Relativization in Arabic and English. A case of Translation Problems with Sudanese Students
- A contrastive study -

AL GOOT ABDALLAH AL AWAD SALIM
Sudan University of Science & Technology
MAHMOUD ALI AHMED
Sudan University of Science & Technology

Abstract:

This paper aims at underpinning the similarities and differences between Arabic and English relativization system. It also investigates the problems encountered by second-year English students of Sudan University of Science & Technology in translating relative clauses from English into Arabic and vice versa. The researcher has adopted the experimental, the descriptive and the analytical method via questionnaire and pre and posttest as tools for gathering the data related to this study. The sample of this study composed of (24) students majoring in English in the second year at the Sudan University of Science and Technology. The data obtained from the test has been processed computationally with SPSS program to examine the hypothesis of this study. The results from the test have shown that there are similarities and differences as regards relativization system in both languages with the effect of posing obstacles for the students of translation. Despite the fact that some studies have been conducted that include relativization in English and Arabic, none of them could be considered comprehensive. Therefore, this study presents a detailed discussion of relativization in both languages and examines translation between them. It can also be considered as an attempt to suggest a link between contrastive linguistics and translation studies.
Key words: relativization, Arabic, English, translation problems, Sudanese students

A brief Overview

Languages are the means of communication and debate among human beings and nations. The ever increasing processes of globalization have made the world such a small village to the extent that no nation can live quite independently of the other nations. Though each nation has its different tongue, they need to communicate with their neighbor nations. Therefore, the need for translation is rising all over the world. Translation needs competent translators whose main tool is languages which consist of words and words are structured together to form meaningful sentences and texts for communication. Relativization is one of the basic structures of languages and it is a universal phenomenon that exists in most if not all human languages. Thus, relative clauses are found in both English and Arabic. As will be shown later in the next chapters, relative clause formation in English and Arabic appears to be similar in many aspects; however, there are certain aspects which are distinct (Hamadallah and Tushyeh, 1998: 141).

Modern Standard Arabic and Relativization

The variety of Arabic which shall be considered in the present study is the Standard Modern Arabic(henceforth MSA), the type of Arabic employed in formal public address, over radio and television, classroom settings, lectures and conferences and religious ceremonial. Due to the great universality of its applicability, Modern Standard Arabic has been chosen to be contrasted with English in this study. The phonology, morphology and syntax of Arabic literary language are more complex and comprehensive to provide a solid ground for conducting such a study.

Two influential and opposed forces have affected the development of the vocabulary and syntax of MSA. A reform

movement began toward the end of the last century in *Syria* which has reawakened and popularized the old conviction of educated Arabs that ancient Arabia, of pre-Islamic times, which became the classical form of the language in the early centuries of Islam, is better and more correct than any later form. Advocates of this purist doctrine have held that new vocabulary must be derived wholly in accordance with the ancient models or by semantic extension of older forms. They have insisted on the replacement of all foreign loanwords with purely Arabic forms and expressions. The purists have had considerable influence on the development of modern literary Arabic although there has been widespread protest against their extreme point of view. At the same time, and under the increasing influence of Western Civilization, Arab writers and journalists have had to deal with a host of new concepts and ideas previously alien to the Arab way of life. As actual usage demonstrates, the purists have been unable to cope with the sheer bulk of new linguistic material which has had to be incorporated into the language to make it current with advances in world knowledge. The result is seen in the tendency of many writers, especially the fields of science and technology, simply to adapt foreign words from the European languages. Syntax and Morphology of MSA was also subjected to a kind of reform to help accommodate new loan forms into the main stream of the language.

In the present study which seeks to handle only the relative clauses of MAS contrastively with that of English, the researcher is guided by such immense experience as a classroom practitioner and a translator to come up with a working project that will help students render forms of relative clauses quite effortlessly from Arabic into English.

The present study derives its importance from the fact that it addresses an issue that relates to the field of translation which has grown immensely significant in today's world for the

purpose of communication in a digital world quite often described as a small village. The continuous growing need for translation calls for rigorous research to be carried out in different language aspects to facilitate the very process of translating, especially in contrastive studies. Translation as a discipline requires competent translators who are well informed in the discipline namely language. It goes without saying that language is a composite of morphemes and words that are combined to form sensible structures specifically sentences. Relative clauses are important parts of language structures without whose good knowledge it will be impracticable to form meaningful structures.

Relative clauses or relativization is a basic component of all worlds' languages even those with no writing system. Consequently, good knowledge of relativization in English and Arabic are prerequisite for any student of translation. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, Relativization in English and Arabic has some common ground, a fact that will certainly help facilitate the process of addressing the issue. Similarities and differences between Arabic and English relative clauses will be discussed thoroughly in later chapters, namely chapter three.

As a classroom practitioner, the researcher noticed that undergraduate students of translation make terrible errors in translation in general. The situation worsens even more when it comes to translating relative clauses from English into Arabic and the opposite is also true. The problem arises mainly out of the fact that the students have received no previous training in the area of contrastive linguistics before they embark on their translation courses. They studied relative clauses as part of their English grammar courses in a way that has nothing to do with translation. Students , themselves start their translation course believing that the area of relative clauses is simple as they have already did part of that in secondary schools and

their preliminary year English program and that they know how to use them properly, not knowing that in translation the situation is entirely different.

The problem with translation is that there are more practitioners of the discipline who picked it up through sheer practice without prior thorough training in linguistics and more particularly the theory of translation, translation problems, strategies and solutions. Therefore, graduates majoring in English, lured by the promising market of translation particularly in rich oil countries, have opted for translation as a profession. So, to help alter this awkward situation a need for the inclusion of translation syllabus at undergraduate level is immensely required. In the present research, the researcher seeks to provide a clear look at the relative clauses both in English and Arabic with the aim of exploring the possibility of translating them from English into Arabic and vice versa. So many areas in English and Arabic need to be examined for the purpose of furnishing English Language Departments at our universities with a sensible translation syllabus.

The researcher sets out in the present study to examine in terms of contrastive analysis those points of similarities and differences in English and Arabic relativization. All areas of relative clauses in English are satisfactorily covered in the present research right from the definition to the position of the relative clauses in language structures. To determine some of the essential properties of the relative clauses in both languages, the study addressed the syntactic and semantic functions of the relative clauses as the latter is closely connected with the hub of translation.

A relative clause is a subordinate clause that modifies a noun, Leech. et.al.(1982),Eckersley, C.E (1960), Thomas, L. (1993). To illustrate this point, let's look at the following structure, which is essentially a noun phrase "the woman who betrayed her husband", which contains the noun "woman", which is modified

by the relative clause "who betrayed her husband". In English relative clauses are preceded by relative pronouns such as who, that, which and so on, and they are technically known as complementizers, followed by an antecedent, which is either the subject of the main clause or its object or any other verb-phrase relationship. Relative structures have two basic components: the antecedent and the relative clause. The two parts are joined by a relative pronoun, as in the example "this is the politician who deceived his people". In this construction, the politician is the antecedent and is the subject of the sentence, whereas "who deceived his people" is the relative clause underscoring the antecedent "politician". As they are subordinate in syntactic rank and add information to the nouns, relative clauses are called adjective clauses.

