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The pervasiveness of coordination in Arabic, with reference to Arabic>English translation

Abstract

This article analyses aspects of the greater use of coordination in Modern Standard Arabic as compared to English, illustrating this through Arabic>English translation. It argues that Arabic ‘favours’ coordination linguistically, textually and rhetorically, as follows: 1. The linguistic resources of Arabic favour coordination while those of English favour subordination – whether these are lexical (Arabic ـ wa- and ف fa- vs. English ‘and’), or semantic (the possibility of backgrounding coordinated clauses in Arabic compared to the marginality of backgrounded coordinated clauses in English); 2. Accompanying Arabic textual norms, e.g. (near-)synonym repetition and chained coordination, favour coordination while those of English favour subordination; 3. Further associated ‘rhetorical semantic’ uses of coordination are found in Arabic, e.g. hyperonym-hyponym repetition and associative repetition, which do not exist in English; 4. These extended usages further entrench coordination as a norm in Arabic as compared to English.

1. Coordination vs. subordination

In traditional English grammar, coordination is contrasted with subordination – typically involving subordinating conjunctions (e.g. Cristofaro 2003), the most important of which are ‘and’, ‘but’ and ‘or’. Thus, in ‘They stopped the car, and they bought petrol’, the two main clauses are linked by the coordinating conjunction ‘and’. This can be compared with ‘They stopped the car in order to buy petrol’, where the main clause ‘They stopped the car’ is linked to the subordinate clause ‘buy petrol’ by the subordinating conjunction ‘in order to’.

In Arabic as well, subordination of clauses may be contrasted with coordination. The most basic coordinating conjunctions in Standard Arabic are و wa- ‘and’ (when not used in a subordinating circumstantial, i.e. ححال/hāl, construction; cf. Holes 2004: 266, 270-271), ف fa- ‘and/so’, ثم ثم ‘then’, and أ أو aw ‘or’ (cf. Dickins and Watson 1999: 571-6). All other conjunctions (including ححال/hāl-construction) are subordinating. Thus in أوقفا السيارة لشتروا البنزين awqafū al-sayyāra li-yaštarū al-banzīn ‘They stopped the car in order to buy petrol’, ل ل ‘to’ is a subordinating conjunction, and ل-yaštarū al-banzīn ‘to [they]-buy petrol’ is a subordinate clause. In أوقفا السيارة فاشتروا البنزين awqafū al-sayyāra fa-štarū al-banzīn ‘they stopped the car and/so they bought petrol’, by contrast, ف fa- ‘and/so’ is a coordinating conjunction and ف fa- ‘and/so’ is a subordinating conjunction and أوقفا السيارة فاشتروا البنزين awqafū al-sayyāra ‘they stopped the car’ and اشتروا البنزين fa-štarū al-banzīn ‘and/so they bought petrol’ are both main clauses. (Badawi, Carter and Gully (2004: 587) argue that ف fa- in this usage, what they call ‘causal fa-’, is a subordinating conjunction. From the current perspective, this is not the case syntactically,
though as discussed in Section 3.1, material in the clause introduced by ف fa- may be backgrounded, in which case ف fa- can be regarded as ‘communicatively subordinating’.

Coordinators link words and phrases of different types in both Arabic and English: e.g. nominal ‘I saw {a cat and a mouse}’ رأيت {قطة وفأرآ} {ra’aytu {qiṭṭ wa-fa’r}; adjectival ‘The sea was {blue and beautiful}’ كَان الْبَحْر {أزرق وجميلآ} {kān al-bahr {azraq wa-jamīl}; verbal ‘They {laughed and sang}’ {daḥīkū wa-ğannāw}; clausal ‘They laughed and we sang’ {dāḥīkū wa-ğannaynā; sentential ‘They laughed. And we sang.’ {dāḥīkū. wa-ğannaynā}} ضحكوا، وغنينا daḥīkū wa-ğannaynā; sentential ‘They laughed. And we sang.’

Previous studies contrasting coordination in English and Modern Standard Arabic include Hamdan and Fareh (1999), Othman (2004), Saeed and Fareh (2006), Fareh (2006), and Alharthi (2010: 279). These show a greater tendency for Arabic to use coordination than English, although the last also shows Arabic editorials to use more interclausal subordination than English ones, English making greater use than Arabic of single-clause sentences (Alharthî 2010, 279). A number of these studies, e.g. Othman (2004), point out that fairly dense use of interclausal subordination is a feature of formal English, while coordination is more typically informal, and that this contrasts with Arabic where dense use of interclausal coordination is a feature of even very formal texts.

Diachronic and dialectal dimensions should also be noted. Classical Arabic (i.e. the pre-modern version of Standard Arabic) makes dense use of the basic coordinators و wa- ‘and’, ف fa- ‘and/so’, and ثم ف lu mm a ‘then’ (without any further elements) for both interclausal and other connection. See the analysis of a passage from the Muqaddimah (‘Prolegomena’) of Ibn Khaldun (مقدمه ابن خلدون) in Holes (2004: 273-274), discussed in relation to Arabic>English translation in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016a: 178-179).

By contrast, Modern Standard Arabic uses a variety of interclausal connector styles. Some writing in Modern Standard Arabic follows the Classical Arabic pattern of dense use of the basic coordinators و wa- ‘and’, ف fa- ‘and/so’, and ثم ف lu mm a ‘then’ without any further elements. This may occur when the writer wishes to adopt a rather Classical-sounding style, but is also frequent in genres such as prose fiction whether of a literary or more informal nature.

Some writers, particularly in technical genres, make dense use of و wa- ‘and’, ف fa-‘and/so’, and to a lesser extent ثم ت mum a ‘then’, combined with additional elements expressing a more precise relationship than the range of meanings covered by the basic coordinator. Thus, one finds compound linking forms such as وعلوارة على ذلك و ا Salāw atan Salā gālik ‘and in addition

---

1 Braces (curly brackets) are used throughout this article to identify elements in STs and TTs of specific importance to the argument. For further discussion of coordination vs. subordination in English and Arabic, and some issues with the distinction, see Dickins 2010a: 1084-1092.
Finally, some writers, both of factual and prose fiction material, have recently adopted a style, influenced by English (and other European languages), in which interclausal (and intersentential) connectors are conspicuously absent. A good example is أحمد مراد المряد’s novel al-fīl al-azraq (The Blue Elephant).

