - Jussive                  go (command)
   - Compulsive              he has to go
   - Obligative              he ought to go/we should go
   - Advisory                you should go
   - Precative               go, please
   - Hortative               let us go
   - Permissive              you may go, if you like
   - Promissive              I will go/ it shall be done
   - Optative (realisable)   may he still be alive
   - Desiderative (unrealisable) would he were still alive
   - Intentional             in order that he may go

2. **Containing no element of will**
   - Apodictive              twice two must be (is necessarily) four
   - Necessitativa            he must be rich (or he could not spend so much)
   - Assertive               he is rich
   - Presumptive             he is probably rich/ he would (will) know
   - Dubitative              he may be (is perhaps rich)
Potential he can speak  
Conditional if he is rich  
Hypothetical if he were rich  
Concessional though he is rich

The most significant part of Jespersen’s classification, for the purpose of this study, is the distinction between ‘epistemic’ and ‘deontic’ modality (which will be discussed in the next section 5.5.3). While, the first list of “Containing an element of will” corresponds to deontic modality, the second list correlates to ‘epistemic modality’. These two types of modality will be the focus of the discussion of the present chapter.

5.5.3 Von Wright (1951)
The term ‘modality’ is usually attached to the name of Von Wright (1951), the first scholar to distinguish between the four modes in modal logic:

1. Alethic modes, or the modes of truth. This term is derived from the Greek word *aletheia* (truth). This kind of mode has been considered the main concern of logicians. However, “it has little place in ordinary language” (Palmer 1990: 6). The main function of this mode is to consider the proposition to be true or not true.

2. Epistemic modes or modes of knowing. The main epistemic modalities are: (a) verified (known to be true), (b) falsified (known to be false), and (c) undecided (neither known to be true nor known to be false).

3. Deontic modes or modes of obligation. There are three basic deontic modalities: (a) obligatory (*must*), (b) permitted (*may*), and (c) forbidden (*must not*).

4. Existential modes or modes of existence. Von Wright (1951: 2) admits that this mode is not considered a branch of modal logic as it belongs to quantification theory. Yet, he agrees that there are significant similarities between the existential mode and the other three modes.

Von Wright (ibid) puts these modes in a table for the purpose of interpreting their structures, and uses them to defend the quantification theory. On the other hand, Palmer (1990: 6) makes it clear that the alethic and existential modality
are more the logician’s concern than the linguist’s: “the aim of the linguist must be simply to investigate the kind of modalities that are clearly recognisable in language and the system which they exhibit”. This is one reason for ignoring the existential and the alethic modes and focussing on the epistemic and the deontic modes in this study. Another reason is that ‘necessity’ and ‘possibility’ – which are the main concern of this research – are found more in the epistemic and deontic modes than in the other two. In addition, the relation between the epistemic and deontic modality is clearly based on the link between possibility and necessity. Lyons (1977: 787) states that: “Necessity and possibility are the central notions of traditional modal logic”.

5.5.4 Ehrman (1966)

A corpus-based study on modality cannot be undertaken without referring to Ehrman’s contribution to the analysis of modality. Leech (1971: 124) describes this contribution as “the most important study of the meanings of modality to date”.

In her study, Ehrman discussed three central terms, which are considered to be crucial to her corpus analysis:

(1) ‘Basic meaning’ which refers to the general meaning of the modal under discussion – “the meaning that applies to all its occurrences” (Ehrman 1966: 10).

(2) ‘Use’, which stands for “meanings conditioned by specific sentence elements and features of nonsemantic interest” (ibid).

(3) ‘Overtones’, which account for the secondary or supplementary meanings that derive from the basic meaning – “the factors which account for overtone variation are almost certainly from the content of the surroundings” (ibid: 10-11).

Ehrman’s discussion introduces other terms (for example, “time function, temporal function, prediction, utterance…etc.” [1966: 11]). However, Ehrman’s three main terms (basic meaning, use, and overtone) will be illustrated in sentences containing probabilities (must, may, might, can, could, and should), and the other terms will be ignored, as they are not related to the present study.
5.5.5 Halliday (1970)

Halliday (1970: 325) emphasises three functions of the English language, and illustrates them in one example – ‘Smith died’. First, this sentence can be interpreted as an expression of the speaker’s own mind/ experience of the real world. It reflects the factual conditions on the content expressed in the clause. Halliday named this function of language ‘the experiential’ or ‘ideational’ function. Secondly, there is a kind of relationship between speaker and hearer in which “the speaker is taking upon himself a particular communication role, that of (let us say) ‘declarer’, and is inviting the hearer to take on the complementary role” (ibid). This example is an explanation of language in its interpersonal function. Thirdly, and finally, Halliday considers that the sentence ‘Smith died’ expresses ‘texture’, and thus presents a textual or discourse function: “It takes on a particular form, as a message, that is operational in the given context. If instead we had ‘the one who died was Smith’ this would be a different message with quite different presupposition” (1970: 325-326).

It is interesting to note that the three functions of language illustrated above are strongly connected to the three basic topics (modality, modulation, and mood) discussed in Halliday’s article (1970), as well as in his book “An introduction to functional grammar” (1994), and hence they are applicable to the present discussion. The first topic, ‘modality’, expresses the relationship between speaker and hearer, showing the interpersonal function. The second topic, ‘modulation’, clarifies “the factual conditions on the process expressed in the clause” (Halliday 1970: 343), thus exemplifying the ideational and experiential function. The third topic, ‘mood’, is considered to be an interaction of the two functions: “the (interpersonal) system of ‘mood’, which is concerned with the speaker’s choice of speech role, comes together with the (textual) system of ‘theme’, which is concerned with the organisation of the clause as a message” (1970: 360).
5.5.6 Mindt (2000)


(1) Central modals:
Mindt (ibid) lists nine central modals: *will*, *would*, *can*, *could*, *shall*, *should*, *may*, *might*, and *must*.

(2) Marginal modals:
There are two marginal modals:
   a) Need (e.g. you need have no fear of her).
   b) Dare (e.g. I dare not let go the chance) (ibid).

(3) Modal catenative constructions:
Catenative is from a latin word 'catena', which means 'chain' in English. There are two modal catenative constructions:
   a) ought to (e.g. she ought to be ashamed of herself.)
   b) used to (e.g. he used to swim when he was a child.)

In (b), 'he' is linked by 'used' to the infinitive that follows (to swim). Thus, there is a chain formed by 'ought' in (a), and 'used' + [infinitive (to be) in (a)] or [(to swim) in (b)].

(4) Modal auxiliary constructions:
‘Be’ (to) and ‘have got to’ are the two modal auxiliary constructions presented by Mindt (ibid), e.g.
   a. They are to get no dividend this year.

Mindt's first class of modals, 'central modals', is of central interest to this chapter, as it includes the main modal verbs under discussion.
5.6 Arabic Modality

5.6.1 Introduction

Cook (1978: 5) claims that the problem with English modals lies neither in the surface positioning of modals nor in their wide range of meanings, but in connecting the right modal with the right choice of meaning. With Arabic modality, however, the situation is much more complicated. As Aziz (1992: 102) states: “Arabic does not possess a distinct set of modal forms having special syntactic and semantic properties, as in the case of the English modals”. While the main problem with English modals is how to match one modal with its correct meaning, the real difficulty with Arabic modals is that Arabic does not have a clear and distinct set of modal verbs; instead there are modal expressions.

5.6.2 Anghelescu (1999) and related works

Anghelescu (1999) proposed an outline of modals in Arabic. Modals have common tendency in Arabic to appear at the start of the sentence. However, any change in word order is considered to be a type of grammaticalisation (sentence structure), with very important effects on the grammatical rules, as well as on the system of the language as a whole. Arabic is essentially a VSO (Verb, Subject, Object) language and therefore shares all the characteristic features of this type of language: the typical propositions and the adjective and adjectival phrase following the noun; the auxiliary preceding the verb; and the closed (yes/no) question-words appearing in the initial position in the sentence. A change of word order, together with the complexity of the meaning and function of these modal auxiliaries may lead to misuse of the modal auxiliary.

Another example of failure to understand the modal auxiliary is the use of must in the following example, paraphrased by El-Hassan’s students:

(178) He must have seen her.
This sentence is paraphrased as:

  (a) It is necessary for him to see her.
  (b) It was necessary for him to see her.
  (c) He is obliged to see her.
  (d) He was obliged to see her.

El-Hassan (1990: 150) sees such paraphrases as motivated by a partial and misleading understanding of the semantics of *must*. An English-Arabic learner assumes that *must* expresses an obligation, and that is why the above paraphrases (a-d) are given. However, sentence 178 expresses none of the paraphrases in (a) – (d), but refers to an inference/conclusion and is paraphrased as:

  (e) The only possible/reasonable conclusion is that he saw her.

### 5.6.3 Must and May

#### 5.6.3.1 Must

It goes without saying that Arabic learners of English, language tutors, and translators can explore the different uses of modal verbs by using corpora. In this section, I will focus on the different syntactic and semantic patterns that affect the translations of *must* as a basic English modal of necessity, and *may* as a basic English modal of possibility. The analysis here is based on data extracted from SOC as well as BNC and Al-H corpora.

Coates (1983: 21) identifies two types of deontic *must*. The first type denotes strong obligation and is paraphrased into 'it is necessary for'. The second type of obligation is rather weak and usually is interpreted as 'it is important that'. However, there is a basic general meaning that both types of obligation share, i.e. 'it is necessary for'.

Another distinction is also made between deontic *must* and epistemic *must*. Though this distinction is not clear cut, it is often unambiguous when a context is provided. Consider the following example from BNC:
In this example, the deontic interpretation is that 'you have an obligation to know him well'. The epistemic interpretation, on the other hand, refers to the speaker's own judgement and inference on something. It can be paraphrased as 'I do believe that you must know him well'. Thus the phraseological context surrounding *must* is very important to distinguish between deontic *must* and epistemic *must* and, accordingly, a correct translation can be provided.

Interestingly, the analysis of SOC shows *must* as predominantly deontic. The next figure demonstrates the distribution of the Arabic translations of *must* in SOC.

![Figure 18: Distribution of the Arabic translations of must and must not in SOC](image)

Since Arabic, unlike English, does not have modal forms corresponding to those found in English, figure 18 presents different choices of *must* and *must not* in Arabic as appeared in SOC.

1. **Affirmative necessity**
   a. *yajibu, yanbaghī, yataḥattamu*

   The most frequently used modal form of *must* is realized through affirmative necessity verbs (which have almost the same meaning of necessity), i.e. *yajibu,*
yanbaghi, yataḥattamu. These unmarked options usually indicate the speaker's authority and to what extent he/she thinks it is important to carry out the action. For example:

(180)

يجب أن نتغاضى عن قانوننا الأخلاقي
(SOC, 479)

yajibu an nataghādā 'an
must that we put aside

qānūninā al-akhlāqī
er code the moral

"We must put our own moral code to one side" (SOC,
235)

There are two other derived forms of the verb yajibu that are used to imply necessity as well. While yajibu refers to present necessity, wajaba denotes a past necessity and the prepositional phrase min wājibinā min al-wājibi implies the necessity of doing something in the future, e.g.

من واجبنا أن نعد هذه الخاصة العبرية "آرية" حقة
(SOC, 607)

min wājibinā an na’udda
from our duty that prepare
hādhihi al-khāṣīyah al-‘ibrīyah āriyah

🚿aqqah

"This Hebraic feature must now be considered strictly 'Aryan'" (SOC, 286-287)

It should be noted that the form yajibu is more frequently used in MSA than its other derivative forms.

b. lā budda an, lā budda min

These non-verbal forms do not have past forms and are typically self negated, i.e. negation is usually confined to the modal form itself. Though lā budda is commonly used in MSA as an epistemic modal that implies the sense of
predictability, data in SOC and Al-H corpus (see figure 19) present lā budda as frequently deontic modal of necessity (see 182 and 183) rather than epistemic as in 184.

And finally, there must be education" (SOC, 3)

"it must be arranged by the parents"

"like Bactra, which must have held a teeming population"

Here, in 182 and 183, and according to the context, must be [lā budda min (fa) lā budda an] can be paraphrased as 'it is necessary to, while in 184 the speaker has an inference that 'Bactra must have held a teeming population'. Here, the speaker's evaluation is based on the previous and following part of the sentence: "City after city was abandoned as men fled west and east, north and south, in search of water; half buried in the desert lie ruined cities like
Bactra, which must have held a teeming population within its twenty-two miles of circumference”. Thus, the interpretation of 184 cannot be a deontic one, i.e. ‘it is necessary to’. Similarly, the two marked concordance lines in figure 19 below indicate an epistemic lā budda anna, whereas the rest of lines refer to a deontic lā budda an.

Figure 19: Concordance lines of lā budda an and lā budda anna extracted from Al-H corpus
As shown in figure 19 above, the epistemic lā budda anna occurs only twice and it has the typical structure (lā budda + anna + n. or pron.), while the most frequently used pattern of deontic lā budda in SOC and Al-H corpus is (lā budda + an + v.).

The second modal form is realized by ‘alayka, ‘alā (anna), ‘alā (man). Obviously, the sense of necessity in this type is less than that expressed by the affirmative necessity group, e.g. yajibu and lā budda an. In other words, ‘alayka, ‘alā (anna) and ‘alā (man) imply the sense of ‘advisability’, e.g.
One must pass through it by motorcar

"One must give alms to Brahmans" (SOC, 447)

Therefore, in 188 and 189, must is interpreted as 'it is advisable to'

3. Negative necessity: lā yajib, lā yanbaghī, lā yajūz, laysa

If the speaker wants to negate the sense of necessity, then the typical forms used in Arabic are lā yajib, lā yanbaghī, lā yajūz, laysa, as in the examples below:

wa ḥatta qiṣṣata Mūsā
and even story Moses
nafsuḥā yajibu allā nata‘ajjal
itself must not be in a hurry
fa narfuṣuḥā
so we reject it
"Even the story of Moses must not be rejected" (SOC, 301)
لا يجوز له أن يغادر السجن حياً (188)
(SOC, 952)

لا ياجوز له أن يغادر السجن حياً

not must for him that
yughādira al-sijna ḥayyan

"He must not leave the prison alive" (SOC, 446)

As can be seen from the two examples above, the negative particle lā (unlike not) can occur before or after affirmative necessity verbs, e.g. yajibu or yanbaghī.

Interestingly, deontic must can be expressed in MSA through particular expressions. Most frequently expressions in SOC are: ])** lā mandūḥah and lā shakka/bī-lā shakka. lā mandūḥah is an equivalent of deontic must that can occur initially (190) or medially (189):

فابناء الإسكيمو لا مندوحة لهم عن قتل والديهم (189)

(SOC, 121)

fa abnā' al-iskīmī lā manduṭah
as sons Eskimo must
lahum 'an qatl wālidayhim
for them to kill their parents

"Eskimo sons must kill their parents" (SOC, 53)

ولا مندوحة كذلك عن وحدة لغوية (190)

(SOC, 7)

wa lā mandūḥah kadḥālika 'an
and must also to
wil̲d̲ah lughawīyah
unity linguistic

"There must be some unity of language" (SOC, 3)

وهي بلا شك هزلية (191)
wa hiya bi-lā shakk hazliyah
and it with no doubt humorous

"the humorous caricatures [as surely they must be]" (SOC, 133)

Obviously, clauses with lā mandūḥah, lā shakka/bi-lā shakka are less certain than those expressed by yajibu or lābudda.

There are also few instances in SOC, where must has zero translation, e.g.

لكن لكل هبة ثمنها (192)

In this example, if the the writer were to use any of the affirmative necessity group or those belong to the tentative group, the meaning would not be commonly acceptable in MSA.

Hence, a distinction should be made between two different senses of must, i.e. the necessity meaning realized by affirmative necessity group and the advisability recommendation meaning realized by affirmative tentative necessity group.

5.6.3.2 May

Abunowara (1996: 282) states that the degree of possibility in MSA is quite limited compared to English. Accordingly, the Arabic equivalents of may in SOC can be divided into two main sub-categories, i.e. integrative possibility, e.g. qad/rubbama and superordinated equivalents of possibility, e.g. yumkinu/ mina al-mumkini, as illustrated in figure 20 below.
1. Integrative possibility: \textit{qad/rubbamā la‘alla‘asā}

As shown in figure 20, integrative possibility is more frequently used in SOC than the other group. This type of possibility is usually realized by the particle \textit{qad} which typically occurs before a verb (see figure 21).
The problem with the Arabic modal *qad* is that its different functional usages could be mixed up. As noted earlier in this chapter (5.6.1), the main difficulty is not only with English modals, but also with Arabic modal expressions – a fact that should be considered while translating English modals. This section will explain how the semantic choice of *qad* in a sentence depends largely on the syntactic pattern of the sentence. There are three choices of *qad*:

1. **(1) qad + present simple** → possibility
2. **(2) qad + past simple**
3. **Past perfect (kāna) + qad** → certainty

Preceding a present simple, *qad* refers to ‘possibility/doubt’. For examples:
قد تبعث الصورة الفنية في أنفسنا الرضى
(SOC, 189)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qad} & \quad \text{tab’ath} \quad \text{al-ṣūrah} \quad \text{al-fanniyah} \\
\text{may} & \quad \text{send} \quad \text{the form} \quad \text{the artistry} \\
\text{fi} & \quad \text{anfusinā} \quad \text{al-riḍā} \\
\text{in} & \quad \text{ourselves} \quad \text{the satisfaction} \\
\end{align*}
\]

"the form may please us."
(SOC, 83)

قد يكون الموعد في مقهى فلور
(Al-H, 2000)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qad} & \quad \text{yakīnu} \quad \text{al-maw’id} \quad \text{fi} \\
\text{may} & \quad \text{be} \quad \text{the appointment} \quad \text{at} \\
\text{maq̱hā} & \quad \text{filawwar} \\
\text{café} & \quad \text{flower} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“The appointment is may be at the Flower Café”

Preceding a past simple, \textit{qad} does not refer to a validity meaning in the past, rather it implies that the act has really finished and completed just at the moment of speaking. Its use is associated with the present perfect. For example:

كنت أعرف أن فيروز وأمي قد خرجتا معا
(Al-H, 2000)

\[
\begin{align*}
kuntu & \quad a’rif \quad anna \quad fayrūz \\
wass & \quad I \text{ know} \quad that \quad Fayrouz \\
waw & \quad ummī \quad qad \quad kharajatā \\
\text{and} & \quad \text{my mother} \quad \text{may} \quad \text{have gone out} \\
\text{ma’an} & \quad \text{together} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“I knew that Fayruz and my mother had gone out together”
Baker (1995: 127) summarizes the problem as follows: "Arabic does not have an equivalent of the present perfect: I've been a director is rendered into Arabic as 'since then become-I', thus putting a temporal adjunct in theme position and pushing the inflected verb further towards the rheme". Therefore, qad is commonly used to render the present perfect into Arabic. In addition, when qad is preceded by the past perfect (kāna كان), qad refers to remote past, e.g.

