CHAPTER THREE

COHESIVE DEVICES IN ARABIC AND THE WESTERN TREATMENT OF THESE DEVICES

3.1 Preliminaries

Because there are no independent studies on discourse analysis in Arabic, little information on the subject which is scattered in various chapters of Arabic grammar and rhetoric books is available. Moreover, unlike English, cohesive devices in Arabic do not possess a distinct linguistic system. Consequently, it is expressed lexically by items which have the same or nearly the same concept, and grammatically by particles to which cohesion is a secondary function. These reasons necessitate a thorough analysis of cohesive devices in Arabic.

The kind of Arabic to be discussed in this chapter is Modern Standard Arabic (henceforth MSA). This is the language used by educated people in formal situations. It is the language of mass media. It is some how different from Classical Arabic (henceforth CA) in that it takes into consideration the changes Arabic has undergone. This should not lead us to say that MSA is a distinct variety of Arabic; rather, it shares much similarity with CA. It is also different from Colloquial Arabic, which is the result of people's unique usage of Arabic in daily communication. This uniqueness is either geographical or social.

In analyzing cohesive devices in Arabic, the researcher has depended on the available literature, especially major sources in Arabic, and has counted on her intuition checked upon by native speakers of Arabic.
3.2 A Glimpse at ‘Cohesive Devices’ in Classical Arabic and Western Treatment of these Devices

3.2.1 Personal Pronouns and Demonstratives

The basic source of information on the grammar of the Arabic Language is represented by the works of the medieval grammarians. Their works provide comprehensive descriptions and analyses of aspects of Arabic. Although their works are based on the Arabic of the Holy Quran and Pre-Islamic literature, it has greatly influenced all subsequent Arabic linguistic and grammatical theory that they are still referred to as the main body of information on the structure of MSA. In fact, the aim of many present-day grammar textbooks is to present the ancient grammarian's analyses in a more organized and simplified way rather than to provide new insights into the structure of the language (Al-Batal, 1985:20). Even the texts studied and the examples provided are often those used by the medieval grammarians. As a corollary, it seems necessary to examine those works.

In this chapter, the researcher does not propose to present a full account of their works since this in itself would require a separate study. Instead, only a brief overview of their treatment of each of the issues at hand will be introduced.

Ancient Arab grammarians like Sibawayh (1966), Ibn Hisham (1913), al-Zamakhshari (1900), Ibn Jinny (1956) and many others deal with personal pronouns in great detail. They classify them with nouns in their tripartite classification of parts of speech. They explain that the only permanent meaning of pronouns is that of person and gender, and that pronouns acquire a semantic meaning only by referring to some entity that either precedes or follows them. In addition, pronouns are also considered definite nouns since the speaker uses them only when sure that the listener is familiar with the referent.
Early grammarians focused their treatment on explaining the morphological aspect of pronouns, their different types (isolated, affixed, explicit, and implicit), their syntactic functions, and their use at the sentence level (Ibn Hisham, 1985: 261).

The demonstratives are considered nouns and called ‘mubhama:t’ (ambiguous) because they can refer to anything, whether human or non-human and also because they do not mean anything specific in themselves; only when referring to something outside of them do they acquire meaning (Ḥasan, 1971: 338). Here again, the ancient grammarians followed the purely traditional way; they study the types of demonstratives, their syntactic function and their usages.

In their treatment of personal pronouns and demonstratives, most modern Arabic grammarians such as Ḥassan Abbas (1971), Tammam Ḥassan (1973), and Al-Saqee (1977) base their grammatical theory on, and select sample materials from, the works of medieval Arab grammarians. Among those who follow the traditional method are Ḥasan, Al-Sinjiri, and Al-Jundi. Ḥasan’s book ‘al Nahw al-Waːfiː’ (The Satisfactory Grammar) is considered a standard reference of Arabic grammar. It includes descriptions of the semantic properties of personal pronouns and demonstratives as the ancients viewed them. It, like the other studies mentioned above, focuses on the syntactic functions of personal pronouns and demonstratives.

However, not all studies by modern Arab grammarians follow the purely traditional approach; there have been studies that deal with pronouns and demonstratives at the discourse level and others that focus on semantic aspects as well as syntactic.

a new approach to personal pronouns. Whereas early and orthodox modern Arabic grammarians group pronouns with nouns in their tripartite classification of the parts of speech, Ḥassan places them with demonstrative and relative pronouns in a separate category in his seven-member classification of the parts of speech. He bases this new classification on distinctions he makes between the seven categories in terms of syntactic and semantic features. To him, isolated personal pronouns in themselves indicate ‘presence’ or ‘absence’ of person, and acquire a *lexical meaning* only through their referents. Affixed pronouns, on the other hand, have no meaning in themselves; only when affixed to verbs do they indicate person and number. Ḥassan also mentions the role of both types of pronouns as linking devices in a sentence.

Ḥassan (1973: 322) considers demonstratives as pronouns. This is different from the practice of early Arab grammarians and traditionalists who classified demonstratives with nouns and called them ‘asmaʿ al-ʾisha:rah’, (nouns of indication), in the sense that they give the listener indication or determination of a noun (Cantarino, 1975:2-29). To Ḥassan, demonstratives, like personal pronouns, indicate presence, are interpreted by reference to another element, and act as linking devices in a sentence.

However, Ḥassan's treatment of personal and demonstrative pronouns has some limitations. First, it is rather brief and general, for it does not provide detailed descriptions of the various meanings and textual functions of pronouns. Second, although it mentions the function of both personal and demonstrative pronouns as linking devices, it realizes this function at the sentence level only. But inspite of those limitations, Ḥassan's study is of value since it introduces a new approach to the study of Arabic language (Al-Batal, 1985; 29), an approach that attempts to examine pronouns,
demonstratives, and other aspects of the Arabic language within a syntactic-semantic framework.

Western grammarians based their treatment of personal and demonstrative pronouns on the works of medieval Arab scholars and modern native Arabic grammarians. Thus, most of these studies focus on the syntactic and morphological considerations of pronouns. Their treatments appear either in Arabic grammar reference books, such as Wright's *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, or in grammar textbooks and handbooks intended for classroom use, such as Bateson's *Arabic Language Handbook*, Thatcher's *Arabic Grammar of the Written Language*, and Cowan's *An Introduction to Modern Literary Arabic*. However, there have been a number of studies that attempt to use different approaches to personal pronouns and demonstratives.

In his book, *The Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose*, Cantarino (1975) gives a semantic and syntactic analysis of pronouns and demonstratives. His intention is to analyze the structure of literary Arabic as it is used today, independently of the syntactic forms employed in the older days, and to cover semantic and literary aspects as well. Cantarino's treatment of personal pronouns is mostly syntactic. He discusses in detail the various functions of isolated and suffixed pronouns within the sentence. As to demonstratives, he offers descriptions of their meanings but focuses on their syntactic functions as demonstrative adjectives in apposition to a substantive and as demonstrative pronouns referring to a situation or to a noun whose function is filled by the demonstrative.

Cantarino's presentation differs from that of the ancients in that, it is based on modern literary work, but its descriptions and analyses of the syntactic aspects of the language are mostly in accord with those of the ancients. The reason behind this is that the syntactic structures have hardly changed. Baker (1979:3) explains that it is possible that some grammatical structures are not as commonly used as before, but there has not been any complete
disappearance of a specific syntactic construction or process from the overall grammatical statement. Thus, the statements and judgments that the Arab grammarians made about ‘al-Fusḥah’ (the Standard form) are valid for Literary Arabic. An important limitation of Cantarino’s treatment of personal pronouns and demonstratives is that it is restricted to the sentence level. While he explains their syntactic function within the sentence, he does not address their textual functions within or between sentences.

3.2.2 The Study of Ellipsis

Ellipsis received special attention from early Arab grammarians. Their analyses and discussions of ellipsis are primarily based on texts from the Holy Quran due to the fact that ellipsis is a dominant linguistic feature of the Quran and is considered an important source of its eloquence. They studied various aspects of ellipsis, including its meaning, its necessary conditions, its purposes, and its types. However, these discussions did not all appear in one single comprehensive work on ellipsis; they were rather dispersed in treatises on grammar and rhetoric. Among the ancient grammarians who provided thorough treatments of ellipsis are Sibawayh, Ibn-Hisham, Ibn Jinni, and al-Jurjani.

Ancient Arab grammarians dealt with ellipsis and presented a detailed description of the syntactic, semantic and stylistic features of its various aspects at all levels in a text, from suffix to discourse (Matlub and Al-Bashir, 1982:1985). Among the ancient grammarians who provided thorough treatments of ellipsis are Sibawayh (1966: 453) and Ibn Al-Athir (1939: 78-81). They studied ellipsis of particles, nouns, verbs and sentences and explained the meanings of and reasons and conditions for each type. To them, a necessary condition for ellipsis is that either a linguistic element or the context of situation should supply the missing information. In the first case, the element can be either within the sentence in which the ellipsis
occurred or in a previous sentence. Some of them saw that in order to determine what the deleted item is, one has to imagine what the structure would have been if no ellipsis had occurred. This structure the ancients called ‘al-‘ašliyyah’ (primary) as opposed to ‘al-farṣiyyah’ (secondary). These two terms or concepts seem to correspond roughly to the transformationalists' notions of deep and surface structure (Hammoudah, 1983: 83).

The pioneer grammarians made a distinction between ‘optional’ ellipsis and ‘obligatory’ ellipsis. In the first type, the deleted item can be mentioned and the sentence will remain grammatically acceptable. In the second, however, ellipsis is a grammatical necessity; if the deleted item is mentioned, the sentence becomes grammatically unacceptable. In ‘optional’ ellipsis, the presupposed item is always present in the text, whereas in ‘obligatory’ ellipsis it is not. It is the optional ellipsis that pertains to this study since ellipsis, as perceived here, is not grammatical.

To the ancient grammarians, ellipsis was of great rhetorical and stylistic value. Its ultimate purposes were concession, brevity, and eloquence. In his book, ‘Dala:‘il al-‘iqja:z’ (Signs of Inimitability), Al-Jurja:ni: (1984:146) says:


(for you see in it (ellipsis) that leaving something unsaid is more eloquent than saying it, withholding information is more informative (than giving it), and you find yourself most articulate if you do not articulate, and most expressive if you do not express).
A limitation to the ancients' descriptions, however, is that they do not provide much in way of explanation of the textual function of the ellipsis (as a cohesive device); rather they focus on the syntactic aspects of ellipsis across the sentence boundaries.

There have been a number of attempts by some modern grammarians, however, to depart from the methods of ancient grammarians and to shift the focus in analysis from formal considerations into more semantic and pragmatic consideration. However, most modern Arab grammarians and rhetoricians, like the early ones, base their study on the Holy Qur’an and early poetry. Among these are Al-Jarim and Amin (1951), Al-Makhzumi (1964), and Hasan (1971). In his book, ‘Al-Nahw Al-Wafi:’ (The Sufficient Grammar), Hasan examines ellipsis in coordinate clauses, nominal sentences and conditional clauses. Yet, the role of ellipsis as a cohesive device remains untouched.

The same can be said about the Arabic grammar books written by orientalists. Cantarino (1975) deals with ellipsis and presents a detailed description of its types, but does not address its role as a cohesive device.

Ancient studies of cohesion in Arabic are rare. The Medieval Arab rhetoricians dealt with aspects of cohesion in their treatises on rhetoric. Al Batal (1985) mentions books of ancient rhetoricians, which deal with a number of phenomena that can be described as cohesive. Among these are Ibn al-Athir’s ‘al-Mathal al-Sa’ir’ (A Treatise on the Art of Literary Composition) which mentions al-takrar ‘repetition’, and al-Jurjani: ’s ‘Dala: il al-ṣiṣjaż’ (Signs of Inimitability), which includes a section on ‘al-waṣl wal-faṣl’ (Conjunction and Disjunction) observes the roles of some connectives, and provides a brief discussion of connectives and of how elements in a sentence adhere.
3.2.3 The Study of Conjunctions

As has been stated earlier, early Arab grammarians classified, ‘al-kala:m’ (speech) into three essential parts: nouns, verbs, and particles, which are grammatical categories and can perform different syntactic functions. A particle (حرف) is usually used to refer to prepositions, conjunctions, and even some adverbs (See, Haywood and Nahmad, 1965: 412). However, as far as the present study is concerned, ‘حرف’ is used to refer to ‘ادعات الرابط’ (conjunctions) only.

The basic function of ‘conjunctions’ as conceived by the grammarians is to connect verbs and nouns together (HASAN, 1971: 62). In performing this function, many connectives have been said to possess governing power or regency over the nouns or the verbs, which follow them. This governing power appears to have been the main concern that seized the attention of ancient grammarians in their treatment of Arabic conjunctions. The grammarians’ study of the syntactic functions of conjunctions has far outweighed their study of their semantic and textual features. Conjunctions were more significant to ancient grammarians as inflection-changing elements than as meaning-carrying vehicles. Actually, this tendency is not unexpected, taking into account the formal inclinations of ancient Arab grammarians who were very much interested in the phenomenon of ‘الى’ (case and mood inflection). Among the classes and sub-classes they proposed for dividing particles we find ‘الحرف الف ال–ميلال’ (operative particles), ‘الحرف الف ال–محملال’ (inoperative particles), ‘الحرف الف ال–يد’ (redundant or augmentative particles), ‘حرف الف ال–joining’ (coordinating conjunctions), ‘حرف الف ال–جذام’ (jussive particles), ‘حرف الف ال–ناشب’ (subjunctive particles)...etc. As an outcome of this classification, conjunctions like ‘بلك’ (but, but rather) ‘لكيننا’ (but), ‘لكين’ (but) and ‘يناما’ (but) which share a similar meaning have been assigned to different
syntactic categories. Thus, ‘ba’l’ and ‘la:kin’ are considered to be ḥaru:faṯṣafaṯ (coordinating conjunctions), ‘la:kinna as ḥarf mushabbah bi-al-fīṣ’l’ (a verb-resembling particle) and ‘innama:’ as ‘inna al-makfu:faṯ’ (inna with no governing power) (al-Rummani, No date, pp. 89, 94, and 133).

Within the framework of this syntactically oriented classification of particles, however, some attempts were made to reveal some of the semantic intricacies of conjunctions. Examples of this are the analyses of the semantic differences between the two conjunctions aw and am (or) (Ibn al-Hajib, No date, pp. 2:377; Sibawayh, 1966:3:169-72) and between law (if) (it was the case that…), and in ‘if’ (it be the case that…) (al-Rummani, No Date: 174-5). In his treatment of inna (indeed) and innama: (but), al-Jurjani (1961:206-20) even introduced some pragmatic elements which necessitate the use of such conjunctions. Such attempts at a semantic study of conjunctions, however, were not always done systematically and were mixed with linguistic and non-linguistic elements in an unclear fashion. This is the case, for example, with fa: ‘al-sababiyyah (causal fa:’), which was designated as the ‘causal’ fa even though it is not the only fa in Arabic with a causal meaning. The semantic status of this fa, as will be seen later, was assigned on the basis of a certain syntactic constraint that is associated with its use. It is also the case with aw (or) that some of its meanings were distinguished in light of some non-linguistic considerations.