Arabic dialects have a variety of means of expressing coordination and subordination. These differ somewhat from those of Standard Arabic (as far as I am aware, no dialect uses an etymon of َثُمُّا ‘then’, for example), and from dialect to dialect (cf. Holes 2004: 267-299).

2. Objectives, material and method

While general register issues, as discussed in the previous section, play an important role in differences in the frequency of coordination (and subordination) in English and Arabic, this article highlights other factors which are also of importance. Although the article derives partly from my previous work, the synthesis of the elements is new, as are some of the examples and analyses. Through this synthesis, I seek to demonstrate the value of comparing languages through translation taking several linguistic angles into account.

The data comes largely from Arabic texts originally used in relation to teaching Arabic or Arabic-English translation. To make references to the data maximally concise, I have listed all data-sources in an Appendix, giving each a category and a number (‘Data-source A1’, ‘Data-source A2’, etc; see Appendix), which I shall use when referring to texts in the body of the article. All Data-Sources are reproduced in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016a and 2016b), with the exception of Data-Source E7.

This article is corpus-based in that it draws on a group of texts. The overall corpus for the article from which all Data-Sources come, apart from Data-Source E7, is the totality of the texts found in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016a), since all these texts were analysed for the phenomena examined in sections 3.1-5.2. These texts do not constitute a balanced corpus (i.e. they are not representative within a particular sampling frame), and the number of texts is not large enough to draw statistical generalisations. However, none of the extracts was originally selected to illustrate the points which it does in this article, these points ‘emerging’

For further discussion of this example, see Holes (2004: 275), and in connection with Arabic>English translation, Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016a: 178).

For further discussion, see Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016a: 181). Modern Standard Arabic also seems to make generally greater use of subordinating connectors (conjunctions) than Classical Arabic, probably under the influence of English (and perhaps other European languages) via translation and imitation.
via translations and related work on the data. There is, therefore, a random-type element to the data. At the end of sections 3.1, 4.1, 4.2.2, 5.1 and 5.2, I consider the genres in my data in which the different phenomena discussed in the section occur. Throughout the article I have used translations which I deem to be idiomatic (i.e. ‘natural-sounding’, etc.), except where the translation is explicitly designated ‘literal’ or ‘fairly literal’, and by implication, not idiomatic. Taking translations, some of which are one’s own, and declaring them to be idiomatic has potential problems, the most important being: i. whether the translations are in fact idiomatic, and ii. whether a more literal translation would also be idiomatic. Accordingly, the reader (assuming he or she is a native English speaker) is asked to have recourse to his/her intuitions to determine whether a particular translation is in fact idiomatic, and to check, where appropriate, that a more literal translation would not be idiomatic.

The current article is exploratory, rather than categorical. For more categorical results, the study would have to reduce the role of intuition, on both the readers’ and writer’s part. This could be done by analyzing two corpora: (i) a parallel corpus of Arabic STs and corresponding English TTs, where all examples of the translation-related issues identified in this article were identified and analyzed; (ii) a corpus of corresponding original English texts where all linguistic forms relevant to the parallel Arabic-English corpus were analyzed. The two corpora could also be controlled for genre. Even here, problems might remain, e.g. it might prove difficult to identify and analyze all linguistic forms relevant to the Arabic-English parallel corpus in a corpus of corresponding original English texts. It might prove more practicable to test whether forms such as (near-)synonym repetition (Section 4.1), hyperonym-hyponym repetition (Section 5.1), and associative repetition (Section 5.2) occur in the English TTs of the Arabic-English parallel corpus, than to identify elements in the comparable original English corpus which could be said to correspond to Arabic (near-)synonym repetition, hyperonym-hyponym repetition and associative repetition. Almost certainly, it would prove impossible to eliminate intuition in such a study, there being some need to determine in both the STs and particularly TTs in the parallel corpus and the comparable English corpus whether particular forms are idiomatic.

3. Linguistic norms favouring coordination in Arabic

Arabic favours coordination linguistically as compared to English, in two ways: lexical and semantic. Lexically, Arabic has two ‘and’-type coordinators، wa- and することが, with somewhat different ranges of meaning, while English has only one ‘and’-coordinator.

Various writers have produced lists of functions of ‘and’ and other English coordinators. These functions are almost certainly not distinct senses of ‘and’ (etc.), i.e. this is not a matter of polysemy. Rather, they are ‘sub-senses’ (Dickins 2014: 4, 9) of a single global sense of ‘and’, etc. shading into one another. In the case of ‘and’, we might term this global sense ‘connectivity’. This suggests that ‘and’ and other coordinators do not have a fixed number of
functions/sub-senses, but that any list is fairly ad hoc, and could be expanded or contracted
to the demands of the analysis at hand.

Perhaps the best known list of the functions of ‘and’ is that of Quirk et al. (1985: 930-932),
while various writers such as Fareh (1998) and Holes (2004: 267-272) provide lists for the
functions of the Arabic coordinators ِ, wa- and ُ fa-. Table 1, derived from the table in
Dendenne (2010: 6) and drawing particularly on Quirk et al (1985) and Saeed and Fareh
(2006), lists the functions of ‘and’, ِ, wa- and ُ fa-.

Table 1
Functions of ‘and’ in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>ِ</th>
<th>wa-</th>
<th>fa-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Addition</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Contrast</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Concession</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Comment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Simultaneity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reason</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Result</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sequence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Explanation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Resumption</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although applying largely to verbal and clausal coordination, this list can also be used to
categorise coordination between other elements. The categories are explained as follows:

1. Addition
   This subsumes Quirk et al.’s ‘pure addition’ and ‘similarity of content’. Pure addition
is exemplified by ‘He has long hair and (also) he often wears jeans’ (Quirk et al. 1985: 932),
and similarity of content by ‘A trade agreement should be no problem, and
(similarly) a cultural exchange could be easily arranged’ (Quirk et al. 1985: 932)

2. Contrast
   This is also termed ‘contrast’, and is illustrated by ‘Robert is secretive and (in contrast)
David is candid’ (Quirk et al. 1985: 931).