(Al-H, 2000)

لَكِنَّ عَابِيْشَ كَانَ قدَ أَختَفَى وَلَا يَعْرِفُ أُحَدًا مَكَانَهُ

The following three examples summarise the three functions of qad:

a) قد يذهب

qad yadhhabu.

he may go.

b) قد ذهب

qad dhahaba.

he might go -> incorrect

he has gone -> correct

c) كان قد ذهب

kāna qad dhahaba.

He had gone.

As examples (a) and (b) show, it is misleading to translate may as might because might in he might go refers to possibility, while the Arabic sentence in (b) denotes certainty. Arabic grammarians believe that there is a slight
difference between (b) and (c). The past perfect (kāna+qad) refers to a remote past and is translated into the past perfect tense in English.

The other integrative modal that is typically used in MSA is the adverbial particle *rubbamā*. For example:

ربما كانت هذه أول مرحلة من مراحل طريق أخذ يتطور حتى...

(SOC, 29)

rubbama | kānat | hādhihi | awwal
---|---|---|---
may | be | this | first
marḥalāh | min | marāḥil | ṭariq
stage | of | stages | a way
akħadha | yataḥawwar | ḥattā
started | develop | till

"this may have been the first stage of a development that..."

(SOC, 13-14)

It appears that *qad* and *rubbamā* can be used interchangeably, i.e. it is acceptable to use *qad takūn* in the place of *rubbamā kānat* in example 197.

The other two forms of integrative possibility are realized by *la'alla* and *‘asā*. These forms are less frequently used in SOC and in MSA in general, e.g.

و لنعلنا كلنا مخطئون...

(SOC, 369)

wa | la'allana | kulluna | mukhṭā'ūn
and | may | all of us | mistaken

"It may be that we all mistaken"

(SOC, 193)

لأنه لا يعلم متى عساه أن يجد القوت مرة أخرى...

(SOC, 118)

li'annahu | lā | ya'lam | matā
because he | not | know | when

‘asāhu | an | yajida | al-qūt
he may | that | find | the food
marratan | ukhrā
once | again
"because he does not know when he may find food again"

(SOC, 52)

Arabic grammarians (Badawi et al. 2004) refer to la’alla and ‘asā as particles of 'speculative possibility' which implies a weak degree of possibility compared to qad and rubbamā.

2. Superordinated equivalents of possibility: yumkinu, mina al-mumkinī/lajāza/yajāzu

Usually, all these equivalents occur with predicand clauses, i.e. جملة أن that-clause. For example:

ويمكنك أن تلاحظها اليوم قائمة في داخل ليبريا

(SOC, 37)

\[ \text{wa yumkinuka an talīṣāzāhā} \]
\[ \text{and you can that observe it} \]
\[ \text{al-yawm qā'imah fi dākhil} \]
\[ \text{to day existed in inside} \]
\[ \text{laybirya Liberia} \]

"and in inner Liberia it may be observed today"

(SOC, 16)

yumkinuka, mina al-mumkini, bi-imkānika are all derived from the verb yumkinu and, accordingly, they have essentially the same meaning.

Similarly, jāza and mina al-jā'īzi are derived from the verb yajāzu. In SOC, a typical translation of the pattern (if we may + v.) is إذا جاز لنا if we may + v. is 

إذا جاز لنا أن نأخذ برواية هيرودوت... (201)

(SOC, 613)

\[ \text{idhā jāza lanā an na'khudh} \]
\[ \text{if allowed for us that we take} \]
\[ \text{bi riwāyat Hirūdut} \]
\[ \text{with recounting Herodotus} \]

"If we may follow Herodotus,…"

(SOC, 289-290)
Though "yastaṭiʿ" (and its derivations) is a verb that refers to ability in MSA and it is typically used as a translation of "can," there are instances in SOC where "yastaṭiʿ" is used as an equivalent to the 'ability' – not possibility – "may," e.g.

(202)

(SOC, 179)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wa} & \quad \text{kull} & \quad \text{mā} & \quad \text{nastāṭiʿuh} \\
\text{and} & \quad \text{all} & \quad \text{what} & \quad \text{we can} \\
\text{huwa} & \quad \text{al-takhmin} & \quad \text{wa} & \quad \text{al-ẓann} \\
\text{is} & \quad \text{the guessing} & \quad \text{and} & \quad \text{the assumption}
\end{align*}
\]

"and we may only surmise" (SOC, 78)

In terms of possibility, neither integrative nor superordinated modal meanings show any significant difference in expressing degrees of possibility (cf. Aziz 1992: 106 and Abounowara 1996: 291). Perhaps the only exception is "laʾalla" and "‘asā" which denote a lesser degree of possibility.

Finally, a list of probable – degree – equivalents of necessity "must" and possible "may" is provided as follows:

**Must**

- "yajibu, yanbaghi" (high necessity)
- "lā budda anna" (high necessity)
- "lā mandāḥah/lā shakka" (lower necessity)
- "‘alayka/‘alā an" (least necessity)

**May**

- "qad/rubbamā" (high possibility)
- "laʾalla/‘asā" (low possibility)
- "min al-mumkiṇī/mina al-jāʿīzi" (low possibility)

### 5.7 Conclusion and Implications

This chapter has summarised some crucial issues that arise with regards to the study of 'possibility' and 'necessity' as two basic elements in modality. It has
been argued that translations of the meanings of modality have not yet been understood as successfully and comprehensively as many researchers have thought.

This study has attempted to explore the different semantic choices of English and Arabic modal verbs, with special focus on modals that indicate possibility and necessity in the two languages. In terms of Huddleston's (1976: 333) NICE properties (see chapter 5, section 5.3), modal meanings in Arabic are totally different from those of English.

This chapter has attempted to move our understanding of modal verbs and modal meanings a few small steps forward. The main purpose of this chapter has been to reveal some of the difficulties that translators face in dealing with English modals. Some examples provided in the current chapter show the extent to which the meanings of English modals are mixed up. This chapter also tackled the distinct choices that pertain to translations of must as a basic English modal of necessity, and may as a basic English modal of possibility. The present study also focused on qad as an example of an Arabic modal particle, and explained how the semantic choice of this particle is based on the syntactic pattern of the sentence.

Through concordance lines, translators, teachers, and even learners can explore the use of a modal in different types of texts to see how frequently the relevant word is used. They also can identify the semantic, as well as the syntactic environments surrounding a modal. Accordingly, this kind of approach could provide new insights into the structure of the Arabic language.

The analysis provided has illustrated that the deontic sense of must is more frequently used than epistemic in SOC. Although English-Arabic-English dictionaries provide the lexical meanings of modals, they do not guide the reader in a way that enables them to match every meaning with its appropriate modal. Some basic rules for providing translators with guidelines in the process of translation have been discovered through the analysis of data.
Chapter Six

Collocation, Synonymy, Polysemy and Translation

6.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature on three related concepts – 'collocation', 'synonymy' and 'polysemy' – and the role they play in translation. A remarkable amount of linguistic research has been carried out in the field of collocation, synonymy and polysemy. However, it is outside the scope of this study to provide an extensive review of all these studies. Rather, this chapter will focus on the most relevant work in this area for the present study. Section 6.2 deals with the definition of 'collocation'. Section 6.3 explains the difference between denotation, connotation and their effect on polysemy. The close relationship between collocation, semantic prosody and corpus linguistics will be discussed in 6.4. The concept of synonymy as a controversial issue, along with its definitions and degrees, will be handled in 6.5. Finally, a conclusion for the whole chapter will be provided in 6.6.

6.2 Defining Schemes of ‘Collocation’

Although there are some notable definitions of ‘collocation’ in the literature (which often quote Firth’s (1951, 1957) notion directly or indirectly), collocations remain ‘notoriously difficult to define’ (Gorgis and Al-Kharabsheh 2009: 21; Lesniewska 2006: 59; Bahumaid 2006: 133; Poulsen 2005: 25; Martynska 2004: 5; Smadja 1996:1). Laybutt (2009: 6) also note that "while collocation and its influence on linguistic choice maybe readily observed, its precise role within text remains unclear". Similarly, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 284) state that the function of collocation has always been "problematic". Fontenelle (1998: 191) asserts that "there does not seem to be any clear-cut, non-controversial definition of the term 'collocation'".
However, Partington (1998: 15) highlights three different definitions of ‘collocation’. He groups these into 'textual', 'statistical' and 'psychological' definitions. The first definition is that provided by Sinclair (1991), who regards ‘collocation’ as “the occurrence of two or more words within a short space of each other in a text” (ibid: 170). This definition is a 'textual' one, as it suggests that collocations must be defined in terms of their textual occurrence. Gledhill (2000: 202) has similarly argued that the textual view of collocation does not regard the unit of analysis as a grammatical phrase; rather it has a specific textual function that seeks to find significant relations between words in contexts.

The second definition of collocation is 'psychological' or 'associative'. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 287) refer to collocation as a cohesive device and describe it as "a cover term for the kind of cohesion that results from the co-occurrence of lexical items that are in some way or other typically associated with one another, because they tend to occur in similar environments". Similarly, Hoey (2005: 3-4) describes psychological or associative collocation as a 'property of the mental lexicon' that reflects the individual's psychological knowledge of a text.

Apparently, both the textual and psychological definitions of collocations are closely related. Partington (1998: 16) makes it clear that "The learner, child or adult, faced with an unknown word looks to the co-text to gain clues as to what the unfamiliar item might mean. Meaning is function in context, as Firth used to say".

The third definition of ‘collocation’ is a 'statistical' one provided by Hoey (1991), who holds that: “Collocation has long been the name given to the relationship a lexical item has with items that appear with greater than random probability in its (textual) context” (1991: 6-9). The statistical view of collocation helps by allowing the linguist to identify and examine the statistical distribution of collocational patterns that could not be discovered using traditional methods.

In the study of corpus linguistics, the 'statistical' definition is considered to be a good working definition, as large amounts of data can be made available for computer analysis. If there are patterns of collocation, the co-occurrence of two items becomes effective (and interesting) as the collocation seems to occur for a purpose. Therefore, measuring the statistics of collocation
is both essential and interesting. This statistical approach is accepted by many corpus-linguistic scholars (e.g. Halliday 1966; Greenbaum 1974, Sinclair 1991; Hoey 1991; Ananiaidou 1994; Stubbs 1995; Smadja et al. 1996; Partington 1998; McEnery and Wilson 2001; Hunston 2002).

Following Firth’s notion – “collocations of a given word are statements of the habitual or customary places of that word” (1968: 181) – all the aforementioned linguists argue that collocation can be defined as the recurrent co-occurrence of two or more patterns of words.

Hyland differentiates between ‘collocation’ and ‘clusters’, the latter referring to the repeated string of continuous word forms: “Most clusters are structurally incomplete units, but the co-occurrence of two or more items becomes interesting if it seems to happen for a purpose and is repeated across many texts” (2008: 43).

On the other hand, Sinclair (2003) states that ‘collocation’ is similar to another linguistic idiom called ‘colligation’, in that both concern the co-occurrence of linguistic features in a text. The difference between the two idioms is that ‘colligation’ is concerned mainly with the co-occurrence of grammatical classes or structural patterns; whereas ‘collocation’ refers to the co-occurrence of lexical items.

Regarding the effect of collocation, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 286) believe that:

The cohesive effect of such pairs depends not so much on any systematic relationship as on their tendency to share the same lexical environment, to occur in COLLOCATION with one another. In general, any two lexical items having similar patterns of collocation—that is, tending to appear in similar contexts—will generate a cohesive force if they occur in adjacent sentences.

Commenting on Halliday and Hasan’s observation, Dais (2009: 10) says that: “These remarks remind translators of paying attention to the collocations in the translating process; otherwise, they will stumble into the problem of ‘translationese’.

Baker (1992: 48) also supports Halliday and Hasan's view and describes the patterns of collocation as "largely arbitrary and independent of meaning", a fact that is realised both within and across languages. Baker (ibid) provides an
example of the English verb *deliver* and explains how it collocates with a number of nouns, for each of which Arabic uses a different verb. ‘deliver a letter/telegram’ is translated into *yusallimu khuṭaban/tillīghātan*, ‘deliver a speech/lecture’ matches the Arabic *yulqī khuṭbatan/muḥādaratan* and ‘deliver news’ *yanqilu akhāran*…etc. This suggests that patterns of collocation reveal significant information about the preferences of specific language communities for certain modes of expression.

### 6.3 Collocation in Practice

In linguistics, there are two main factors that influence the meaning of words in a language, namely **denotation** and **connotation**. Denotation refers to the core meaning of a word as defined by dictionaries. Therefore, the denotational meaning is also termed as dictionary meaning (or referential meaning). It is also described as being neutral in the sense that there are no positive or negative feelings made in mind. Whereas denotation refers to the literal meaning of the word, connotation refers to the figurative meaning of the word (emotive/implied meaning). That is, the meaning that we create and associate it with positive and negative feelings. Connotative meaning is, therefore, connected with the personal psychology and cultural associations by words. For example, while the word *snake* denotes a kind of long, legless reptile, it connotes an evil or a harmful, insincere person who pretends to be a friend.\(^{31}\)

Rouhani (1994: 17) believes that the above two types of meaning (literal and figurative) relate to different - but related - types of sense-relations (relations between sets of lexemes) such as: polysemy, homonymy, synonymy, antonymy, metonymy, synecdoche. These cohesive features are “contextually bound, i.e. they impose constraints on lexical cohesion of 'collocation’” (ibid). Kilgarriff (1992: 4), on the other hand, suggests that:

Polysemy describes a crossroad. In one direction lies homonymy, in another-metonymy. In others again, collocation and analogy...For each direction, there is no natural divide between polysemy and its neighbour. *Light*, of colour and of weight, maybe considered homonymous or polysemous.

---

The above figure indicates that polysemy is a concept that is interrelated with other cohesive concepts such as: homonymy, alternation, collocation and analogy. Kilgarriff makes it clear that it is really hard to calculate the difference between polysemy and homonymy. He believes that both concepts are useful for the description of the lexicon of a language, although "to turn a sense treated as polysemous into one treated as homonymous is trivial" (Kilgarriff 1992: 94). The distinction is not always seen as valid.

However, Koskela and Murphy (2006: 742) points out a subtle difference between the two concepts:

In both polysemy and homonymy, a single word form is associated with multiple distinct meanings, but while in polysemy one lexical item has more than one related meaning, homonymy involves distinct lexical items and the meanings are not related. Distinguishing between polysemes and homonyms is, however, not always uncontroversial.

To give further explanation, the noun 'screen' is considered polysemous, since it is used variously of a fire screen, cinema screen, a television screen, and so on. Another polysemous example is the noun 'head'. It can be used to refer to the object on top of a body, or a person at the top of a company or department (cf. *jabbār* in ch. 7). However, in the case of homonymy, the meanings are quite unrelated, for example, 'bow' (front end of a ship) and 'bow' (bending of the head).
In much the same way, some linguists view the relation between polysemy and synonymy as interdependent since polysemy refers to many concepts for the same word (cf. \textit{qāsin} in ch.7; it is an adjective that refers to negative and positive concepts.) and synonymy refers to many words for the same concept (cf. \textit{qawī, jabbār, qāsin} and \textit{ḍa‘īf, wāhin, rakīk} in 7.6). Lamb (1999: 143) argues that "Polysemy and synonymy usually go together...that is, synonymy generally comes interconnected with polysemy".

As far as sense-relations are concerned, chapters 6 and 7 in this study focus on polysemy, synonymy and collocation. The other cohesive concepts highlighted earlier in this section lie outside the scope of the study. Despite their inherently controversial nature, polysemy, synonymy and collocation have been accounted for in dictionaries for at least two decades (cf. 7.2). Moreover, these three interrelated cohesive concepts have been at the centre of attention of corpus linguistics where problems of word senses are carefully tackled (see chapters 6 and 7 for more details).