An important limitation to the ancients’ treatment of conjunctions is the fact that it was confined to the sentence limits. The grammarians did not deal with the roles that some conjunctions perform at higher levels such as that of the paragraph and the discourse; thus, a potentially important aspect of conjunctions has been overlooked. It is worth noting that studying the language at levels higher than that of the sentence was not, to some
grammarians, part of the linguistic study but part of ‘ẓilm al-bala:ghaha’ (Rhetoric), (See ‘Matlub wa Al-Bashir’, 1982). Nevertheless, many grammarians dealt with some aspects of rhetoric in their books (Ḍayf, 1965:102), their treatment did not go beyond sporadic comments on the topic and thus has a limited value.

However, a major contribution to the study of some conjunctions as cohesive devices was made by Ibn-Al-Athir in his book ‘Al-Mathal Al-SA:vir’ (A Treatise on the Art of Literary composition) (1939) and Al-Jurjani (1961). They studied some conjunctions in a well-integrated manner (semantically, pragmatically and rhetorically). Al-Jurjani (1961:215-20) for example, believed that the inimitability of some Arabic texts (especially the religious texts) was not limited to some rhetorical phenomena but also included what is called in Arabic ‘al-naẓm’ (a structural combination of syntactic and semantic elements). From this perspective came his treatment of conjunctions like ‘innama:’ (but) (p.215), ‘inna’ (indeed) (pp.206-14) and ‘wa:w al-ḥa:l’ (circumstantial wa).

Apart from the fact that Al-Jurjani's treatment of conjunctions was limited to these three, it presents us with an adequate model of how to deal with conjunctions in their semantic and pragmatic environments and not merely in terms of their syntactic properties.

Al-Jurjani's model has been applied to a large number of modern Arab grammarians. This is partly due to the fact that it proposes the tools necessary to account for grammatical, semantic and rhetorical aspects of studying conjunctions. Good representatives of good grammarians are Ḥasan (1963) and al-Sayyid (1968). Ḥasan (1973:487-92), for example, deals with
the conjunctions and presents an excellent synopsis of the ancient grammarians' views on the syntactic and semantic properties of each. Nevertheless, he does not deal with their role beyond the limits with which Al-Jurjani has dealt.

Tammam Ḥassan (1973:123-132) exhibits some new trends in dealing with conjunctions. His treatment is actually noteworthy because it presents a systematic way in which he perceives the roles of conjunctions. Although Ḥassan's analysis of conjunctions does not provide any details of the various meanings and textual functions, the researcher considers it to have been a step forward along establishing a new integrated syntactic, semantic and discourse framework within which conjunctions can be appropriately studied.

A detailed discussion of conjunctions is included in ‘Muṣṭafa Al- Naḥḥas’ ‘Diraːsaːt fi Al-adwaːt Al-Nahḥwiyyah’ (Studies in Grammatical Particles) (1979). Here, the word ‘particles’ (of which conjunctions are members) refers to so many Arabic connectives. In this study, in which the influence of Tammam Ḥassan's approach can be clearly noticed, Al- Naḥḥas deals with a number of conjunctions. The emphasis of this study seems to be on revealing the various semantic functions, which conjunctions perform in different contexts. Al- Naḥḥas gives a definition of conjunctions similar to that of Ḥassan’s, saying “conjunctions are connectors which link together parts of the sentence and which indicate the various interrelationships among them” (p.24). This statement along with Ḥassan's reveals a good understanding of the connecting role of conjunctions but restricts this role to the sentence limit.
3.2.4 Western Treatment of Arabic Devices

The study of connectives in most western grammars of Arabic (Thatcher, 1948; Cowan, 1958; Beeston, 1968; and Wright, 1974) does not extend beyond presenting summaries of the ancient Arab grammarians' opinions, using western linguistic terminology. In recent years, however, a number of important studies on conjunctions and some aspects of cohesion in Arabic have come out and seem to bear relevance to this study.

Among these studies is Cantarino's *The Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose* (1975). In this comprehensive book, Cantarino examines the syntactic structure of Arabic in light of modern usage. The structural descriptions he provides are supported by ample examples extracted from novels, short stories, autobiographies, etc., written by established modern Arab writers. This gives the book real value as a serious attempt at establishing a reference to the structure of MSA as it actually exists. Such a reference had long been needed for MSA.

In this book, Cantarino deals with conjunctions in MSA and presents a detailed description of the syntactic and semantic features of each. The presentation of the conjunctions is carried out along syntactic lines and thus does not seem to differ greatly from the ancient Arab grammarians' method of presentation. Conjunctions are dealt with primarily as coordinating conjunctions, subordinating conjunctions, subjunctive particles, etc. within this syntactically based presentation an exhaustive description is given of the various meanings each conjunction conveys in different contexts.

While Cantarino's treatment of conjunctions is adequate in terms of revealing the basic syntactic and semantic properties of conjunctions at the sentence level or below, it does not seem to address itself to the functions of the conjunctions at the discourse level. The contexts he provides for
conjunctions, mostly sentences, does not always seem sufficient to fully understand the role performed by the conjunctions in those particular contexts.

An attempt to discover the relationship between the use of conjunctions and narrative/non-narrative discourse types was made by Beeston (1974) in an article titled ‘Coordination in Literary Arabic’. In this article, Beeston discusses two types of coordination, which operate at the word, phrase, and sentence levels: *syndetic* and *asyndetic*. Syndetic coordination is by a particle while asyndetic coordination is not.

In the field of sentence coordination, Beeston notes, “Every reader of Arabic becomes at once aware that the dominance of syntactic linkage is very marked. In per-modern prose style, it is virtually impossible to begin a fresh sentence without a coordinate particle” (1974:169-70). For the European reader, he adds “An even more striking fact is that the insistence on marking the beginning of each new sentence by syndetic linkage is so dominant that even paragraphs commonly begin so, a habit wholly alien to European style” (p.171).

Beeston (1974:171) states that in the domain of narratives, syndetic linkage is as prevalent in modern writing as it was in the past. It is in descriptive writing that asyndetic linkage occurs today. In order to justify this statement, he analyzed a number of passages from contemporary short story writers. The results yielded by his analysis were very supportive of his statement.

The significance of Beeston's study emanates from the fact that it is the first attempt to investigate the link between coordination and discourse in Arabic. It is the first time the text, and not the sentence was thought of as the domain of some conjunctions; Beeston says: “the speech unit within which the coordinative structure operates is the total literary work, which is thus organized in one continuous logical stream” (1974:171). The only comment
the researcher would like to make here is that the terms ‘syndetic’ and
‘asynthetic’ should not be limited to describing the presence or absence of
coordinate conjunctions –as Beeston seems to suggest- but should be used to
describe the presence or absence of any kind of conjunction.

Modern western studies of cohesion in Arabic have been very scarce. Among the few but pioneering studies in this area is one that pertains to the role of repetition in cohesion and persuasion in Arabic by B. Koch (1981). In the course of her discussion, the author deals with the cohesive role some conjunctions play in the text as well as the relationship between parallelism and the conjunction *wa*. Although this study is not related to our own, except in general terms, the researcher has chosen to point it out here due to its important role in leading the way for the study of discourse in MSA.

### 3.3 Cohesion in Modern Arabic

The theoretical background of cohesion has been laid down in the previous chapter, with illustrations from English (cf. Chapter 2). Further, cohesion in English has been discussed in some detail. In the present chapter, cohesion in Arabic will be analyzed and compared with its English counterpart. This will include comparing and contrasting cohesive devices and their use in the two languages.

Following Halliday and Hasan (1976), all the main types of cohesive devices reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction and lexical cohesion can be identified in Arabic.

#### 3.3.1 Reference

Most Arab linguists and grammarians have advocated the same semantic classification of referring expressions identified for English texts. Some Arab scholars, including (Sibawayh, 1966) and (Al-Jurjani, 1982) adopt the following referring expressions:
### 3.3.1.1 The Definite Article ال [al] ‘the’

Al- (Arabic: الـ, also transliterated as el-) is the definite article in the Arabic language; a particle (حرف) whose function is to render the noun which it is to prefixed definite. For example, the word كتاب kita:b ‘book’ can be made definite by prefixing it with al-, resulting in الكتاب al-kita:b ‘the book’. Consequently, al- is typically translated as the in English.

Unlike most other particles in Arabic, al- is always prefixed to another word and it never stands alone. Consequently, most dictionaries will not list it as a separate word, and it is almost invariably ignored in collation. By the same token, al- is not a permanent component of the word to which it is prefixed. It is added and removed to toggle between the definiteness and indefiniteness of the word.

As a particle, al- does not inflect at all—not for gender, plurality, grammatical case, etc. It is often used anaphorically to point to the referent of an item in a preceding part of the text as in (1), (Hasan, 1971: vol.1: 133):

> انا ارسلنا اليكم رسولا شاهدنا عليكم كما ارسلنا الى فرعون رسولا، فعصى فرعون الرسول

1. …inya: يارسالنا: ييلاكم رسولان شاهدين الالكيكم كما يارسالنا الى فرعون رسولا، فعصى فرعون الرسول

(We have sent to you (oh men) a messenger to be a witness concerning you even as we sent a messenger to Pharaoh but Pharaoh disobeyed the messenger) (The Holy Qur’an, Al-Muzzamil: 15-16).

In the above example, the indefinite noun is used in the first sentence ‘rasu:lan’, and then it is referred to by the definite noun in the second sentence ‘a-raru:la’. Thus, a cohesive bond is created between the two sentences of the text.
3.3.1.2 Demonstratives

The number and forms of demonstratives have been a controversial issue among traditional and modern Arab grammarians. Generally speaking, Arabic has three sets of demonstratives depending on whether or not the demonstrative pronoun is near to the speaker. Therefore, they are classified into: near and remote demonstratives. Nearer demonstratives refer to persons or things that are found in the same place of the speaker. These demonstratives correspond to the English nearer demonstratives *this* and *these*. Remoter demonstratives usually refer to objects or things that are far away from the speaker. They are roughly equivalent to *that* and *those* in English.

The demonstratives in Arabic are either simple or compound. Table (1) shows the simple demonstratives. This simple form of the demonstrative pronoun is used to indicate a person or thing near to the speaker. Table (2) shows the complex forms of the demonstratives which also indicate ‘nearness’ to the speaker. Table (3) shows another set of complex forms of the demonstratives that indicates a person or object that is distant to the speaker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing</td>
<td>dha:</td>
<td>dhi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Nom</td>
<td>dha:ni:</td>
<td>tani:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Acc</td>
<td>dhayni:</td>
<td>tayni:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur. Comm. Gen</td>
<td><em>u:la:</em> i:</td>
<td><em>u:la:</em> i:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3.1) The Simple Forms of the Demonstratives
It is interesting to note that the demonstratives in Arabic are arranged not only on the basis of number and distance, as is the case with English, but also according to gender and grammatical case. The most common ones are shown in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Near (gender and grammatical case)</th>
<th>Far (gender and grammatical case)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هذا (هذا) (ha:dhla:) (Masc-)</td>
<td>ذلك (dhālika) (Masc-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هذة (هذة) (ha:dhhihi) (Fem-)</td>
<td>ذلك (tilka) (Fem-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dual</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هذان (هذان) (ha:dhna:n) (Masc-Sub-)</td>
<td>ذلك (dha:lika) (Masc-Sub-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هتان (ha:ta:n) (Fem-Sub-)</td>
<td>تانك (ta:nka) (Fem-Sub-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هذين (هذين) (ha:dhain) (Masc-Obj-)</td>
<td>ذئنيك (dhanaika) (Masc-Obj-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هتين (ha:tain) (Fem-Obj-)</td>
<td>تنئيك (tanaika) (Fem-Obj-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هؤلاء (هلاء) (ha:iyla:i)</td>
<td>أونئيك (u:la:i:ka)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3.4) Demonstratives in Arabic

(See Al-Saqee (1977:252); Al-Samarai (1987: 95-97); Aziz (1989: 154))

Arabic demonstratives can be used to indicate referents that have been mentioned earlier in that text. Therefore, they contribute to reading a cohesive textual force by ruling out items that occur for the second time. Anaphoric demonstratives can relate the elements of a text semantically and substitute items whose repeated occurrence may damage the cohesive value of a text. Demonstratives indicating remoter, nearer or referents can be used to identify items in a previous text.


I- saw car beautiful yesterday it- was that most

ma: ra’ayt”. (remoter)

beautiful I have seen

(I saw a beautiful car yesterday. That was the most beautiful car I have ever seen.)
b. “Yadrusu a-tṭullabu  bijdin kulu yawmin wa ha’u:la:ri yasta‘iqa:qu:na a-’naja: t”. (nearer)

(Students study hard every day, and these deserve success.)

Demonstratives function syntactically as adjectives or pronouns. As adjectives, they modify only definite nouns. As pronouns, the demonstratives occur in most of the syntactic positions of a noun:

- as predicate:  
  
  kitabi:  huwa ha: dha:

  Book-my it this

  (This is my book)

- as subject:  
  
  ha: dha:  kita: bun

  This book

  (this is a book)

- governed by a verb:  
  
  ra‘aytu ha: dha:

  Saw-I this

  (I saw this)

- governed by an accusative particle:  
  inna ha: dha: muhimmun

  That this important

  (this is important)

- governed by a noun in construct:  
  akhadhṭu kita: ba  ha: dha:

  Took-I book this

  (I took the book of this)
-governed by preposition: \( \text{nadhartu 'ila: ha:dha:} \)
Looked-I to this \((I \text{ looked at this})\)

The demonstrative adverbs are listed in table (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near</td>
<td>huna: ‘here’</td>
<td>ha:huna: ‘right here’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far</td>
<td>huna:ka ‘there’</td>
<td>huna:lika ‘right there’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table (3.5) The Demonstrative Adverbs**

In Arabic, there is no separate demonstrative form that points to non-human entities. Arabic uses the singular masculine forms ‘ha:dha:’ ‘this’ and ‘dha:lika’ ‘that’ to point to non-human entities that are of masculine gender and singular in number. For example

3. \( \text{dha:lika/ ha:dha: kita:bun mufi:dun.} \)
   That / (this) a-book useful
   *(that is a useful book. Or this is a useful book)*

‘book’ is of masculine gender and singular in number and is therefore referred to by ‘ha:dha:’ or ‘dha:lika’

As in English, the primary function of Arabic demonstratives is to locate the referent item in time or space (in reference to the speaker). They refer exophorically to something in a context of situation and also endophorically to something in the text. It is their endophoric reference that is considered
cohesive since the referent is in the text. Almost always, the reference is anaphoric.

3.3.1.3 Personal Pronouns

Unlike English, Arabic distinguishes only two types of pronouns: ‘huwa’ هو (he), (masculine) and ‘hiya’ (she) هي (feminine). The plural pronoun is ‘hum’ (they) هم for masculine, and ‘hunna’ (they) هن for feminine. Personal pronouns have also dual number ‘huma:’ هما used for both masculine and feminine gender.

Arabic personal pronouns are either ‘al- za:hir’ الظاهر (explicit) or ‘al- mustatir’ المستتر (implicit). The former is either inseparable ‘muttašil’ متصول, realized as a bound morpheme attached to the verb or separable ‘munfašil’ منفصل realized as a free morpheme (Aziz, 1989: 138).