In Arabic relative clauses are subordinate adjective clauses, as was already mentioned above, in that they have the function of a modifier that adds information to the noun they are attached to. The relative clause (*جملة الصلة*) follows the relative noun (*إسم الموصول*) for the purpose of clarifying the meaning of the relative noun and its antecedent. The relative noun cannot stand in isolation as it has no meaning without the relative clause. To provide sense or meaning the relative noun must have what is technically known as the "referent pronoun"(*العائد أو الرابط*), that refers to the relative noun الإسم (*الموصول*), for example *"graʔtu al magal aladhi ktabtahu ams*" "I read the article you wrote yesterday." The part "hu" attached to the verb *katbt* is known as clitic object pronoun and refers back to the relative noun "aladhi".

Two types of adjective clauses are readily recognizable in Arabic. They are defining and non-defining. The defining clause needs a relative noun which is *connected*, while the non-defining does not require a relative noun, that is *unconnected*.

Relativization in English

Generally, clauses that function inside the noun phrase as modifiers are called relative clauses (RCs), i.e. relative clauses are typically found as a part of a noun phrase and provide some information about the person or thing indicated by the head of a noun phrase (Park, 2000: 4; Yule, 2000: 240).

According to Crystal (2003: 148), "The most complex kind of postmodification in the noun phrase is a finite clause … introduced by the set of pronouns *who(m), whose, which, that*, or 'zero'. These are the **relative pronouns**… and the clause they introduce is known as a **relative clause**." He (ibid: 151) adds that "Relative clauses need to be distinguished from a second type of finite clause which can postmodify a noun: the **appositive** clause". This seems to be very similar to a relative clause introduced by *that*. Compare these two sentences:

(1) The story that she told her brother is not true. (Relative)
(2) The story that she killed her brother is not true. (Appositive)

The first sentence is relative: „that" can be replaced by „which" and the sentence becomes *the story which she told her brother is not true*. The second is appositive: „that" cannot be replaced by „which", and the sentence means *the story is that she killed her brother and the story is not true* (Govande, 2010). In addition, Hudson (1990: 383) says that "One of the typological characteristics of English is the wide range of 'relativization strategies' that it allows". And as it is well known that complement clauses modify verbs (e.g. as objects; Miller, 2002: 64), relative clauses modify nouns. In older descriptions, relative clauses were called adjectival clauses, reflecting the fact that adjectives also modify nouns (Miller, 2002: 64).

(3) The available money.
(4) The money which is available.

One feature that distinguishes between adjectives and relative clauses in English is that the former precede nouns while the latter follow them.

Reibel and Schane (1969: 225) say that:

> "Relativization is the process whereby a sentence is embedded as a modifier in a noun phrase. In this way the relative clause becomes the source of productive instances of both pre- and post modifiers. Involving as it does the introduction of relative pronouns, the movement of constituent, and various deletions, relativization provides a rich source of insight into other areas of the structure of English".

Definition of Relative Clauses

According to Roberts (1997: 288) "Relative clauses are wh-clauses, but they are not interrogatives. In contrast to interrogative clauses, they can only be subordinate. This is because relative clauses function as modifiers." Radford (2004: 233) says that "They are called **relative clauses** because they contain a **relative pronoun**… that 'relates' (i.e. refers back) to an… antecedent in a higher clause". For example the clause in brackets, in example (5) below, is a relative clause:

(5) The man [who crossed Antarctica] was happy.

However, some relative clauses do not include relative pronouns. These are called **zero relative pronouns.** Miller (2002: 64,65) states that "The term 'relative' goes back to the Roman grammarians, who called the Latin equivalent of *which, who* and so on relative pronouns because they referred to a noun. *Refer* derives from the Latin verb *referre*, an irregular verb whose past participle passive is *relatus*, from which 'relative' derives".

English relative clauses are introduced normally by relative pronouns and modify the noun phrase (NP) preceding

them. In example (5), *man* is the antecedent of the relative pronoun *who* that is modified by the relative clause (RC) in brackets. The relative pronoun *who* indicates or replaces the antecedent *man* and also serves as a complementiser.

According to Biber et al (1999: 608), "relative clauses are always missing a constituent, which corresponds in meaning to the head noun. The structural location of this missing constituent is referred to as the „gap‟". Consider a relative clause construction like:

(6) The diamond earrings that Mama wore are beautiful.

The head of the noun phrase is *the diamond earrings*; the relative pronoun *that* refers to the earrings and the *gap* occurs in the direct object position, after the verb *wore*. That is, the underlying meaning of the relative clause is that „Mama wore the diamond earrings‟.

The basic structural relationship in RCs is formed by a process called relativization or embedding, which is the generation of one clause within another higher–order or subordinate clause, such that the embedded clause becomes a part of the subordinate main clause. For example:

(7) *The fans [who were attending the rock concert] had to wait* in line for three hours.

a. The fans had to wait in line for three hours.

b. The fans were attending the rock concert.

(Celce–Murcia & Larsen–Freeman, quoted in Park (2000:5)).

Sentence 7 is derived from 7a and 7b. 7a is a main clause and 7b is embedded in 7a. *The fans* is the noun that occurs in both sentences. When embedded, this noun will be substituted by the relative pronoun, which is *who* in sentence 7. In this process, the relative pronoun will take the same case as the noun in the original embedded sentence. In other words, *the fans* in the second clause (7b), is in the nominative case,

therefore, it will be replaced by the nominative relative pronoun, *who*. In the main sentence, *the fans* will be an antecedent that will be modified by the relative clause.

One common type of post-modifier is the relative clause:

(8) He had a nasty gash which needed medical attention.

The relative clause is embedded in the noun phrase. As an independent sentence, it might be:

(9) The gash needed medical attention.

We might think of the embedding as a process that takes place in stages. The first stage puts the sentence close to the noun it will be modifying:

(10) He had a nasty gash. *The gash* needed medical attention.

It can be noticed that the two sentences share the same noun (gash) which refers to the same thing. The second stage changes the noun phrase into a relative pronoun.

(11) He had a nasty gash *which* needed medical attention.

The relative pronoun *which* functions as subject in the relative clause just as the gash functions as subject in (10). In (11), the relative pronoun *which* can be replaced by the relative *that*. (Greenbaum 1991: 42).

In the process of embedding, different modifications become available. The chief of them is **relative pronoun omission**, which is acceptable in some constructions but cannot be accepted in some others. The omission could include something else too. Consider the following examples:

(12) The girl [who was] sitting on the beach remained quite impassive. (The auxiliary verb is omitted as well).