6.4 Collocation, Semantic Prosody and Corpus Linguistics: A Close Relationship

According to Halliday (1994), two linguistic features evoke appraisals: semantic meaning and grammar. Often using a word in a particular context carries additional connotations that lie outside the core meaning. Sinclair (2003: 117) has called this kind of meaning ‘semantic prosody’ or ‘connotation’ (see section 6.3). Sinclair defines the notion as: ‘semantic’ because it deals with meaning, and ‘prosody’ because it typically ranges over combinations of words in an utterance rather than being attached just to one’ (ibid). Louw (2000: 58) states that the main function of semantic prosody is to evaluate the speaker/writer attitude – the primary concern of ‘appraisal theory’ (cf. chapter four).

Many scholars highlight the importance of collocational analysis for understanding the semantic prosodic meaning in language learning (e.g. Mitchell 1971; Partington 1998; Hoey 1991, 2000; Hunston 2000; Altenberg and Granger 2001; Sinclair, et al. 2004; Xiao and McEnery 2006). With the exception of Xiao and McEnery (2006), the focus of these studies has been
monolingual. Xiao and McEnery’s research is regarded as the first bilingual collocational research on Chinese and English. Apart from their research, there are few bilingual contrastive studies of collocations between different languages (these being: Nesselhauf 2003 [between German and English]; Wolter 2006 [English and Japanese]; Bartrming & Hammarberg 2007 [Swedish and French]; Sadeghi 2009 [Persian and English]). No published research using appraisal corpus-analysis to explore the collocational semantic prosody of powerful/less adjectives in English and Arabic is available.

Comparing semantic prosody to collocation, Xiao and McEnery (2006: 6) assume that “it is at least as inaccessible to a speaker’s conscious introspection as collocation is”. With the advent of corpora and suitable software, linguists’ explorations of computer-readable corpora have revealed semantic prosodies much more frequently. Stewart (2010: 80) describes the relation between semantic prosody and corpus linguistics as an ‘unbreakable chain’, stating that:

The link between semantic prosody and corpus linguistics is incontestable. There are scarcely any studies on semantic prosody outside the domain of corpus linguistics. Semantic prosody, it would seem, is contingent upon concordancing and lexical profiles, apparently depending upon them for its recognition (ibid).

Further, Stewart (ibid) believes that many linguists are of the same opinion when they state that the study of semantic prosody is only possible with concordance lines (e.g. Bublitz 1996: 9; Louw 1993: 159; Louw 1997: 247; Adolphs and Carter 2002: 7; Hunston 2002: 142; Tognini-Bonelli 2004: 20; Baker et al. 2006: 58; Sardinha 2000: 93). However, while concordances and co-selection patterns are observable, semantic prosody is not. Although corpus data imply the existence of prosodies, this does not mean that prosodies are observable phenomena. It is the analyst’s role to interpret the corpus data and pick up the hidden meanings, i.e. ‘semantic prosody’ (Stewart 2010: 82).

Sinclair (1991: 112) was the first to describe the phenomenon of ‘semantic prosody’ – though he did not mention the term explicitly in his work "many uses of words and phrases show a tendency to occur in a certain semantic environment". Similarly, Hatim and Munday (2004: 251) assert that "Semantic prosody refers to the positive or negative connotative meaning which
is transferred to the focus word by the semantic fields of its common collocates”. Louw (1993: 157) was the first to use the expression directly as: "a consistent aura of meaning with which a form is imbued by its collocates is referred to in this paper as a semantic prosody”. In Louw's view, semantic prosody is recognised in the form of 'positive' (favourable), 'negative' (unfavourable), or 'neutral' showing no evidence of positive or negative items. This kind of evaluation is assigned according to the surrounding contextual environment that imparts a meaning to the word (i.e. the positive/negative grouping of words). The good/bad parameter of semantic prosody is shown in figure 23 below.

![Semantic Prosody Diagram](image_url)

**Figure 23**: Good/bad parameter of semantic prosody.

Obviously, the goodness and the badness of a semantic prosody may have many forms. For example, 'good' includes *pleasurable, profitable, being in control*, etc., while 'bad' involves *sad, difficult, not being in control*, and so on (Morley and Partington 2009: 141).

As the literature of semantic prosody is very fruitful, I will adapt Xiao and McEnery's (2006: 43) summary table of the most previous significant studies of semantic prosody.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Negative Prosody</th>
<th>Positive Prosody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair (1991)</td>
<td>BREAK out HAPPEN SET in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louw (1993, 2000)</td>
<td>bent on build up of END up verbing GET oneself verb ed</td>
<td>BUILD up a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubbs (1995, 1996, 2001a, 2001b)</td>
<td>ACCOST CAUSE FAN the flame signs of underage teenager(s)</td>
<td>PROVIDE Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partington (1998)</td>
<td>COMMIT PEDDLE/peddlner Dealings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunston (2002)</td>
<td>SIT through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt and Carter (2004)</td>
<td>bordering on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Xiao and McEnery’s (2006) summary of the previous studies of semantic prosody.

As noted in the table above, there are more than twenty lexical items in English that have been investigated by different linguists. Some of these have been interpreted as showing positive or negative prosodies. Despite the significance and originality of these studies, Zhang (2010: 193) considers them to be limited:

> While lots of explorations have been made on the characteristic patterning of semantic prosody and its application in language use and second language acquisition, there are still not sufficient systematic and in-depth explorations. Therefore, in the future research we would need to observe more lexical items [...] and make more insightful analysis before we could be reasonably confident of our conclusions.

If the European studies on collocation and semantic prosodies are considered ‘limited’, as Zhang claims above, then the research applied to the same phenomenon in Arabic (especially lexicographic studies) should be considered ‘extremely limited’. As Bahumaid (2006: 137) says:
Looking at lexicographic work on Arabic collocations, a rather bleak picture emerges. There is an extremely limited amount of information on collocation in both monolingual (Arabic) and bilingual (Arabic-English/English-Arabic) dictionaries. Besides, no monolingual (Arabic) or bilingual (Arabic-English/English-Arabic) collocational dictionary has been compiled as yet.

The problem with both monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, as Bahumaid highlights, lies mainly in the arrangement of the information itself (rather than in the subsistence of these dictionaries). There are certain bilingual dictionaries (e.g. Wehr 1979) that include a large amount of collocational information, but unfortunately this kind of information is not arranged systematically, or in a way that can help translators as well as learners of Arabic. In addition, some of the materials in these dictionaries are ‘obsolete and no longer relevant to standard Arabic’ (Emery 1991: 63).

Based on the fact that these bilingual dictionaries (as Wehr 1979 mentioned above) include collocations but do not have any corpus evidence, the present study aims to analyse semantic prosody in Arabic using corpora (see 7.6).

6.5 Synonymy

Synonymy is a concept that has been defined from different perspectives. It can be defined as a lexical relation that means sameness of meaning (Palmer 1976: 88), or as two or more expressions that are different in form but not meaning (Harris 1973: 6).

6.5.1 Synonymy: A Controversial Issue

It should be emphasised that the phenomenon of synonymy has been a “controversial issue among European and Arab linguists” (Shehab 2009: 870). There are two main approaches regarding synonymy. The first one denies the existence of synonymy altogether. Shehab refers to this as the ‘strict’ approach (ibid). The second, ‘flexible’ approach, accepts the existence of the phenomenon (although it receives different treatments by those who adopt this approach). The first approach is represented by linguists such as Bloomfield
Each linguistic form has a constant and specific meaning. If the forms are phonemically different, we suppose that their meanings are also different [...]. We suppose, in short, that there are no real synonyms (ibid).

The second approach regards synonymy as a flexible concept, i.e. any two words that share at least one sense are synonymous (Jackson 1988: 65). The same debate – between those who accept synonymy and those who reject it – occurs within Arabic linguistics as well. Elewa (2004: 94) summarises the debate in Arabic linguistics as follows:

As noted in the example above, some Arab linguists argue that every word has a different meaning. For example قعد qa’ada is different from جلسة jalasa ‘sit’ “because while قعد the القعد means that the person had been standing before sitting, الجلسة means that he had been lying down before he straightened his position” (Hasan 2008: 13). This means that absolute synonymy does not exist in natural language. However, the phenomenon of synonymy is quite observable in Arabic.

Arabic is well known for the overuse of synonyms. Al-Suyuti (1986: 405) has found forty-one hyponymic near-synonyms for the word السيف al-sayf ‘the sword’, and eighty-seven hyponymic near-synonyms for the word العسل al-‘asal ‘honey’. There are many other examples, some of which are provided below:
- **Sword:** al-
  -sayf, al-
  -wars, al-
  -muhammad, al-
  -mudhakkar
- **Lion:** al-
  -hirmās, usāmah, al-
  -asad, al-
  -ghānfar, al-
  -layth, al-
  -daygham
- **Honey:** asal al-
  -nahl, al-
  -darb, al-
  -wars, al-
  -hamit
- **Wind:** al-
  -harūr, al-
  -bārīh, al-
  -hubūb, al-
  -sumūm, al-
  -nāfijah, al-
  -nakbāa

However, Ishrateh (1982: 177) has a different attitude regarding the kind of synonyms mentioned above. He considers them mere adjectives:

In fact, some scholars use the adjectives of certain concepts as synonyms. For instance, they use the adjective al-
  -wars al-
  -muhammad for the ‘sword’ itself although al-
  -wars refers to the sword that is made in India only and al-
  -muhammad is a semantic feature of the sword (i.e. ‘the sword’).

While Ishrateh refers to the above synonyms as 'mere adjectives', Lyons (1977: 291) calls them 'hyponyms'. Accordingly, al-
  -sayf has only one designation, whereas the other forty-one hyponymic near-synonyms refer to certain types of sword. Lyons (ibid) describes hyponymy as the inclusive relationship between a specific word and a general word where the meaning of the former is included within that of the latter. So tulip and rose, for example, are also flowers. Therefore, the words tulip and rose are both hyponyms, and together are called 'co-hyponyms' of the parent or superordinating term flower. Similarly, cod and salmon are co-hyponyms of fish and knife, fork and spoon are co-hyponyms of cutlery and so on.

Generally, Arabs (in MSA) prefer to mention two or more synonyms in order to add a rhetorical sense to their language. They are used in situations where the speaker is aiming to convince the addressee, especially in religious and political contexts. This kind of synonymy is called 'quasi-synonymy' (cf. Ullman 1963: 193; Elewa 2004: 95). In much the same way, El-Hasan (1982: 177) and Ishrateh (2006: 35) believe that synonymy has an importance in asserting the meaning: “collocation of synonymy is very important since it serves to reinforce the message” (ibid).
6.5.2 Degrees of Synonymy

One approach is to recognise different degrees of synonymy. Lyons (1981a: 148) highlights the difference between two main kinds of synonymy i.e. complete and absolute synonymy. He defines them as:

lexemes can be said to be completely synonymous (in a certain range of contexts) if and only if they have the same descriptive, expressive and social meaning (in the range of contexts in question). They may be described as absolutely synonymous if and only if they have the same distribution and are completely synonymous in all their meanings and in all their contexts of occurrence (Lyons 1981a: 148).

Lyons goes further and explains the difference between the two kinds of synonymy. While complete synonymy is rare, absolute synonymy is even harder to find. Lyons claims that absolute synonymy only exists under certain types of circumstances in certain texts, such as with the use of technical terms (e.g. 'almonds' and 'tonsils') (ibid). Another example is the use of 'truck, lorry and wagon'. These three technical words refer to a type of a mechanical device that is used for lifting heavy objects off the ground. In addition, absolute synonymy entails a complete interchangeability in all possible environments in which the analysed words are correctly used, which is difficult to prove. In the same way, Abu-Ssaydeh (2001: 54) states that “it is undoubtedly true that no two terms can be absolute synonyms; there will always be a point at which the two terms will diverge”. A different kind of classification was provided by Cruse (2000: 156). He mentions other two types of synonymy in addition to absolute synonymy – propositional and near-synonymy. Propositional synonymy is commonly known as ‘cognitive synonymy’ It is less strict than absolute synonymy as Cruse (1986: 88) defines it

X is a cognitive synonym of Y if (i) X and Y are syntactically identical, and (ii) any grammatical declarative sentence S containing X has equivalent truth-conditions to another sentence S1, which is identical to S except that X is replaced by Y.

32 Cf. http://www.webster-online-dictionary.org/definitions (The tonsils are called from their shape, amygdaloë, and in popular language, almonds).
Obviously, Cruse’s definition relies on the idea of ‘substitutability with the truth conditions’ – a major criterion of propositional synonymy. Murphy (2003: 159) refers to ‘substitutability’ as:

a diagnostic tool for recognizing synonyms. Substitution is also one of the purposes for which we search for synonyms – in order to replace one word with another in a text without changing the meaning of the text.

Therefore, a substitution test can be used to diagnose synonymy in the sense that if two expressions can be substituted for each other without changing the meaning, then they are synonyms. However, Murphy asserts that absolute substitutability is hard to find:

If two words start out as full synonyms (say, because they have only one sense among them), they stop being absolutely the same as soon as one of them becomes polysemous and the other one does not gain the same extra meaning…it is still very unlikely that two words have all the same senses (ibid: 165).

Divjak (2010: 3) agrees with Cruse’s and Murphy’s comments on substitutability in the sense that two words are considered synonymous in a linguistic context if all their contextual relations are identical. Accordingly, “it is commonly asserted that absolute, perfect or full synonyms do not exist” (ibid).

**Near-synonymy** (Plesionymy/dictionary synonymy) is the main concern of this study as it is the most common type adopted by dictionary compilers (see chapter 7). Cruse (1986: 285) calls this type of synonymy ‘plesionymy’. Cruse (ibid) distinguishes near-synonymy from ‘propositional/cognitive synonymy’ as follows:

Plesionyms are distinguished from cognitive synonyms by the fact that they yield sentences with different truth conditions: two sentences which differ only in respect of plesionyms in parallel syntactic positions are not mutually entailing, although if the lexical items are in a hyponymous relation, there may well be unilateral entailment.
As clarified, near-synonyms, unlike propositional synonyms, are characterised by different semantic content; i.e. the near synonymous pair might be very close in meaning, yet not identical for whatever reason. For examples,

(203) It isn’t **foggy** - just **misty**.
(204) He was **murdered**, or rather **executed**.
(205) He’s **a farmer**, or strictly **a stockman**.
(206) It’s **a pie**, or actually **a savoury tart**.

Mullany and Stockwell (2010: 66) argue that the reason for using plesionyms - in the above examples - is “to indicate that the speaker is grappling after precision, but perhaps does not possess the precise vocabulary or technical term for the object in mind”. In addition, the substitution of the word does not leave the same exact truth-condition. Plesionyms "are weakly contrastive, but the contrast does not destroy the synonymy" (Cruse 2000: 158-161).

Edmonds (1999: 5) believes that some near-synonyms may be denotationally different; others may only be connotatively different, i.e. they convey meanings indirectly:

Near-synonyms are often said to differ in terms of connotations [...] sometimes it is used to refer to any non-denotational component of meaning (including style and affect), but often a semantic distinction is said to be connotated, e.g. **slip** connotes triviality. The one aspect that distinguishes connotation, though, is that it refers to meaning conveyed ‘indirectly’ by mere suggestion or implification.

The implication or indirect meanings that Edmonds (ibid) refers to are usually peripheral, and this is the main problem that translators and learners face when studying near-synonyms: they find it very difficult to understand the subtle differences that exist between synonyms. Accordingly, “some translators find themselves forced to provide in their translation the conceptual, denotative meaning of the synonymous words” (Shehab 2009: 886).

According to Edmonds (1999: 3) “One of the main problems for lexical choice with regard to synonymy is that while the differences between near-synonyms can be very subtle, the overall effect of using one near-synonym instead of another can be significant”. This naturally links to the possibility of
distinguishing between synonyms using corpus evidence (see the corpus analysis of the three (powerful) near-synonyms in Arabic: Ḷabbār, Ḷawī and Ḷāsīn as opposed to the other (powerless) near-synonyms: Ḷaʾīf, Ṭāhin and Ṭākīk.

6.6 Conclusion

This chapter has not undertaken an extensive study of collocation, synonymy and polysemy. Rather, it has reviewed their definitions, as well as the different types of, and approaches to, both areas, and has highlighted the approach that will be adopted in the next chapter (see Elewa 2004). The study of collocation, synonymy and polysemy has great potential application for dictionary compiling, translation, and language learning. Combining the three cohesive concepts together (see chapter seven) would be useful for analysts (language tutors, learners, and translators). Abu-Ssaydeh (2001: 57) states that the reason for this is that “awareness of subtle distinctions in the meanings of synonyms is not a guarantee that the translator would know how to use them. Sometimes, finer distinctions exist at the collocational level”.

Following Abu-Ssaydeh (2001) and Elewa (2004), the next chapter will focus on analysing ‘synonymy’ and ‘polysemy’ at the collocational level in order to guarantee as much as possible good, authentic translations. Moreover, it will adopt a corpus-linguistic analysis, drawing upon data from two distinctly different languages – English and Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). It is the first study to analyse Arabic-English power-related collocational synonymy from the perspective of the appraisal linguistic approach, as chapter seven will explain.
Chapter Seven

Collocational Appraisal Treatment of Power-related Adjectives in English and Arabic

7.1 Introduction

As was noted in chapter four, emotions are grouped into three main sets in appraisal theory:

a) in/security (the boy was anxious/confident)

b) dis/satisfaction (the boy was fed up/absorbed)

c) un/happiness (the boy was sad/happy)

(Martin and White 2005: 46-9; Bednarek 2008:15).