The cohesive function of Arabic pronouns is basically similar to that of their English counterparts. The Arabic first and second person pronouns, like those in English, do not normally refer to the text; rather, their referents are defined by the speech roles of speaker and hearer and therefore they are normally interpreted exophorically by reference to the situation. Hence, the separate and suffixed first and second pronouns are typically non-cohesive. However, they become endophoric in quoted material, especially in narrative fiction. The reason for this is that in narration, the text itself becomes the context of situation, so that all reference within the text will at one point be clarified in terms of the text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:50). The exception to this is in cases in which the ‘ana’ ‘I’ refers to the narrator and ‘anta’ ‘you’ refers to the reader.

Our main concern here is with the third person pronouns, which are cohesive; the first and the second person pronouns can be explained from the context of situation; a case which is quite similar to English. It should be
emphasized that in third person singular, the subjective pronoun is always *implied* rather than *expressed with the perfect form* (past tense) of the verb, e.g., (kataba ‘he wrote’). Let us study the following illustrative examples:

سالت عن المدير ولكنه لم يكن في مكتبه

4. “Sa'ltu ۢال‌مدير وَلاَكُنْه‌ا لَمْ يَكُنْ فِيِ مَكْتِبِهِ”.

Asked-I about the-manager, but he- was not in office-his.

(I asked about the manager, but he was not in his office.)

The object of the first sentence, ‘ۢال‌مدير’ ties up with suffix pronoun ‘-hu:’ in the phrase ‘لاَكُنْه‌ا’ لَكِنْه‌ا. This pronoun is singular, masculine object (him). This pronoun links the sentence with a preceding part of the text.

(5) and (6) below are linked in a more interesting way:

ثم جاء الرسول مسرعاً وهو يحمل رسالةً من الأمير، وطلب أن يقابل قائد الجيش

5. “Thumma ja: متى الرسول اۢم‌سرعًا وَهَوَهُ يَحْمَلُ رسَائِلًا مِنِ الْاِمْرِيِّر. وَأَلْبِسَهُ أَن يَقَابِلَ قَادِرَةَ الْجَيْشَ”.

Then came messenger-the quickly carrying-he letter-a from اۢم‌رِيِّر. وَأَلْبِسَهُ اۢمْرِيِّر. Wa ۢتَلَبَّ اۢجِسْهُ أَن يَقَابِلَ قَادِرَةَ الْجَيْشَ.”.

prince-the. Asked-he to meet commander-the of army-the

(Then the messenger came quickly carrying a letter from the prince. He asked to meet the commander of the army.)

The subject of the first sentence, ‘ۢاَرْسُل’ is linked with the implied third person masculine pronoun indicated by the verb ‘ۢتَلَبَّ’ طَلَبْ (he asked). In (6) the cohesion is between the noun ‘ۢاَرْسُل’ and the pronoun attached to the end of the verb ‘ۢتَلَبَّ’ فَأَخذَتَهُمْ (then they took him).

...Then him-took to commander-the army on the other side of almukhayyam fa na:walahu alrissa:la”.

camp-the. Handed- he letter-the

(...Then they took him to the commander of the army on the other side of the camp. He handed him the letter.)

The noun phrase ‘qa: id al-jaysh’ قائد الجيش ties up with suffix pronoun ‘hu’-ة in the verb phrase ‘na:walahu’ ناوله. It is to be noted that the expression ‘fa `akhadhu:hu’ فأخذوه has two pronouns: ‘u’-و plural subject ‘they’ and ‘hu’-ة-singular, masculine object (him). Moreover, there is another instance of cohesive third person pronoun, the implied subject of the masculine singular pronoun in ‘na:wal` ناول (he gave); this pronoun ties up with the messenger in ‘a-rrasu:1’ الرسول (the messenger) in (5).

The next example (7) illustrates the cohesive function of separate pronouns:


Arrived Ibrahim and brother-his at bank-the of river-the Tigris after riḥlatin twi:latin fa ẓabara huwa wa ẓharaqa ʿakhuh”.

journey long-a crossed-he and drowned brother-his

(Ibrahim and his brother arrived at the bank of the River Tigris after a long journey. He crossed the river, his brother drowned).

Here, the separate pronoun ‘huwa’ هو links ‘`ibra:hi:m’ أبْراهِيم with the first sentence. It is worth noting here that the two-way division of Arabic
personal pronouns, in contrast with the three-way division in English, results in less explicitness. Examine the following example:

8. “Thumma ʿakhrajat ʿalmarʿatu suːratan min haqiːbatiha

Then took out woman-the picture-a from handbag-her.

alsawda : ʿfanazartu ʿilayha: walam ʿaqul shayʾan”.

black Looked-I at it/her and said nothing.

(The woman took out a picture from her black handbag. I looked at it/her and said nothing.)

This sentence is ambiguous because ‘ʿilayha:’ اليها may refer to ‘al-marʿa’ المرأة (the woman) or ‘as-suːra’ الصورة (the picture). The corresponding English sentence is not ambiguous owing to the personal/non-personal contrast. Actually, this factor, explicitness, often influences the choice of a writer or a translator when building a text (Aziz, 1989: 94).

In verbal sentences (those which begin with a verb), the separate pronouns are primarily used for emphasis since the verbal paradigms in Arabic include affixes and suffixed pronouns which serve as subject markers. Hence their use in such sentences is typically cohesive according to the criteria set up in this study.

In nominal sentences (those which begin with a subject), when both the subject and the predicate are defined, the third person pronoun may be inserted between them. The pronoun in such cases is called ‘ḍamiːr al- faːsɿ’ ‘the pronoun of disjunction’ by Arab grammarians (Wright, 1974:258). .Dispatched al- faːsɿ is not cohesive because it and its referent occur within the same clause. For example:
9. **al-qāʾidu huwa al-mujrimu**

   The leader he the-culprit

   *(The leader is the culprit)*

   In this sentence, the pronoun ‘huwa’ refers to al-qāʾid.

   Halliday and Hasan (1976) explain that the third person pronouns in English can refer cataphorically to an item in a following sentence. In Arabic, a third person pronoun can have cataphoric reference, but in most cases, the referent occurs within the same clause in which the pronoun appears. For example:

   شقيقتُها الحياة التي يحياها المشردون


       Miserable it the-life that live-it the-homeless

       *(miserable is the life that the homeless live)*

       The pronoun ‘hiya’ refers cataphorically to ‘al-hayat ‘life’, but because the pronoun and its referent occur in the same clause, the pronoun is not considered cohesive.

       There are also instances where the third person masculine singular pronoun refers not to a following specific noun, but to a following situation or fact. In such cases, the pronoun is called ‘ḍāmi:r al-sha’n’ ‘the pronoun of the fact’, by Arab grammarians (Catarino, 1975:52 & 430). For example:

       هو الكون حي

       11. **a. huwa al-kawnu ḥayyun**

           He the-universe alive

           *(the universe is alive)*
true that-it not from someone came to this the-city

But and wanted the-staying in-it.

(it is true that every one that came to this city wanted to stay in it)

In the first example (a), ‘huwa’ refers to al-kawn in the same clause; therefore, it is not cohesive. In the second (b), the suffixed pronoun /hu/ in ‘annahu’ refers to the fact stated in the clause that immediately follows the pronoun. Again reference here is cataphoric but not cohesive since the pronoun and its referent form one nominal clause.

The feminine and masculine third person singular pronouns, particularly the suffixed ones /hu/ and /ha:/, have a special kind of cohesive reference that other third person pronouns do not have. Not only can they refer to humans and non-humans, but also to a process or sequences of processes, a fact or report. Halliday and Hasan discuss these special kinds of reference under extended and text reference which only the pronoun ‘it’ can signal in English. They explain that while extended reference differs from usual instances of reference in extent (the referent is a process or a sequence of processes and not just a person or object), text reference differs in kind: the referent is not taken up at its face-value but is rather transmuted into a fact or report (Cantarino, 1975:52).

There is one constraint on such types of reference in Arabic, whether separate or suffixed, the pronoun used to signal extended reference must be followed by a noun that identifies it. In other words, the noun should refer in
some way to the fact or process referred to by the pronoun. The separate pronoun usually occurs as the subject of a nominal sentence; the suffixed usually appears attached to the accusative introductory particle ‘‘inna’. Thus:

(1) After a speaker explains her\his problem in detail, s\he may conclude:

\textit{Hiya qi\u{c}\u{c}satun mu\u{c}aqqadatun}

She a-story complicated

Or

\textit{\'inna\i: qi\u{c}\u{c}satun mu\u{c}aqqadatun}

It is a complicated story

(2) after a speaker describes how something is done, s\he may conclude:

\textit{\'inna\i: çamaliyyatun tawi:latun}

It procedure long

(it is a long procedure)

In the first example the pronoun ‘hiya’ and /ha/ in ‘innaha’ refer to the speaker's description of the problem. In the second, the pronoun /-ha:/ in ‘innaha:’ refers to the process. The pronouns in the two examples are followed by a noun which also refers to the presupposed item. Although this noun is another referent for the pronoun, it is not cohesive since it occurs within the same clause.

3.3.1.4 Possessive Pronouns

Arabic does not have separate possessive pronouns. The pronouns that express possession are those suffixed to nouns denoting the genitive. These third person pronouns are typically cohesive. Thus:
فمهمة الحوار أذا ليست أن يروي ما حدث لأشخاص ولكن مهمته أن يجعلهم يعيشون حوادثهم

12. fa-muhimmatu al-ḥiwa:ri ʿidhan laysat ʿan yarwiya ma : ḥadatha

For task the-dialogue then, is-not to relate what happened

li-ʿ ashkha:šin, wa la:kina muhimmatahu ʿan yajçalahum yaçi:shu:na
to-characters, and- but task -its to make-them live-their

ḥawa:dithahum
event-their

(the task of dialogue then, is not to relate what happens to the characters; instead, its task is to make them live their events)

Here the two suffixed pronouns /-hu/ in ‘muhimmatahu’ and /-hum/ in ‘ḥawa:dithahum’are in the genitive (indicating possession). They relate the two clauses to each other through the ties they form with their referents ( al-ḥiwa:r and ʿ ashkha:š) in the first clause. First and second pronouns in the genitive are cohesive only when the referent is located in the text. This usually occurs in dialogues in narratives.

3.3.1.5 Subject Markers

Wright (1974: 56) states that there are no suffixed pronouns expressing the nominative that refers to the masculine and feminine third person in verbs both in the Perfect and the Imperfect, the masculine second person singular in verbs in the Imperfect, and the singular and plural first person also in verbs in the Imperfect. Instead of suffixed pronouns, prefixed and suffixed subject markers are used to refer to these mentioned persons. Table two shows these subject markers. Grammarians call these subject markers ‘ḥuru:f ʿal-muḍa:raçah’ ‘particles indicating the Imperfect’ or prefixed pronouns. In this study, they referred to as subject markers since they, like pronouns in the nominative, denote the person, gender, and case of the subject of a verb. Thus, in answer to the question ‘where did Sameera go?’ the response may be:
13. *Dhahabat ila al-bayti*

Went-she to the-house.

*(she went to the house)*

Here, the suffixed subject marker /at/ indicates that the subject is a feminine third person singular noun, in this case, Sameera.

Similarly in a sentence like:


Not we-believe except in-the-struggle

*(we believe in nothing but struggle)*

The suffixed subject marker /nu/ denotes that the subject is the first person plural noun ‘naḥnu’ ‘we’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.m.s.</td>
<td>…0</td>
<td>Ya…</td>
<td>yadrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.f.s.</td>
<td>..at</td>
<td>Ta…</td>
<td>tadrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.m.s.</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>Ta…</td>
<td>tadrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.s.</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>a…</td>
<td>adrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>Na…</td>
<td>nadrus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table (3.6) Subject Markers**

Subject markers are obviously reference items since they, like pronouns, cannot be interpreted semantically in their own right; they depend for their interpretation on another element to which they make reference. Like
suffixed pronouns, subject markers are important to the cohesion of a text. However, they are not always cohesive. In a clause which has a noun or a pronoun functioning as the subject of the clause, the subject marker is not considered cohesive since its presence becomes a grammatical necessity. But in clauses which have no noun or pronoun in the nominative, the subject marker becomes cohesive because it refers to a noun or pronoun mentioned in a previous clause. In other words, these subject markers (or the lack thereof) relate the clause they occur in to another which contains the subject they refer to.

Since this ‘relating’ of clauses and sentences is the function of cohesion, subject markers become as important in their textual function as the other cohesive devices. Without the reference they make, the clause they occur in would become incomplete: it would have no subject. A passage consisting of clauses that do not have explicit subjects becomes a series of sentence fragments that do not ‘hang together’. The best way to illustrate this point is to translate a passage from Arabic to English without mentioning the subject to which the concord markers in the verb refer:

Did not believe his eyes. Reread the letter until believed his eyes!... put her letter next to this letter, love on the right and infidelity on the left... almost lost his mind. It is unbelieviable. Carried his head between his hands and started to remember the past.

It becomes clear that these subject markers have an important cohesive function since they relate clauses and sentences to each other and contribute to the ‘hanging together’ of the text. Moreover, they may be the only device available for determining clear reference.
3.3.1.6 Comparison

Generally speaking, adjectives in Arabic have two degrees of comparison: the absolute degree ‘Jami:l’ (beautiful) and the comparative degree (usually termed the elative form) ‘ṣi:ghat al-tafḍi:l’ which is used for comparing two or more persons or things. This comparative degree has usually the form ‘afẓal’ (Al-Jurjani, 1982: 34). So, we say ‘ajmal’ (more beautiful), ‘aqwa:’ (stronger).

Wright (1974: 35) and Nasir (1967: 131) confirm that the comparative form is sometimes used with a definite article ‘al-`ajmal’ (the most beautiful) to express the sense of the superlative in English. The comparative form is used as a cohesive device pointing to a noun in the preceding part of the text:

"Worked father-my doctor-a in clinic-a in city Baghdad. Then he moved to hospital large it was responsibilities-he heavier."

(My father worked as a doctor in a clinic in Baghdad. Then he moved to a very large hospital, where he was given heavier responsibilities).

As the example shows ‘`asẓab’ (heavier) is associated with the first sentence, i.e., a reader cannot understand the exact meaning of ‘`asẓab’ without going to the first sentence.


Worked father-my doctor-a in clinic-a in city Baghdad.

Thumma `intaqala `ila: mustashfa: kabi:r faka:rat mahammatuhu:

Then moved-he to hospital large it was responsibilities-he `asẓab”.

heavier.
Al-Jurjani (1982: 36) points out that a periphrastic form of comparative is used when the form יא法人 is felt to be awkward or is not possible. This involves the use of ‘“ashad’ (greater) or similar expressions with the noun, i.e., ‘‘ashaddu r투:bah’ (more humid).

Climate- the hot in provinces-the central-the. Where in south-the heat-the hotter.
(It is hot in the central provinces. In the south it is hotter.)

Other comparative expressions that help tie a text are ‘mithl’ (same) and ‘ghayr’ (other, different). For example:

Want-I juice the-orange and piece-a cake. And want-I
mithlah”.

same-the.
(Can I have orange juice and a piece of cake ... I want the same.)

3.3.2 Substitution and Ellipsis
3.3.2.1 Substitution

In exploring the possibilities of substitution in Arabic, the researcher looks at Halliday and Hasan's concept of substitution in English and examines whether or not it works in Arabic the way it does in English. Halliday and Hasan divide substitution into three categories: nominal, verbal and clausal. According to them, nominal substitution occurs when one, ones or the same
function as head of a nominal group and substitute for an item which is itself head of a nominal group. The words corresponding to ‘one’ in Arabic are ‘wa:ḥidun’ (masculine) and ‘wa:ḥidatun’ (feminine). There is no word corresponding to ‘ones’. As for ‘the same’, its Arabic counterpart is ‘nafs’.