(13)*The girl [who was] impassive sat on the beach.

(14)*Bankers [who are] capitalists lack popularity.

(15)*Professors [who] give grades to pretty co-eds are impressionable (Fowler 1971: 144).

Structure of Relative Clauses

There are four steps for producing RCs in English: first, the identical NP or modified antecedent should be identified. Second, a proper relative pronoun should be chosen to substitute the identical NP in the relativized clause. Third, the relative pronoun should be fronted when the function of the identical NP is an object in the relativized clause. Fourth, the relativized clause should be placed after the modified antecedent. This process, as mentioned above, is called embedding. When the relative clause modifies the subject of the main clause, the relative clause is embedded in the middle of the main clause; this is called centre embedding (Park, 2000: 6). Identifying identical NPs, relative pronoun substitution, and embedding apply to all types of relative clauses. On the other hand, relative pronoun fronting and centre embedding apply only to certain types. The following sections introduce the different types of relative clauses and explain the structures involved in each type.

Identification of Relative Clauses

According to Stageberg (1971: 249, 250) relative clauses in English can easily be identified by the following characteristics:
a) A relative clause is introduced by a relative: *that, who, whom, whose, which,* or „zero".
b) The relative has a grammatical function in its own clause (subject, direct object, object of preposition, modifier, or subjective complement), as illustrated in the following sentences:
(16) The man *who suffers from AIDS* is half dead. (Subject)
(17) The partner *whom she selected* was a very educated man. (Direct object)

(18) It was the prime minister *to whom I presented the novel.* (Object of preposition)

(19) The client *whose stock he was handling* died. (Modifier)

(20) The play *he wants* is Romeo and Juliet. (Zero)

(21) The victory *that you achieved* is the first step in your practical life. (Subjective complement).

Types of Relative Clauses

The structure of relative clauses can be broadly categorised in terms of the function of the head noun in the main clause and of the identical noun in the relative clause. In the main clause, a head noun can function as a subject, a direct object, an indirect object, an object of a preposition, or a predicate noun. In the relative clause, heads of the NPs can function as subjects, direct objects, indirect objects, or objects of prepositions. Moreover, the possessive determiner *whose* can relativize any noun functioning as a subject, a direct object, an object of a preposition, or a predicate noun, as in:

(22) I met a teacher whose ideas confused me. (Subject)

(23) It was a car whose colour I could not recognise. (Object)

The following is a discussion of the kinds of relative clauses in English, namely: nominal relative clauses, sentential relative clauses, and restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses.

Nominal Relative Clauses

The nominal relative clause, also called the **fused relative construction,** is illustrated in (24), which may be compared with the structurally more straightforward (25):

(25) [He had quickly spent] what she gave him.

(26) [He had quickly spent] the money which she gave him.

In (25) *which she gave him* is a restrictive Rel-word relative clause functioning as modifier within the NP *the money which she gave him*; the relative word *which* is anaphoric to *(the) money*. Semantically (24) is very similar to (25): both can be roughly analysed as "she gave him X; he had quickly spent X" (with (25) explicitly saying X is money). But whereas in (25) we find separate expressions corresponding to the two Xs, *(the) money* and *which*, in (24) we do not: they are, as it were, fused together in *what* (="that which"). We will accordingly call *what she gave him* in (24) a **fused relative** construction (Huddleston 1988: 158).

Greenbaum (1991: 109) claims that "**Nominal relative clauses** are clauses that are introduced by nominal pronouns… Whereas relative clauses post-modify nouns, nominal relative clauses have the same functions as noun phrases:

(26) He gave his children what they wanted.
(27) Whoever said that does not understand the question."

Sentential Relative Clauses

Sentential relative clauses are similar to non-restrictive relative clauses with a slight difference owing to the fact that they do not postmodify nouns only, but they postmodify their antecedent which is the whole or part of what precedes them in a sentence (Greenbaum, 1996: 228), as in:

(29) Neither of the two students gave an excuse for their absence for the whole week, which may affect their level this term.

In the above mentioned sentence, the antecedent of *which* is everything that precedes the relative pronoun *which*.

Greenbaum (ibid) also adds that "The sentential relative clause is non-restrictive, and therefore it is generally separated

from what precedes it by an intonation break or pause in speech and by a punctuation mark in writing."

Moreover, *which* can be used as a determiner in relative clauses, with a general noun which repeats the meaning of what came before. This construction is mainly used after prepositions, especially in some fixed phrases like *in which case* and *at which point.*

(30) She may be late, in which case we ought to wait for her.

(31) He lost his temper, at which point I decided to go home.

- *That* is the relative pronoun that can be used in restrictive clauses to replace any relative pronoun except *whose.*

Restrictive and Non-Restrictive Relative Clauses

Stageberg (1971: 250) states that "The two kinds [of relative clauses] are traditionally called restrictive and non-restrictive". These two kinds are used to refer back to the head noun. According to Crystal (2003: 150)

> There are two ways in which a relative clause relates to the head noun, as can be seen from these two sentences:
> (32) My brother who is abroad has sent me a letter. (My other brothers have not).
> (33) My brother –who is abroad- has sent me a letter. (He is the only brother I have).
> In the first case, the relative clause is needed in order to identify what the noun is referring to; it 'restricts' the noun to mean 'the brother I am talking about'. This is therefore known as **restrictive relative clause**. There is no such restriction in the other sentence; the relative clause provides optional, extra information which could be omitted without affecting the noun's identity. 'My brother has sent me a letter'. This is known as a **non-restrictive relative clause**.

Huddleston (1988: 155) notes that "Restrictive relative clauses function as modifiers within NP structure". Restrictive

relative clauses are also called "defining" relative clauses because they define or restrict the reference of the antecedent noun. They help to identify or classify the person or thing being talked about.

Dixon (1992: 28) says that "In a restrictive clause, a wh-relative (other than *whose*) may be replaced by *that* (which is here functioning as a relative pronoun); or it can be omitted, so long as the coreferential NP was not in subject function in the relative clause… Restrictive relative clauses that have a coreferential subject NP and refer to present time can have a reduced version; the relative pronoun is omitted and the verb is put in –ing form", as in:

(34) Those mangers who/that sack firemen are saving money for the company.

(35) Those mangers sacking firemen are saving money for the company.

Dixon (ibid) says that "A nonrestrictive relative is like an inserted, parenthetical comment, and is set off by contrastive intonation (shown by commas in the written style). It could be considered as not really a part of the subordinate NP, but rather as an independent constituent in apposition with it. The relative pronoun in a nonrestrictive clause is not likely to be replaced by that, and could not be omitted." A non-restrictive relative clause is, syntactically, a parenthetical structure in which additional information is given for the sake of clarification.