However, the keywords in the above three sets do not accurately capture power-related appraisal adjectives, like weak/strong appraisal adjectives, which I believe should constitute a separate group. The analysis presented here has two main goals: firstly, it reveals some problematic areas concerning the Arabic and English translations found in different dictionaries; and secondly, it shows the collocational synonymous patterns of the emotional adjectival set under discussion, as well as its influence on translation. The different types of dictionaries used in the analysis will be discussed in 7.2, and the English and Arabic emotional appraisal adjectives in 7.3. In 7.4 I will present a snapshot of the Arabic adjective. The following two sections, 7.5 and 7.6, will provide a detailed illustration of the semantic appraisal features of power-related adjectives. 7.7 will explain the main findings of the analysis. The implications of the findings for language tutors, learners, and translators are discussed in 7.8.

7.2 Dictionaries: A Serious Problem

Unfortunately, given the ambiguous and sometimes complex structure of dictionaries, their users (researchers, learners, and teachers) may have
difficulty in getting the exact sort of information they are seeking at any given
time. Sinclair (2003: 73) illustrates this problem as follows: “A word may have
several meanings, and dictionaries present the meanings without giving much
guidance as to how they may be differentiated from each other”.

Moreover, from even a quick glance through dictionaries, it is easy to see
that most common words have dozens of meanings and that it is impossible to
try all of these meanings each time we read the relevant word. Kilgarriff (1992:
127) asserts that "people face various dilemmas when they try to slot usages
into dictionary senses". At this point, corpora offer some helpful clues for
deciding the appropriate meaning of the word. As Thomas (2009: 257) explains:

Concordance lines, which typically show instances of a key word in
their immediate contexts, have proved useful in uncovering patterns
of usage and variation that may not be apparent either from reading
individual texts or from consulting reference resources, such as
dictionaries and grammars.

On the other hand, because most dictionaries do not give exactly the same
explanations of meanings, it is useful to consult more than one dictionary in
order to discover the indistinctness of English-English dictionaries in addition to
English-Arabic dictionaries. The following five dictionaries are used in the
analysis:

(2) Elias Modern Dictionary: English-Arabic (EMD), 2008
(3) Longman Active Study Dictionary of English. (LASD) Special edition for
   International students, 2nd edition, 1994
(4) Webster Concise English-English Dictionary (WCD), 2002

Later in this chapter (section 7.6), other monolingual Arabic-Arabic
dictionaries will be used for analysing the different semantic functions of the
power-related Arabic adjectives under discussion. In section 7.6 onwards, more
precise analysis will be added to the discussion of Arabic appraisal adjectives
because, as was mentioned in chapter four, this area of appraisal analysis has
not been tackled at all in Arabic. Shehab (1999: 886) believes that English
synonymous pairs are easy to recognise, unlike Arabic pairs. He states that: “Unlike Arabic, in the case of English, the subtle differences between the members of [a] synonymous pair, I assume, may be easily figured out” (ibid). That is why I believe that much more attention should be paid to Arabic synonymous adjectives.

7.3 Emotional Appraisal Adjectives

7.3.1 Why These Adjectives?

As noted in 7.1, the present study will analyse a set of appraisal adjectival groups that have not received much, if any, attention (at least in the field of Arabic linguistics); namely, power-related adjectives. In order to make the analysis comparable, I will focus on three near synonyms of powerful adjectives in English and their three closest translational equivalents in Arabic, as well as three near synonyms of powerless adjectives in English and their three closest translational equivalents in Arabic. These translational equivalents are identified by using two bilingual English-Arabic dictionaries: Al-Mawrid (AMD), and Elias (EMD).

Therefore, six English power-related adjectives are used in the analysis. They are divided into three groups: (1) strong vs. weak (2) powerful vs. powerless and (3) tough vs. tender. Another three groups of six positive/negative Arabic adjectives will be compared to their English equivalents: (1) قوي qawī vs. ضعيف ُda‘if, (2) جبار jabbār vs. واهن wāhin, and (3) ركيك rakīk vs. قاس qāsin.

The main reason for choosing the above power-related adjectives is that after consulting two of the best known bilingual English-Arabic dictionaries – Al-Mawrid and Elias (EMD) – I found that the three powerful adjectives – strong, powerful and tough – are translated as قوي qawī and the three powerless adjectives – weak, powerless, and tender – are translated as ضعيف ُda‘if without much guidance being given about the semantic aspects and different usages of these adjectives. In much the same way, when I consulted EMD (Arabic-

34 Tough is translated as قوي qawī and قاس qāsin. They are used as synonyms (see AMMD, table 20).
English) – by the same author – I found that the three Arabic powerless negative adjectives (ضعيف, واهن, وركیک) are translated as ‘weak’ (see EMD p.262 for rakik, p. 392 for گاپی, and p. 818 for گاپین). Similarly, the three Arabic powerful positive adjectives (قوي, جبار, قاسی) are translated as ‘strong’ (see EMD p. 573 for qawi, p. 104 for jabbîr, and p. 541 for qâsin). In order to analyse the power-related adjectives in terms of ‘evaluation’ or ‘appraisal’, I will use the following three terms adopted by Hunston and Sinclair (2000: 82): ‘Thing evaluated’ (or appraised), ‘Hinge’ (or the linking/main verb), and ‘Evaluative category’ (or the evaluative response that indicates the personal/emotional reaction, represented by the adjective group in the sentence). Hunston and Sinclair believe that this appraisal taxonomy is obviously a ‘good diagnostic of evaluative adjective’ (ibid). These taxonomies for adjectival appraisal groups were originally extracted from Martin and White’s Appraisal Theory (2005) [see chapter 4], which was developed within the tradition of Systemic Functional Linguistics.

It must be noted that adjectives (in general) have been chosen for analysing appraisal because the intrinsic grammatical realisation for attitude is adjectival. Martin and White (2005: 58) assert that: “As inherently gradable meanings, the canonical grammatical realisation for attitude is adjectival; so it makes sense to try and establish grammatical frames for distinguishing kinds of attitude with respect to this kind of realisation”. Moreover, Hunston and Thompson (2000) believe that adjectives in general are the core elements in appraisal sentences.

### 7.4 Arabic Adjectives

Unlike their English counterparts, Arabic attributives adjectives follow the noun they modify in gender, number or grammatical case. For example، قلب ضعيف گلبون گاپیلیون is translated into English as ‘a weak heart’. However, in the so-called false یقلاطah construction، the Arabic adjective precedes the noun it modifies، as in ضعيف القلب گاپیلی al-qalbi، which might be translated into English as ‘one (m.) with a weak heart’. In Arabic، the term اضافة یقلاطah ‘genitive’ means literally ‘addition’، ‘annexation’ or ‘attachment’. Abu-Chacra (2007: 61) explains:
This kind of annexation occurs when two nouns (or an adjective and a noun) are linked together and immediately follow each other. It is comparable to a genitive or attributive construction, where the first noun (or adjective) is the head constitute and the second noun is the attribute.

Abu-Chacra (ibid) distinguishes between two different forms of *iḍāfah*: the first is called الأضافة الحقيقية al-iḍāfatu al-ḥaqiqiyatu, ‘genuine annexation’, or as Schulz (2004: 131) calls it, *iḍāfah proper*. This is the genitive construction, and is very similar to the use of the ‘…of’ or ‘…’s’ constructions in English. For example, قلم الولد *qalamu al-waladi* translates as ‘the boy’s pen’ or ‘the pen of the boy’. This kind of *iḍāfah* consists of two terms. The first is called المضاف al-muḍaf ‘annexed’ or ‘possessed’, and is usually indefinite, without ال...al ‘the’. The second term is called المضاف إليه al-muḍaf ilayhi ‘annexer’ or ‘possessor’, and it is usually definite, with ال...al ‘the’.

The second form of *iḍāfah* is called الأضافة غير الحقيقية al-iḍāfatu ghayru al-ḥaqiqiyati ‘false *iḍāfah’*, sometimes termed ‘improper annexation’ or ‘adjective *iḍāfah’*. This kind of *iḍāfah* occurs when the first term of the *iḍāfah* construction is an adjective. For example: ضعيف القلب *da‘if al-qalb* ‘one (masculine) with a weak heart’ – an example mentioned above. It is called a ‘false *iḍāfah’ because it violates the standard rules of *iḍāfah* construction: “Whether or not the first noun (the annexed) refers to something definite or indefinite, it never takes the definite article...ال...al” (Abu-Chacra 2007: 63). In the case of false *iḍāfah*, when the whole (adjectival) phrase is definite, it is possible to prefix the initial adjective with ال...al. For example: الرجل الضعيف القلب *al-rajulu al-da‘ifu al-qalbi* ‘the weak hearted man’.

Here I focus on the second form of *iḍāfah*, which Abu-Chacra (2007: 64) called the *iḍāfah* adjective construction, because it is more frequent in the I-AR as well as Al-H corpora than the proper *iḍāfah*.

There is one more important difference between English and Arabic forms of adjectives. While there is only one form of adjective in English, the Arabic adjective has six forms: singular masculine, singular feminine, dual masculine, dual feminine, plural masculine, and plural feminine. Surprisingly, in the corpus analysis of power-related adjectives using the Al-H and I-AR corpora, I found that the frequency of the singular masculine form is very high.
compared to the other forms. Additionally, I have ignored plural adjective forms, as they are very difficult to compute and may have more than one form. For example, ضعفاء ضعيف ضعاف, and ضعيف can be plurals of ضعيف. Furthermore, in Arabic grammar references, the regular plural is formed by adding the suffix ون or ين، which is known as masculine sound plural. Deciding which one to choose depends on the case, i.e. nominative, accusative, or genitive (Maxos 2000: 2). Moreover, the frequency of dual masculine and dual feminine adjectives is very low in both Arabic corpora. One reason for this is that the use of the dual form in general is not as dominant as the use of the singular masculine form. Another reason is that there are lots of examples in I-AR using colloquial dialect, which does not usually use dual forms. In this chapter, I will focus on the singular masculine form only, because in addition to the dominance of the masculine form over the feminine in Arabic corpora, it is the form that is typically used in English-Arabic/Arabic-English dictionaries. It is the only form that is used for any descriptive expression. This is the norm in the Arabic language in general, not only in dictionaries. In addition, there is a traditional notion in Arabic linguistic thought that maleness is more basic than femaleness.

7.5 English and Arabic Power-related Appraisal Adjectives: Semantic Prosody in Dictionaries

Partington highlights Louw’s (1993: 173) claim that “Lexicographers in the past have not been fully aware of the extent of semantic prosody […] modern corpora provide new opportunities of studying the phenomenon” (Partington 1998: 68).

In this section, Louw and Partington’s claims are investigated in greater detail, and a precise analysis of examples of semantic prosody in power-related appraisal adjectives is provided. In order to do this, the following sections will introduce the English-Arabic and English-English translations of the selected appraisal power-related adjectives as they appear in the selected dictionaries.
7.5.1 *weak* vs. *strong*

### 7.5.1.1 *weak*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ضعيف (wāhin/daʿīf)</td>
<td>ضعيف (1) غير قوي أو متين أو حصين qawi aw matin aw laşmaٰن</td>
<td>(1) not strong enough to work or last properly.</td>
<td>(1) lacking physical strength and energy.</td>
<td>Lacking power or strength; feeble; ineffectual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. ضعيف العقل (daʿīf al-ʿaql)</td>
<td>غير حكيم أو حكيم qawi aw matin aw лушم</td>
<td>(2) not strong in character</td>
<td>(2) liable to break or give way under pressure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ضعيف العقل (daʿīf al-ʿaql)</td>
<td>ضعيف العقل</td>
<td>(3) containing too much water.</td>
<td>(3) not secure, stable, or firmly established.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ضعيف (wāhin)</td>
<td>ضعيف (2)</td>
<td>ضعيف في النظم</td>
<td>(4) lacking power, influence, or ability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ضعيف (wāhin)</td>
<td>ضعيف (3)</td>
<td>ضعيف في النظم</td>
<td>(5) lacking intensity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ضعيف (khafif)</td>
<td>ضعيف (4)</td>
<td>ضعيف في النظم</td>
<td>(6) heavily diluted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ضعيف (khafif)</td>
<td>ضعيف (5)</td>
<td>ضعيف في النظم</td>
<td>(7) not convincing or forceful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ضعيف (rakik)</td>
<td>ضعيف (6)</td>
<td>ضعيف في النظم</td>
<td>(8) forming the past tense and past participle by addition of a suffix (ed).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ضعيف (sakhif)</td>
<td>ضعيف (7)</td>
<td>ضعيف في النظم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ضعيف (sakhif)</td>
<td>ضعيف (8)</td>
<td>ضعيف في النظم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ضعيف (mākin aw nūqṭatu al-ʿaʿf)</td>
<td>ضعيف (9)</td>
<td>ضعيف في النظم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 13: weak*
Table 13 shows that there is a significant difference between the two bilingual dictionaries (AMMD and EMD) and the monolingual dictionaries (LASD, COED and WCD). In addition, there are significant differences between the two bilingual dictionaries themselves, as well as between the three monolingual English-English dictionaries.

Both bilingual dictionaries interpret *weak* as *IBLET* [Table 13, see underlined meanings], which is regarded as the most common translational equivalent of the powerless adjective *weak* in Arabic. However, while the EMD does not specify the type of category that *IBLET* modifies, the AMMD collocates *IBLET* with the noun *al-`aql*, that is ‘*mind’*.

The following table shows the loglikelihood score (LLS), as well as the absolute frequency/Joint (J) of the ‘physical’ collocation of *weak*, as it appears in the BNC and I-EN corpora:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>I-EN</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>pulse</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physically weak</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chest</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>muscle</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muscle</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>leg</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ankle</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>knee</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chin</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>heart</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leg</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: The physical collocation of *weak* in BNC and I-EN with a span window of 0: 1

The above table provides enough evidence to show that *weak* collocates with physical weakness of the body parts much more than with mental weakness.
The LL score for *mentally weak* in BNC is 0.64, and in I-EN is 0.49. Similarly, the LL score for *weak mind* in BNC is 1.58, and in I-EN is 4.37. This evidence is further supported by the collocational analysis of ضعيف (the singular masculine adjective of *weak*) as illustrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-AR</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>شخصية</td>
<td>150.35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القلب</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الساقين</td>
<td>75.35</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>البصر</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>العقل</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: The behavioural, physical and mental collocation of ضعيف in I-AR

From the table above, we can see that the collocation of *al-shakhṣiyah* is quite high, which goes with the LASD description (*weak personality* is classified under 'behavioural weakness' since it cannot be included within physical or mental categories). This is followed by some physical collocations with *al-qalb*, *al-sāqayn* and *al-baṣar*, which correspond to the COED interpretation. However, the collocation of ضعيف with *al-aql* is very low, with only two examples in the I-AR, and this obviously contradicts the AMMD translation (table 13, no. 2.a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>I-EN</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syllable</td>
<td>87.51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>spot</td>
<td>133.28</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot</td>
<td>86.21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>link</td>
<td>107.04</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>link</td>
<td>80.91</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>point</td>
<td>99.54</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point</td>
<td>57.05</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>economy</td>
<td>58.50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction</td>
<td>56.71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>signal</td>
<td>47.15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>39.28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>tie</td>
<td>40.82</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlap</td>
<td>36.62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>acid</td>
<td>33.38</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smile</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>argument</td>
<td>30.72</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuclear</td>
<td>30.81</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>immune</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>28.07</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>position</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: The top ten collocates of *weak* in the BNC with a span window of 0:1

Table 16 above reveals some missing translations in the bilingual dictionaries. Although the LLS of ‘weak syllable’ appears to be very low in the I-EN (1.87),
table 16 shows that it is the most frequently used collocation in the BNC. However, AMMD does not provide any proper translation of the highest collocation of weak, i.e. spot. COED also refers to ‘weak verbs’, i.e. ‘regular verbs’ in English grammar (see table 13). Neither bilingual English-Arabic dictionaries translate these two grammatical idioms, although al-маqāfī al-khāfīfah(al- ‘المقاطع الخفيفة’ الم القاطع الخفيفة) ‘weak syllables’ and al-‘af‘āl ghāyr al-shādhdhah(‘الأفعال غير الشاذة’ ‘regular verbs’) can be added here as proper Arabic equivalent translations.

The above table also shows that the strongest collocation of weak in the I-EN is ‘spot’, and it is the second highest LLS in the BNC. The EMD translation نقطة الضعف nuqṭatu al-‘af‘īfi (table 13, no. 8) is appropriate to the meaning of the concordance lines in both corpora.