3.3.2.1.1 Nominal Substitute: Wa:ḥidun or Wa:ḥidatun

The best way to see how these nominal substitutes are employed in Arabic is to look at Halliday and Hasan’s list of the various forms in which the use of ‘one’ is obligatory (either it or the noun it substitutes for must be present).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>this one</td>
<td>this new one</td>
<td>this one with wheels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>the big one</td>
<td>the one with wheels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>a big one</td>
<td>one with wheels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English, these forms can occur in a text like: “I do not want that bus; I want…”

The corresponding Arabic forms are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>al-ṣajala:ti ha:dha:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>al-wa:ḥida al-kabi:ra</td>
<td>al-wa:ḥida dhu l-ṣajala:t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>wa:ḥidan kabi:ran</td>
<td>wa:ḥidan dhu:</td>
<td>ṣajala:tin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Form (ai) does not occur in Arabic. In such cases, Arabic uses the demonstrative alone, a case that changes the cohesion type into reference. In English, using the demonstrative alone is grammatically acceptable, but the reference would not be specific enough. However, in Arabic, there will be less ambiguity since the demonstrative agrees in number and gender with the noun it refers to.

Moreover, forms (aii), (aiii), (bii), (bii), and (biii) do not appear in Arabic. To express the meaning of such forms, Arabic would employ either lexical cohesion or ellipsis. Thus, if the former is used, the noun would be repeated; if the latter is used, ‘waḥid’ will be ellipted and the resulting form would be ‘al-jadi:d ha:dha:’ ‘this the new’, ‘dhu: l-ṣajala:ti ha:dha:’ ‘with wheels this’, ‘al-kabi:ra’ ‘the big’ and ‘dhu l-ṣajala:t’ ‘with the wheels’.

It is worth noting that the forms (cii) and (ciii) are the only ones that may occur in Arabic as they do in English. Nevertheless, some Arab linguists and scholars have confirmed that Arabic prefers lexical cohesion, ellipsis or comparative reference to such forms. Consider the following examples:


   This (is) a-book difficult. I want a-book easy.

   (This is a difficult book. I want an easy book.)

19. “...ṣuri:du a:kha:ra ụshal”.

   ...I-want another easier

   (...I want another that is easier.)
20. “...uri:du kita:ban rashala raw akhar”.

...I want a-book easier or another.

(...I want an easier book or another book.)

As regards the other nominal substitutes ‘the same’, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 105-112) explain that it differs from ‘one’ in that unlike the latter which presupposes only a noun, ‘the same’ presupposes an entire nominal group. In Arabic, the word corresponding to ‘the same’ is ‘nafs’ which, in this sense, always comes either governing a noun in the genitive case or as an appositive to a definite noun governing a suffixed pronoun which refers to that noun (Cantarino, 1975: 139).

In both cases, it is a cohesive element of the comparative type and not a nominal substitute. An example is:

ارتكبوا هذا الخطأ قبل سنوات و هاهم يرتكبون نفس الخطأ


Committed-they this the-mistake before years, and here they

yartakibu: na nafs a alkha ta: a’

committing- Same the-mistake.

( they committed this mistake years ago, and here they are now committing

the same mistake.)

Or

وهاهم يرتكبون الخطأ نفسه

“...wa ha: hum yartakibu: na alkha ta: a nafs a: h”

... and here they committing-they the-mistake same-it.

(...They committed this mistake years ago, and here they are now committing the same mistake.)
Finally, in cases where English uses the substitute forms ‘do the same’ and ‘say the same’, Arabic makes use of pronoun reference. Consider the following example:

رآيت الناس يجرون نحو الساحة فعلت مثلهم


Saw-I the-people run-they towards the-plaza, so did-I like-them.

(I saw the people run towards the plaza, so I did (like them) or the same.)

Here in (22) the suffixed pronoun /hum/ هم in / mithlahum مثلهم refers to the noun a-nna:sa in the first clause of the sentence.

3.3.2.1.2 Verbal Substitution

‘Do’ and ‘do the same’ are the two verbal substitutes used in English. The corresponding Arabic verbal substitutes are ‘yafšal’ يفعل (do) and ‘yafšalu dha:lik’ يفعل ذلك (do the same) respectively (the verb is inflected for number and gender). In this regard, Aziz (1998: 97) states that ‘yafšal’ يفعل is basically different from the operator 'do' in the following points:

First ‘yafšal’ يفعل is a full verb, in the negative, ‘la: yafšal’ لا يفعل, the construction is still substitution, whereas the corresponding English verb 'do' ushers an elliptical construction. Secondly, since ‘yafšal’ is basically a lexical device rather than a grammatical one, it is probably a case in which we replace a specific lexical item by a more general one, and in this way one may say that the use of ‘yafšal’, then, is part of lexical cohesion. Thirdly, and this factor supports the previous one, the Arabic construction ‘yafšal’ is not as common as the English construction with the operator ‘do’ in.

On the other hand, it must be mentioned that the functions of the operator ‘do’ in (23):
23. *Did you read this? Yes, I did*

is ambivalent with regard to substitution. Do as a proper substitute is found in:

24. *Did you read this book? No, but I'm doing now.*

Generally speaking, ‘yafṣal’ as a verbal substitute is not used in all places as it is used in English. Compare the following:

25. “*Does Alice know the reason?*” “*No, but Susan does*”.
26. “*Who told her about it?*” “*Susan did*”.

In (25), Arabic would repeat the verb ‘know’, changing the type of cohesion from substitution to lexical. Similarly, in a text similar to (26), Arabic would either repeat the verb (lexical cohesion) or have only ‘Susan’ in the response (ellipsis).

However, in all other cases ‘yafṣal’ is normally used:

على الدولة أن تؤمن للمواطنين حق التعليم، وهي إن فعت...

27. “*ṣala aldwlati ُan tu*’ammina *liahmwu:ţi:ni:na*

The-state guarantee to-the-citizen

*ḥaqqa* altąça:li:mi , wa *hiya ṭin faςalat*”

The-right (of) education. And it if it does…

*(The state should guarantee its citizen the right to education, and if it does…)*

Here, the verb ‘faṣal’ is a substitute for the action mentioned in the first clause. In English, the pro-verb ‘do’ functions in this way and it is usually followed by a reference item (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 125).
Other verbal substitutes that Halliday and Hasan discuss are ‘so do I’ and ‘I do too’ (which have an additional meaning of ‘and’ or ‘to’). Arabic would use the form ‘wa َانا: kادحا:ليك’, which means ‘and I too’. Since neither the verb nor its substitute is present, the form is elliptical:

   I  I-need  equipment  special
   (I need special equipment.)

   “wa َا:نا: َكادحا:ليك”.
   And  I   too
   (And so do I.)

3.3.2.1.3 Clausal Substitution

Here in this type of substitution, the whole clause is presupposed. Halliday and Hasan (1976:131) state that there are three cases where clausal substitution takes place: report, condition and modality. In each of these cases, it may be either positive or negative; the positive is expressed by ‘so’, the negative by ‘not’, e.g.

29. “Do you know what it contains?”
   “I think so”.

30. “Was anybody left?”
   “I hope not”.

‘So’ in (29) substitutes for the entire clause ‘know what it contains’ and in (30) ‘not’ substitutes for ‘nobody was left’.
In Arabic, there are hardly any instances of clausal substitution. However, the demonstrative *dha:lik* ذلک is used where ‘so’ is used in English as a substitute, e.g.

 هل وافقوا على المشروع الجديد


Did agree-they on the-project the new?

*(Did they approve the new project?)*

اعتقد ذلك

*A – “ạṣtaqidu dha:lik”*

I-think that

*(I think so)*

Or the response may be negative:

لا اعتقذا ذلک

*B- “La: ạṣtaqidu dha:lik”*

Not I-think that

*(I don't think so.)*

There is no clausal substitution in this example. The cohesive item is the demonstrative *dha:lik* which refers to the reported clause *wa:faqu: ɔala: almashru:çi* (They approved the new project).

To sum up, it becomes obvious that verbal substitution is the only type of substitution that occurs in Arabic. Ellipsis, reference, and lexical cohesion are used in most instances in which English uses nominal and clausal substitution.

One last point should be mentioned here: whereas nominal substitution hardly occurs in written Arabic, it is very frequent in spoken Arabic. Most of
the possibilities of nominal substitution that Halliday and Hasan discuss occur frequently in spoken Arabic. Clausal substitution, on the other hand, neither occurs in written nor in spoken Arabic. Halliday and Hasan point out that in English substitution in general is more frequent in speech than it is in writing particularly in the case of verbal substitution. In spoken Arabic, verbal substitution does not occur. Though nominal substitution hardly occurs in written Arabic, it is very frequent in spoken Arabic. Most of the possibilities of nominal substitution that Halliday and Hasan discuss occur frequently in spoken Arabic. Clausal substitution, on the other hand, neither occurs in written nor in spoken Arabic. Halliday and Hasan point out that in English, substitution in general is more frequent in speech than it is in writing, particularly in the case of verbal substitution. In spoken Arabic, verbal substitution does not occur.

3.3.2.2 Ellipsis

English has received much attention from early and modern Arab grammarians. They have dealt with ellipsis at various levels in the text, from morphology to discourse. They have also made a distinction between grammatical or syntactic ellipsis and non-grammatical optional ellipsis. In the latter type, the one that functions cohesively, the presence of an item that can provide the ellipted information is a necessary condition.

Quirk et al., (1985: 536) believe that whenever there is ellipsis, the missing information must be recoverable from the text and the ellipted form should be addable. Ellipsis, according to Halliday and Hasan, is divided into three categories: nominal, verbal, and clausal.

3.3.2.2.1 Nominal Ellipsis

To Halliday and Hasan, nominal ellipsis is ellipsis within the nominal type. In an elliptical nominal group, the head is omitted and another element in
that group functions as head. In English, this element is very frequently a deictic or a numerative; epithets are much less frequent as head. Halliday and Hasan divide deictics into two categories: specific deictic (possessive pronoun, demonstrative) and non-specific deictics (each, every, all, both, any, either, no, neither, some, and a). In English, both types of deictics occur as head in an elliptical form.

As in English, most of the elements that can function elliptically in a nominal group in Arabic are modifiers of nouns.

### 3.3.2.2.2 Demonstratives as Elliptical Forms

Like their English counterparts, the demonstratives in Arabic can occur elliptically. The elliptical demonstrative differs from the demonstrative as a reference item (when it functions as a pronoun that is not followed by a noun) in that the former implies no identity with the presupposed element, whereas the latter does. Consider the following examples which illustrate the elliptical function of the demonstrative:

32. “*akhir* kita:bi:n min ha:dihi almajmu:zati, wa wa:lidan

   he-took books-two from this the-group, and one

   *min tilk*”.

   from that.

   *(He took two books from this group and one from that.)*


   not I-want this the-book, I-want that.

   *(I don't want this book, I want that.)*
In the first example, ‘tilka’ is elliptical, and the missing noun is ‘al-majmu:ząati’, which is supplied by the first clause in the sentence. In the second example, ‘dha:k’ is elliptical and ‘alkita:ba’ is left out.

3.3.2.2.3 Words Meaning ‘Totally’ or ‘Partially’ as Elliptical Forms

This group includes ‘kull’ (each, every or all), ‘jami:zę’ (all), ‘kila:’ (both), ‘āyy’ (any), ‘baẓḍ’ (some). Only ‘kullun’ when it has a distributive meaning, (each) and ‘baẓḍ’ (more frequently when definite- al-baẓḍ), and ‘āyyan’ can function elliptically... The nominal group in which these occur as head is usually filled out by a partitive qualifier, since the elliptical item designates a portion of or the whole of the presupposed elements. The nominal group can also be filled out by a noun in the genitive. Examples:

34. "yastaţi:çu alru:asa:u rä yan yaḍaçu: haddan li almushkilati
   Can the-presidents put-they an-end to-the-problem
   ridha: ṣakhadha kullun ẓala: ṣa:tiqiḥi yan…”
   If he-took each upon himself to

(The presidents can put an end to this problem if each takes upon himself to)

‘Kullun’ here is elliptical. The missing partitive qualifier ‘min al-ru:asa:’ (of the presidents) can be retrieved from the preceding clause. Note the following example quoted from (Ḩammoudah, 1983: 213):

35. “Darasa baẓḍa alḥa:la:ti biṣumqin wa ṣa:raḍa ẓan
   He-studied some the-cases in-depth and he-rejected about
   baẓḍ.”
   some

(He studied some of the cases in depth, and rejected some.)
Here بعض ‘baḍd’ (some) is elliptical, and the missing partitive qualifier is ‘mina al ḥa:la:ti’ (of the cases) (Ḥammoudah, 1983: 213).

3.3.2.2.4 Numerals and Indefinite Quantifiers as Elliptical Forms

The numerative element can be an ordinal, a cardinal or an indefinite qualifier. Ordinals are often used elliptically when the definite article ‘al’ (the) is prefixed to them, e.g.

36. “-hal ha:dha: ruwwalu kita:bin lak?”

Is this the-first book for-you?
(Is this your first book?)

لا انه الثاني

“-la: ḫinnahu altha:ni:”

No, it is the-second
(No, it is the second.)

Here الثاني ‘al-tha:ni:’ (the second) is elliptical. It is the question that supplies the missing noun الكتاب ‘al-kita:b’ (the book).

In English, the elliptical ordinals can be preceded by a possessive pronoun. In Arabic, the ordinal cannot function as an elliptical element when a possessive is suffixed to it because in such instances, it cannot meet the condition of addability. For example:

غادر اثنان من الاخوان. أين ثالثهم؟

37. Gadara ṣithna:ni mina al-iikhwani. ṭayna tha:lithuhum?

Came two from the-brothers. Where (is) third-their?
(Two of the brothers came. Where is their third?)
In English translation, the ordinal is elliptical since it can be filled out. In the Arabic sentence, however, it is not elliptical because no noun can be added after it (it is filled out as it is). The difference can be clarified by translating the nominal group ‘tha:lithuhum’ literally: (the third of them).

Cardinals can also function elliptically. They may have the definite article al (the) affixed to them or may be preceded by certain other deictics like ‘ayy’ (any) or ‘kull’ (each) as in ‘ayyu thala:tha’ (any three), ‘kullu ithnayni:’ (each two), ‘ha:u:la:i al-thala:thah’ (these three). They can also be preceded by post-deictic adjectives such as ‘maςhu:d’ (usual) or ‘nafs’ (same) thus:

A- Not he-could he-answer the-questions all-it (he)answered çala:thala:thatin faqat”

(He could not answer all the questions. He answered three only.)

B- “-ayyan min ha:dhihi alkutubi turi:d?
Which of these the-books you-want?
(Which of these books do you want?)

أريد هذه الثلاثة

*“-uri:du ha:dhihi al-thla:thata”
I-want this the-three.
(I want these three).
Or

أريد الثلاثة

“uri:du althalâ:tha”.
I-want the-three
(I want the three.)

C- “Hal ḥadara jami:ẓu alṭulla:b?”.
Did came all the-students?
(Did all the students came?)

No, came the-three the-usual only.
(No, only the usual three came.)