A non-restrictive relative clause gives extra information about an antecedent. It provides additional information, not identifying information. In writing, a non restrictive clause is usually marked by commas, dashes, or parentheses, as shown in 36 below. In speaking, these non-restrictive clauses would be marked by pauses, and a change in intonation. These commas, dashes, brackets, and pauses are generally known as

separation markers (Yule, 2000: 248). Hence, the parenthetical structures in 36 below are all non-restrictive relative clauses which provide additional information, not identifying information. If they were restrictive relative clauses, there would be no separation markers between the antecedents and the relative pronouns.

(36) a- My neighbour, who is an English teacher, plays very loud music.

b- The man –whose name is John Johnson- also likes to have weekend parties.

c- The parties (which are very crowded) seem to go on all night.

These distinct separation markers around non-restrictive relative clauses make them easy to recognise. In writing, they also help to make a distinction between some extra information about the antecedent, as with *my friend* in (37a) and some necessary information, as in (37b) that identifies a particular *friend who is Japanese.*

(37) a. My friend, who is Japanese, is coming.

b. My friend who is Japanese is coming.

We can paraphrase (37a) as „My friend is coming and, by the way, s/he is Japanese", whereas (37b) will communicate that „My friend who is Japanese, not my friend who is Chinese, is coming". The commas in the non-restrictive relative clause in (37a) actually signal that this clause could easily be omitted.

But to choose the right kind of relative clause can be critical. Compare the following sentences:

(38) a. Snakes which are poisonous should be avoided.

 b. Snakes, which are poisonous, should be avoided.

The use of the restrictive clause (sentence 38) implies that only **some** snakes are poisonous, which is true. But the use of the

non-restrictive clause implies that **all** snakes are poisonous, which is false (Crystal 2003: 151).

In the following example, (a) is restrictive and (b) is non-restrictive:

(39) a. The coat which Jack had presented to her was in the safe.

b. The coat, which Jack had presented to her, was in the safe.

As already suggested, in speech, the distinction is clearly marked prosodically: non-restrictive relatives are pronounced with a separate intonation contour, whereas restrictive clauses are prosodically bound to their antecedent. In writing, non-restrictive clauses are normally distinguished from restrictive clauses by being marked off by separation markers as has been mentioned earlier. Semantically, the information included in the non-restrictive clause is presented as separate from, and secondary to, the information included in the rest of the subordinate clause, whereas this is not so with the restrictive clause: here the information it expresses forms an integral part of the message conveyed by the subordinate clause as a whole. For example, in (a) the relative clause is part of the description that defines which coat is being referred to: the implication is that there is more than one coat in the context of discourse, but just one that Jack had presented her; (b) on the other hand, implies a context where there is only one coat: the non-restrictive relative clause simply gives additional (and extra) information about it. (Huddleston 1988: 157).

According to George Yule (2000: 248), separation markers are found more often with names and other proper nouns as in [40a], with additional comments on previous statements, as in [40b], with clauses that begin with quantity expressions (e.g. *many of whom, none of which),* as in [40c].

(40) a- Mrs. Britos, who is the librarian, reported that some books were missing.

b-Someone said that I took the books, which is not true.
c- I had never touched the books, most of which were in German.

In order to clarify the difference between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses, Stageberg (1971: 250, 251) analyses these two examples:
(41) He walked to the garage *which he liked best*. (Restrictive)
(42) He walked to the garage, *which was a mile away*. (Nonrestrictive)

"The first clause points out one garage among many. Of all the garages, he walked to the particular one that he preferred. In the second sentence, however, there is only one garage, and as additional information, we learn that it is a mile away. In short, the restrictive clause restricts the meaning to part of the total, but the nonrestrictive clause makes no such limitation. This is the semantic way of distinguishing the two kinds of relative clause" (Stageberg, ibid).
George Yule (2000: 249) also states that:

> There are some aspects of restrictive relative clauses that are not normally found with non-restrictive types. The relative pronoun "that" and the zero relative pronoun are typical features of restrictive relative clauses. Also with antecedents such as anyone, any person, everyone and everything, a restrictive relative clause is typically used to identify more specifically who or what is being talked about.

It would be unusual to find a non–restrictive relative clause after any of these general antecedents. Thus, the italicised examples in [43] are all restrictive relatives.
(43) a- Is there anything *you cannot do?*
b- Well, I cannot help every person *who needs help.*
c- But those *that you help* are usually satisfied.
d- I am sure there are some people *who are never happy.*

Hudson (1990: 383, 384) claims that:

> It is quite easy to represent this distinction (between defining and non-defining relative clauses), because defining relatives clearly relate to the sense of their antecedent, whereas non-defining relatives refer to its referent. For example, if my wife who lives in Rio is taken to contain a defining relative, then who lives in Rio adds a property to the existing properties of the sense of wife, so that this word refers not just to 'wife of me', but to 'wife of me such that she lives in Rio'. If on the other hand the relative clause is non-defining, then the referent of who is the same as that of wife, and does not define a particular kind of wife; consequently it is customary to compare a non-defining relative with a parenthetical clause containing an ordinary identity-of-reference pronoun.

Restrictive relative clauses are also shorter than non-restrictive relative clauses. Finally, the differences between the two types of relative clauses are summarized in table 1 below:

Table 1: Differences between Restrictive and Non-restrictive Relative Clauses

Restrictive	Non-restrictive
Defining	non-defining
necessary information	extra information
no separation markers	separation markers (e.g. commas)
not usually after proper nouns	after proper nouns
not as additional comments	provide additional comments
initial "that" and "zero" relative	not with "that" or "zero" relative
with general antecedents	not with general antecedents
shorter and more common	longer and less common

Restrictive relative clauses are thus closely tied to their antecedents while non-restrictive ones are quite separated. The commas in writing or pauses in speech before the non-restrictive relative clauses create more linguistic distance between the antecedent and the relative clause. As can be noted elsewhere, more linguistic distance conveys a much looser connection. This distance is also noticeable when both restrictive and non-restrictive relatives are used with the same antecedent.

Relativization in Arabic

This section presents in detail relativization in Arabic. According to the traditional Arab grammarians, adjectival clauses identifying indefinite nouns are taxonomically the same as adjectives and both are called صفة /ṣifa/ adjective; whereas, the clauses that qualify definite nouns are dealt with as adjuncts and thus called صلة /ṣila/ adjunct. Both are relative clauses (Badawi et al, 2004: 491).

The aim of this section is limited to describing Arabic relative clauses with respect to definition of relative pronouns, kinds of relative pronouns, kinds and functions of relative clauses and finally the resumptive pronoun.

Relative Pronouns
Relative pronouns are the determining factor of relativization in general.