On the other hand, although ‘weak smile’ has 24 examples in the BNC, it does not have an accurate translational equivalent in the two bilingual dictionaries, despite the fact that the Arabic language has a variety of common collocations that fit ‘weak smile’, e.g. ابتسامة باهته – صفراء ابتسامة باهته – صفراء (ibtisāmah bāhitah – ṣafra‘) ‘weak smile’

Another misleading translation of weak provided by the AMMD is أحمق aḥmaq (table 13, no. 2.b), which means ‘foolish/not wise’, a meaning that is not even mentioned in the other English-English dictionaries under discussion. On the other hand, EMD translates weak as خفيف khafīf and طفيف ṭafīf [table 13 (no. 3 & 4)]. Surprisingly, in the EMD Arabic-English (written by the same author), these two adjectives are not translated as weak. The following lines show the three translations of ṭafīf in the EMD Arabic-English (p. 406):

(a) ناقص nāqīs deficient
(b) qasīr / قليل (qalīl / yasīr small, little, slight
(c) zahīd trifling, trivial, insignificant

خفيف khafīf, on the other hand, is translated as: “light, not heavy” – referring to weight (p. 194) – with no mention at all to the adjective weak. These examples reflect the ambiguity and contrast between the EMD English-Arabic dictionary and the EMD Arabic-English dictionary.
### 7.5.1.2 strong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) قوي</td>
<td>محارب</td>
<td>(1) having a degree of power, esp. of the body.</td>
<td>(1) physically powerful.</td>
<td>physically or mentally powerful; potent; potent; intense; healthy; convincing; powerfully affecting the sense of smell or taste, pungent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. qawi</td>
<td>muḥārib</td>
<td>(2) not easily broken; spoilt or changed.</td>
<td>(2) done with or exerting great force.</td>
<td>(2) done with or exerting great force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. شديد</td>
<td>shadid</td>
<td>(3) a certain number.</td>
<td>(3) able to withstand great force or pressure.</td>
<td>(3) able to withstand great force or pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) مولف من عدد معين</td>
<td>متيين</td>
<td>(4) having a lot of the material which gives taste.</td>
<td>(4) secure, stable, or firmly established.</td>
<td>(4) secure, stable, or firmly established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu'allaf min ‘adad mu’ayyan</td>
<td>matiin</td>
<td>(5) [still] going strong active, esp. when old</td>
<td>(5) great in power, influence, or ability.</td>
<td>(5) great in power, influence, or ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) هام/صغير</td>
<td>حصر/منيع</td>
<td>(6) fa‘al/ ḥādd</td>
<td>(6) great in intensity or degree.</td>
<td>(6) great in intensity or degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hámm/ ḥākm</td>
<td>ḥaṣīn/mani’</td>
<td>(7) ذو فرامل قوية</td>
<td>(7) forceful and extreme.</td>
<td>(7) forceful and extreme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) مركز</td>
<td>معرض</td>
<td>(8) mu’aqid</td>
<td>(8) not soft or muted.</td>
<td>(8) not soft or muted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murakkaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9) pungent and full-flavoured</td>
<td>(9) pungent and full-flavoured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) متطرف</td>
<td>mutaṭarrif</td>
<td></td>
<td>(10) مرتفع باطراد</td>
<td>(10) مرتفع باطراد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. mutaṭarrif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. متحمس</td>
<td>mutaṭhammis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) عسير الهضم</td>
<td>مركز</td>
<td>(7) كرير الرائحة أو المنام</td>
<td>(7) forceful and extreme.</td>
<td>(7) forceful and extreme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عسير الهضم</td>
<td>murakkaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘asīr al-haḍām nisbiyyan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) متطرف</td>
<td>mutaṭarrif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. منيع</td>
<td>mani’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. راضح</td>
<td>rāṣik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) كريه الرائحة أو المنام</td>
<td>karih al-rā‘ilāh aw al-madhaq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خصبة</td>
<td>khisb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) مرتفع باطراد</td>
<td>murtafi‘ biṭṭirād</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17: strong**
Interestingly, the positive appraisal powerful adjective *strong* is the subject of a similar kind of debate as that which concerns *weak*, in terms of the category being ‘appraised’ or ‘the thing evaluated’. While, the COED and the LASD translate its meaning with reference to physical strength, the WCD interprets the kind of power either ‘physically or mentally’ (see table 17). On the other hand, the AMMD and the EMD do not classify the type of strength at all. However, the LLS in the BNC and the I-EN have the following indications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thing evaluated</th>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>I-EN</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arm</td>
<td>93.66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55.75</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character</td>
<td>44.13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.84</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality</td>
<td>34.88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58.54</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mind</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 18: Different collocates (thing evaluated) of *strong***

The above table shows that the occurrence of ‘strong mind’ is quite low in both corpora compared to physical and behavioural strength. Moreover, in table 17, the first translation of ‘strong’ in the EMD is محارب, *muḥārib* which means ‘fighter’, while the EMD Arabic-English translates it as ‘fighter, soldier, warrior, belligerent, combatant’ (p. 142), without mentioning *strong*. Moreover, the other three monolingual English-English dictionaries, as well as the two English corpora, do not have one single occurrence of *strong* as ‘fighter’.

In much the same way, the EMD translates *strong* as *muʿāḍālid* معضّد (table 17, EMD 8), which means: ‘helper, aider, supporter’35, as mentioned in the EMD Arabic-English (p. 443). In general terms, it seems likely that the two English-Arabic dictionaries, AMMD and EMD, focus on some very limited usages of lexical words (e.g., *dhū farāmil qaṭīyah* ذو فرامل قوية ‘with strong brakes’ in table 17, no. 7) and ignore collocations of high frequencies as the following table shows:

---

35 These are the English translations of *muʿāḍālid* in *EMD* (A – E) dictionary. While *strong* is not included as one of the translations of *muʿāḍālid*, *EMD* (E – A) dictionary translates *strong* as *muʿāḍālid*. 

---
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The strongest collocate of *strong* in the BNC is *wind*, as shown in the above table. It also has a high frequency in the I-EN (266.76), which indicates the frequent and wide usage of this collocation. However, the Arabic translation given in the EMD and the AMMD does not suit the nature of *wind*. The adjective عتابية 'atiyah in Arabic, which means ‘very strong’, fits perfectly with *strong wind*, although the LLS of رياح عتابية is 6.31 in the Al-H, and 10.24 in the I-AR, which is quite low. Moreover, table 19 shows that *strong feeling* has the highest LLS in the I-EN (372.52), and the second highest (352.24) in the BNC. Again, going through the concordance lines of the I-AR, I found that the Arabic emotional adjective جياشة jayyāshah is more frequently used with مشاعر mashā'ir 'feelings' than with the common emotional adjective قوية qawīyah given in the AMMD and the EMD.

Although *strong smell* does not appear in the top ten collocates of *strong*, the concordance analysis reveals interesting findings that dictionaries do not realise. Both the AMMD (see table 17, no. 8) and the I-AR (see figure 24) interpret the collocation of *strong smell* as a negative and unfavourable semantic prosody. In the I-AR, there are fourteen examples of رائحة قوية rā'iḥah qawīyah *strong smell*, but only one example is positive (underlined in figure 24 below), and the other thirteen examples are extremely negative.
Similarly, the collocates of *رائحة قوية* `ra'īḥah qawīyah` *strong smell* in Al-H show unpleasant connotations. There are only two occurrences of `ra'īḥah qawīyah` in this corpus:

![Figure 25: the concordance lines of *رائحة قوية* `strong smell` from Al-H](image)

Likewise, in I-EN, there are 23 occurrences of *strong smell* and 35 instances in the BNC. Apparently, in both corpora, *strong smell* tends to attract negative words and so exhibits an obvious negative semantic prosody. The concordance lines – see figure 26 below – reveal that *strong smell* collocates most frequently with unfavourable nouns like: *urine, drains, disinfectant, hot tar, rancid milk, fermenting fruit*, etc.
However, a careful analysis of the broader context in BNC and I-EN, reveals that some instances of *strong smell* are associated with positive/neutral collocates which refer to something favourable. For example:

(207) "The air felt fresh and exhilarating. Mungo caught the **strong smell** of pine and rich wet earth. Being the first to inhale it" (BNC, *The forest of the night*, W. fict prose, 1991).

(208) "Grate the lemon zest directly into the pan and cook for approx 1 min until there is a **strong smell** of lemon from the pan" (I-EN, [http://www.aspoonfulofsugar.net/blog/2004/01](http://www.aspoonfulofsugar.net/blog/2004/01)).

(209) "A **strong smell** of coffee emanating from the basement reminded her that Mrs Crouching, her landlady, was having one of her monthly " evenings" (BNC, *An unsuitable attachment*, W. fict. Prose, 1982).
Apparently, the above examples demonstrate strong smell as a positive semantic prosody in example 207. It collocates with positive and favourable connotations such as felt fresh, exhilarating and rich. In examples 208 & 209, strong smell tends to attract neutral words as pan, cook, basement, lemon, coffee.

On the whole, and based on the concordance lines of both corpora, strong smell shows a negative semantic prosody especially when it is used with:

- fumes, gas, smoke, gunpowder, petrol, paints
- animals (e.g. dog, pig, fish).
- food and drink (accompanied by something undesirable, e.g. rancid milk and fermenting fruit).
- Body odour (e.g. smell of sweat).

When strong smell is used with food and drink that are not bad, sour or rotten, it shows a mixed semantic prosody, either positive or neutral, as figure 27 shows below:

![Figure 27: Different interpretations of strong smell in English and Arabic](image)

There are also different types of 'lacking' that correspond to the powerless adjective weak, as well as several ‘abilities’ of the powerful adjective strong. In
order to summarise all these kinds of ‘lacking’ and ‘abilities’, the following tables (20& 21) will present glosses for the Arabic senses of weak and strong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thing evaluated</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mental/ behavioral/physical part of the body. or after feel/become</td>
<td>مريض/واهن / غير قادر/ضعف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medicine/pills/food</td>
<td>غير طري/نافشف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market/economy/ company/industry/security (characterized by falling prices)</td>
<td>سوق نائمة-مؤذنة بالهبوط/متقلب/غير مستقر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smile</td>
<td>باهته/صفراء</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drink/solution</td>
<td>مدق</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argument/document</td>
<td>غير مؤثر/غير مقنع</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Glosses for the Arabic senses of weak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thing evaluated</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wind</td>
<td>قوية جدا/ عاصفة/عاتية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beliefs</td>
<td>راسخة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believer</td>
<td>ذو عقيدة راسخة/متحسس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feelings/emotions</td>
<td>متفقة / حيآة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidence</td>
<td>مؤثر / مقنع</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>views/ideas</td>
<td>جازر حد الاعتدال/ متطرف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>صحي / شهي / لذيذ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smell (positive)</td>
<td>رائحة زكية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smell (negative)</td>
<td>رائحة نفاثة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Glosses for the Arabic senses of strong
However, it must be noted that ‘weak syllables’ – that has the highest frequency in BNC (LLS = 87.51) and occurs 29 times – has been omitted from the above tables as it refers to ‘unstressed vowels’ like schwa in English grammar – an interpretation that has nothing to do with the appraisal of power-related adjectives.

### 7.5.2 powerful vs. powerless

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p.714</td>
<td>p. 590</td>
<td>p. 468</td>
<td>having power</td>
<td>p. 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) a. قوي</td>
<td>قدير/قوي (1)</td>
<td>(1) having great power; very strong, full of force.</td>
<td></td>
<td>mighty; strong; influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qawi</td>
<td>مقدتر</td>
<td>(2) having a strong effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. جبار</td>
<td>qadir/qawi/ muqtadir</td>
<td>(2) فعال/شديد</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jabbār</td>
<td>فعال</td>
<td>fa‘āl</td>
<td>(3) غزير</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) فعال</td>
<td>fa‘āl</td>
<td>غزير</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabīr/قابح</td>
<td>ghazir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: powerful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 714</td>
<td>p. 590</td>
<td>p. 468</td>
<td>Without ability, influence or power</td>
<td>p. 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عاجز/واهن/ضعيف</td>
<td>ضعيف/واهن/عاجز</td>
<td>lacking power or strength; weak; unable</td>
<td></td>
<td>without power, feeble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ājiz/wāhin/ ḍa‘if</td>
<td>عديم القوة أو التأثير</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: powerless
7.5.2.1 powerful

Unlike strong, table 22 reveals that monolingual and bilingual dictionaries do not differ in their interpretation of the powerful appraisal adjective, powerful, i.e. ‘having power or being strong’. Moreover, both monolingual dictionaries translate powerful and strong as قوي qawi, which is the most common translational equivalent of strong and powerful in Arabic.

However, Halliday (1976: 73) notes that ‘tea’ is typically described as ‘strong’ rather than ‘powerful’, whereas a ‘car’ is more likely to be described as ‘powerful’ than ‘strong’, even though the two modifiers share the common general features of strength and ability.

In addition to Halliday’s observation, the I-EN and BNC reveal that powerful collocates with military/political expressions, and has a kind of forceful tone [underlined in table 24 below], whereas strong is linked with ‘feelings, emotions, sense, support…’ [see table 24].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>I-EN</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>143.09</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>tool</td>
<td>814.27</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influence</td>
<td>136.16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>force</td>
<td>207.16</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>force</td>
<td>103.39</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>nation</td>
<td>186.20</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>90.58</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>weapon</td>
<td>136.33</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weapon</td>
<td>83.64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>86.53</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argument</td>
<td>57.96</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>influence</td>
<td>77.79</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>55.52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>incentive</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>message</td>
<td>63.50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice</td>
<td>44.83</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>computer</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>54.29</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: The top ten collocates of powerful in BNC and I-EN
In Arabic, the adjectives جبار jabbār and ذو سلطنة عظيمة dhū sūltān ‘ażīmah correspond to the semantic tendency of powerful, although there are some differences that depend on the structural usages of the sentence that will be discussed later in this chapter (section 7.6).

7.5.2.2 powerless

Table 23 compares the interpretations of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries that look very similar to each other denoting ‘lack of power’. There is in fact a significant difference between powerless and weak. Although both bilingual dictionaries (AMMD and EMD) have the same translations of both powerless adjectives, as ضعيف / عاجز ‘ājīz, the highest collocation of powerless in both corpora is powerless to (see table 25), which gives the sense of being helpless, passive, unable to do anything, totally dependent, hanging, as figure (28) below shows:

Figure 28: Concordance lines of powerless to from I-EN
As can be seen from Table 25 – a span window of 0:1 – and Figure 28, powerless correlates mostly with prepositions and conjunctions. However, a wider span window of (3:3) reveals that powerless can collocate with two groups of nouns: animate (e.g. people, human, woman) and inanimate (e.g. society and government). The Arabic phrase لا حيلة له ḫilat ḫahu ‘helpless’ is very close in meaning to powerless. The following table shows the highest noun collocates of powerless in BNC and I-EN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>I-EN</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>187.92</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>148.66</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against</td>
<td>18.16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>against</td>
<td>38.48</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>35.61</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: The top ten collocates of powerless in BNC and I-EN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>I-EN</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>alcohol</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>25.16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>22.32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>face</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>power</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>society</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>thing</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>person</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: The highest noun collocates of powerless in BNC and I-EN using a span window of 3:3
### 7.5.3 tender vs. tough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>نضير/غض</td>
<td>(1) soft, easy</td>
<td>(1) gentle and</td>
<td>soft, delicate;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>رياني/رخص</td>
<td>to bite through</td>
<td>fragile; painful,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>sahl al-</td>
<td>نادر/غداش</td>
<td>(2) sore; easily</td>
<td>sore; sensitive,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>maksar/sarī</td>
<td>rayyān/rakhṣ</td>
<td>hurt</td>
<td>sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>لين/طری</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3) sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>sahl al-maḍgh</td>
<td>layyin/ṭariyy</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) young and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سخي</td>
<td></td>
<td>vulnerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>sakhiyy</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) requiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>جنون/حساس</td>
<td>رطی /لين</td>
<td>tact or careful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>ḥanūn/ḥassās</td>
<td></td>
<td>handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>ساذج/غیر ناضج</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>ṣādhiyy/ghirr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>حسن</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>ḥanūn/muḥīb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>حسن</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>حسن</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>حسن</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>حسن</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>حسن</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>سهل المكسر</td>
<td>حسن</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 27: tender


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ناشف (1)</td>
<td>متين (1)</td>
<td>(1) strong; not easily weakened.</td>
<td>(1) strong enough to withstand wear and tear.</td>
<td>Strong, durable, hardy, rough and violent, difficult, infml. Unlucky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عنيف (2)</td>
<td>عسير المضغ (2)</td>
<td>(2) difficult to cut or eat:</td>
<td>(2) able to endure hardships, adversity, or pain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غشين (3)</td>
<td>نرج (3)</td>
<td>(3) difficult to do; demanding effort.</td>
<td>(3) strict and uncompromising.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جامد (4)</td>
<td>حازم - صاسم (4)</td>
<td>(4) rough, hard.</td>
<td>(4) involving considerable difficulty or hardship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كضيف القرام (5)</td>
<td>حذن - قوي - صلب - قاس</td>
<td>(5) infml. Too bad; unfortunate</td>
<td>(5) rough or violent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kathif al-qawam</td>
<td>khashin/qawi/šalb/qāsin</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) used to express a lack of sympathy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عيند (6)</td>
<td>عسير الهضم (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'anid</td>
<td>'asir al-hađm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عنيف (8)</td>
<td>جلف - شكس (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'anif</td>
<td>jilf/shakis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>واقعي إلى حد (10)</td>
<td>شخص جلف أو شكس الخ (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القسوه waqī‘ī ʿilā ḥadd al-qaswah</td>
<td>shakhš jilf aw shakis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: tough

Although tables 27 and 28 provide a wide range of information on tender and tough, this kind of information is introduced in an unsystematic order. For example, in table 28, EMD provides five different translations for tough: (1) dry;
(2) violent; (3) hard, coarse, rude, mannerless, uncivil; (4) solid; (5) thick and dense. However, these five meanings are not provided in a clear phraseological context that can help the user of the dictionary to correctly identify the things being appraised. In much the same unsystematic way, AMMD follows the same procedure in displaying the meanings of tough. Also some common translations – eg. งา’ิf and qawi, which are repeated in tables (13, 17, 22 and 23) – are provided without much guidance. On the other hand, by analysing the collocates of tender and tough, some prosodic meanings have been revealed and hence they can be added to the previously provided dictionary meanings. The following tables 29 and 30 show the top ten collocates of tender and tough in BNC and I-EN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>I-EN</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>offer</td>
<td>offer</td>
<td>90.55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>90.64</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>86.29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>moment</td>
<td>39.89</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loving</td>
<td>loving</td>
<td>59.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>offer</td>
<td>35.09</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mercy</td>
<td>mercy</td>
<td>34.49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>loving</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flesh</td>
<td>flesh</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>mercy</td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant</td>
<td>plant</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>touch</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>price</td>
<td>price</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>coin</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot</td>
<td>spot</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>affection</td>
<td>18.73</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiss</td>
<td>kiss</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>meat</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: The top ten collocates of tender in BNC and I-EN
Knowing the frequency of a collocate is very useful in the sense that the collocation pairs which are highly frequent are considered as regular and normal. Conversely, infrequent collocations "catch our attention and strike us as unusual" (Baker 1992: 50). Tables 29 and 30 suggest that what a word means often depends on its association with definite collocates. For example, tender has a vast collocational range, some of its typical noun collocates are offer, age, loving care/heart, mercy, flesh, plant, price, moment, and coin as clearly shown in table 29. The collocates offer, age, loving care/heart and moment have a high LLS and hence they are rather frequent collocates of tender in both corpora. When tender collocates with offer or price it means that the price offered is usually at a premium to the market price. On the other hand, tender age refers to the young immature age. Moreover, it is clear from the concordance analysis and as shown in table 29 that tender typically collocates highly with positive, sentimental and romantic nouns like moment, memories, affection, touch, kiss, mercy, loving care/heart, which is quite normal as Stubbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>I-EN</th>
<th>LLS</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>guy</td>
<td>170.73</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>357.46</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>72.90</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>question</td>
<td>261.73</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>decision</td>
<td>193.13</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cookie</td>
<td>47.94</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>guy</td>
<td>119.01</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>game</td>
<td>36.34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>choice</td>
<td>91.59</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competition</td>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>job</td>
<td>70.24</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stance</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>issue</td>
<td>45.47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line</td>
<td>28.38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>37.26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measure</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>competition</td>
<td>36.85</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: The top ten collocates of tough in BNC and I-EN
(2002: 225) believes that "there are always semantic relations between node and collocates, and amongst the collocates themselves".