3. Concession
   This is also termed ‘concession’, and is exemplified by ‘She worked hard and (yet)
she failed’ (Quirk et al. 1985: 931).

4. Comment
   This is also termed ‘comment or explanation’, and is exemplified by ‘They disliked
John – and that’s not surprising in view of his behaviour’ (Quirk et al. 1985: 932).

5. Simultaneity
This is not included in Quirk et al.’s list of the functions of ‘and’, but is found in Holes (2004: 268). An English example is ‘They eat and drink’ (both actions taking place at the same time).

6. **Reason**
   This indicates cause of (prior reason for) something happening. An example from Arabic with ﻓ ﻭ- (since this does not occur with English ‘and’) is
   لا تَبَكِّف وَالْبِكَاء ضَعْف
   ‘Don’t cry because crying is a weakness’ (Saeed and Fareh 2006: 28).

7. **Result**
   This is also termed ‘consequence’, an example being ‘He heard and explosion and he (therefore) phoned the police’ (Quirk et al. 1985: 930).

8. **Sequence**
   This is also termed ‘sequence’, and is illustrated by ‘I washed the dishes and (then) I dried them’ (Quirk at al. 1985: 930).

9. **Explanation**
   The clause following the connector ‘offers an explanation/illustration of the one that precedes it’ an example being
   هَذَا أَخْطَأَ تَارِيْخِيَةَ فِي مُسْلِمْ عَمَّرُ الْخَيْامُ فَاغْتَبَلَ الْمُلُوكُ كَانَ طَنَّاً و
   لاِبِدَاءَ الْبَسْمَ الحَرَّمِيَّةَ فِي مُسْلِمْ عَمَّرُ الْخَيْامُ فَاغْتَبَلَ الْمُلُوكُ كَانَ طَنَّاً و
   ‘there are historical mistakes in the Umar Khayyam series; the king was assassinated with a dagger and not by poison’ (Dendenne 2010: 17). This is somewhat different from Quirk et al.’s ‘comment or explanation’ (4. above).

10. **Resumption**
    ‘Resumption’ involves simply signalling ‘topic continuity’ (Dendenne 2010: 39). In Arabic, this is typically done using ﻭ-، frequently at the start of sentences and even paragraphs (Holes 2004: 267). In formal written English, by contrast, intersentential linkage (‘coordination’, in an extended sense; cf. Dickins 2010a: 1089) very rarely involves sentence-initial ‘and’.

Arabic thus has more lexical resources – two basic coordinators، ﻭ and ﻻ-، compared to the one basic coordinator، ‘and’، in English – with more varied meaning possibilities . Arabic also makes extensive use of intersentential syndetic coordination, while formal English almost never has intersentential syndetic linkage.

### 3.1 Coordination and ‘grounding’

This section summarises some of the ideas in Dickins (2010a). While none of the examples discussed are new, the analysis of the data sources in terms of genre is.
Tomlin distinguishes between foreground and background information: “Foreground information is information which is more important, or significant, or central to the narrative. Background information serves to elaborate or enrich foreground information” (Tomlin, 1987: 87). Foreground information is important for subsequent text development, while background information has only local significance. Thus, background information is information which is not presented as significant for later information in the text, while foreground information is information which is presented as significant for later information in the text.

Main clauses in English typically present foreground information, while subordinating elements – including adverbial subordinate clauses – present background information (for limitations on this, see Sekine 1996; also Dickins 2010a). Similar ideas are found in various approaches to discourse, such as Segmented Discourse Representation Theory (Asher and Vieu 2005) and Rhetorical Structure Theory (Mann and Thompson 1988), some employing the terms “foreground” (plus derivations) and “background” (plus derivations), others using other terminology. For various approaches, see Ramm and Fabricius-Hansen (2005).

English coordinated clauses are virtually always foregrounded (Sekine 1996: 25-42). Therefore in ‘They went out, and we smiled’, both coordinate clauses (‘They went out’ and ‘we smiled’) are foregrounded. In Arabic, however, coordinate clauses are more open to different grounding interpretations, and main clauses in coordinate structures may be backgrounded (cf. Dickins 2010a: 1112-1118). The following is taken from the start of Data-Source A1. Like all translations in this article, unless otherwise stated, the English translation is by myself.

1.

1.1 ST

얀در الأطفال {ف} يستقبلون الحياة بالصريح، هذا هو المعروف ولكن بروى أن الزين، والعهدة على أمه والنساء اللذين حضرن ولادتها، أول ما مس الأرض، انفجر ضاحكاً

1.2 Fairly literal TT

Children are born, {fa- and/so} they greet life with screaming, this is well known. But it is told that Zein – and this is on the authority of his mother and the women who attended his birth – when he first touched the ground, he exploded laughing.

1.3 Idiomatic TT

{When} children are born, they greet life with a scream; this is well known. However, according to his mother and the women who attended his birth, as soon as Zein came into the world he burst out laughing.

Here, the Arabic uses the coordinating conjunction ف فا- ‘so/and’ to link the two phrases يلاد الأطفال يستقبلون الحياة بالصريح (‘children are born’) and ياستقبلون الحياة بالصريح (‘they greet life with screaming’). On the basis that coordinating conjunctions typically present the information given by the relevant clauses as equally foregrounded, one might
expect the translation to read something like: ‘Children are born, and they greet life with a scream’. This, however, sounds rhetorically marked in English, because the structure accords major, foregrounded, status to the information in the first clause. Thus, the notion that children are born is obvious: an author (or translator) might want to use this formulation in the translation if he or she were deliberately ‘shocking’ the reader into re-examining this notion, according it fresh significance. A less striking effect is achieved through subordinating ‘children are born’, and introducing it with the subordinating conjunction ‘When’. This illustrates the fact that Arabic fa- ‘so/and’ can function not only to foreground what follows it, like English ‘and’, but also, unlike ‘and’, to background the conjoined clause preceding it. Arabic fa- thus has the capacity to function discoursally as a ‘reverse subordinator’, or ‘superordinator’.