Definition of Relative Pronouns

A relative pronoun is a pronoun that refers to a specific person or thing and introduces a clause that modifies it. A relative pronoun cannot stand alone but it needs a clause or a quasi-

clause (see 4.2.2.1 later) that follows it in order to clarify it. This is called ﺧ /şilatu lmawşu:l/ (relative clause), as in:

ﺑَ ﺧَﻋﺎ ﺧُﺀﻳ١٧ ٢ﺃُﺍ ﺑَﻳﭙَﻧﺮﺍ ﺑُﺀﻳﺍ! (133)

/ma: ?a mala l?u nijata llati: stama ʕna: ?ilajha:/

What a beautiful song (zero) we listened to!

In the above sentence, the relative pronoun ٢ﺃُﺍ /allati:/ (which) refers to ١٧ﺧُﺀﻳ /al?u nijata/ (the song), the particular song being identified by the clause that follows it which is ﺑَﻳﭙَﻧﺮﺍ ﺑُﺀﻳﺍ /istama ʕna: ?ilajha:/ (we listened to it). It is noted here that the clause ﺑَﻳﭙَﻧﺮﺍ ﺑُﺀﻳﺍ /istama ʕna: ?ilajha:/ (we listened to it) includes another pronoun that refers back to the relative pronoun, called ﻻﺍﻧﺒﭙﺎ ﻭَﺀﺃُﺃﺍ /aḍḍami:ru lʕa:?id/ (resumptive pronoun). This means that the relative pronoun needs two important things which are: ﺧﺎ ﺃَﻵَﻳ /şilatu lmawşu:l/ (relative clause) and ﻻﺍﻧﺒﭙﺎ ﻭَﺀﺃَﺃﺍ /aḍḍami:ru lʕa:?id/ (resumptive pronoun) (Nor-Addeen, 1991: 133).

Kinds of Relative Pronouns

Specific relative pronouns, namely; ﺍﻧﺎﺍ /allaði: / , ٢ﺃُﺍ /allati:/, ﺍﻧﺎ١ﺍ/allaða:ni/, ﺑﺎﺯُﺍ /allata:ni/, ﻧﺎ١٣ﻳ /allaði:na /and ﺍﺭُﺍ ٢ /alla:ti:/, ﺍ۱۰ﺍﺋُﺮﺍ /alla:?i:/ or ٢ ﺭَﺃَﻵُﺍ /allawa:ti:/; regularly reflect gender and number. And so, each of the terms just mentioned, may, depending of course on the context, stand for or be translated into *who, whom, which, that* or *what*. However, Dickins (2009) claims that "Relative „elements" in Arabic, such as ﺍﻧﺎﺍ /alla i:/ and even the colloquial forms such as ٢ﻳﺮُﺍ /illi/ are sometimes referred to as relative pronouns … do not function much like pronouns, and certainly not like the relative pronouns of English and some other European languages." The following is a discussion of each pronoun:

/allaði:/ is a specific relative pronoun applicable to singular, masculine, persons -ﺃَﻧَﺮand non-persons. For example:

(134) أَكَبُت أَنِ ا ْغِپ كِبى ثُبُغبُيِح (Per.)

/aṭṭa:libu llaði: na a a fa:za bil a:?iza/

The student who succeeded won the prize.

(135) أَكَزِبة أَنِ ا هوأَزثبَّ اَ ل ءَل (Non-per.)

/alkita:bu llaði: qara?tuhu bil?amsi mufi:d/

The book which I read yesterday is useful.

/allati:/ is a specific relative pronoun applicable to singular feminine persons and-أَزنِب non-persons, and inanimate (non-human) plurals. For example:

(136) ألنِزبح أُزٰ٢ هِذ أُمَ هج ثبهَگخ (Per.)

a/ʕalfata:tu llati: rasamati ṣṣu:rata ba:ri

The girl who drew the picture is clever.

(137) أُمَ هج أُزٰ٢ هِزب ألنِزبح غ ءخ (Non-per.)

/aṣṣu:ratu llati: rasamatha: lfata:tu ami:la/

The picture which the girl drew is beautiful.

The picture which the girl drew is beautiful./allati:/ is also used with the inanimate (non-human) أُز٢ The feminine singular plurals; so we may say:

(138) أُجٰءد أُزٰ٢ تَّ . أُنْ٢ءَ و٣ئخ

ala a:ṭi:?i muri: a/ ʕalbuju:tu llati:

The houses which are on the beach are comfortable.

(139) أُ غواد أُزٰ٢ آبَ أُيِضُوح

/a a ara:tu llati: ama:ma lmanzili muθmira/

The trees which are in front of the house are fruit-bearing.

/allaða:ni/ is a specific relative pronoun applicable to dual, masculine, nominative-أَزنِرُا

ان٣ُpersons and non-persons. Its equivalent in the accusative and genitive cases is /allaðajni/; as i in:

(140) a هعغ أُكُ لا أُزِنا يكوا ثبَّ (Dual, masc., per., nom.)

lwalada:ni llaða:ni sa:fara: bil?ams/ ʕra a

The (two) boys who travelled yesterday came back.

(141) **هبثذِ اُقُل3 اُن3 زجب اللَّة** (Dual, masc., per., acc.)

/qa:baltu lwaladajni allaðajni kataba: ddars/

I met the (two) boys who wrote the lesson.

(142) **مجذ اُ. اُقُل3 اُن3 زجب اللَّة** (Dual, masc., per., gen.)

/ðahabtu ?ila lwaladajni llaðajni kataba: ddars/

I went to the (two) boys who wrote the lesson.

/allaðajni/ are used for non-persons too; as in: **3ن اُن** /allaða:ni/ and **اُنِ**

(143) **اُكِبُ اُبِ نُب اُنِا اُج3عب اُأ** (Dual, masc., non-per., nom.)

ʕal ?umam /llaða:ni jabnija:ni huma: lma:alu wa ilmu/

Knowledge and money are those (two) which build nations.

(144) **اُِنذ اُجبث؛ اُن3 ٓ ٓوا** (Dual, masc., non-per., acc.)

/aşla tu lba:bajni llaðajni kusira:/

I repaired the (two) doors which were broken.

Moreover, Elder (1950: 57) states that "The relatives **انُا** /alla i:/, **اُز2** /allati:/ (and the other specific relatives) may be used as **ال؟** /man/ and **باآ** /ma:/ without antecedents", e.g.:

(160) **انُا ٓهل3 لغث كِٓغٓ3**

/alla i: jadrusu bi iddin jan a / Whoever studies hard succeeds.

The following table summarizes the forms of specific relative pronouns:

Table 2: Specific Relative Pronouns

	Masculine	Feminine
Sing, all cases.	انُا /allaði:/	اُز2 /allati:/
Dual, nom.	اُنِا /allaða:ni/	اُنِ2 /allata:ni/
Dual, acc, and gen.	اُن3 /allaðajni/	اُز؛2 /allatajni/

Pl., all grammatical cases (nominative, genitive, and accusative)	اللَّذِينَ /allaði:na/ ١٠ الأُولى /al?ula/	اللَّذِرَ ٢ /alla:ti:/ اللَّذَئِي ٢ /alla:?i:/ اللَّذَواتِ ٢ /allawa:ti:/ ١٠ الأُولى /al?ula/

- الِّي /ill/ is a colloquial relative pronoun, which exists in most if not all dialects of Arabic, used in reference to all antecedents, regardless of gender, number, case, and person/non-person. Accordingly, it could substitute all relative pronouns in the above mentioned examples. Althogh, this thesis is limited to standard English and Arabic, الِّي ٢.illi/, which is a colloquial word, is mentioned here because its addition to standard Arabic is a suggestion for a future research (7.3 later).