However, the analysis reveals that tender collocates with other – unromantic – nouns that can be negative or neutral like spot, plant, process, coin. For example, tender spot is more likely to occur negatively with unfavourable nouns like pain, lumps, blood. In such negative contexts, tender spot often means a particular (physical/psychological) painful or hurting spot. Similarly, it appears that tender plant is found in negative phraseological contexts such as to safeguard tender plants from frost, freeze damage, unprotected, survive, cause chlorosis, stunting, leaf drop, knock the leaves off, bleak and unattractive, kill. Therefore, tender plant refers to a kind of plant that is easily killed by unfavourable (like freezing temperature) condition.

On the other hand, it is clear that the collocates, process and coin are neutral in their contexts. While tender process indicates the process of issuing a proposal/supplier contract to select a preferred project, tender coin is a collocation that has a very narrow and technical meaning in the settlement of debts. It is a sort of gold currency whose market price depends on its gold content. This kind of coin is used as a method of payment and a legal tender coin should offer the exact amount due because no change can be demanded.

In contrast to tender, table 30 shows the top collocates of tough. Though most of the entries shown in table 28 introduce tough as a strongly unpleasant adjective, the positive/neutral semantic prosody of tough has been shown through concordance analysis. For example, tough guy has the highest LLS in BNC (170.73) and the fourth top LLS in I-EN (119.01). Tough guy can be interpreted as a positive/negative semantic prosody depending on the good/bad company in the contexts they occur in as shown below.

(210) "He's a tough guy. He makes our trains run on time. We need him." (BNC, Lying together, W fict prose, 1990)

(211) "Paul Raymond, 67, is trying to come to terms with his daughter's death. I'm a tough, tough guy but I've been crying my eyes out all day." (BNC, Today, W newsp other report, 1992)
(212) "Boston, Massachusetts The Donald’s a tough guy, but behind the scenes he’s very compassionate with the people who work for him."


Whereas examples 210 and 211 above show tough guy as a positive prosody and denote a 'strong confident guy that has the ability to face difficulties with determination', 212 and 213 introduce the negative unfavourable features of tough guy as 'dispassionate/insensitive/rough'. The other collocate that is used to describe persons is cookie. Tough cookie is mainly used in an informal setting as a positive prosody. It refers to someone who is not easily disappointed. Tough cookie indicates a strong character that can face and tolerate difficulty. It collocates with determined career girl, refusing to be deflected, winning something of reputation, dedicated, admires, positive, impressive manner, cool enough to handle, refusing to crumble, brought…back, as the following concordance lines show.

![Concordance lines of tough cookie from BNC](image)

Figure 29: Concordance lines of tough cookie from BNC

Tough love is another positive collocation that occurs 40 times in I-EN with 45.97 LLS. After observing the concordance lines and looking at the left and right collocates, I found that family disease, addictive disease, family members, kids, sufferer, seek recovery, care so much, urge, help, fix and
control are repeated throughout the concordance lines in BNC and I-EN. That means, tough love is an approach that hurts, but still it is a necessary pain. It is a very strict practice with a relative or a friend that has a disease or a problem in order to help them pass the storm and overcome the problem.

On the other hand, the other collocates in table 30 can be put in groups. For example, tough question/decision/job means very complicated and hard to solve, take or do. Whereas tough competition/game refers to a kind of challenging (still it can be enjoyable and interesting), tough stance/action/line/measure/issue/situation indicates a very strict and firm procedure or reaction.

The following tables 31 and 32 introduce glosses for the Arabic senses of tender and tough, focusing on the highest collocations as appeared in the BNC and I-EN as well as the lexicographical senses in tables 27 and 28.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thing evaluated</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>year/age</td>
<td>inexperienced</td>
<td>غير ناضج ghayru nādj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant</td>
<td>soft/mellow</td>
<td>لين/طري layyin/ṭari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people, behaviour</td>
<td>gentle, nice, delicate</td>
<td>لطيف–رفيق latif-raiqiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>easy to chew/bite/cut</td>
<td>سهل المضغ sahl al-maḏīgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part of the body/flesh/spot</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>حساس/مرهف ḥassas/murḥaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer/price</td>
<td>generous</td>
<td>سخي/كريم/معطاء sakhiyy/karim/ miʿtāʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feelings, touch affection/memory emotions, love, kiss, moment</td>
<td>romantic/arousing warm feelings</td>
<td>حنون/رومانسي/عاطفي ḥanūn/rumānsiyy/ʿatīfiyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>document</td>
<td>bid</td>
<td>وثيقة مناقصة wathīqt munāqaṣah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wound</td>
<td>painful/sore</td>
<td>موجع عند اللمس mūjiʿ inda al-lams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Glosses for the Arabic senses of tender
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thing evaluated</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>guy (positive)</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>رجل صلب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guy (negative)</td>
<td>aggressive</td>
<td>‘عدواني</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>أوقات عصيبة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>task/job</td>
<td>difficult to do</td>
<td>من الصعب القيام بها</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people (cookie)</td>
<td>rough, stiff, violent/confident, determined</td>
<td>قاس -- جلف -- شكت -- شديد القسوة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stance/action/line measure/</td>
<td>extremely rough/ serious procedure</td>
<td>'إجرا شديد القسوة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question/problem decision/ choice/ competition/game issue/situation</td>
<td>difficult to solve / complicated</td>
<td>صعبة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opponent</td>
<td>stubborn, obstinate</td>
<td>‘عندلا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luck</td>
<td>unfortunate, too bad</td>
<td>حظ سيء</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather</td>
<td>rough (very cold/hot)</td>
<td>طقس قاس شديد الحرارة شديد البرودة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>difficult to chew</td>
<td>ناشف/عسير المضغ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Glosses for the Arabic senses of *tough*
7.6 Arabic Power-related Appraisal Adjectives

7.6.1 Powerful Appraisal Adjectives: قوي qawī, جبار jabbār, and قاس qāsin ‘strong’

This section considers the three Arabic powerful adjectives under discussion, which have a common shared translation in the EMD, i.e. strong (see 7.3). The lexical meanings of these adjectives are first examined in three monolingual Arabic-Arabic dictionaries. These dictionaries are: Qāmūs Al- Wāfi, Qāmūs Al-Muhīt ‘Al-Muhīt Lexicon’, and Muhīt Al- Muhīt. These dictionaries were specially selected as they are considered the most comprehensive and reliable Arabic dictionaries.

(1) قوي qawī

Al-Wāfi p. 526

القوي: ذو القوة - جمع: أقوياء - من أسمائه تعالى والقوة: ضد الضعف وفي تعريفات الجرجاني"القوة هي
تمكن الحيوان من الأعمال الشاقة" والقوة أيضا: الطاقة
al-qawī: the one who has strength. Plural: aqwīyā’. It is one of God’s names.

al quwwah ‘the strength’: opposite ‘weakness’. In al- jurjāni’s definitions: ‘the strength is the animal’s ability to do hard actions’. ‘Strength’ is also: Energy

Al-Muhīt p. 1710

فلان قوي: أي في نفسه و دابته. والقوة: ضد الضعف والقوى (جمع): العقل
Someone is qawī: means in himself and his animal/beast. The strength: opposite ‘weakness’. quwī (plural): mental power.

Muhīt Al-Muhīt p.1779

القوي: ذو القوة - جمع: قوات وقوي (بضم القاف) وقوي (بكسر القاف) والقوة ضد الضعف. وفي التعريفات:
القوة هي تمكن الحيوان من الأعمال الشاقة.
al-qawī: The one who has strength. In definitions: the strength is the animal’s ability to perform difficult tasks.

(2) جبار jabbār
It is one of Allah’s (God) attributes – The Almighty – that denotes His superior might over which one has no control. When used of God’s creation, it means tyrannical, oppressive, or arrogant. It is said: “Woe (sorrow/misery) to the tyrant of earth from the tyrant (The Almighty) of the Heavens. Metaphorically: “A tyrant (stony) heart does not feel mercy”.

Al-Waфи p. 77

الجبار: الله تعالى لتكبره وكل عات، وكل عات يجبر الناس على ما يريد، والجبار: اسم الجوزاء، ولكل عات يجبر الناس على ما يريد، والجبار: اسم الجوزاء، ولكل عات يجبر الناس على ما يريد.

jabbār: God The Almighty, an epithet for everyone who is oppressive, a merciless heart, illegal fighting as a synonym of great, strong and tall.

Al-Muhît p. 460

jabbār is one of God’s attributes and it is a quality of everyone who is seen as an oppressive and tyrant who obliges people to do what he wants. jabbār also refers to the Gemini (constellation) and to a merciless heart. jabbār is also used of the one who kills people illegally and unjustly. Another meaning of Jabbār is a tall and strong palm tree. The jabbār is also the one who is great, strong and tall or the one who has an outstanding, supernatural power and body, for example jālīt (Goliath). When a palm tree is described as jabbārah (sing.fem.), it means that its fruits (dates) cannot be reached. However, when a camel is addressed as jabbārah, it means that it is great and fat.

Al-Waфи p. 501

القاس: اسم فاعل...يقال:“قلب قاس وحجر قاس”...ليلة قاسية: شديدة الظلمة...القاسية: أرض لا تنبت شيئا

al-qāsi is an active participle, as in the expression: “A stony/tough heart and a stony stone”. When qāsiyah qualifies ‘night’, it means ‘very dark’ and when qualifies ‘earth’, it means ‘sterile, barren or infertile’.

Al-Muhît p. 1707 (Not given as an adjective)
qasā is a verb in the past tense, it means ‘became hard and tough’. qāsāhu means ‘suffered from’. The poet gathered the two senses (heart and stone) together by saying: I pass by the stone and kiss it! ...because your heart looks like a stone.

Table 33: Definitions of qawī, jabbār and qāsin in monolingual Arabic dictionaries

The above dictionaries mark similar and dissimilar appraisal categories of senses between the three powerful adjectives under discussion. Altogether, there are three main appraisal senses: (1) An attribute of Allah (God), (2) Physical strength, and (3) Metaphoric strength. While, qawī and jabbār share the meaning in (1) – with the addition of the definite article al – qāsin does not, as it is not a name of God. Table 33 also shows that the second sense (2) is also shared between qawī and jabbār only, which both denote physical ability. It is quite unclear that Al-Wāfi and Muhīṭ Al-Muhīṭ evaluate al-quwwah ‘the strength’ only in terms of an animal’s ability to do hard actions. The three monolingual dictionaries agree that jabbār and qāsin can be used metaphorically to evaluate a ‘tyrant/stony heart’. They even quote the same poetic verse for qāsin. As for qawī, the three dictionaries do not mention any figurative usage. There are other meanings that are mentioned in the dictionaries because of the use of the feminine singular form of qāsin, that is qāsiyah. For example, Al-Wāfi describes laylah ‘night’ as qāsiyah in order to denote its darkness. The distribution of the main appraisal senses are presented in table (34) below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal senses</th>
<th>qawī</th>
<th>jabbār</th>
<th>qāsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A name of God</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical strength</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphorical strength</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34: The three main appraisal senses of qawī, jabbār and qāsin as they appear in the monolingual Arabic dictionaries

Although the above table displays the main appraisal senses of qawī, jabbār and qāsin, it does not guarantee an exclusive distinction between the three powerful adjectival synonyms. Thus, before a final conclusion can be reached regarding the three powerful adjectival synonyms, a more precise analysis must be undertaken. Following the methods of Lyons (1995), Elewa (2004), and Xiao and McEnery (2006), a collocational analysis will be used to reveal the (dis)similarity between apparent near-synonyms. The three tables below (35, 36 and 37) represent the significant collocations of qawī, jabbār and qāsin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocates</th>
<th>I-AR</th>
<th>Al-H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLS</td>
<td>Joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شكل</td>
<td>manner</td>
<td>341.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تأثير</td>
<td>effect</td>
<td>191.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>زلزال</td>
<td>earthquake</td>
<td>149.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فريق</td>
<td>team</td>
<td>97.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دليل</td>
<td>evidence</td>
<td>86.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اقتصاد</td>
<td>economy</td>
<td>84.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>منافس</td>
<td>competitor</td>
<td>79.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جيش</td>
<td>army</td>
<td>76.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رجل</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>75.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نفوذ</td>
<td>influence</td>
<td>69.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35: The top ten left collocates of qawṣ in I-AR and Al-H
| Collocates | I-AR | | Collocates | Al-H |
|------------|------|----------------|----------------|
|            | LLS  | Joint | Collocates | LLS  | Joint |
| كل-establish / kull | every | 121.06 | 55 | محرك / muḥarrīk | engine | 14.00 | 4 |
| مجهود-establish / majhūd | effort | 75.25 | 25 | نووي / nawawīyy | nuclear | 11.12 | 3 |
| يا-establish / yā | O God! | 55.98 | 40 | عمل / ‘amal | work | 9.85 | 5 |
| متكبر-establish / mutakabbīr | arrogant | 31.98 | 9 | بحث / balt’h | research | 5.66 | 2 |
| ملك-establish / malik | king | 25.30 | 13 | كمبيوتر / kumbiyūtar | computer | 5.65 | 2 |
| منتقم-establish / muntaqīm | revenger / revengeful | 23.92 | 6 | مارد / mārid | mutinous / giant | 5.49 | 1 |
| عمل-establish / ‘amal | work | 20.00 | 26 | بغل / baghl | mule | 5.01 | 1 |
| ظالم-establish / zālīm | unjust | 11.79 | 6 | ملك / malik | a king | 4.46 | 1 |
| شعب-establish / sha’b | people | 8.22 | 5 | بلد / balad | town | 4.13 | 2 |
| مشروع-establish / mashrū’ | project | 6.27 | 7 | جهد / juhd | effort | 4.12 | 1 |

Table 36: The top ten left collocates of *jabbār* in I-AR and Al-H
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocates</th>
<th>I-AR</th>
<th>Al-H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLS</td>
<td>Joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شكل</td>
<td>manner</td>
<td>19.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دِرْس</td>
<td>lesson</td>
<td>17.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بِرْد</td>
<td>reply/cold</td>
<td>17.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قَلْب</td>
<td>heart</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شَيْء</td>
<td>thing</td>
<td>9.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هُوَ</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عَدُو</td>
<td>enemy</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تَعْذِيب</td>
<td>torture</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَاقِع</td>
<td>reality</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عَالِم</td>
<td>world</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37: The top ten left collocates of qāsin in I-AR and Al-H
The above three tables display the frequency of the top ten collocates of the three powerful adjectives in the I-AR and Al-H, with the manual elimination of all irrelevant hits (all words that do not represent MSA, i.e. colloquial words, proper nouns, etc.). The LLS and Joint are used to highlight and reveal other collocations of the three powerful adjectives that are missed in the monolingual dictionaries.

The first interesting point to emerge is that the most statistically significant ten collocations of qawī (i.e. collocates of highest LLS in both I-AR and Al-H) do not modify the physical ability of people or animals as table 33 claims. One exception is the collocate رجل rajul ‘man’ which denotes physical, mental and behavioural ability. qawī also appraises different types of appraisal categories, i.e. it can be positive, negative or neutral, depending on the appraised contextual environment. The following figure displays this point.