3.3.2.2.5 Modifiers Designating Indefinite Quantity as Elliptical Forms

The indefinite qualifiers are items such as ‘kathi:r’ كثير (many or much), ‘qali:l’ قليل (few or little), ‘zd:da:ḥ’ عديدة (several) and their plural forms which refer only to persons: ‘kathi:ru:n’ كثيرون, ‘qali:lu:n’ قليلون, and ‘zd:du:n’ عديدون. The category also includes ‘baς ḍ’ بعض (some), ‘akthar’ أكثر (more), ‘aqall’ أقل (less) and indefinite numbers such as ‘mi:ya:t’ مئات (hundreds) and ‘zd:sha:ra:t’ عشرات (tens).

Of these, only the first three cannot function as head of a nominal group, and therefore cannot occur as elliptical forms. However, when the definite article is prefixed to the first two, they can function as elliptical items. It should be mentioned that adding the definite article does not really change their classification as indefinite quantifiers since formal determination in Arabic
does not necessarily imply determination in meaning (Cantarino, 1975, 2:6). Let us study the following illustrative example:

لا أريد كن هذا الطعام. القليل يكفي
Do-not I-want all this the-food. The-little is-enough.

(I do not want all this food. A little will do.)

Here ‘al-qali:lu’ (A little) is elliptical since it is head of the nominal group which can be 'filled out' by the partitive qualifier ‘min ha:dh a: al-taça:mi’ (of this food) or ‘minhu’ (of it) retrieved from the preceding sentence.

The plural forms can occur as elliptical elements whether or not the definite article is prefixed to them. Thus:

هجم رجال الأمن على المتظاهرين ثم قاموا بضرب الكثيرون وأعتقال العديدين ولم ينجوا ألا قليلون
40. ‘hajama rija:lu al-ramni çala: almuta:za:hiri:na thumma qa:mu:
Attacked men(of) the-police the-demonstrators then started-they
with the beating the-many and arresting the-several and not escapes except few.

(The police forces attacked the demonstrators, then they (policemen) beat up many, arrested several, and only a few escaped.)

In this example, there are three indefinite quantifiers that are elliptical ‘qali:lu:na’, al-kathi:rin’ and ‘al-ḍadi:di:n’. The missing partitive qualifier ‘min al-muta:za:hiri:na’ (of the demonstrators) is recoverable from the first clause.

The elliptical function of the indefinite numbers can be illustrated if in the previous example ‘al-mi: ʿa: t’ (hundreds) replaces ‘al-kathi:ri:n’ the-kثيدين ‘al-ḍaḥara:t’ (tens) replaces ‘al-cadi:di:n’ the-عديدين, and
‘aqaliyyatun’ (minorities) replaces ‘qalilun’ قليلون. The replacing quantifiers can be filled out from the first clause in the same way the replaced ones were.

The comparative adjective ‘akthar أكثر (more), which also designates indefinite quantity, also occurs as an elliptical form:

عشرة دولارات لا تكفي. أريد أكثر.

(Ten dollars are not enough. I want more.)

3.3.2.2.6 Adjectives as Elliptical Forms

In English, it is not common for adjectives (except for color adjectives) to occur as head in a nominal group (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 163). In Arabic, on the other hand, adjectives, when definite, frequently function as elliptical elements ( Hammoudah, 1983: 215). The definite adjective may also be followed by a demonstrative. For example:

أي السيارتين تريد؟

(Which of the two cars do you want?)

*الجديدة أو الجديدة هذه؟

*the-new the-new this

(the new one’ or ‘this new one)
The fact that adjectives in Arabic agree in number and gender with the modified noun makes retrieving the missing noun easier.

In Arabic, the elative, which corresponds to the superlative in English, also functions elliptically when determined by the definite article. For example:

من بقيت من الفتيات؟

43. Man baqiyat min alfata:ya:t?
   Who stayed from the-girls?
   (Which one of the girls stayed?)

*alṣughra:
“the-youngest”
(The youngest)

Another type of modifier that can function elliptically is the ‘Iḍa:fa’ consisting of ‘dhu:’; a member of the class of nouns which Arab grammarians call ‘al’asmar’ alkhamsah (the five nouns), followed by a noun in the genitive case. The word dhu is inflected for case, gender, and number. In the following example, the ‘Iḍa:fa’ functions as an elliptical form:

عندما خيروها بين الرجلين أختارت ذا المال

44. ḥindama: khayyaru:ha: bayna alrajulayni, ʿikhta:rat Dha:
   When gave choice-they-her between the-men-two, chose-she The-owner of
   ṣalma:l
   the-money
   (When they gave her a choice between the two men, she chose the wealthy one.)
Here, ‘dha: `alma:l’ is elliptical and the missing noun ‘alrajula’ (the man) is supplied by the first clause.

3.3.3 Relative Clauses

Relative clauses in Arabic often occur independently of the noun they modify; therefore they can function as elliptical forms. For example:

- من الرجل الذي حضر أمس؟

45. a- “man alrajulu alladhi: ḥaḍara ṭams?”
   Who the-man who (relative) came yesterday?
   (Who is the man that came yesterday?)

* “alladhi: ḥaḍara ṭamṣi ḥakhi:”.
   Who (relative) came yesterday brother-my.
   (The one who came yesterday is my brother.)

In this example the relative clause ‘alladhi ḥaḍara ṭamṣi’ (who came yesterday) is elliptical and the missing noun ‘alrajulu’ (the man)

- من الرجلين ستختارين؟

b- “Man min alrajulayni sa takhta:ri:na?”
   Who of the-men-two will-you-choose?.
   (Which of the two men will you choose?)

*“Alladhi: yuḥibbuni:”.
   Who he-loves-me.
   (The one who loves me)
Again, the relative clause ‘alladhi: yuhibbuni:’ is elliptical and the ellipted noun is ‘alrajul’ (the man).

3.3.4 Verbal Ellipsis

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 170) divide verbal ellipsis into lexical and operator ellipsis. The former occurs when the lexical verb is missing from the verbal group, the latter when the operator is omitted. Operators in English are either tense operators such as (be, have, do, used to, etc.), or model operators such as (shall, will, should, need, etc).

Such a division is not possible in Arabic simply because Arabic has neither tense operators nor model operators that correspond to the English ones. There are, however, certain lexical items that Arabic makes use of to express the concept of modality and temporal meanings (Aziz, 1998, 97).

According to Kharma (1983: 37-52) and Beeston (1968: 80-82), these lexical items include the following: the particle ‘qad’ قد, the verb ‘ka:na’ كان, and the particles ‘sa’ سَ and ‘sawfa’ سوفَ.

‘Sa’ and ‘sawfa’ are used before the imperfect indicative to emphasize its future meaning (Comrie, 1976; Kharma, 1983: 34).

46. “Sa‘ aktubu lahu risa:la
Will-I-write to-him letter-a
(I will write him a letter.)

Ibn Hisham (1960: 293) points out that the particle ‘qad’ usually precedes the verb, which it influences either temporally or depending on the tense, e.g.
47. “qad taghayyara kullu shay’”
Has changed every thing.

(Everything has changed.)

48. “qad tataghayyaru al’ahwa:l
Might change the-situation-s.

The situations might change.

In (47) ‘qad’ emphasizes that the action has taken place; in (48), it indicates probability or uncertainty. The important thing here is that none of the mentioned particles can occur independently of the verb. Here, they can neither function as the elliptical element nor be the ellipted element.

As for ‘ka:na’, it is a verb which can govern another to express the time-sphere of the verb (Al-Samarrai, 1987: 54-59). Note the following:

49. “ka:na yuqi:mu huna:”.
Used-to-he he-live here.

(He used to live here.)

Ka:na, which is the perfect, precedes a verb which is in the imperfect, thus imparting to the latter the idea of duration in the past (Cantarino, 1975: 73). It is not, however, considered a forming part of a compound tense since it has preserved a certain degree of independence in position and agreement (Cantarino, 1975: 71). ‘Ka:na’ differs from ‘sa, sawfa and qad’ in that in very few instances it can function as an elliptical element. Examples are:
50. a: “kunta tuqi:mu fi: Austiralia”.

Used to-you you-live in Austiralia.

(You used to live in Australia.)

50. b: “kuntu wa la:ziltu”

Used to-I and still-I.

(I used to, and still do.)

Here, both verbs ‘kuntu’ and ‘la:-ziltu’ are elliptical (la:-ziltu has a syntactic function and a terminal aspect similar to those of ‘ka:na’). The lexical verb ‘uqi:mu’ and the residue of the clause are presupposed. Though these two verbs can function elliptically, they themselves cannot be omitted.

Other verbs that can function as elliptical elements are ‘yastati:ς’, ‘yaqdir’ and ‘yatamakkan’, the three of which mean (can). Thus:

حاولت المستحيلَ ك أقنعهَ ولكن لم استطيع

“Ḥa:waltu almustaḥi:la kay ṣuqniςahu wa la:knnani: lam ˙aṣṭaṭi:ς”.

Tried-I the-impossible to I-convince-him and but-I not I-can.

(I tried the impossible to convince him, but I couldn't.)

Here, the omitted item is the verbal clause ṣan ṣuqniςahu (convince him). In the same example, ‘aqdir’ or ‘atamakkan’ can replace ‘aṣṭaṭi:ς’ and become the elliptical element.

It becomes clear that the only type of verbal ellipsis that occurs in Arabic is the lexical (Aziz, 1998: 100). According to HECKMOUR (1983: 232), verbal ellipsis occurs when the verb alone or the verb with its suffixed pronoun whether the latter is in the nominative or the accusative, is ellipted. Thus:
52. a: “mata: tusa:fir?”
  When you leave?
  (When do you leave?)

52. b: “-ghadan”
  (Tomorrow.)

Here, the verb is missing in the response. It is retrievable from the question.

53. “-yila: yukhtihi alkubra: ıarsala kita:ban” wa “yila: alṣughra: hadiya”.
  To sister-his the-eldest sent-he letter-a and to the-youngest a-present.
  (To his eldest sister, he sent a letter; to his youngest sister, a present.)

In the second clause, the verb ‘ıarsala’ ‘sent’ is omitted and can be recovered from the first clause. There is also an instance of nominal ellipsis in the second clause; the nouns along with the pronoun in ‘yukhtihi’ ‘his sister’ are ellipted. The adjective ‘alṣughra:’ ‘the youngest’ serves as the elliptical element.

3.3.5 Clausal Ellipsis

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 196-222) divide clausal ellipsis into four categories: modal, propositional, general ellipsis of the clause, and the ellipsis of the entire clause. To .Helper on the other hand, clausal ellipsis occurs when an entire clause is omitted (1983: 225). He does discuss the ellipsis of parts of the sentence, but not as clausal ellipsis. In the present study, neither Halliday and Hassan's categorization nor .Helper's will be adopted as it is, instead, a modified combination of the two will be used.
At this point, a brief description of the ‘sentence’ in Arabic is necessary since the categorization of the types of clausal ellipsis on the two-part structure of the sentence.

There are two types of sentences in Arabic: the nominal and the verbal. The nominal sentence consists of a noun subject ‘almubtad’ (that with which a beginning is made, the topic) followed by a predicate ‘al-khabar’ (the comment) which may be a noun, an adjective, an adverb, a prepositional phrase, or a verbal sentence. Examples of nominal sentences include:

54. a: “Ahmadu ca:lim”.
Ahmad scientist.
(Ahmad is a scientist.)

(b) أحمد يفي البيت

54. b: “Ahmadu fi-l-bayt”.
Ahmad in-the-house.
(Ahmad is in the house.)

(c) حياتك تعيش

54. c: “Hayatu:ka taçi:sa”.
Life-your miserable.
(Your life is miserable.)

(d) أحمد يحب الأدب

54. d: “Ahmadu yuhibbu al-radaba”.
Ahmad he-loves the-literature.
(Ahmad loves literature.)
The verbal sentence begins with a verb followed by a noun subject and complements. The complements usually include one or two objects of the verb, an adverb, a prepositional phrase, or any combination of these. The subject of a verbal sentence is ‘al-fa:ẓil’ (the agent, the subject) and the predicate, ‘al-fiẓl’ (the verb or action). Unlike the nominal sentence in which the predicate may precede the subject, in a verbal sentence the verb must always precede the subject. For example:

(55a) ﴿dhahaba ʿamdu ʿila: al-madrasa”.
Went-he Ahmad to the-school.

(Ahmad went to school.)

(55b) ﴿talaba minhu ran yugha:dir”.
He-asked from-him to he-leave.

(He asked him to leave.)

According to Wright, the difference between the nominal and verbal sentences is that the former gives a description of a person or thing and the latter relates an event or act (1974: 252).

In the present study, clausal ellipsis will be studied under three categories: subject ellipsis, propositional ellipsis, and general ellipsis of the clause. The first type involves the ellipsis of elements that can fill the slot of the mubtada’ ‘subject’ in a nominal sentence.

(56a) ﴿ha:dhihi tuhtmwtun khaṭi:ra”.
This an accusation serious.

(This is a serious accusation.)
56. **b**: “tuhma?”

(An accusation?)

In the question rejoinder, the mubtada ‘hadhihi’ (this) is ellipted. If filled out the rejoinder will be ‘hadhihi tuhmatun?’ (Is this an accusation?)

57. **a**: “kayfa ant?”.

(How are you?)

57. **b**: “bi khayr”.

(In good health.)

In this response, the pronoun ana: (I) functioning as ‘mubtada’ is ellipted.

قال هذا هو امري فقالوا طاعة


He-said this he order-my so-said-they obeyed.

(He said this is my order, so they said your order is obeyed.)

In the second reported clause, the mubtada ‘amruka’ (your order) is presupposed (Hammoudah, 1983: 180).

Hammoudah (1983: 180) discusses the ellipsis of the ‘mubtada’ in several environments. However, of the examples he discusses the two instances in which ellipsis can be considered cohesive are met in answers to questions and reported speech. In those cases, the conditions for ellipsis are met.
Ellipsis occurs across clause boundaries, and the ellipted item preserves the class of the presupposed item and is recoverable from the text.

3.3.6 Propositional Ellipsis

חַמְמוּדָה (1983: 188-191) confirms that this type of ellipsis of ‘al-khabar’ (the comment) in a nominal sentence with its complements and adjuncts in sentence. He (1983:191) discusses five environments where this type of ellipsis can function, only two of them are related to our study. These are:

1. In answers to certain WH-questions. Consider:

   59. A: “Man fi alda:ri?”
      Who in the house?
      (Who is in the house?)

   B. “Ahmad”.
      (Ahmad.)

   In (B’s) responses, ‘al-khabar’ which consists of the prepositional phrase ‘fi alda:ri’ (in the house) is ellipted.

2. When the (topic)‘mubtada’ and the (predicate)‘khabar’ of a nominal sentence are present and another (topic) ‘mubtada’ related to the first one follows, the (predicate)‘khabar’ of the first clause may also function as that of the second (topic) ‘mubtada’ and can thus be ellipted. Examine the following example:
60. “Alṯaṣa:mu wa: firuṇ wa alshara:b”.

(The food abundant and the water.

(The food and the water are abundant.)

In (60) above the (predicate) ‘khabar wafi:run’ (the adjective abundant) of the second nominal clause is ellipted and is supplied by the preceding one. However, most of the professors, whom the researcher has continually consulted, confirmed that such kind of ellipsis is little in Modern Written Arabic.