General Relative Pronouns

General relative pronouns are applicable to both types of gender and to all the numbers. They are six in number; مَنْ /man/, مَا /ma: /, الِّي /al/, أيّ /?ajju/, ذا /ða:/, and مَا /ma: a:/.

According to Hassan (1975, Vol. 1: 347) none of these pronouns change even if the antecedent nouns change; and because of this, general relative pronouns are applicable to different kinds of antecedent nouns. The antecedent nouns are clarified and distinguished by the resumptive pronouns which are discussed later. The following is a discussion of the general relative pronouns that are widely used in Arabic.

English-Arabic Contrastive Studies

Contrastive studies of English and Arabic are numerous and they have a long history. They started more than a half century ago. Mukattash (2001: 115) claims that "Arabic-English contrastive studies are not a recent development; their history goes back to the late 1950s". Therefore, in this section some studies are to be referred to in order to shed some light on the

importance of this thesis as one of contrastive studies of English and Arabic.

Aziz (1974) compares the phonological features of Iraqi Arabic and English and predicts that the differences between individual sounds and clusters will pose a major problem for Iraqi learners. His conclusion, which is based on empirical research, shows that mispronunciations of the sounds caused by interference of the native language are not many, which contradicts his predictions.

A contrastive study of the phonology of English with that of Jordanian Arabic has been done by Rummuny as quoted in Abu-Jarad (1986: 17). In this study, Rummuny finds that "Jordanian learners of English, for example, will pronounce the English sound /p/ as the Arabic sound /b/ because the NL (Arabic) does not have /p/."

An investigation of English and Arabic in the areas of phonology, vocabulary, and syntax was made by Nasr (1963). In this investigation, he predicts some problems that some Arab students face when learning English. Some of the problems he predicted are the use of the resumptive pronoun in the English relative clause, the use of '*hisself*' instead of 'himself', and '*theirselves*' for 'themselves'. However, according to Abu-Jarad (1986), these predictions have not been empirically proved.

The most comprehensive contrastive study of English and Arabic, according to Elwedyani cited in Abu-Jarad (ibid) was conducted by Catford et al. This comprehensive contrastive study includes phonology, morphology, and syntax. Abu-Jarad (ibid: 18) states that "The results of this comparison predict that the differences between the two languages (English and Arabic) will create an area where NL interference, TL overgeneralization, and fossilization, are most likely to occur."

Contrastive Studies and Translation

Contrastive studies are useful not only in second language teaching, but also in translation studies as well. Catford (1965: 20) states that "The theory of translation is concerned with a certain type of relation between languages and is consequently a branch of comparative linguistics". Catford (ibid: 76) also argues that "translation equivalence may occur between sentences, clauses, groups, words and (though rarely) morphemes".

Contrastive and comparative linguistic studies are of great importance to translators and translation students. Translation theory itself is a branch of comparative linguistics (Newmark, 1988). Moreover, James (1980: 4) highlights that "There are … three branches of two-valued (2 languages involved) interlingual linguistics: *translation theory*- which is concerned with the process of text conversion; *error analysis*; and *contrastive analysis*".

In addition, Hatim (1997: 1) states that "One useful way of seeing contrastive linguistics at work is through translation, and an interesting way of looking into the translation process is perhaps through an examination of the kind of decisions which translators make in handling texts. This should enhance our understanding not only of what actually happens when text confronts text, but also… of what it means to be textually competent". Therefore, the decision-making involved in the translation process for the discipline of contrastive linguistics must get to grips with linguistic structures of a syntactic and semantic nature; and also seen not within the sentence and elements below but the sentence and beyond (Hatim, ibid: 11).

Contrastive studies in translation do not only concentrate on texts but also they go further to smaller units in languages such as grammatical structures and/or even lexis. Williams and Chesterman (2002: 90) highlight that "A

contrastive approach might also focus not on texts but on grammatical structures or lexical items, looking for equivalence rules for translating certain structures between a given pair of languages, or for terminology equivalents".

Relativization in the World's Languages

This section deals with the studies of relativization in a number of the world¨s languages. The main purpose of this review is to pay special attention to relativization as a universal phenomenon that exists in all human languages. This review of the related literature is organised chronologically as follows:

A syntactic study of relative and comparative clauses was made by Andrews (1975) in which he makes a survey discussing relativization in a number of the world¨s languages namely: English, Japanese, Turkish, Eskimo, Samoan, Faroese, Classical Tibetan, Hottentots, Navajo, Warlpiri, Mabuiag, Hindi, Sanskrit, Marathi, Crow, Swahili, Modern Greek, and Persian. Andrews (ibid: 1) claims that this typological survey of relative clauses in the languages of the world directs the attention to the varieties of constituent structure relations between relative clauses and their heads.

Andrews (ibid) adds that this "serves both to convey a general impression of what relative clauses are like in the languages of the world, and to establish certain phenomena that are of theoretical import. One of the most significant of these is that there are relative clauses that cannot be deep structure constituents with the NP they modify, but must be generated in the base at an unbounded distance from those NPs".

Finally, Andrews (ibid: 4) concludes that this discussion gives a useful and valuable picture of the relative clause construction in universal grammar.

Dunbar (1982:154), who discusses some parallel constraints in German and English subordinate clauses, argues

that "Further effects of topic switch on German and English syntax can be seen when reviewing the restrictive/non-restrictive distinction in relative clauses. … it is quite easy to effect a switch of discourse topic after a (coordinate) non-restrictive relative clause, but very difficult after a (subordinate) restrictive relative clause".

After conducting this discussion, Dunbar (ibid: 155) concludes that: Three things have been illustrated in this section: (1) that topic switch in both German and English is more allowable in main clauses than in subordinate clauses, and correspondingly more allowable in non-restrictive than in restrictive relative clauses; (2) that topic switch in German occurs much more readily in conjunct subordinate and relative clauses with paratactic verb-second than the hypotactic verb final order; and (3) that constraints on left dislocation and shift of topic with the English conjunction *because* can be predicted on the basis of whether it translates as paratactic *denn* or as hypotactic *weil*.

Relativization in Chinese has been investigated by Yong (1987). He argues that the aim of his study is "to provide a clear, comprehensive description of relativization in Chinese and present further data from Chinese to form a modest contribution to the growing body of data and formulations for topics on language typology and universals".