![Figure 30: The three highest collocates of qawī in terms of polarity, i.e. positive, negative and neutral.](image)

The first three highest collocates of qawī in I-AR are in order (from highest to lowest): شكل shakl ‘manner’, تأثير ta’thīr ‘effect/influence’, and زلزال zilzāl ‘earthquake’. The first collocate, shakl, is always positive – it collocates with favourable words like رائعاً ra‘ī ‘fantastic’, تحسن النتائج taḥassun al-nata‘ij ‘improvement of results’, زائد من الثقة mazid mina al-thiqah ‘more confidence’, مرغوب marghīb ‘desired’, الإجابية al-‘ijābiyah ‘positivity’…etc. The second
collocate *ta’thīr* can be both neutral and positive, as shown in the examples (214) and (215) below:

> "الأعلام عموما له تأثير قوي في تغيير اراء الناس..." (214)

al-i’lām ‘umūman lahu *ta’thīr qawī* fī taghīr ārā’ al-nās

(‘the real freedom’, http://www.real-freedom.maktooblog.com)

“In general, media has a strong influence in changing people’s opinions…”

> "وقد نذكر بعض الأطباء أن للعسل تأثير قوي في مرضى الكبد..." (215)

wa qad dhakara ba’d al-aṭībbā’ anna lil’asal *ta’thīr qawī* fī marṭa’ al-kabid... faqad ra’aynā nata’ā’ij mumtāzah wa mushajji’ah

(‘The benefits of honey’, http://www.al’iz.net)

“...Some doctors mention that honey has a strong (effective/useful) effect on liver patients...we have seen encouraging and excellent results…”

> "و جاء زلزال قوي يسفر عن اصابة أكثر من مئة شخص..." (216)

wa jā’a *zīlẓāl qawī* yūsfīr ‘an ʾisābat akthar min mi’at shakhṣīn

(‘A strong (destructive) earthquake caused the injury of more than one hundred person)."

Example 214 shows a neutral tendency of the collocate *ta’thīr*, as the influence of media can be positive or negative. In example 215, *ta’thīr* is extremely positive, as it reflects the positive and favourable benefits of using honey. On the other hand, example 216 shows an extremely negative use of *qawī*, as it here describes the destructive power of an earthquake.

Moreover, *zīlẓāl* ‘earthquake’ is obviously negative as it collocates with unfavourable objects, such as: *yāṭib ‘hit’*, *qatl ‘killing’*, ʾisābah ‘injury’, *yudammir ‘destroy’*, *indhār ‘warning’*. In addition to *ta’thīr* ‘influence/effect’, ʾāthār *athar*, and *nufūd* are also considered as neutral collocates of *qawī* as they have the same semantic denotations.

Although *qawī* and *jabbār* are well known as names of God among Muslims, there is no indication in either corpus, or even in the monolingual
dictionaries (apart from Al-Wāfi) that refers to al-qawī as a name of God. On the contrary, jabbar has a very high LLS frequency (55.98) and occurs 40 times in the I-AR preceding the Arabic vocative یَا ʻO God!’. By examining all the concordance lines of the collocate (yā jabbar), it was discovered that yā jabbar appraises only God, despite the fact that it can be modified to human beings (with the opposite meaning, such as ‘anīd ‘stubborn’ or zālim ‘unfair/unjust’).

A closer look at table 36 reveals that jabbar tends to be more frequently used with tools, e.g. محرك muḥārik ‘engine’, كمبيوتر kumbiyūtar ‘computer, etc., to indicate their outstanding quality. Similarly, jabbar is used as a highly positive appraisal powerful adjective when the things appraised are جهد juhd ‘effort’, عمل ‘amal ‘work’, مشروع mashrūt ‘project’, etc., where a gorgeous piece of work is being referred to, for instance.

Surprisingly, the three monolingual dictionaries ignore these two important appraisal categories that corpus analysis reveals, i.e. appraising tools and efforts. However, both categories are in the top ten collocates, as indicated in tables 35 and 36.

In fact, jabbar and qawī can be used interchangeably in MSA when jabbar is used as a positive appraisal adjective. However, when jabbar denotes a negative tendency, it cannot be used in the place of qawī. For example, qawī and jabbar can both modify سلاح qawī ‘a weapon’ or juhd ‘effort’. However, analysing the concordance lines reveals that positive jabbar — generally — indicates greatness and perfection in addition to power, whereas qawī denotes mainly having power.

Figure 31: Concordance lines of سلاح qawī from AL-H.
The above figure shows the five occurrences of *silāh qawī* in Al-H. Interestingly, the five examples show *silāh* as a figurative noun, i.e. it is not the actual weapon used in war. It modifies (in order) سوق qīṣāṣīyyah ‘arabiyah ‘Economic Arabic Market’, حوار الحضارات hiwār al-ḥadārāt ‘Civilizations’ dialogue’, دور الأعلام dawr al-īlām ‘Media’, الصداقة al-ṣadāqah ‘The friendship’ and الدور الدار al-dawr ad-dard al-īlām ‘The role of media’.

*silāh jabbār*, on the other hand, refers to an extraordinary, unusual, outstanding and extremely effective weapon as the following example illustrates:

Conversely, when the things appraised are ‘people’, such as *malik* ‘king’, ḥākim ‘judge, commander, leader’, then *jabbār* turns into an absolute negative adjective. All examples in the Al-H and the I-AR corpora that modify people denote extremely negative categories, such as ‘*ānid* عنيد ‘stubborn’ or *ẓālim* طالم ‘unfair/unjust’. In this negative sense, *jabbār* cannot be used interchangeably with *qawī*. In a span window of 0:1 ‘*ānid* عنيد ‘stubborn’ appears to be the strongest collocate of *jabbār* in I-AR with LLS (212.91) and occurs 53 times in the corpus, as the following examples explain.

"وجَسَلَ كُلَّ جَبَّاِرٍ عَنْيَدَ (217)


wa khāba kull jabbār ‘ā nid
and failed every stubborn obstinate
"and every obstinate/stubborn potentate was brought to naught"

"ونَتَلَّبَ مِنْ رَبِّنَا أَنْ يَنْتَقِمَ مِنْ كُلِّ جَبَّارٍ عنٍّ (218)

Figure 32: An example of *silāh jabbār* from I-AR.
wa naṭlub min rabbinā an yantaqim
and we ask from our God to take revenge
min kull jabbār ‘anīd
from every stubborn obstinate
"and we ask our God to take revenge on every obstinate/stubborn potentate"

Although qāsin is widely used as a negative appraisal adjective in MSA, LLS and Joint reveal a very interesting and unexpected appraisal positive collocate of qāsin, i.e. نبض nabḏ ‘pluck’ – that is, ‘a stringed instrument’, as defined in EMD (p. 685) (pl. نوابض nawābīd). ‘pluck’ also refers to the act of pulling and releasing a taut cord\(^{36}\), i.e. resilience. When qāsin modifies a ‘pluck’ it reflects a highly favourable positive adjective and it means ‘very strongly/firmly’. nabḏ is the only positive collocate and, surprisingly, it has the highest LLS in Al-H, at 29.84. qāsin, as a positive adjective, collocates with favourable phrases extracted from concordance lines of Al-H corpus, as illustrated in the underlined examples below:

(219)

\[\text{مصاصات صدمات بنبض قاس يعكس مزيدا من الثبات} \]

\[\text{massāyat ṣadamāt binabḏ qāsin ya‘kis mazīdan min al-thabāt }\]

"Shock absorbents with a very strong pluck that reflects more stability"

(220)

\[\text{لا يعد من سلبيات سيارة من هذا المعيار} \]

\[\text{lā yu‘ad min salbiyyāt sayyārah min hadhā al-mi‘yār }\]

It (pluck) is not considered as a negative criterion of a car of this kind

(221)

\[\text{نبض قاس مع قضيب مقاوم للاحناء} \]

\[\text{nabḏ qāsin ma‘ qadīb muqāwīm lil‘inhīnā’} \]

A very strong pluck with a bending resistant bar.

It should be noted that all the examples that include the positive collocate نبض قاس nabḏ qāsin are related to the car industry. Apart from nabḏ, all other

\[^{36}\text{See: http://www.audioenglish.net/dictionary/pluck.htm}\]
collocates of qāsin in Al-H and I-AR are extremely negative, i.e. they occur in unfavourable contexts, for example: ‘adūww ‘enemy’, taḍḥīb ‘torture’, and ‘iqāb ‘punishment’, as indicated in table (37).

7.6.2 Powerless Appraisal Adjectives: ضعيف qā‘if, واهن wāhin, and ركيع rakīk ‘weak’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Wafī</td>
<td>p. 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>الضعيف: ذو الضعف..جمع ضعفاء وضعاف وضعفي..والضعف بالفتح والضم ضد القوة وقيل الضعف بالفتح في الرأي والضعف بالضم في البدن.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adḍa‘if37: the one who has weakness. The plural is: du‘afā‘, dī‘āf, and da‘fā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adḍa‘: is the opposite of al-quwwah ‘the strength’. It is said that adḍa‘f denotes weakness in ‘opinion’ or ‘body’ (depending on its vowel markers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Muhīt</td>
<td>pp. 1072, 1073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>الضعف: ضد القوة..الضعف (بالفتح): في الرأي و (بالضم): في البدن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>الضعف: (في اللغة الحميرية) الأعمى</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adḍa‘: is opposite to al-quwwah ‘the strength’...it denotes weakness in ‘opinion’ or ‘body’ (depending on its markers). adḍa‘f ‘the weak’: (in the Himyaritic language) means ‘blind’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhīt Al-Muhīt</td>
<td>p. 1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>الضعف: ضد القوة..أو الضعف (بالفتح): في الرأي و (بالضم): في البدن..والضعف عند العامة بمعنى</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

37 The assimilation is used in the transliteration of al-qā‘if as it is presented in the Arabic monolingual dictionaries with shaddah on q.
المرض... والضعيف أيضاً "الأعمى" في لغة بني حمير

\( a\tilde{d}\tilde{d}\tilde{a}'f \): is opposite to \( al\-quw\tilde{w}ah \) 'the strength'... it denotes weakness in 'opinion' or 'body' (depending on its markers). \( a\tilde{d}\tilde{d}\tilde{a}'f \) 'the weak' is the 'blind'
in the language of ḫimyar.

(2) \( w\tilde{a}hin \)

\textbf{Al-Wāfī} p. 723

رجل واهن: أي ضعيف لا بطش عنده الوهن: ضعف في الأمر والعمل والبدن

A man who is \( w\tilde{a}hin \): one who is weak, feeble, lacking power.

\( al\-w\tilde{a}n \) (n.): indecisiveness, weakness of action or physical capacity.

\textbf{Al-Muhīt} p. 1599

واهن و موهون: لا بطش عنده الوهن: ضعف في العمل (وكذلك في الأمر والعظم و نحوه).

\( w\tilde{a}hin \) and \( maw\tilde{h}\tilde{a}n \): one who lacks power or strength.

\( al\-w\tilde{a}n \): weakness of action; also in decision-making, etc.

\textbf{Muhīt Al-Muhīt} p. 2294

والاهن: اسم فاعل... ورجل واهن أي ضعيف لا بطش عنده الوهن: ضعف في الأمر والعمل والبدن

\( al\-w\tilde{a}hin \): active participle. A person so described as weak and lacks power/capacity.

\( al\-w\tilde{a}n \): indecisiveness and weakness of action or physical capacity.

(3) \( rak\tilde{ik} \)

\textbf{Al-Wāfī} p. 243

الركيك: المسترخي القصير الهمه...الركيك من الكلام: السخيف الألفاظ والمعاني.
**al-rakīk**: used of a person: lacking any sufficient resolve or determination.

**rakīk**: referring to speech: silly, trivial, meaningless.

**rakīk**: referring to knowledge: slight, inadequate.

**rakīk**: referring to utterance or expression: weak.

**rakīk**: referring to garment: weakly/ loosely textured.

**Al-Muhīt** p.1215

الركيك: الضعيف في عقله و رأيه... أو من لا يغار أو من لا يهابه أهله.

**al-rakīk**: used of one who is weak or feeble in his thinking and opinions, or of one who feels no jealousy or is not respected by his own family members.

**Muhīt Al- Muhīt** p. 813

الركيك: يستوي فيه المذكر و المؤنث ... جمع: ركاك... و رجل ركيك العلم أي قليله... و ركيك النفث أي ضعيفه... و ثوب ركيك النسج أي ضعيفه و رقيقه ... و في الكلمات كل شيء قليل من ماء أو نبت أو علم فهو ركيك... و الركيك المسترخي القصير الهمه... و الركيك من الكلام السخيف الألفاظ و المعاني.

**al-rakīk**: a form covering both masculine and feminine...pl. *rikāk*...one whose knowledge is described as *rikāk* has only slight or inadequate knowledge. Any utterance that is *rakīk* is a weak one. A garment that is *rakīk* in its texture is one that is weakly or loosely woven. In general terms, anything that is deficient in water, plant life or knowledge may be termed *rakīk*. The expression **al-rakīk** refers to someone who lacks sufficient resolve or determination. When referring to speech, *rakīk* means any silly, trivial or meaningless utterance.

**Table 38**: Definitions of *qa’yf*, *wāhin* and *rakīk* in monolingual Arabic dictionaries
The first obvious thing to note from the table above is that the three monolingual dictionaries define the three powerless adjectives as ضعيف *da‘if* ‘weak’ or ‘not having power’. However, there are two main observations to make here. In the first place, table 38 shows the denotational meaning of the three powerless adjectives under discussion. The lexicographical meanings provided by the three dictionaries can be divided into three main appraisal categories:

(a) Physical/mental weakness
(b) Linguistic weakness (verbal/non-verbal)
(c) ضعيف *da‘if* ‘weak’ is defined as opposite of قوي *qawī* ‘strong’ (although defining a word by its opposite is not a currently recommended approach).

In the second place, the apparently near synonyms *wa‘hin*, *da‘if*, and *rakīk* are used to define each other. *Da‘if* is used to define *wa‘hin* and *rakīk*, and vice versa, as shown in table 38. In addition, the appraisal senses in (a) & (c) are shared between *wa‘hin* and *da‘if*. Al-Muhīt adds another appraisal meaning to *da‘if*, i.e. عمي *a‘mā* ‘blind’, a meaning that is no longer used in MSA. The three dictionaries also agree that *wa‘hin* is used to appraise actions and physical weakness.

As for *rakīk*, Al-Wāfī provides meaning (b), which refers to a weakness in utterances in general (whether verbal or written). On the other hand, Al-Muhīt also refers to *rakīk*, as an appraisal adjective to modify a person who is unrespectable or a person who does not feel jealous, a meaning that, as far I am aware, is unusual in MSA. Table (39) below summarises the main dis/similarities between the three powerless adjectives as the monolingual dictionaries present them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal senses</th>
<th><em>da‘if</em></th>
<th><em>wa‘hin</em></th>
<th><em>rakīk</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical weakness</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental/opinion weakness</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic weakness</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39: The three main appraisal senses of *da‘if*, *wa‘hin* and *rakīk* as they appear in the monolingual Arabic dictionaries
However, the following three tables of LLS and Joint show what other sorts of differences or similarities occur between ِja’if, wāhin, and rakik.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocates</th>
<th>I-AR</th>
<th></th>
<th>Al-H</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLS</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>Collocates</td>
<td>LLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isnād</td>
<td>attribution</td>
<td>393.01</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>mawqif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huwa</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>340.08</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>iḥtimāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥadith</td>
<td>ḥadith</td>
<td>302.08</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>numuwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qalb</td>
<td>heart</td>
<td>105.61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>fariq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anā/annaka/annahu</td>
<td>I am/you are/he is</td>
<td>105.06</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>iqbāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makhliq</td>
<td>creature</td>
<td>55.43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>balad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iḥtimāl</td>
<td>possibility</td>
<td>53.34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>al-amal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sawt</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>52.86</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>tādāwul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāna/yakūn</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>34.82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>annahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insān</td>
<td>mankind</td>
<td>33.87</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>waqīf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40: The top ten left collocates of ِja’if in I-AR and Al-H
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocates</th>
<th>I-AR LLS</th>
<th>I-AR Joint</th>
<th>Al-H LLS</th>
<th>Al-H Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>صوت</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>43.76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻazm</td>
<td>resolution</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miwā’</td>
<td>meow</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻaml</td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mijdāf</td>
<td>oar</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻaw'</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khiwār</td>
<td>mooing/sound of cows</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻāmir</td>
<td>slim/thin</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasim</td>
<td>breeze</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ho</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41: The top ten left collocates of wāhin in I-AR and Al-H
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocates</th>
<th>I-AR LLS</th>
<th>I-AR Joint</th>
<th>Collocates</th>
<th>Al-H LLS</th>
<th>Al-H Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أسلوب</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>الأصلي</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uslīb</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>al-ūlá</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شعر</td>
<td>poetry</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>ضعيف</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shīr</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>֡aʿīf</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تأويل</td>
<td>interpretation</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>كلام</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taʿwil</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>kālām</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كلام</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>أسلوب</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kālām</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>uslīb</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خط</td>
<td>hand-writing</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>آخر</td>
<td>another</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khaṭṭ</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ākhar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أثاث</td>
<td>furniture</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>أنه</td>
<td>he is</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athāth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>annahu</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مزيج</td>
<td>mixture</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mazīj</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>موضوع</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mawqūṭiyya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شكل</td>
<td>form</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shakl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حديث</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>֡adīth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42: The top ten left collocates of *rakīk* in I-AR and Al-H

An analysis of the most significant collocates of *֡aʿīf*, wāhin, and *rakīk* represented in the above tables (40, 41 and 42) reveals that *֡aʿīf* occurs most frequently with words of different appraisal categories, and it is not only an adjective that appraises physical and mental aspects, as dictionaries presume in table 38. More surprisingly, physical and mental hits are not found in the top ten collocates of *֡aʿīf*, either in the I-AR or Al-H corpora.
isnād ‘attribution’ (related to the Prophet Mohammed’s ḥadīth), موقف mawqif ‘situation’, احتمال ihtimal ‘possibility’, and فريق farih ‘team’ are the strongest collocates of qa‘if, as shown in table 40. In fact, collocates such as صوت sawt ‘voice’, حديث ḥadīth ‘speech’, and هو huwa ‘he’, are repeated in the top ten collocates of qa‘if, wahin and rakik.