While the previous example illustrated the possibility of an Arabic coordinator foregrounding the second clause and backgrounding the first, there are also cases where the second coordinated clause is backgrounded rather than foregrounded, an example being found in Data-Source E1. For discussion, see Dickins (2010a: 1117-1118).

The material in this section has been taken from Data-Sources A1, a novella, and E1, a newspaper article. Other Data-Sources which display grounding issues are:

A2 a short story (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 12.2, notes 4, 10, 13).
A3 a short story (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 13.3, Note 22).
B2 a historical/political book (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 5.2, Note 3).
E2 a magazine article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 13.2, Note 4).
E3 a magazine article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 13.3, notes 8, 15, 21).
E4 a magazine article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 16.2, Note 10).
F1 a newspaper article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 2.3, notes 19, 25, 90).
F2 a polemical newspaper article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 8.4, Note 38).
F3 an online newspaper article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 12.3, notes 10, 12, 24).
G1 an online tourism article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 6.1, Note 12).
G2 an online tourism article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 20.3, notes 15, 31).

Additional examples involving grounding differences between Arabic and English are given
As the above list shows, the grounding issues discussed in this section are found in a wide variety of texts in Modern Standard Arabic: fiction and non-fiction, news reports, scientific articles, tourism texts, and academic books, as well as neutral and strongly opinionated texts. It may be that grounding differences between English and Arabic are in fact ‘pan-generic’, occurring in texts of all kinds.

4. Textual norms favouring coordination in Arabic

4.1 (Near-)synonym repetition

This section partly summarises material in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016a: 83-85). By ‘(near-)synonym repetition’ is meant the repetition of synonyms or near-synonyms, in a coordinating structure. While none of the examples discussed are new, the analysis of the data sources in terms of genre is.

(Near-)synonym repetition is fairly common in Arabic, but much more restricted in English. In Arabic, it is of two basic kinds: (i) where two words or phrases have closely related but distinguishable meanings, an example being al-istiqṣāʿ wa-al-tahlīl ‘investigation and analysis’ (Data-Source E5); (ii) where words or phrases are fully synonymous or, at least in the context, there is no clear difference in meaning, an example being mustamirra mutawāšila in بصورة مستمرة متواصلة bi-ṣūra mustamirra mutawāšila, literally ‘in a continuing continuous manner’ (Data-Source E6).

(Near-)synonym repetition may be syndetic (typically with  wa-) or, in the case of adjectives in particular, but also occasionally elsewhere, asyndetic. A syndetic example is al-hamajī wa-l-barbarī ‘savage and barbaric behaviour’ (Data-Source F4). An asyndetic example is jamīlāt aniqāt in فتيات جميلات انیقات, literally ‘pretty, elegant girls’ (Data-Source A4). (For syndetic vs. asyndetic connection in Arabic, see also Dickins and Watson 1999: 47-49).

Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016a: 83-85) suggest four typical translation techniques for translating Arabic (near-)synonym repetition into English.

2. Merging

The two Arabic elements are merged into one English element. An example is تدابير صارمة وقاسية tadābīr sārīma wa-qāsiya (literally ‘severe/stern and severe/stern measures’) (Data-Source F4) as ‘severe measures’ (صارمة sārīma and قاسية qāsiya, both meaning ‘severe’). Merging is likely to be appropriate where there is no obvious meaning difference (in the context) between the ST words.
2.2 Grammatical transposition

The grammatical category of at least one of the elements is shifted, subordinating it to another element. An example is تحلل الفهم والأخلاقيات تاحلل al-qiyam wa-al-axlāqiyāt (literally ‘the collapse of values and morals; قيم qiyam ‘values’ and أخلاقيات axlāqiyāt ‘morals’) (Data-Source B1; reproduced in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 83). This has been translated, by Ives, as ‘the collapse of all moral values’, the ST noun-doublet being replaced by an adjective-noun pair (the adjective being subordinated to the noun). This is likely to be appropriate where English offers an acceptable collocation involving a subordinating structure.

2.3 Semantic distancing

The two elements are made less similar in meaning in the TT than in the ST. An example is وكان منظرها بدهشه ويدهله wa-kān manqār-hā yudhīṣu-hu wa-yuğhīl-hu (literally ‘her appearance astonished/baffled and astonished/baffled’ her) (Data-Source A4; in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 84), translated, by St John, as ‘Her appearance had both astonished and alarmed him’. Here ST virtual synonyms are translated by semantically clearly distinct TT words. This is likely to be appropriate where English offers two words which are sufficiently semantically different from one another that the use of a doublet is perceived as giving two bits of separate information.

2.4 Maintenance

Both ST elements are kept in the TT. An example is من حقك علينا الطاعة والثقة الكاملة والطمأنينة الشاملة وعلى هذا بايعنا وعاهدنا inna min ḥaqqi-ka ʿalay-na al-tāfa wa-al-qiqa al-kāmila wa-al-tamaʾnina al-sāmila wa-ṣalā hāgdā bāyaṣnā wa-ṣāḥad-nā (literally ‘Of your right against us is obedience, complete trust and total confidence, and on this we pledged and committed’) (Data-Source B1; in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 84-85), translated by Calderbank as ‘You have the right to our unquestioning obedience, complete trust and total confidence. This is the oath which we have taken and the pledge which we have made’. Maintenance is likely to be appropriate where the English has strong emotive force, and is also used in formulaic language.

The material in this section has been taken from Data-Sources: A4, a short story; B1 a polemical book; E5, a magazine article; E6, a magazine article; F4, a newspaper article.