### 3.3.7 Ellipsis of the Clause

In this type of ellipsis, Aziz (1998: 90) affirms that the whole clause may be ellipted in polar questions, with the exception of the polar marker. This type of ellipsis is similar to that found in English clauses. Consider:


Do you know this the man?

(Do you know this man?)

B: “naẓam (‘aẓrifu ha:dha: alrajul”).

Yes {I know this the man}

(Yes {I know this man}).

In (B’s) response, the verbal clause ‘aẓrifu ha:dha: alrajul is presupposed.
It is amazing to note that, unlike English, the Arabic verb phrase is basically simple and has no auxiliary element functioning as an operator. Thus, it is not possible in Arabic to keep part of the verb and omit the rest with predication. The Arabic equivalent of:

62. **Will the governor attend the meeting tonight?**

Yes, he will.

Is not like (63), which is ungrammatical

أسوف يحضر الاجتماع الحاكم هذه الليلة؟


Will attend the-meeting the-governor this the-night?

(Will the governor attend the meeting tonight?)

ب. **Naẓam sawfa:**

yes will.

(Yes he will.)

But (64) below, where the whole verb and the futurity particle is kept, or both are omitted:

أسوف يحضر الاجتماع الحاكم هذه الليلة؟

64. a. “ئَآ سَآْوَفآ يُأُدُرُو أَلْيَتُمآ:َضآ أَلْحآ:كِمآ هآ:ذِهيِ

Will attend the-meeting the-governor this the- allayla?”

night.

(Will the governor attend the meeting tonight?)
b. naṣam {sawfa  yahḍar}

Yes {he will}

Another type of clausal ellipsis is in information questions, where the whole clause except the question word may be ellipted (Ḥammoudah, 1983: 254)

65. a. “Lan  rāḥara  alḥafla”.

Will-not  I-attend  the-party.

(I will not attend the party.)

لماذا؟

65. b. “Lima đha:?”

(Why?)

However, Aziz (1998: 98) states that in information questions part of the clause may be presupposed as in (66):

66. a. “Waṣala wafidu  al-ṣumami al-mutaḥida  rila al-

Arrived  delegation  the-nations  the-United  to  the  qa:hira”.

-Cairo.

(The United Nations delegation arrived in Cairo.)

ب- متى وصل؟

b. “Mata: waṣal?”

When arrived-it?

(When did it arrive?)
However, one important point concerning ellipsis in the two languages should be stressed here before ending this chapter. Probably, the main difference between English and Arabic involves ‘epithets’. In Arabic, they are frequently used in place of the head in elliptical constructions. This may be due to the fact that Arabic adjectives, to a large extent, have the same semantic and syntactic features of nouns such as definiteness, case, number, etc. The Arab grammarians, past and present, (such as Sibawayh, 1966, 1: 12; Al-Suyuti, 1971, 1: 4; Ḥasan, 1963: 1: 62) usually place adjectives and nouns in one class: substantives. Thus, adjectives in Arabic are a productive source of ellipsis; almost any adjective can replace a noun head. Consider the following example taken from Aziz (1998: 101).

67. “Jaːrat fataːtaːni ʿilaː bʿir almaː ː thumma ṭalabat
   came two-girls to well the-water then asked
   alṣaghiːraːtu ran yussaṣidahaː fiː mabri ʿinaːrihaː bilmaː ː ʾ.”
   The-young to help-her to fill her-vessel with-water.
   (Two girls came to the well. The young (one) asked him to help her to fill her vessel with water).

The epithet alṣaghiːra re replaces the girl and thus creates a cohesive bond. It is to be noted, in such constructions, English prefers substitution to ellipsis. Note the use of one in the translation of (67) above.

3.4 Conjunctions

Aziz (1998) and Obeidat (1998) point out that Arabic makes frequent use of conjunctions to build texts. It is to be noted that Halliday and Matthiessen's (1999: 327) phenomenon the ‘implicit conjunction’ is rare in Arabic, where
the general tendency is express explicitly the relationships between the sentences of a text. Compare the following simple texts from English and Arabic which are taken from Farghal (1995: 60).

68. “Baker didn't lean on any one during his visit. The pressure will gently begin this week...”

لم يمل بيكر على أحد خلال هذّة الزيارة فالضغط سيبدأ خفيفا هذَا الأسبوع


In the English text (68), the two sentences are not joined by any explicit conjunction. On the other hand, the two sentences of the Arabic text (69) are linked by an explicit conjunction ‘fa’ (as) which marks the thought relationship between the two sentences. This conjunction is obligatory rather than optional in Arabic, whereas in English, as Farghal (1995) states, is optional. Thus, in English, the writer has two textualizations available to him: either to implicitly mark the thought-relationship between the two sentences (as in 68 above) or to explicitly mark this thought-relationship, the conjunction ‘as’ is a good candidate. Observe the explicitly marked thought-relationship in (70) below:

70. “Baker didn't lean on any one during his visit, as the pressure will begin gently this week...”

3.4.1 The Semantic Category of Conjunctions in Arabic Language

In this section Arabic conjunctions will be classified according to their cohesive semantic role. The following classification is adopted from Halliday and Hassan (1976), Quirk et al. (1985), Halliday (1994) and Aziz (1998) with some modification. Three main relationships, Elaboration, Extension, and Enhancement can be recognized with a number of
subdivisions. This means all the semantic relationships found in English have their equivalents in Arabic texts. Here elaboration will be mentioned in some detail:

**A. Elaboration**

It may be divided into two subdivisions: apposition and clarification.

1) **Apposition**, in its turn, it is divided into *(i) expository and (ii) exemplifying.*

(i) Expository uses words such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>بتكلمة أخرى</td>
<td>in other words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عن</td>
<td>(I mean to say)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أي</td>
<td>(that is to say)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

أن المشاريع الثلاثة جميعها تواجه مشكلات صعبة، أي أنها ينبغي أن تدرس بدقة


*(All the three projects are facing serious problems; I mean to say they have to be re-examined carefully.)*

(ii) **Exemplifying**, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>مثال ذلك</td>
<td>for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مثال</td>
<td>for example;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>على سبيل المثال</td>
<td>for instance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) **Clarification**, on the other hand, has the following subdivisions: corrective, transitional, dismissive, particularizing, resumptive and summative.
(i) Corrective: e.g.

- بالآخرين: Bil'a:hra: (or rather)
- في الأقل: Fil alaqal (at least)
- بعبارةٍ أدق: biçiba:ratin, ḍadaq (to be more precise)

كأن سلوكه يتسم بالتحدي مع أنه سبب ضرراً كثيراً للشركة. فكان ينبغي في الأقل أن يعترض.


(He was in a defying mood although his careless behaviour caused a lot of damage to the company. He should at least have apologized.)

(ii) Transitional: e.g.

- بالمناسبة: bilmuna:sabah (by the way; incidentally)

لقد قضيت الامسية كلها بقراءة رواية. بهذه المناسبة هل التقيت جيراننا الجدد؟


(I spent the whole evening reading a novel. By the way, have you met our new neighbors?)

(iii) Dismissive, e.g.

- على أيّة حال: čala: ḍayyati ḫa:l (in any case)
- على كل حال: čala: kuli ḫa:l (any way)
قد يبدو الخطر بعيداً أو غير محتمل وعلى كل حال ينبغي أن نكون حذرين

74. “qad yabdu: alkhāṭaru baḍi:dan āw ghairu muḥtamalin wa ‘ala: kulli
ha:lin yanbaghi an naku:na ḥathiri:n.”
(The danger may seem far or even improbable. We must in any case be
cautious.)

(iv) particularizing, e.g.

على وجه الخصوص (particularly)
خاصة بالذكر (especially)
خاصة (in particular).

أن عدداً من الطيور والحيوانات مهددة بالانقراض. خاصة الفيل الأسيوي، سوف يختفي قريباً إذا لم تتخذ التدابير الصارمة.

75. “inna ẓadadan mina ʿlṭuyu:ri wa alḥayawa:na:ti muhaddadatun
Bi alʿinqira:d ẓa:ṣṣatan alfi:l ala:syawi sawfa yakhṭafi: qari:ban ʿidha lam
tuttakhaḍh altada:bi:r alsa:rimṣa”.
(A number of rare birds and animals are threatened with extinction. The Asian
elephant in particular will soon disappear if very strict measures are not taken.)

(v) Resumptive, e.g.

نعود إلى موضوعنا (to get back to the point)
كما ذكرنا (as we said)
كما قلنا: (as I was saying)
Then came a difficult period when everyone was busy with one thing or another. We did not seem to notice what was happening in our neighborhood. As I was saying, there was a single, old man who lived next door to us.

(The apartment has good furniture, luxurious bathroom and a sitting room. In short, you have everything you need.)

B. Extension

This relation often involves positive addition of ‘wa’ (and) and negative addition of ‘ṣala: khila:fi dha:lik’ (on the contrary) or variation ranging from replacive ‘wala:’ (nor), subtractive ‘ma:ṣada:’ (except) and alternative ‘aw’ (or).

Here are some examples of these relations:
(a) Positive relation

دخل الزائر الغرفة، وأخذ ينظر إلى الحاضرين

78. “Dakhala alzaː iru alghurfata wakhadha yanžuru ɾilaː alhaːdiriːn”.

(The visitor entered the room and started looking at the guests).

(b) Negative addition

فلم تقل الفتاة شيئا ولا اعترضت على ما قيل عنها

79. “falam taqul alfatatu shayːan. Wa laː ẓtaraːdat ɾalaː maː qiːlaː ɾanhaː”.

(So, the young girl neither said anything, nor objected to what was said about her).

(c) Replacive

كانت المدينة هادئة جدا. وعلى خلاف ذلك الساحل الذي كان يعج بالناس

80. “kaːnat almadiːnatu haːdiratan jiddan. wa ɾalaː khilaːfi dhaːlika alsaːhil alladhi kaːna yaːciːju ɾinnas”.

(The city was calm. On the contrary, the beach was so crowded).

(d) Subtractive

جميع هذه الملاحظات جيدة بالدراسة. باستثناء الملاحظة الأخيرة فهي ليست ذات علاقة بالموضوع

81. “jamiːṣu haːdhīhi almulaːhaːzaːt jadiːrah bildiraːsah. Bistithnaː yi almulaːhaːzaːhti alʾakhiːrati fahiya laysat dhaːta ɾilaːqatin bilmawḍuːṣ”.

(All these notes are worth studying except for the last one which is out of context.)
(e) Alternative

82. “yajibu a\n\ntunhi\ya çamalaka alyawma a\w\atatluba\min\shakh\s\rin a\kh\ra\ran\yunjizahu\lak”.

(You must end your work today or ask someone else to do it for you.)

c) Enhancement

Four kinds of enhancement contribute to cohesion in Arabic; these are spatio-temporal, manner and causal-conditional.

(a) Spatio-temporal:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{قبل ذلك} & \quad \text{(before that)} \\
\text{ف في النهاية} & \quad \text{(finally)} \\
\text{في تلك الأثناء} & \quad \text{(meanwhile)} \\
\text{بعد ذلك} & \quad \text{(then)}
\end{align*}
\]

83. “Dakhala ñlayna: wa bada a\bi\intiqa\dikulli\shakh\sin\fi\alqaçati \thumma \ghadara\duna\ran\yanta\za\ran\narudda\çala: \itiha\:ma\:tih”.

(He came in and began to criticize everyone in the hall. He then left without waiting for anybody to reply his accusation).

(b) Manner e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kadha\:lika} & \quad \text{(also, likewise)} \\
\text{على هذا المنوال} & \quad \text{(similarly)}
\end{align*}
\]
يمكن أن تشن حملة ناجحة ضد المخدرات وكذلك يجب تقليل أو الحد من ظاهرة الجرائم الخطيرة.


(A successful campaign against drugs could be carried out; likewise other serious crimes should be eliminated or at least reduced).

(c) Causal-conditional e.g.

- بسب ذلك bisababi ḍha:lik
- من أجل ذلك min rajli ḍha:lik (as a result\for this reason)
- نتيجة لذلك nati:jatan li-ḍha:lik
- وللهذا السبب wa-liha:ḍha alsabab

عاشَ زيدٌ حياة غامضة فهو لم يخالط أبناء القرية الآخرين ولهذا السبب فقد أصبح مغمورا جداً.


(Zaid lived a mysterious life; he never mixed with other villagers. For this reason, he had become very unpopular).

3.4.2 The Function of Conjunctions in Arabic

The purpose of this section is to highlight the cohesive category of connectives and their functions in Arabic. Arab grammarians usually refer to the connectives, according to their different significance, as ‘adawaːt alrabṭ’ or ‘ḥuruːf alɔːʃəf’, i.e. connective particles. Sometimes they are treated under the heading of ‘ɔʃəf al-nasaq’ (conjunction of sequence) and ‘ɔʃəf
albaya:n’ (explicative apposition). For most of the Arab grammarians, connectives are treated as linking devices, and their function is, mainly to coordinate units such as words, phrases, clauses, sentences, etc. Old Classical Arab grammarians were mainly interested in ‘aliṣra:b’ (case or mood inflection), in their descriptions of the connectives. That is, the textual function fulfilled by the connectives was completely neglected or overlooked. However, in the late sixties and later on, the textual function of connectives in Arabic has attracted the attention of many discourse analysts (e.g. Beeston, 1968, Wright, 1974, Cantarino 1975, al-Jubouri 1983, and Holes 1995). In his book ‘The Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose’ published in (1975), Cantarino puts forward a full account and detailed analysis and description of the syntactic and semantic features of the cohesive category ‘connectives’ in Arabic. He investigates the different functions a single connective may perform in different contexts. The most commonly used connective particles in Arabic are: ‘wa’ (and), ‘fa’ (and/then), ‘thumma’ (then), ‘yam’ (or), ‘yaw’ (or), ‘la:kinna’ and ‘la:kin’ (but). These are presented under the following major headings:

3.4.2.1 WA (and)

The conjunctive particle wa (and) is the most generally used particle in Arabic. Clive's Holes (1995:217) notes that:

[wa] is the primitive conjunctive particle: it is the most commonly encountered sentence connective and has the widest variety of uses, analogous in these aspects to English 'and'. Unlike English 'and', however, [wa] regularly functions as a textual, as well as a sentence- connective.

Regarding the use of wa and fa, Wright (1974:330) asserts that:
The Arabs, as well as other Semites, often connect single verbs and entire sentences with one another merely by means of the particles [wa] and [fa] … They use [wa]… where we would prefer a disjunctive or adversative particle; as [Allah-u yaçlam-u wa ‘antum la: taçlamu:n] 'Allah knows, but you do not know'. In such cases, however, [wa] has in reality only a copulative force; the adversative relation lies in the nature of the two clauses themselves.

Wright also notes that wa in Arabic, like its equivalent in other Semitic languages, often serves to connect two clauses, the second of which describes either the state or condition of an element (i.e. the subject or one of its complements) in the preceding one, or else of a new subject (1974:332).

Another type of ‘wa’ exists in Arabic called by Arab grammarians ‘wa:w almaçi:ya’ or sometimes called ‘wa:w almuṣa:haba’, both of which mean the (wa:w of simultaneousness actions). This type of ‘wa’ is used according to Wright “when the governed verb expresses an act subordinate to, but simultaneous with, the act expressed by the previous clause”; as in:

لا تنه عن خلقٍ وتات  مثله

86. la:tanha çan khuluqin wa tari: mithluh:

(Do not restrain (the others) from any habit, whilst you (yourself) practice one like it) (Wright, 1974:32).