However, low frequency words were excluded because it would not be possible to build reasonable conclusions upon such few examples (see tables 41 and 42). McEnery et. al (2006 : 11) assert that there should be a reasonable number of usages to be examined because “the low frequency may result in unreliable quantification”.

7.7 Results: Same But Different!

Although the power-related adjectives in both languages share similar denotational meanings, as dictionaries presume, analysis reveals that there are differences. The three Arabic powerful adjectives جبار jabbār, قوي qawī and قاس qāsin, as well as their three powerless antonyms ضعيف qa‘if, واهن wahin, and ركيك rakik, can be positive, negative, or neutral, depending on the contextual surrounding environment. The two tables below illustrate this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal powerful adjectives</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>E- translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qawī</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Effective/influential/useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>destructive/damaging/devastating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jabbār</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>great/outstanding/remariable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>unjust/prejudiced/unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qāsin</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>solid/firm/well-knit/ firmly connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>very difficult/hard/complex/cold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43: Possible English translations of qawī, jabbār and qāsin in terms of appraisal polarity
### Table 44: Possible English translations of َْذَِخَين, َْذَِفََو and َْذَِكَك in terms of collocational appraisal categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal powerless adjectives</th>
<th>Appraisal categories</th>
<th>E- translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>بُحَين</td>
<td>silence/voices/cries/sounds of animals</td>
<td>feeble/faint/exhausted/powerless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َْذَِفََِ</td>
<td>hadith/attribution/situation/growth</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َْذَِكَك</td>
<td>language/speech</td>
<td>unfashionable/not stylish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 43 and 44 highlight the fact that although *jabbar*, *qawi* and *qasim* have similar denotative meanings, the native speaker of Arabic prefers to say: *iqtiṣād qawi* ‘strong economy’ (not *jabbar* or *qasim*). Interestingly, *jabbar* does not actually exist as a neutral appraised powerful adjective. It is an adjective that is used either extremely positively or extremely negatively. If *qawi* modifies words like *fariq* ‘team’, *jaysh* ‘army’, or *iqtiṣād* ‘economy’, it denotes favourable contents. A negative *qawi* occurs when the thing evaluated is a *zilzāl* ‘earthquake’. In such cases, *qawi* is interpreted negatively and turns into an unpleasant adjective meaning ‘destructive/damaging/devastating’. *Qawi* remains neutral when it modifies nouns such as *ta’tih* ‘influence’, or *shakl* ‘form’. It can be interpreted either positively or negatively. All instances of its use in both Arabic corpora show *qasim* as a negative, unfavourable and powerful adjective with one single exception of positive indication, i.e. its collocates with *nabu* ‘pluck’. As a negative appraisal adjective, *nabu* usually means ‘very difficult/tough_complex’, especially when modifying *rajul* ‘man’, *waqqi* ‘reality’, and *shay* ‘something’. However, as a positive adjective, it has only one meaning, i.e. ‘solid/firm/well-knit’.

In order to get a more precise picture about the polarity of the powerful appraisal adjectives, and to see which one is the most positive/negative, one hundred concordance lines from I-AR and Al-H were analysed, and the positive, negative, neutral, and unrelated hits of each powerful adjective were counted.

---

38 The polarities of the powerless adjectives are not examined here because they all have a negative tendency.
manually. The concordance lines were sorted out by ‘frequency/left’. The following table displays the result of this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adj.</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unrelated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jabbār</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qawî</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qāsin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45: Distribution of jabbār, qawî and qāsin in terms of polarity in I-AR and Al-H

Analysing the concordances of jabbār, qawî, and qāsin will show their tendency to occur in negative, positive, or neutral contexts. First of all, it is obvious that jabbār has the highest number of unrelated hits, especially in Al-H. More than half of the total one hundred concordance lines are either proper nouns (e.g. آسيا جبا jabbār), names of songs, or colloquial language that does not represent MSA. In comparison to jabbār, qawî and qāsin have a lower number of unrelated hits. Most of the unrelated examples involving the graphic form of قوي qawî refer to the verb قَويَ qawiya ‘to be strong’ preceded by إن in or إِذَا idhā ‘if’, and some refer to the plural noun form قوى quwā ‘forces’. Calculating the total number of positive and negative occurrences of jabbār, qawî and qāsin in I-AR and Al-H, it was found that qawî had the highest frequency of positive uses, occurring 151 times, while positive jabbār occurred 71 times, and positive qāsin 7 times. On the other hand, negative qāsin has the highest frequency of negative uses (164), followed by jabbār (48) and qawî (25). Obviously, the gaps between the adjectives are very large, a fact that contradicts the dictionaries’ claims that they are nearly synonymous. The above table and the two figures below show that qawî, jabbār, and qāsin are typically far from being synonyms.
The above figures show that the three near-synonyms can be arranged, from positive to negative as follows: *qawī*, *jabbār* and *qāsin*.

Contrary to expectations, there are a variety of structural patterns that feature the Arabic appraisal power-related adjectives. I could not find a typical syntactic structure for positive *jabbār* that differs from that of negative *jabbār*. To illustrate this point, I have extracted some examples from I-AR and Al-H corpora. The following examples are represented in an appraisal frame with several slot values.

(222)

يجب أن يكون أساسا لتضامن عربي قوي

(Al-H, 2000)

"It must be a foundation of strong Arabic solidarity"

- **Appraiser:** ضمير مستتر *a hidden pronoun*, i.e. هو 'he' which is deemed by traditional grammar to be omitted after *yakīna*.
- Appraised: *asās*an *litaḍāmun*
- Hinge: *yajibu an yakīn*
- Appraisal category: ‘*arabī qawī*
- Polarity: positive

(223)

إنَّ الله يذل كل جبار


indeed God suppresses every stubborn

"(Indeed) Allah (God) suppresses every stubborn"

- Appraiser: *Allāh*
- Appraised: *kull*
- Hinge: *yudhill*
- Appraisal category: *jabbār*
- Polarity: Negative

(224)

هذا أمر طبيعي لكنه عمل و مجهود جبار


this matter normal but it a work and

effort great

This is natural, but it is a great effort and work.

- Appraiser: suffix *hu* on *lākinna*
- Appraised: *majhūd* and ‘*amal*
- Hinge: *lākinna*
- Appraisal categories: *jabbār*
- Polarity: positive
"Especially that the paper was written in an unfashionable style"

- Appraiser: (Unknown due to passive voice)
- Appraised: al-warraqah
- Hinge: kutibat
- Appraisal categories: rakik
- Polarity: negative

The first example has the particle أن an, which Jiyad (2006: 27) describes as “the most common subjunctive particle in Arabic”. It usually occurs between two verbs, in this example (e.g. 222), the two verbs are yajib and yakūn. an has the same function as the infinitive in English and usually does not have an English translational equivalent. For example, in 222, an introduces a subordinate clause “yakūn asāsān lītalāmun ‘arabi qawi’, which functions as the subject of the main verb yajibu.

As can be seen from the above examples, the appraiser can be implicitly or explicitly mentioned in the appraisal sentence. In example 222, the appraiser is called ضمير مستتر jamīr mustatir ‘a hidden pronoun’, which refers in this example to the ‘unity’ between Lebanon and Syria. On the other hand, the appraiser, Allāh, is explicitly mentioned in example 223. Although examples 223 and 224 have the same appraisal category (i.e. jabbar) they are different in polarity. However, it is noticeable that examples 223 and 224 are introduced by inna (in 223) and lákinna (in 224), which are two particles of إن و أخواتها “inna and its sisters”. inna and its sisters are six accusative particles: إن inna ‘indeed’, أَن anna ‘that’, لعل la‘lla ‘so that’, كأن ka‘anna ‘as if’, and لَيْت layta ‘wish’. inna and lákinna are called nominalisers because – as seen in 223 and 224 – they introduce the nominal sentence. The subject of these six accusative particles is called اسم إن ism inna, and is always in the accusative case (i.e.
منصبَت manṣūb), whilst the predicate خبر إنّ khabar inna is always in the nominative case (i.e. مرفوع marfū').

Examples 223 and 224 also show that inna and its sisters as well as lākinna should be followed by either a noun (NP), such as Allah (e.g. 223), or an attached pronoun suffix, such as Al-ḥā' (e.g.224). In addition, the subject – that is ism inna or any of its sisters – in both examples functions as the appraiser. Whereas inna in e.g. 223 functions as an affirmative particle and means ‘in fact’ or ‘indeed’, anna in e.g. 225 means ‘that’. Example 225 also shows that the appraiser can be unknown if the structure of the sentence is passive.

7.8 Conclusion and Implications

The present study reveals that even large, well-known dictionaries do not always provide full and accurate information about the meaning of words. Dictionaries are not very helpful for identifying the different semantic prosodies of near-synonyms, as they focus on denotational rather than connotational meanings (cf. Partington 1998: 69-72; Tognini-Bonelli 2001: 25; Xiao and McEnery 2006: 12). Although the AMMD and EMD are considered the most well known and trusted dictionaries for Arabic learners and researchers, this analysis has shone a spotlight on some limited, missing, misleading, and even erroneous translations of appraisal adjectives.

While English and Arabic are unrelated, their collocational behaviour and the semantic prosodies for near synonyms share some similarities (consider, e.g: powerful computer vs. كمبيوتر جبار kumbiyūtar jabbār⁴⁰, in tables 24 and 36).

The analysis of this chapter has focused on contrastive (positive/negative) power-related adjectives in order to reveal the different semantic environments using concordancing and collocational tools. The most striking result to emerge from the data provided about the English powerless adjective weak, as well as the powerful adjective strong, is the different and somewhat contradicting information presented by the bilingual dictionaries

[^39]: For more information on inna and its sisters, see: http://corpus.quran.com/documentation/adjective.jsp
[^40]: kumbiyūtar is a loan-word derived from the English word computer.
AMMD and EMD, as well as by the monolingual dictionaries LASD, COED, and WCD.

The collocational analysis has shown that some collocations whose meanings seem transparent, and which are taken for granted by native English speakers, may be ambiguous and misleading for Arab learners, and lexicographers need to always bear this in mind.

The study proves that – assumed – synonymous words like the powerful Arabic adjectives: \( jabbār \), \( qawī \) and \( qāsin \) are not necessarily collocationally interchangeable as their meanings can be entirely different and even contradictory.

This study can provide some lessons for translators, language tutors, and Arab learners of English as a second language and for English learners of Arabic too. It reflects the extent to which collocation and the semantic prosody of appraisal adjectives are really problematic in English-Arabic-English translation, especially if we consider dictionaries as reliable sources of denotational meanings.

Moreover, by contrasting the lexicographical meanings with the others provided by corpora, it is suggested that human intuition together with dictionary meanings can never be a reliable route to meaning. The secondary meanings and relationships that lie outside the core meanings of a word are best explored by the powerful tools of corpus linguistics. As Dais (2009: 3) comments: “The dictionary shows only some limited results and collocations. But a large corpus will avoid these kinds of limitations”. Hence, concordance lines can help translators, teachers, and learners to observe repeated patterns and meanings. In the case of analysing collocational synonyms in particular, a corpus can provide useful clues in finding different shades of meaning for a word.

In practice, as can be seen from this study of power-related adjectives, semantic prosody can provide insight into the translation of appraisal adjectival near-synonyms like \( jabbār \), \( qawī \) and \( qāsin \), on one hand, and \( da'if \), \( wāhin \), and \( rakīk \) on the other, as they typically operate in a different range of contexts. For example, \( qāsin \) is a well known negative adjective in Arabic, but was found to be involved in a typical positive phraseological pattern that belongs to a particular function (of expressing firmness and stability in the car industry). This typical function set \( qāsin \) apart from its near-synonyms. The reliable examples that
corpora provide make compiling a dictionary an easier task. Moreover, lexicographers can gain a more accurate picture of the frequency, and the semantic and syntactic usage of a word through corpora.

In conclusion, lexicographers must be aware of the fact that: “He [(one who writes or speaks in a foreign language)] will be ‘caught’ every time, not by grammar, which is probably suspiciously better than that of educated natives, not by his vocabulary, which may well be richer, but by his unacceptable or improbable collocations” (Newmark 1981: 180).
Chapter Eight

Conclusion and Future Work

This thesis opens up many avenues in the field of Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). The predominant theoretical approach informing the chapters offers certain insights into the main facets of SFL, i.e. ‘above’ and ‘beyond/around’ the clause. The thesis views the two functional systems as complementary, as they correspond to each other in the creation of meaning.

As far as Arabic linguistics is concerned, this thesis is the first to consider features both 'above' and 'beyond' the clause. One way into this is by looking above the clause at the phenomena of coordination and subordination, and another way is by looking beyond the clause at the phenomena of possibility and necessity.

The initial chapters set out to produce an SFL analysis of coordination and subordination that belong to Halliday’s parataxis and hypotaxis [above the clause]. This study has discovered that English and Arabic are different in their preference for syntactic relations, most importantly in their use of subordination and coordination. Through analysing original English texts (BNC and I-EN) and original Arabic texts (Al-H and I-AR), it was shown that Arabic coordinators do not always have the same English translations.

The subsequent chapters focused on the other facet of SFL, i.e. beyond/around the clause. Chapter four dealt with appraisal theory, which was regarded as an extension of Halliday’s SFL. Though Arabic and English are very different languages, the analysis has revealed remarkable similarities with respect to degree adverbs; thus while totally different is frequently used in BNC and I-EN, its Arabic equivalent mukhtalif tamāman is commonly used in Al-H and I-AR. In addition, there is an obvious similarity between the occurrences of extremely difficult and ʿaʾb lilghāyah. On the other hand, the analysis has shown that there is a different contextual environment for the boosters extremely, totally, tamāman and lilghāya, i.e. they tend to be collocationally restricted to a particular semantic class of items.
Chapter five analysed modality as a way for achieving appraisal. Some crucial issues relating to possibility and necessity as two basic elements in the study of modality (a major carrier of appraisal/evaluation) were explored. It was argued that translations of the meanings of modality have not been documented as comprehensively as most researchers have assumed. The thesis presented different choices for the translations of possibility\textit{ may} and necessity\textit{ must}. In terms of modal meanings in Arabic, the analysis has shown that Huddleston's NICE properties are probably not universal and accordingly, the characteristics of modals often vary between languages.

An outline of how the corpus data shed light on the seldom-discussed phenomenon of power-related appraisal adjectives in English and Arabic was also given in chapters 6 and 7, where a collocational semantic prosodic appraisal treatment was provided. In addition, the concordance data show that it is a tool that is very well suited to highlighting collocational patterns. Studying the collocational behavior of power-related adjectival near-synonyms by using corpus data can supplement dictionary information, and hence can help learners decide which substitution of one item is more appropriate than another.

Chapter seven's analysis led to the conclusion that the learner/translator must pay attention to the collocational habits of related items in order to achieve collocational suitability as well as semantic appraisal comprehensiveness. With reference to the examples discussed in chapter seven, \textit{qāsin} (a well known negative adjective in Arabic) was found to be involved in a typical phraseological positive pattern that belongs to a particular function (of expressing firmness and stability in the car industry). This typical function sets \textit{qāsin} apart from its near-synonyms. The reliable examples that corpora provide make a dictionary compiler's work easier, and provide lexicographers with a more accurate picture of the frequency of word use, as well as semantic and syntactic information. As far as semantic prosody is concerned, the study of power-related prosodies of appraisal elements requires the contribution of researchers from different disciplines – ranging from lexicography to corpus linguistics and translation studies, as observed in chapter seven. My data analysis has led me to share Louw's (1993) hope that prosodies will receive their just attention from lexicographers, who need to be particularly careful in indicating a substitutional synonym of the entry word.
Finally, the results attained throughout the thesis imply a pressing need for the corpus-linguistic approach to be considered in Arabic linguistic research. Applying this methodology can improve lexical awareness and increase credibility in Arabic studies. Thus, this thesis offers interesting findings and implications for learners, language tutors, and translators. As with all such research, the scope of the present PhD has its limits, and a number of recommendations for further research arise from this. With respect to power-related appraisal emotional adjectives, chapter seven can be considered to provide a starting point for uncovering other disguised areas of emotional adjectives, such as *offensive* emotional adjectives (e.g. مهذب / مهين *muhîn/muhadhdhab*). This is an interesting topic that has yet to be tackled in Arabic linguistics. Moreover, this thesis suggests reworking the field of modality with a different scope to 'possibility and necessity', which is tackled in chapter five. In other words, I suggest that modal expressions in the Arabic language that denote the future (e.g. سوف *sawfa* ‘shall/will’) should be analysed from an appraisal perspective. It is hoped that this study will be of value to those concerned with translation, as well as those learning and teaching English as a second language in Arab countries.
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