Other Data-Sources which display (near-)synonym repetition are:

A1 a novella (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 9.3, Note 6).
A3 a short story (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 13.3, Note 50).
B3 a polemical book (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 7.1, Note 14).
(Near-)synonym repetition occurs in a wide variety of Modern Standard Arabic texts: fiction and non-fiction, news reports, tourist texts, political tracts and academic books, as well as neutral and strongly opinionated texts. It thus seems to be fairly ‘pan-generic’.

4.2 Listing and chained coordination

4.2.1 Listing

This section partly summarises aspects of Dickens (2010b), although the English examples given here are not found in that article. Listing is defined as the coordination of two or more words or phrases (primarily nouns or noun-phrases), normally belonging to a relatively coherent semantic field (cf. Baker 2011: 16-18). It is an extension of (near-)synonym repetition in two ways: it prototypically involves more than two entities, and it involves elements whose semantic relationship is looser than the elements in (near-)synonym repetition.

The typical English pattern is asyndetic linkage between all except the last two list members: ‘books and pens’, ‘books, pens and ink’, ‘books, pens, ink and paper’. The typical Arabic pattern is syndetic linkage with و ‘and’ throughout: الكتب والالبلاطم al-kutub wa-al-aqlâm ‘books and pens’, الكتب والالبلاطم والحرير al-kutub wa-al-aqlâm wa-al-hibr ‘books and pens and ink’, etc. However, asyndetic linkage also occurs in Arabic listing, and has become more common in Modern Standard Arabic, apparently under the influence of French and English (cf. Badawi, Carter and Gully 2004: 539-541), although it is also found in Classical Arabic (ibid.: 359). In origin, listing is a response to communicative demands: a list of goods one wants to buy from the supermarket is made for practical purposes, not for rhetorical or stylistic preference. However, listing may be used for rhetorical effect (Al Jubouri 1984: 105-6), in both English and Arabic.
The following illustrate various listing patterns in English and Arabic.

3.
3.1 Syndetic coordination throughout

3.1.1 English
The trunks of the trees too were dusty {and} the leaves fell early that year {and} we saw the troops marching along the road (Hemingway 1929: 3).

3.1.2 Arabic

3.1.2.1 ST
هؤلاء يقتلون باسم الله {و}يسلحن {و}ينفرجون {و}يذبحون {و}يقتلون العقول {و}يكسرون العظام {و}يحرمون الإبداع أيضا باسم الله!
(Data-Source E9; cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 12.1, Note 26)

3.1.2.2 Fairly literal TT
These [people] kill in the name of God, {wa- and} arm, {wa- and} explode, {wa- and} slaughter, {wa- and} wash brains, {wa- and} break bones, {wa- and} forbid creativity also in the name of God.

3.2 Asyndetic coordination throughout
(Throughout this article, Ø marks asyndetic coordination.)

3.2.1 English
Refugees are like you – they have children, {Ø} they cry, {Ø} they laugh.

3.2.2 Arabic

3.2.2.1 ST
الشباب مرحلة عزيمة من حياة الإنسان {Ø} حبيبة إلى قلبه {Ø} قريبة من نفسه
(Data-Source E7)

3.2.2.2 Fairly literal TT
Youth is a stage of life which is dear to the heart of man, {Ø} beloved to his heart, {Ø} near to his soul

3.3 Syndetic coordination with final element only, asyndetic elsewhere

3.3.1 English
‘John, {Ø} Peter {and} Mary’

3.3.2 Arabic

3.3.2.1 ST
الشباب مرحلة عزيمة من حياة الإنسان, {Ø} حبيبة الى قلبه, {Ø} قريبة من نفسه
3.3.3.2 Fairly literal TT
Youth is a stage of life which is dear to the heart of man, Ø-beloved to his heart, {and} near to his soul

Pattern 3.1 is the norm in Arabic, while 3.3 is the norm in English. This does not make coordination more common in Arabic listing, but because of the typical presence in Arabic of an explicit coordinator, it does make coordination more prominent in listing in Arabic than in English with the latter’s greater use of Ø (asyndetic) coordination.

4.2.2 Chained coordination

This section in part summarises aspects of Dickins (2010b), though some of the examples used here are not found in that article. The analysis of the data sources in terms of genre is also new to this article. ‘Chaining’ is the joining of elements in a simple repetitive manner, i.e. putting them in sequence one after the other. This involves a basic form of recursion, which is rather different from that achieved, for example, by multiple subordination (as in ‘This is the cat that killed the rat that ate the malt that lay in the house that Jack built’).

Simple chained coordination also contrasts with embedded coordination, i.e. where there is not only an overall chain of coordinated elements, but within elements of this chain there are also sub-elements coordinated with one another. An example of simple chained coordination is ‘books, pens, ink, paper, rubbers, and rulers’, representable as:

4. (books) ← (Ø pens) ← (Ø ink) ← (Ø paper) ← (Ø rubbers) ← (and rulers)

Here, the arrow in each case points from the more ‘peripheral’ element to the more ‘nuclear’ (head) element, while Ø, as noted, indicates asyndetic coordination.

This can be contrasted with embedded coordination, as illustrated by ‘books and pens, ink, paper, rubbers, and rulers’, and representable as:

5. [(books) ← ([and] pens)] ← (Ø ink) ← (Ø paper) ← (Ø rubbers) ← ([and] rulers)

Here there is embedded coordination between ‘books’ and pens’; the two sub-elements together form a single element with regard to the overall chain. A more complex form of embedding of coordination, ‘books and pens, ink and paper, rubbers and rulers’, is representable as:

6. [(books) ← ([and] pens)] ← [Ø (ink) ← ([and] paper)] ← [Ø (rubbers) ← ([and] rulers)]
Here, the overall chain (list) consists of three elements: 1. ‘books and pens’, 2. ‘ink and paper’, and 3. ‘rubbers and rulers’. Within each element, there is embedded coordination between two sub-elements (i.e. between ‘books’ and ‘pens’, between ‘ink’ and ‘paper’, and between ‘rubbers’ and ‘rulers’).

The following is an example of simple chained coordination in Arabic (Data-Source E9; cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 11.4, Note 16):

7.