Yong (ibid: 85) concludes his study by saying that "The relative clause in Chinese always precedes the head NP it modifies and relative clause formation involves either of the two different processes: deletion and pronominalization of the relativized NP".

Mhinga (1987) has discussed relativization in Tswana and how Tswana relative clauses fit into the Accessibility Hierarchy introduced by Keenan and Comrie.

According to Keenan and Comrie quoted in Mhinga (ibid) "Languages differ in relation to which noun phrase

position can be relativized. Some relativize all four positions, i.e. subject, direct object, indirect object and the genitive, while others do not".

Mhinga (ibid) also argues that "All languages use clauses to modify nouns, but the syntactic form and the positioning of these relative clauses differs considerably across languages". He (ibid: 2) also claims that "There are two kinds of relatives in Tswana: subject relatives and non-subject relatives".

A study of syntactic properties of restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses in Japanese was done by Kameshima (1989). In this study, Kameshima (ibid: 1, 2) claims that "Japanese relative clauses do not have relative pronouns corresponding to wh-words in English which associate the head and a gap in a relative clause... Semantic properties of restrictive and non-restrictive relatives in Japanese are not expressed as overtly as English".

In this study also, Kameshima (ibid) points to:
- What some linguists describe as gapless relatives saying that "restrictive relatives in Japanese in fact require a gap".
- Whether movement is involved in restrictive relatives.
- The analysis of restrictive and non-restrictive relatives distinction in Japanese.
- The existence of the resumptive pronoun in some Japanese relative clauses.

A contrastive analysis of relative pronouns in English and Dutch was made by Amir (1990). Amir (ibid: 62) claims that "One of the distinctive syntactic features of English and Dutch relative pronouns is that they perform two main functions in the relative clauses in which they normally occur. First, they serve as subject, object, or object of preposition in the subordinate clause; and secondly, they, as their name implies,

act as connectors relating the subordinate clause to the main clause".

Amir (ibid) discusses further, the areas of difficulties that English learners of Dutch and Dutch learners of English encounter in learning relative pronouns. One of the findings of this study is that "English learners of Dutch are likely to transfer relativizer deletion from their MT (mother tongue) into Dutch. One of the reasons is that the word order of such a construction is parallel in these two languages, a phenomenon which may tempt the learners to impose a literal translation of their own construction whenever they use the Dutch one".

A discussion of relativization in English and Korean was done by Lee (1991). In this study, the writer found that

> The review of English and Korean RC and related structures… suggests that fundamental principles of UG can account for both English and Korean, in spite of apparent surface differences across these. Cross-linguistic differences appear to lie in morphology (e.g. the fused verb morphology in Korean, or the morphological realisation of Comp), or in language-specific variations relevant to case to assignment in each language, or in the level of representation at which rules apply. They do not lie in the fundamental principles of UG which underlie RC formation in both languages.

A comparison of grammatical categories: nominal number in English and Yucatec was conducted by Lucy (1992). Lucy (ibid: 1, 2) argues that "Without a comparative dimension, nothing can be established about the impact of language differences… The comparison should also be undertaken with a broad understanding both of the attested world-wide range of language types and of the particular cultural context of the specific languages communities being compared". In terms of the comparison of Yucatec and English, Lucy (ibid: 56), focusing on the grammatical category of number, claims that "Both English and Yucatec represent number in the noun phrase and do so in somewhat similar ways: they both mark

plural by inflection and concord, they both mark singular by modification …, and they both provide a variety of specialized modifiers to indicate other number distinctions".

An investigation of the semantics of relative clauses in Korean has been done by Yoon (1994). Yoon concludes that "Korean-type RCs cannot be accounted for by the standard syntactic and semantic approaches available, both because syntactically they lack a syntactic gap and because semantically the relation between an RC and its head noun is not one that is directly describable in the popular approaches". Yoon (ibid: 427) finds further that Korean, along with Chinese and Japanese, has the type of discourse- bound R-relation (relative-relations), while English does not.

Relativization in English and Chinese has been discussed by Ming L Chiu and Lili, (1994: 61, 62). They state that:

> Relativization is a cross-linguistic phenomenon. That is, relativization is to be found in many of the world languages. It may, and does, take different surface forms in different (types of) languages. For example, in English which has the basic S V O order, relativization is postnominal; Chinese is the only S V O language that has the prenominal relativization (the relative clause precedes its antecedent noun).

Relativization in Hindi has been investigated by Dayal (1996: 152) who claims that "Hindi relativization structures are known in typological literature by the name of correlatives… The chief characteristic associated with correlative construction is the possibility of having the relative clause at the periphery of the main clause". Dayal (ibid: 186) concludes that "Hindi correlatives … argue for a more traditional view of restrictive relativization at the NP level".

An investigation of the use of relative clauses in French children's narrative texts was conducted by Jisa and Kern (1998). The results of their study show that "The use of relative

clauses in general discourse functions precedes their use in more specific narrative functions".

Alexidou et al (1999: 10) who discuss relativization in Greek argue that "Relative clauses are introduced either by the declinable relative pronoun preceded by the definite article … or by the invariable complementizer/ relativizer".

Summary of the Contrastive Study

Having discussed the similarities and differences between English and Arabic relativization, we can sum up as follows:

1- Relative clause formation in English and Arabic is similar in many ways; however, there are certain aspects in which they are distinct.

2- The relativization process is basically the same in English and Arabic.

3- The position of the relative clause is postnominal in both English and Arabic, i.e. the relative clause always follows the antecedent.

4- Restrictive and non-restrictive distinction is a determining factor in English. In Arabic, this distinction is largely irrelevant. However, it must be noted that Arabic uses a conjunction (e.g و /wa/ „and‟), not a relative pronoun, to express a non-restrictive relationship where the relative clause refers to the whole or part of the preceding clause or is subsequent to the main clause.

5- In both English and Arabic, there are two sets of relative pronouns: major and marginal in English and specific and general in Arabic.

6- While English has five different forms of the major relative pronouns, Arabic has eight forms of specific relative pronouns. Arabic has no equivalent to the English major relative pronoun „whose‟.

7- Unlike English, a specific relative pronoun in Arabic agrees with the antecedent in number, gender, and case for the duals.

8- Unlike English, prepositions cannot usually precede specific relative pronouns in Arabic especially when the antecedent is explicit. When the antecedent is implied, prepositions may precede specific relative pronouns in Arabic.

9- A specific relative pronoun in Arabic is used only with definite antecedents whereas in English it is used with both definite and indefinite antecedents.

10- Both English marginal relative pronouns and Arabic general relative pronouns are used for some other purposes such as in interrogative sentences.

11- As in English, Arabic general relative pronouns are not distinguished by grammatical categories of gender, number, and case.

12- English and Arabic relative pronouns differ in the grammatical categories of gender, number, case, and person/non-person.