The conjunctive particle ‘wa’ is also used to connect two nouns in such a way that the second is subordinate to, and not coordinate with the first, as in:

سارَ زيدٌ وطارق

87. sa:ra zaydun wa ṭariq.

(Zayd went along with tariq) (Wright, 1974:83)
Another usage of the conjunctive particle *wa* identical with the above is when it is used to connect two nouns; in this case it is known as ‘*wa:wu alluzu:m*’, (*wa:w* of adherence), if the two nouns belong necessarily together, as in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{كل شيء وثمنه} & \\
\text{(Each thing has its own price.)} & \\
\text{كل إنسان وهمه} & \\
\text{(Every man has his own care.)} & \text{(Wright, 1974: 84)}
\end{align*}
\]

However, ‘*wa*’ in the above instances and in similar instances is not regarded as a cohesive device because it is used to link phrases in a structural sense similar to the structural ‘*and*’ in English (cf. Halliday and Hasan (1976) for complete reference on the structural ‘*and*’).

Unlike the English structural ‘*and*’, however, this use of conjunctive particle *wa* has no additive function either. Rather, the function may be rhetorical.

**3.4.2.1.1 Functions of Wa**

In terms of functions, the conjunctive particle ‘*wa*’ has subtle and varied functions; it may express one of the following relations:

**1. To Signal the Beginning of a Chunk of Information**

In simple narrative, the conjunctive particle ‘*wa*’ is sometimes used to signal the beginning of every paragraph except the first. Its function in such texts is simply to mark the beginning of the next episode in the report, as in:
89. *wa* there were a few women, some of them revealing dainty arms which carried handbags resembling shoe or jewel boxes. *wa* there was not a single peasant woman among them.

Here, Holes (1995:217) notes that:

> These two sentences … form the second half of a descriptive paragraph, and follow a full stop. It is typical that *wa*, the indigenous device for sentence concatenation, continues to be used alongside the full stop, which here is performing the same function of marking the end of one sentence and the beginning of another.

2. **To Express Additive Relations (x and y)**

The conjunctive particle ‘*wa*’ can be used to express additive relations between clauses that are intended as equally important in the exposition or the narratives, as in:

90. *wa* there were a few women, some of them revealing dainty arms... *wa* there was not a single peasant woman among them (Holes, 1995: 217).

3. **To Express Temporal Relations (x then y)**

The conjunctive particle ‘*wa*’ can also be used to express temporal relations between the clauses that it connects, i.e. it links successive episodes in narrative, as in:

91. *They brought out the pot* *wa* took the mashed dates *wa* threw them into the middle of the pot *wa* mashed them... (Holes, 1995: 218).

Here, the conjunctive particle *wa* is used to signal the successive relationship between the four clauses.
4. To Express Simultaneous Action (x at the same time as y)

The conjunctive particle ‘wa’ can be also used in Arabic to express simultaneous action without giving particular topical prominence, as in:

92. I watered the crops 

The conjunctive particle ‘wa’, in the above example, connects the two clauses, but it does not explicitly indicate which happens first ‘the watering or the eating’.

5. To Express Circumstantial Relations (x in circumstance y)

According to Holes (1995), the conjunctive particle ‘wa’ can also be used to signal circumstantial relations between clauses in discourse, as in:

93. He abandoned them 

Here, the conjunctive particle ‘wa’ is used to connect the two clauses to indicate the surrounding circumstances in which the main action ‘abandoned’ occurred. In this context, it must be pointed out that this last usage is another usage of ‘wa’ in Arabic called ‘wa:w alḥa:l’ (when/while) which is a circumstantial ‘wa’. As the name implies, ‘wa:w alḥa:l’ introduces a circumstantial clause that has the function of describing a situation, which is represented as simply an attendant circumstance to the main statement, or an intention present at that time (Beeston, 1968: 81).

Wright has also noticed that the ‘wa’ which introduces a circumstantial clause, is called by the Arab grammarians either ‘wa:w alḥa:l’, (the wa:w of the state), condition or circumstance … or ‘wa:w alibtida:’, (the wa:w of the commencement) (Wright, 1974:332-3)

In his description of circumstantial clauses in Arabic, and the use of ‘wa’ to introduce a circumstantial clause, Beeston (1970:89-90) writes:
The circumstantial clause may be purely temporal, or adversative … or explanatory … but there is an unsophisticated lack of overt marks of the logical intention. One structure of this kind has a clause form preceded by a functional [wa], which must have been originally the ordinary coordinating functional ‘and’; just as in English we find “he has behaved disgracefully to me, and he calls himself my friend” where the implied logical relationship is adversative, i.e. ‘and’ is replaceable by ‘although’ … But in Medieval and SA (Standard Arabic), the circumstantial [wa] has to be felt as having its own clearly defined functional value, although still logically ambiguous to the extent of admitting temporal ‘while’, adversative ‘although’ and causal ‘in as much as’ interpretations.

Regarding the use of ‘wa’ to introduce a circumstantial clause, Beeston (1968:47) notes that:

The position of a circumstantial complement may be filled by a clause usually introduced by /wa-/) and which here acts as a subordinating particle (sometimes accompanied by other marks, especially /qad/ for the prefer), translated as ‘while’, ‘when’, ‘although’, ‘but’, … which requires the tense of the verbs it governs be interpreted in relation to the main clause; /kataba maktu:b-an wa huwa malik-un/he wrote a letter while (or although) he was a king.

Another point of view is upheld by Cantarino (1975) who considers the conjunctive particle ‘wa’, which introduces circumstantial clauses as a coordinating conjunction, despite the fact that it always introduces circumstantial clauses, i.e. subordinate clauses.

6. To Express Adversative Relation (x but y)
The conjunctive particle ‘wa’ is used also in Arabic to express an adversative relation between the clauses it connects. Holes (1995:219) notes:
Without any adverbial support, *wa* may link two sentences which are overtly or implicitly mutually inconsistent or when the second implies a restriction or concession of some kind on the first.

A similar point of view is upheld by Cantarino (1975), who writes:

The two sentences connected by the conjunctive [*wa*] may be, and in fact frequently are, in an adversative relationship, such as ‘but’, ‘yet’ especially when one of the statements is negative...

This is presented as follows:

94. *a.* *ka*ānnaḥa: *fi:* *almadī:*na *wa* *laysat* *minḥa:*

*(As if she were in the city, yet out of it.)*

*ānık *al-yūm* *tajhali:n* *wa* *ghadān* *taςlami:n*

*(You do not know today, but you will tomorrow.)* (Cantarino, 1975: 18)

In this regard, Beeston (1968:56) also notes that ‘*wa*’ will often be found in contexts where English would use a non-emphatic ‘but’ or ‘or’

### 3.4.2.2 FA (So)

The conjunctive particle ‘*fa*’, according to some linguists is called the ‘particle of classification’. It indicates coordination together with the idea of development in the narrative. For Holes (1995), ‘*fa*’ usually indicates a relationship between two clauses or between two paragraphs of a text, such that the second clause describes a state or an action which occurs as a consequence of the first one. In order to illustrate this, Holes presents the following examples:
95.  a. I discovered from the first puff that smoke was escaping from lots of holes fa I stubbed it out in the ashtray.

b. One day I heard a boy selling books who kept calling out ‘Diary of a Tough-Guy’ fa I called him over and bought a copy.

c. The plane got lost fa crashed in the desert.

3.4.2.2.1 Functions of fa

The conjunctive particle ‘fa’, like ‘wa’, has varied functions. It may express one of the following relations:

1. Result and Causal Relations

The conjunctive particle ‘fa’ is regarded by Arab grammarians as a signal of causality between clauses where the first clause implies a reason and the second a result. Sometimes ‘fa’ marks a conclusion. The function of ‘fa’ as a signal of causal and relationship is highlighted by Cantarino (1975: 23-24) who notes:

fa implies an internal-and logical-relationship between the two coordinate sentences...It may refer back to the preceding statement as a necessary premise for the action of the second. ... It may also unite two sentences that have a causal relationship pointing toward the effect, or fact, and its consequences.

In another context, Cantarino (1975:33) points out that:

fa may also be used to introduce an action which is intended as the aim of a previous action, or which is the logical result of an action designed to achieve such a consequence.
A similar point of view is upheld by Beeston (1968:56) who states that “fa can be a signal of logical sequence of the train of thought … the mind can proceed from a cause to a consideration of its effect”, and in this case fa corresponds to English ‘so’ as in:

قد أدليت بحجة قاطعة لهذا فسأعتقده

96. qad adlayta bihujjatin qat'aicipants liha: dha: fa sa'iztagidah.
(You have given a decisive argument for this, so I will believe it.)

Alternatively, ‘fa’ may signal the reverse of the above, that is, “the mind can proceed from a phenomenon to a consideration of its cause or justificatory generalization, and in this case ‘fa’ corresponds to English ‘for’” (Beeston, 1968:56). To illustrate this, Beeston presents the following example:

قد أخطأت فالخطأ أنساني

97. qad akhfarta fa akhatau insani:
(You have erred, for error is human.)

2. Adversative Relations

The conjunctive particle ‘fa’, like the conjunctive particle ‘wa’, may express an adversative relationship existing between the two clauses/sentences it connects. Within this context, Cantarino writes:

'Fa', like the conjunction 'wa', may also connect two sentences that are in an adversative relationship; in such cases, one statement is usually affirmative while the other is negative.

To demonstrate this, Cantarino (1975:39) presents the following examples:

أفتتش عن كلمة اقولها فما أجدها

98. a. ufattishu; çan kalimatin aqu:luha; fa ma: rajiduha:
(I search for a word to say, but I could not find any).
3. Sequential / Temporal Relations

The conjunctive particle ‘fa’, like ‘wa’, may be used to express sequential and temporal relations. Beeston notes that, unlike ‘wa’ which coordinates two phrases, clauses and sentences without implication as to the priority of one over the other, “fa implies what precedes it has some sort of priority over what follows it”. When the priority intended is one of time, ‘fa’ makes the independent stages in a sequence of events, as in:

قَامَ الْوَزِيرُ عِنْ مَجْلِسِهِ فَانْصَرَفَ

(The minister rose from his seat, and departed”. (Beeston, 1968:56)

In this context, Cantarino (1975:32) notes that ‘fa’ is “also used to introduce a main clause after statements intended as modifications (temporal, modal, etc.) of the main clause”.

As there is an overlapping between the functions of the two conjunctive particles, ‘wa’ and ‘fa’, it is important to differentiate between them. Cantarino (1975:20-21) highlights this by saying:

The main difference between fa and the connective particle wa is that the latter only joins equally important sentences, stating their simultaneous validity, but without any attempt at internal arrangement or logical classification. fa, however, implies an arrangement in the narrative, as a consequence of this and in order to indicate fully its actual meaning and function, fa should almost always be translated with the
connective conjunction 'and' plus any of the English adverbs used to express a similar progression and arrangement in sequence, e.g., 'so', 'then', 'thus', etc.

The same point of view is upheld by Beeston (1968:56) who writes:

... and whereas wa simply links two items (sentences/clauses) without implication as to the priority of one over the other, fa implies that what precedes it has some sort of priority over what follows it.

3.4.2.3 *Thumma* (then)

The conjunctive particle ‘*thumma*’ is one of the commonly used particles in Arabic. Like *wa*, ‘*thumma*’ can signal sequential action. The difference between the two particles is highlighted by Holes (1995:220-221) as follows:

The difference between the two … is that thumma marks a new development, event, or change of direction in the actions described in the narrative … thumma acts as a superordinate staging marker for the narrative as a whole; *wa* adds information within each of the narrative frames thus created without taking the narrative forward ...

The difference between the conjunctive particles, ‘*fa*’ and ‘*thumma*’, is highlighted by Cantarino (1975:35):

The conjunctive particle thumma emphasizes the sequence existing between two structurally independent statements as an interval, contrary to [fa], which stresses the connected series; thus, before thumma, a pause or an interval in the narrative to be understood.

In terms of functions, unlike the preceding two conjunctive particles ‘*wa*’ and ‘*fa*’, ‘*thumma*’ has only one function. It is used to signal a temporal relation. This is highlighted by Cantarino (1975: 36) who writes:
As a consequence of its temporal meaning, 'thumma' usually implies that the action of the preceding sentence has been completed, introducing a new event or situation.

Moreover, Cantarino also believes that ‘thumma’ (then) may introduce a logical sequence; in this case, it always has an emphatic character. ‘Thumma’, according to Cantarino, has another function; it is sometimes used to introduce “development in the narrative, it will precede the dependent clause when this precedes the main clause” (1975: 38). The following example would demonstrate this:

أشتريت الكتاب بثمن غالٍ ثم ذهبت ناحية الركن فقهوة.

100. ishtaraytu alkita:ba bithamanin gha:li-n thumma dhahabtu naḥiyata alrukni fi: qahwatin

(I bought the book at a high price, and then I went to a corner at a coffee house.)

3.4.2.4 La:kinna and La:kin (but)

The prototypical adversative conjunction in Arabic is ‘la:kinna’. Both ‘la:kinna’ and ‘la:kin’, which is another version of ‘la:kinna’, are said to denote the general meaning of what is called by Arab grammarians ‘istidra:k’ (concessive), i.e. particles that signal an adversative meaning.

The difference between the two particles ‘la:kinna’ and ‘la:kin’ is highlighted by various linguists. Cantarino, for example, notes that Arab grammarians consider the particle ‘la:kinna’ as the basic form, whereas ‘la:kin’ is seen to be the lightened form derived from it. Arab grammarians do not go into details in discussing the differences between the two particles in terms of scope and functions. However, when reading unvocalized text, Cantarino (1975: 39-40) asserts that:
It is not always possible to determine which is meant, and while only [la:kin] may be used immediately preceding a verb, it cannot be stated that the opposite is the rule, that is to say, that only[la:kinna] should be used preceding a noun.

Some linguists like Cantarino (1975) and others do not consider the adversative particles ‘la:kinna’ and its lighter form ‘la:kin’ as conjunctive particles, like the preceding ones, as they cannot stand by themselves, i.e. they require one of the properly conjunctive particles ‘wa’ or ‘fa’ to precede them. In this context, Cantarino (1975: 45) writes:

la:kinna actually precedes the sentence without having any ties which might structurally connect the particle with the sentence. Hence, Arabic may use this particle to introduce clauses in adversative relationship to the preceding situation or statement, even in cases when the subordinate precedes the main clause. In the instance, the main clause is introduced by the conjunctive fa or, at times, also by wa.

In terms of functions, the two conjunctive particles, ‘la:kinna’ (but) and its derived from ‘la:kin’, are very frequently used to express an adversative relationship to a preceding statement or situation. Cantarino (1975: 41) asserts that:

la:kin presents a statement in adversative coordination to one which is precedent. la:kinna , on the other hand, stresses the function of one part within a sentence in an adversative relationship to another sentence

Nevertheless, it must be pointed out that the adversative relationship is sometimes obscured by the use of the additive particle ‘wa’ in place of an adversative particle. A case in point is a suggestion put forward by Cantarino (1975: 39) who notes:
Adversative constructions are very frequently coordinated by the conjunctive particle wa; only the adversative meaning of the two propositions will reveal the actual nature of the construction.