7.1 ST

٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠_|
8.2.2 **Literal TT**
And those other than them live in forbiddenness, {wa- and} corruption, {wa- and} ignorance [of religion], {wa- and} disbelief, {wa- and} atheism.

8.2.3 **Idiomatic TT** (adapted from Hetherington 1996: 20):
Everyone outside the group is impious, {Ø} corrupt, {and} irreligious.

### iii. (8.3) Conversion of list introducing embedded coordination

#### 8.3.1 ST
حرف الثقافات ، {أو} حوار الحضارات ، {أو} حوار الأديان ، {أو} الحوار الإسلامي المسيحي ، {أو} حوار الشمال والجنوب ، {أو} حوار الإسلام والغرب ، {أو} الحوار العربي الأوروبي ، كلها عنوان...

(Data-Source D2; cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 10.3, notes 1-3)

#### 8.3.2 Literal TT
The dialogue of cultures, {aw- or} the dialogue of civilisations, {aw- or} the dialogue of religions, {aw- or} Islamic-Christian dialogue, {aw- or} the dialogue of North and South, {aw- or} the dialogue of Islam and the West, {aw- or} Arab-European dialogue, all of them are titles for a single topic […]

#### 8.3.3 Idiomatic TT
The notions of dialogue between cultures {or} civilizations, {or} religions, {or} between Islam and Christianity, {or} between North and South, {or} Islam and the West, {or} the Arab world and Europe, all relate to a single topic […]

Here, the ST simple chaining has seven elements, while the idiomatic TT has three main chain elements: 1. ‘between cultures or civilizations, or religions, 2. ‘or between Islam and Christianity’, and 3. ‘or between North and South, or Islam and the West, or the Arab world and Europe’. Within 1, there is further coordination between ‘cultures’, ‘civilisations’ and ‘religions’ and within 3, further coordination between ‘North and South’ and ‘Islam and the West’, and ‘the Arab world and Europe’.

### iv. (8.4) Conversion of coordination to subordination

#### 8.4.1 ST
شبح ١٩٩٢ كان حاضراً بقوة مع كل الاجتماعات {و} التحالفات {و} اللقاءات الجانبية
(Data-Source F5; reproduced in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 91)

#### 8.4.2 Literal TT
The ghost of 1992 was present, with all the meetings, {wa- and} alliances, {wa- and} secondary encounters} […]
8.4.3 More idiomatic TT (adapted from Jones 1999: 8)

The ghost of 1992 was strongly felt, with countless meetings taking place […]

For a combination of techniques ii.(8.2)-v.(8.4), see Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016a: 158), and Dickins (2010b: 351-352).

The material in sections 4.2.1 and this section has been taken from Data-Sources: D2 (cf. also examples discussed in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016b); Practical 10.3, notes 1, 2, 8), a book on Arab-Western relations; E7, a magazine article on going grey; E9, a polemical magazine article; and F5, a newspaper article. Other Data-Sources which display English TT list restructuring of Arabic ST chained coordination are:

A1 a novella (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Note 6)
A3 a short story (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 13.3, Note 50).
C1 an autobiography (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 5.3, Note 14).
D3 literary criticism (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 11.2, notes 5, 19).
F1 a newspaper article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 2.3, notes 14, 15, 80).
G1 an online tourism article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 6.1, Note 20).

Arabic ST chained coordination, and concomitant English TT list restructuring thus occur in a wide variety of texts: fiction and non-fiction, news reports, literary criticism and academic books, as well as neutral and strongly opinionated texts. The use of extended lists in Arabic accordingly seems to be fairly ‘pan-generic’.

5. ‘Rhetorical semantic’ developments of coordination in Arabic

I turn now to facets of coordination in Arabic which are ‘rhetorical’ in nature, in that they are features of sophisticated writing: hyponym repetition and associative repetition.

5.1 Hyperonym-hyponym repetition

This section draws partly on material in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016: 85-88). The analysis of the data sources in terms of genre is new to this article. A hyperonym (or hypernym or superordinate) is “a linguistic expression whose denotative meaning includes, but is wider and less specific than, the range of denotative meaning of another expression, e.g. ‘vehicle’ is a hyperonym of ‘car’” (Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 293), while a hyponym is “a linguistic expression whose denotative meaning is included in, but is narrower and more specific than, the range of denotative meaning of another expression; e.g.
‘lorry’ is a hyponym of ‘vehicle’” (Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 293). ‘Hyponym’ and ‘hyperonym’ are the converse of one another.

Fairly commonly in Arabic a hyperonym is followed by its hyponym, yielding what appears to an English speaker to be a semantic anomaly. Consider the following:

9.

9.1 ST

وهم لا يتحدثون إلى أحد من الناس .. ولكنهم يداعبون {الباعة} و {المتجولين}.

(Data-Source A5)

9.2 Literal TT

They don’t talk to anyone, but they joke with the {sellers} and the {barrow-men}.

Here, الباعة al-bāṣa ‘the sellers’, is a hyperonym of المتجولين al-mutajawwilīn ‘barrow-men’ (literally ‘travelling [people]’, but normally used to describe people who sell goods from a barrow or handcart); all barrow-men are sellers but not all sellers are barrow-men. In this context, the meaning of the first word has to be taken as excluding that of the second: الباعة bāṣa ‘sellers’ is interpreted as meaning not sellers in general, but those sellers who are not المتجولين mutajawwilīn ‘barrow-men’. Accordingly, الباعة bāṣa here could be translated idiomatically as something like ‘shopkeepers’, giving:

9.3 Idiomatic TT

They don’t talk to anyone, but they joke with the {shopkeepers} and the {barrow-men}.

The following example is also to be understood along the same lines:

10.

10.1 ST

[...] أن سياسة تصدير الثورة [...] أوقعت إيران في العديد من {المشاكل} و {الآزمات} [...] [Data-Source F6]

10.2 Literal TT

[...] that the policy of exporting the revolution [...] led Iran into a series of {problems} and {crises} [...] [...