13- A basic difference between English and Arabic in relativization is the use in Arabic of a personal pronoun connected to the end of the clause. This pronoun is called the resumptive pronoun and it generally agrees with the antecedent in number, gender and case.

14- English and Arabic agree in their use of relative clauses. i.e. relative clauses have the same functions in both English and Arabic.

Conclusion and Findings

The findings of this study show that some Sudanese university students at Sudan University of Science & Technology encountered a degree of difficulty in translating relative clauses

from English into Arabic and vice versa. In addition, the findings indicate that the students under investigation have a clear and obvious weakness in both English and Arabic, which could be considered a negative indication of the level and quality of the teaching program in the university where this study was conducted. Moreover, the findings of the pre and post-test used in data collection for this study have provided no indication that the two tests were not done in a proper way. In contrast, the findings have shown that the two tests were well-designed and administered properly, which proves the validity and reliability of the results of this study and its usefulness for the students of Sudan University where the empirical part of this research was conducted.

Judging by the errors which the students made in translating the texts presented to them, the errors may be attributed to some problems such as: unfamiliarity with English marginal and Arabic general relative pronouns; differences between English and Arabic in the grammatical categories of gender, number, case, and person/non person; over adoption of literal translation; interlingual transfer; lack of competence in the grammar of both languages; the lack of one-to-one correspondent relative pronouns between English and Arabic; and most importantly the translation teaching program at Sudan University of Science & Technology where the empirical part of this study was conducted.

The results of this study have shown that one obvious reason for such errors was the differences between the language systems of English and Arabic. It also have shown that some difficulties were due to some limitations in the translation teaching at Sudanese Universities and Sudan University in particular. It was also shown that the students" level is not up to the mark in either English or Arabic and they lack competence in the grammar of both languages. It has also been proven that the aims of this study have been successfully

achieved. Therefore, the researcher hopes that the results of this study would be taken into consideration as a step forward towards improving the students" level and competence as well as in developing the translation teaching program at Sudan University of Science & Technology. Finally, this paper, to the best of my knowledge, is the first to deal with relativization in English and Arabic in detail and to shed some light on the link between contrastive linguistics and translation studies.

REFERENCES

- Alexidou, Artemis et al. Eds (1999). *Studies in Greek Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Amir, H. S. (1990). *A Contrastive Analysis of English and Dutch Personal, Possessive and Relative Pronouns*. Unpublished MA dissertation. Durham: Durham University.
- Andrews, Avery D. (1975). *Studies in the Syntax of Relative and Comparative Clauses*. London and New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Aziz, Yowell (1974). „Some Problems of English Consonant Sounds for Iraqi Learners". *English Language Teaching Journal*. 29. 166-168.
- Badawi, Elsaid; Carter, M. G.; and Gully, A. (2004). *Modern Written Arabic*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Biber, Douglas et al. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. 2nd ed. Guangzhou: Longman Group.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). A *Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dayal, Veneeta (1996). *Locality in WH Quantification*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Dickins, James. (2009). „Relative Clauses in Sudanese Arabic‟. In *Journal of Semitic Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dunbar, Ronald W. (1982). „Discourse Pragmatics and Contrastive Analysis: Some Parallel Constraints on German and English Subordinate Clauses‟. West Virginia University. In Lohens, Walter and Hopkins, Edwin (Eds). *The Contrastive Grammar of English and German*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Karoma Publishers.
- Dixon, R. M. W. (1992). *A New Approach to English Grammar on Semantic Principles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eckersly, C. E. and Eckersly, J. M. (1974). *Comprehensive English Grammar*. London: Longman.
- Elder, E. E. (1950). *Arabic Grammar: Inductive Method*. Cairo: American University at Cairo.
- Fowler, R. (1971). *An Introduction to Transformational Syntax*. London and Southampton: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Govande, Ajit Santosh. „What Is an Appositive Clause‟, http://www.englishforums.com/English/WhatIsAppositiveClause/3/bnqdx/Post.htm, (retrieved 20 November 2010).
- Greenbaum, Sidney (1991). *An Introduction to English Grammar*. London: Longman.
- Greenbaum, Sidney (1996). *Oxford English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hamadallah, R. and Tushyeh, H. (1998). „A contrastive analysis of English and Arabic in relativization‟. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*. Vol/34: 141-151. Paznon.
- Hassan, Abbass (1975). /anna□w alwa:fi:/ [*The Comprehensive Grammar*]. Vol/1. Cairo: Dar Almaarif.

- Hatim, Basil (1997). *Communication Across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Hudson, Richard (1990). *English Word Grammar*. Chicago: Basil Blackwell.
- James, Carl (1980). *Contrastive Analysis*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Jisa, Harriet and Kern, Sophie (1988). *Relative Clauses in French Children's Narrative Texts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kameshima, Nanako (1989). *The Syntax of Restrictive and Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses in Japanese*. PhD Thesis. University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Lee, Kwee-Ock (1991). *On the First Language Acquisition of Relative Clauses in Korean: The Universal Structure of Comp*. PhD Thesis. Cornell University.
- Leech, Geoffrey and Svartvik, Jan (1977). *A Communicative Grammar of English*. Hong Kong: Longman.
- Lucy, John A. (1992). *Grammatical Categories and Cognition: A Case Study of the Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, Jim (2002). *An Introduction to English Syntax*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ming, Li Chiu and Lili (1994). „Relativization in English and Chinese‟. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics.* Vol 29:61-74. Paznon.
- Mhinga, Sina S. (1989). *Relativization in Tswana*. Unpublished MA dissertation. Durham: Durham University.
- Mukattash, Lewis (2001). „Some Remarks on Arabic-English Contrastive Studies‟. *Pozan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics.* 37. School of English, Pozan: Adam Mickiewicz University.

- Nasr. Raja T. (1963). *The Teaching of English to Arab Students*. London: Longman.
- Newmark, Peter (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Stageberg, Norman C. (1971). *An Introductory English Grammar*. 2nd edn. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Park, Chanyoung (2000). *The Syntactic Difficulty of Relative Clauses For Korean Students*. MA Dissertation. Arizona State University.
- Radford, Andrew (2004). *Minimalist Syntax: Exploring the Structure of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Radford, Andrew (2004). *Minimalist Syntax: Exploring the Structure of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reibel, David A. and Schave, Sanford A. Eds. (1969). *Modern Studies in English*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, INC Eaglewood Cliffs.
- Williams J and Chesterman A. (2002). *The Map: a Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester and Kinderhook (NY): St. Jerome Publishing.
- Yule, George (2000). *Explaining English Grammar*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yong, Dai (1987). *Relativization in Chinese*. Unpublished MA dissertation. Durham: Durham University.
- Yoon, Jae-Hak (1994). „The Semantics of Relative Clauses in Korean‟. Ohio State University. In Akatsuka, Noriko (Ed). *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*. Vol. 4. Stanford: CSLI Publications.