3.4.2.5 Aw and Am (or)

The disjunctive particle ‘aw’ (or) is the prototype of disjunctive constructions whereas ‘am’ (or) is the prototype of alternative constructions in Arabic. One of its basic functions is described by Beeston (1968:57) as follows:

aw is a connective linking two items which are mutually exclusive possibilities, of such a nature that they could be marked in English by (the correlative conjunction) ‘either…or alternatively …’ (e.g. ‘qad taṣduqu qiṣṣatuhu *aw taz:fu’ ) (His story may be true or false). Modern usage, however, tends to extend the use of aw to all contexts where English uses (or). And just as in English ‘or’ can be reinforced by a preceding ‘either’, this can be represented in Arabic by imma:.

To illustrate this, Beeston presents the following example:

اَمَّا فِي مَصر أَو فِي الشَّام

101. ...imma: fi: misr  *aw  fi: alsha:m

(Either in Egypt or in Syria) (1968: 57)

Cantarino (1975:49) emphasizes that:

aw is the general and most frequently used disjunctive conjunction. It can be found in any position when a disjunctive is to be expressed; however, it can only be used in affirmative or interrogative sentence […]aw may also connect a sequence of two or more dependent clauses with a disjunctive meaning.
The prototype of alternative conjunctions is ‘am’. The function of ‘am’ is summed up well by Cantarino (1975: 50) who suggest that ‘am’ generally introduces the second of two interrogative sentences presenting an alternative. Contrary to ‘aw’, ‘am’ frequently implies a condition of exclusion in one of the two sentences.

3.5 Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion refers to the role played by the selection of vocabulary in organizing relations within a text. A given lexical item cannot be said to have a cohesive function in its own right, but any lexical item can enter into a cohesive relation with other items in a text. Lexical cohesion is usually achieved by means of lexical semantic relations between lexical items in the text.

Semantic relations such as repetition, synonymy, antonymy and collocation are used by Arabic writers to create a text in Arabic. Following is a brief account of Arab scholars' effort regarding lexical cohesion.

3.5.1 Repetition and Parallelism in Modern Studies

Many modern researchers have studied the phenomenon of repetition and parallelism in Arabic (e.g., Kaplan 1966, Beeston 1968, Koch 1981, Williams 1982, Al-Jubouri 1983, Holes 1995, etc.). Al-Jubouri was among the first contemporary scholars to investigate this phenomenon in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). He (1983) investigates the role of repetition in Arabic argumentative discourse and identifies three levels of repetition: morphological level, word level, and the chunk level. The term ‘chunk’ is used by Al-Jubouri to refer to the Arabic grammatical notions ‘jumla’ and ‘shibh jumla’ which do not always correspond exactly to the English concepts of ‘phrase’, ‘clause’ and ‘sentence’. These are presented as follows:
A. Repetition at Morphological Level

According to Al-Jubouri, Arabic, being a Semitic language, is characterized by its root system referred to by modern linguists as ‘al-judhu:r’ (roots) and patterns of the derived form of ‘al-awza:n’ (morphological patterns). He (1983: 100) notes that:

Arabic roots are ordered sets of usually three, but occasionally four consonants. Each root has a general meaning which is the common denominator of the meanings of all the forms in which it is realized: e.g., [k-t-b] has to do with writing and [s-m-c] has to do with hearing [….] Morphological repetition is enhanced in words that lie in close syntactic proximity, and is manifested in their root or pattern similarity.

Al-Jubouri distinguishes two types of repetition at the morphological level: pattern repetition and root repetition. The former, according to Al-Jubouri, involves “using words that have an identical or similar morphological pattern.” This is exhibited in the following example:

\textit{almun\textsuperscript{\textdegree}n\textsuperscript{\textdegree}n\textsuperscript{\textdegree}tu\ allati: ta\textasciitilde{\textacute{c}}:\textsuperscript{\textdegree}ajat\ da:k\textsuperscript{\textdegree}hilaha: hubu:\textasciitilde{\textdegree}tan\ wa\ Su\textsuperscript{\textdegree}cu:dan}

Here, both words \textit{hubu:\textasciitilde{\textdegree}tan} and \textit{Su\textsuperscript{\textdegree}cu:dan} are on the \textit{fu\textsuperscript{\textdegree}cu:} pattern, and display final ‘\textasciitilde{\textacute{a}}lif’ because of the adverbial ‘\textit{ha:}l’ (circumstantial role) in the sentence.

As for root repetition, Al-Jubouri notes that this type of repetition is common in Arabic. It is used here to refer to lexical items derived from one root and repeated in one sentence. The most common example of this phenomenon might be the device known as ‘\textit{mafu\textsuperscript{\textdegree}l mu\textsuperscript{\textdegree}laq}’ (cognate object). The cognate object is the abstract noun derived from the verb it follows. One of Koch’s (1981) examples can be quoted here for illustration: ‘\textit{tajrufu}’ (sweeps) ‘\textit{jarf\textasciitilde{\textdegree}n\textasciitilde{\textdegree}}’ (a-sweeping), where the abstract noun ‘\textit{jarf}’ and the verb ‘\textit{tajrufu}’ are derived from the same root \textit{j-r-f}.  
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Al-Mahmoud (1989), in his analysis of root repetition, notes that repetition of roots may involve several types of structures. He presents the following types:

i. **A Construction Involving Repetition of Roots Consisting of a Verb Together with the Corresponding Noun of Place, as in:**

   a. *wa yaqifu minna: mauqif al-ida:ca*

      *(And stands from us a hostile standing)*

   b. *thumma yuha:jiru liyastau ṣin ar da shaçbin wa yaḥillu maḥallahu bilquwati*

      *(Then emigrates to settle on other people’s land and take place of its place by force).*

   In the above examples, there is a repetition involving verb-noun of place idioms, i.e. frozen linguistic units involving root repetition ‘yaqifu’ and ‘mauqif’, on the one hand, and ‘yahillu and maḥallahu’.

ii. **Different Collocational Pressures**

   This category of repetition is subject to some collocational pressures, i.e. the sequences of verbs and their verbal nouns which habitually co-occur and whose constituents are semantically cohesive, as in:

   a. *la: tarbiţuhum wa rawa:biţan qaumi:ya …*

      *(are not linked by links national and ....)*

   b. *laqad ḥa:na alawa:nu litaşhi:hi al‘akhṭa:* *

      *((the) time is timed to redress the wrongs)*
B. Repetition at Word Level

At this level, repetition is realized by two types: word repetition and word strings.

i. Word Repetition

This type of repetition involves the use of the same lexical item (with the same referent) several times within a given paragraph. Beeston (1970: 113) writes:

[…] if the thought demands the repetition of a concept, Arabic will usually try to avoid repetition of the word by using some synonym. On the other hand when structural considerations demand the repetition of a word it can be repeated without hesitation.

ii. Word Strings

This type of repetition is realized through the use of ‘word strings’. ‘Word strings' is a term referring to the use of two or more different lexical items strung together to form one group, roughly sharing the same meaning. These lexical items are of the same syntactic category. The use of word strings may create semantic elaboration through the use of:

(a) Nouns, as in Ḥuru:b wa muna:zaça:t (wars and conflicts)
(b) Verbs, as in na:qash wa baḥath (debated and discussed)
(c) Adjectives, as in wa:dih wa qa:ṭiç (clear and decisive)
(d) Adverbs, as şakhiṭan wa ḥa:qidan (grudgingly and maliciously)

Since the term ‘word strings’ is used in the sense that its constituents share a similar semantic spectrum, this would lead us to consider Al-Jubouri's categories. He identifies eight groups of word strings:
a. Group one: In this group, the constituents of the string are synonymous, commutative and interchangeable in that particular context, as in:

\[ \text{tadhiyatun wa badhlun wa fida:un} \]

(\textit{Sacrifice and sacrifice and sacrifice})

b. Group two: This group is similar to the previous one. The elements are near synonyms in that particular context; but they have a further function: they help to offer two slightly different angles for viewing the referent, as in:

\[ \text{alṢawa:çiqu wa lḍaraba:t} \]

(\textit{The-thunderbolts and the-blows})

c. Group three: In this group, there is a relation of implication between the constituents. The former constituent can lead to the latter or vice versa, as in:

\[ \text{ḥistiqla:lan wa maka:sib} \]

(\textit{Exploitation and gains})

d. Group four: In this group, though the constituents share a common meaning to a certain extent, they differ in that the first is more particular while the other is more general, as in:

\[ \text{alḤurri:yati wa Ḥuqu:qi al}^{\prime} \text{insa:n} \]

(The-liberty and rights the-man)

(\textit{Liberty and human rights})

e. Group five: In this group, one of the constituents, usually the second, though it can be the first, modifies the meaning of the other, as in:

\[ \text{al}^{\prime} \text{iqna:çi wa alḤujjati wa aldali:l} \]

(The-persuasion and the-proof and the-evidence)

(\textit{Persuasion,proof, and evidence})
f. Group six: The constituents in this group imply gradation of meaning and tend to form a semantic scale as in:

\[\textit{al\textsuperscript{c}umda wa shaykhu alghafari wa almuha:fi\textit{z}}\]

the-mayor and chief the-guards and the governor

\(\textit{(the mayor, chief of the guards and the governor)}\)

g. Group seven: The constituents in this group are antonyms or near-antonyms, as in:

\[\textit{\textit{\textbf{H}akamat thumma \textbf{H}ukimat}}\]

\(\textit{(Ruled then got-ruled)}\)

h. Group eight: The word strings in this group are freezes, or near-freezes, as in:

\[\textit{alyawma wa kull\textit{a} yawm}\]

\(\textit{(Today and every day)}\)  \(\textit{(Al-Jubouri, 1983: 102)}\)

Finally, Al-Jubouri notes that the rhetorical effect of word strings have a specific discoursal role. When word strings reiterated through an argument, for example, they tend to create an immediate emotional impact. He notes, “This is largely achieved through a passionate and forceful concentration of ideas, and is aimed directly at exercising an irresistible influence over the minds of the recipients (hearer/reader)” (1983: 103).

**C. Repetition at Chunk Level**

Repetition at the chunk level is manifested through two major processes: parallelism and paraphrase. The former refers to repetition of form, whereas
the latter refers to the repetition of substance. These two types are presented as follows:

I. Parallelism

According to Al-Jubouri (1983), parallelism is a rhetorical as well as text-building device. It keeps the discourse recipient (hearer/reader) to a definite viewpoint while at the same time attracting new material to it. Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) listings of cohesive devices excludes parallelism; however, its role in creating textual semantic unity, which is what cohesion is all about, has been commented on by many linguists (e.g. Holes: 1995, Beeston: 1966, Kaplan: 1966, Koch: 1981 and Williams: 1982, etc.). Al-Jubouri identifies two types of parallelism: complete parallelism and incomplete parallelism. These two types are discussed under the following headings:

i. Complete Parallelism

Al-Jubouri (1983: 105) defines complete parallelism as occurring when “there is total, or almost total, coincidence between parallel forms”. This is exhibited in the following example:

   (1) wa kam min aḥza:b-in Ḥakamat thumma Ḥukimat./(2) wa tawallat thumma ndatharat./(3) wa rtafaçat thumma saqaṭat./

   ((1) and how many parties ruled then got-ruled./(2) and took power then perished./(3) and rose then fell.) (Al-Joubouri, 1983: 107)

ii. Incomplete Parallelism

According to Al-Jubouri, incomplete parallelism takes place when “there is a partial coincidence between parallelistic forms”. He notes that both complete and incomplete parallelism give the effect of commutation of claims which
makes the argument more persuasive. This is exhibited in the following example:

(1)\(^*\) \text{idha}: da:faç-a çan qaḍi:yaṭ-i l-Ḥurri:yaṭ-i wa Ḥuqṭ:q-i l-\(\text{ṣ}\) inṣa:n-i,

if defended issue the-liberty and rights the-man,

(2)\(^*\) \text{idha}: iḥtaḍan-a kull-a māẓlu:m,

if embraced every unjustly-treated,

(3)\(^*\) \text{idha}: qa:wam-a l-fasa:d-a,

if resisted the-corruption,

(4)\(^*\) \text{idha}: ḍarab-a l-\(\text{ṣ}\) amṭelat-a fī: l-qedwat-i S-Sa:liḥat-i,

if gave the-examples in the-exemplification the-good, (Ibid: 108)

Commenting on the above example, Al- Jubouri (1983: 109) says:

There are four instances of the conditional construction reiterated. Each begins with \[\text{idha:}\] (if), followed by a verb in the past tense with no explicitly mentioned subject; the subject is implicit, and refers to the subject of the main clause mentioned earlier in the ‘chunk’. The repetition begins with a relatively long conditional clause […] It is followed by two short clauses and two longer ones, the last being composed of two parallelistic phrases combined with ‘wa’.

II. Paraphrase

Here, Al-Jubouri (1983: 110) notes, “While parallelism […] is repetition of form, paraphrase refers to a repetition of substance. It involves a restatement of a certain point or argument a number of times”. He asserts that the objective of this type of repetition is a reflection of a tendency the writers
have towards forceful assertion. In this category, he distinguishes the following two types:

i. Paraphrase Type One

Al-Jubouri (1983: 110) defines this type as “an action or event which is described a number of times from one perspective. It is similar to a rephrasing of a statement.” To illustrate this, he presents the following example:


The words into actions and the-promises into realities

ii. Paraphrase Type Two

Al-Jubouri (1983:110) defines this type as “an action or event which is described from two opposite perspective.” The following example is presented by Al-Jubouri to illustrate this type:


(1)\[\text{no value to-partty as it in the-power seats, / (2)\text{and as-for value-his, the-}\]true appears when criticizes the-ruler/ (Al-Jubouri, 1983: 110).

3.6 Conclusion

The present chapter has clearly shown that the textual studies in Arabic are quite similar to the western (e.g. Halliday and Hasan, 1976) works. Arabic, like English, uses the main types of cohesive devices: reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Many western scholars have studied cohesive devices in Arabic chief among them are Cantarino (1975), Wright (1974) and Beeston (1974). However, all these works have some kind of limitation, i.e., they have not dealt with the Arabic textual devices in
a comprehensive way. They even sometimes limit themselves to the boundaries within sentences; they haven't exceeded the level of sentence.

In addition, Arab scholars and linguists like Ibn al-Athir, Ibn Hisham, and Sibawayh have analyzed Arabic cohesive devices, but unfortunately they have some limitations due to the fact that they had been concerned with cohesive links within the boundary of the sentence.

However, modern Arab linguists have followed the western studies, which investigate cohesive devices within units larger than sentences. So, depending on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model, the Arab linguist Aziz (1998) has discussed thoroughly cohesive devices in Arabic texts. He has recognized that the five main types of cohesive devices: reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction and lexical cohesion are employed in Arabic. He concludes that the main difference is in subtypes and finer details.

It is worth mentioning that, in spite of our thorough discussion of the Arab scholars’ extensive studies regarding the use of cohesive devices, the researcher has come to the conclusion that it would be quite appropriate, even more practical, to adopt Halliday and Hasan (1976) in the analysis chapter. This decision is attributed to the fact that this model, though more than thirty five years have passed since it was first published is still the best reference ever written on the subject to the extent that some specialists refer to it as the bible of cohesion.
Notes

1These scholars are some professors and assistant professors from the Department of Arabic at the University of Baghdad and Al-Mustansiriyah University.