Here المشاركات al-mašākil ‘the problems’ is a hyperonym (or virtual hyperonym) of الازمات al-azamāt ‘the crises’. All crises are problems, but not all problems are crises (or virtually so). Here the best translation solution might be to retain the more dramatic ‘crises’, and to abandon المشاركات al-mašākil ‘problems’.

10.3 Idiomatic TT 1
[...] that the policy of exporting the revolution [...] led Iran into a series of {crises} [...] 

Alternatively, given that (near-)synonym repetition in Arabic is often used for emphasis, one might use an emphatic adjective such as ‘grave’, or ‘serious’ in combination with ‘crises’, giving an idiomatic translation along the lines:

10.4 Idiomatic TT 2
[...] that the policy of exporting the revolution [...] led Iran into a series of {grave crises} [...] 

The following example is from the Qur’an (Chapter 2, Verse 238) (Data-Source H1):

11.
11.1 ST حافظوا على {الصلاة} و{الصلاة الوسطى} [...]

11.2 Literal TT
Keep your prayers and the middle prayer [...] 

11.3 Idiomatic TT (Yusuf Ali 1938) Guard strictly your (habit of) prayers, especially the Middle Prayer [...] 

Here صلاة الوسطى اس-صَلَاتْ وَاوْضَاتٌ (‘the middle prayer’) is a hyponym of صلاة (‘prayer’ صَلَات, appearing in the plural form صَلاَاتْ صلاوات ‘prayers’). A literal translation ‘prayers and the middle prayer’ seems to suggest that the ‘middle prayer’ is not a ‘prayer’. By introducing ‘especially’, Yusuf Ali’s translation ‘prayers, especially the Middle Prayer’ avoids this.

While in the previous examples of hyperonym–hyponym pairs the hyperonym occurs first, there are also cases where the hyponym occurs first:

12.
12.1 ST هوِيَّة اِیرَانِیَّهُ الْسیاسیَّةِ الْجِدیدَةِ وَطِبَیُّعِهَا عِلَاقَتاً مِعِیِّبَیَانُ‌هَا وِ{دولَ الْعَالَم} \[\ldots\] (Data-Source F5; reproduced in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 87-88)

12.2 Literal TT [...] the identity of Iran and the nature of its relations with its {neighbours} and the {states of the world}. 

In this context, جَارِان ‘neighbours’ is effectively a hyponym and دول العالم duwal al-عالم a hyperonym; i.e. what is meant by جَارِان ‘neighbours’ in this context is the neighbouring states. Since all neighbouring states are states of the world (but not vice versa), this looks like
a hyperonym-hyponym relationship. In fact, دول العالم duwal al-عالم should be interpreted here as referring to the other non-neighbouring states only. An adequate idiomatic translation is achieved by adding the word ‘other’, giving an idiomatic translation along the lines:

**12.3 Idiomatic TT 1**

[...] the identity of Iran and the nature of its relations with its {neighbours} and {other states of the world}.

An alternative might be to eliminate the word ‘states’, on the basis that it is clear from the context that states are being talked about, giving a translation along the lines:

**12.4 Idiomatic TT 2**

[...] the identity of Iran and the nature of its relations with its {neighbours} and the {rest of the world}.

The material in this section has been taken from Data-Sources: A5, a short story; H1, the Qur’an. Other Data-Sources which display hyperonym-hyponym repetition are:

- D1  a book on Iraqi music (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 7.2, Note 38).
- D3  literary criticism (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 11.2, Note 3).
- F5  a newspaper article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b; Practical 7.2, Note 10).

Hyperonym-hyponym repetition thus occurs in a wide variety of texts in Modern Standard Arabic: fiction and non-fiction, news reports, literary criticism and academic books, as well as neutral and strongly opinionated texts. It accordingly seems to be fairly ‘pan-generic’. See Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016a: 86-88) for further examples of Arabic hyperonym-hyponym repetition and English translation possibilities.

**5.2 Associative repetition**

This section draws on material in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016: 88-90), although the analysis of the data sources in terms of genre is new to this article.

A third form of semantic repetition sometimes found in Arabic but not normally in English, is ‘associative repetition’. This involves two or more elements, one being basic and the other(s) being associated with that element. An example is ‘ship’ and ‘crew of a ship’. The following, from Data-Source E8, contains four examples of associative repetition:

**13.**

**13.1 ST**

ف[النجوم ومجموعاتها وأفلاكها وأبعادها]، و[الشمس وحركتها]، و[القمر وأطواره ومنازله] و[السماء]
13.2 Fairly literal TT
And/so {the stars wa- and their groups, wa- and their orbits, wa- and their distances}, and {the sun wa- and its movements}, and {the moon wa- and its phases and wa- its mansions}, and {the sky wa- and what it contained} [...] were all matters in which the humble believer saw the proofs of the veracity and the evidence of the truth of the existence of the Creator [...] 

13.3 Idiomatic TT
{The orbits and positions of the stars and constellations}, {the movements of the sun}, {the phases and mansions of the moons, {the variety of celestial objects}, [...] were all matters in which the humble believer saw incontrovertible proof of the existence of the Creator [...] 

In the first example in the ST مجموعاتها majmūṣātu-hā (‘their groups’, i.e. the groups of stars), أفلاكها aflāku-ha (‘their orbits’, i.e. the orbits of the stars’) and أبعادها abṣādu-ha (‘their distances’, i.e. the distances/dimensions of the stars) stand in an associative relationship to the stars themselves, as features associated with the stars. Other parts of this extract can be analysed in the same way.

In all the cases in example 13, the coordination specifically involved in Arabic associative repetition is eliminated in the idiomatic English TT. Thus, ST فالنحوم ومجموعاتها وأفلاكها وأبعادها fa-al-nujūm wa-majmūṣātu-hā wa-aflāku-ha wa-abṣādu-hā (fairly literal TT: ‘The stars and their groups, orbits, and distances’) is translated in the idiomatic TT as ‘The orbits and positions of the stars and constellations’. Here, the ST has a list of four coordinated elements: 1. النجوم al-nujūm ‘the stars’, 2. مجموعاتها majmūṣātu-hā ‘their groups’, 3. أفلاكها aflāku-ha ‘their orbits’, and 4. أبعادها abṣādu-ha ‘their distances’. The idiomatic TT converts the first two to a coordinated of-phrase ‘of the stars and constellations’ and the second two to a coordinated head (nuclear) element which is modified by the of-phrase ‘The orbits and positions’, reducing the simple chained coordination of four ST elements in the ST to two separate cases of coordination between two elements only in the idiomatic TT. For further examples of associative repetition in Data-Source E8, see Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2016a: 88-90). 

The material in this section is taken from Data-Source E8. Only one other of my Data-Sources contains associative repetition: F1, a newspaper article (cf. Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016b: Practical 2.3, Note 64). It is, however, not difficult to find further examples fitting the same general pattern. An internet search (Nov 11, 2016) for the phrase القرآن ومعجزاته al-qr‘ ān wa-muṣ斐jizzt-uh (literally ‘the Qur‘ān and its miracles’), yielded a number of relevant examples, including {القرآن ومعجزاته وأسراره} [https://annajah.net/article/view?id=2240] {al-qr‘ ān wa-muṣ斐jizzt-uh wa-‘asrār-uh} bar‘īn min axqā ‘na, translatable fairly literally as ‘{The Qur‘ān and its miracles and its secrets} are innocent of our mistakes’ and more idiomatically in context as ‘{The secrets and miracles of
the Qur’an} are not invalidated by our own misunderstandings’.

Nevertheless, given the small number of examples, it is impossible to make any reliable claims about the general use of associative repetition in Modern Standard Arabic. I suspect, however, that it is a Classicising feature, being more common in Classical than Modern Standard Arabic. Data-Source E8 deals with a topic in classical Arabic culture. Similarly in the only other Data-Source including associative repetition, F1, the topic under discussion, the lack of competence among contemporary educated Arabs in using Standard Arabic, is consonant with the writer himself using a ‘good’ Arabic, i.e. employing stylistic features going back to the classical period.

The phrases used to elicit further internet examples of associative repetition, الأثر والمنهج، وتعاليمه السماحة and وال kaufen wa-μuṣjīzat-uh (‘the Qur’an and its miracles’) and إسلام وتعاليمه السماحة and al-islām wa-taḥālīf-uh (‘Islam and its teachings’), are both religious, a language area frequently much more influenced by Classical Arabic norms than are some other genres (e.g. news reporting). The fact that examples of associative repetition were readily available for both these phrases is consistent with the view that associative repetition is a Classicising usage, but only, of course, weakly corroborates this view. For stronger corroboration or refutation, one would need a balanced corpus, of much larger size than in the current study.

6. Conclusion and possible extensions

In considering the pervasiveness of coordination in Modern Standard Arabic, this article has attempted to extend the domain of investigation beyond previous studies. By bringing together the findings of such studies, the article has attempted to sit them within a wider conceptual framework, with the aim of gaining more integrated insights into why Arabic and English differ in the use of coordination. Thus, while previous studies concentrated on the fact, as a general writing feature, of the greater use of coordination in Arabic than English, particularly to link clauses or sentences, this article has argued that not only is coordination a general feature of Arabic writing, but that various linguistic, textual and ‘rhetorical semantic’ norms work individually – and sometimes in combination – to further entrench coordination as a feature of Modern Standard Arabic. Coordination is thus more ‘hard-wired’ in Modern Standard Arabic than a simple statistical analysis of its relative predominance would suggest. This perspective suggests a new approach to Arabic coordination. This would consider in greater detail (e.g. through larger and more coherent corpora) than in the current study the relationship between the general fact of the prominence of coordination in Arabic and the way this interacts with the linguistic, textual and ‘rhetorical semantic’ norms identified in this article and with other similar norms perhaps still awaiting identification and analysis.

Appendix: Data-Sources
All extracts from the following texts are translated by me in this article, unless otherwise stated.

**A. Fiction**


**B. Political books**


**B3. Polemical book by the leading Egyptian Islamist:** معانٍ في الطريق maאлим fأل-طارأ (Signposts along the Way), by سيد قطب sayyid qأ (1990) (extract reproduced in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 92).

**C. Autobiography**

**C1. Autobiography by an Egyptian politician and literary figure of the early twentieth century:** qisأat hayأ (The Story of My Life), by أحمد لطأف السيد aхmad luأf al-sayyيد (1962) (extract reproduced in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 58).

**D. Cultural books**

D2. Book on relations between the Arab and Islamic worlds, and the West: نحن والآخر (We and the Other), by ناصر الدين الأسد (1997) (extract reproduced in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 144).


E. Magazine articles


E4. Article on dark matter: المادة المظلمة لغز الكون (Dark Matter: the Riddle of the Universe), published in the Kuwaiti social, cultural and scientific magazine The Arab (June 1994) (extract reproduced in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 244-245; translation based on that of Garrett 1995).


E6. Article on Muslims in America: المسلمين في أمريكا وتأثيرهم في المستقبل (Muslims in America and their Influence in the Future), published in the Kuwaiti social, cultural and scientific magazine The Arab


F. Newspaper articles


F2. Polemical article on the killing of nine pro-Palestinian activists on board the Mavi Marmara ship by the Israeli military in 2010: القرصنة الصهيونية جريمة صغيرة مكررة al-qarṣana al-ṣuḥyūniyya jarīma ṣuğrā mutakarrira (Zionist Piracy is a Small Repeated Crime), published in the Egyptian newspaper الشعب al-ša变速箱 (The People) newspaper, 1 June 2010 (extract reproduced in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 107).

F3. Article reporting an agreement between Turkey and Iran regarding Iran’s nuclear enrichment programme: حذرت تركيا من المضي قدما haddarat turkiyya min al-midy quduman (Turkey Warns Against Going Forward), published on the Arabic Al-Jazeera website, 18 May, 2010 (extract reproduced in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 84).


G. Tourist material


H. Religious texts
H1. The Qur’an (extract reproduced in Dickins, Hervey and Higgins 2016a: 87).
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