

COHESION AND COHERENCE IN ENGLISH AND ARABIC: A CROSS-THEORETIC STUDY

Prof. Dr. Fareed Hameed Hamza Al-Hindawi,
University of Babylon, Babylon, Hilla P.O. Box (45),
9647808229001 / 9647722350507.

Dr. Hasan Hadi Mahdi Abu-Krooz ,
University of Kufa , Najaf, Kufa , P.O. Box (21)
9647807297193 / 9647706822551.

ABSTRACT: *Cohesion and Coherence Theory plays a significant role in the field of discourse analysis. Despite the fact that it occupies an important status in the Western linguistic literature, its linguistic roots in other cultures especially those in Arabic have not been paid enough attention. In Arabic, the classical linguistic renown study, namely Al-Nadhm Theory, proposed by Al-Jirjani seems to be an antecedent version, in a way or another, to the Western one. Thus, a scholar investigation of this claim is worth conducting to form a solid and clearer picture about cohesion and coherence as linguistic notions. This has prompted this paper to concern itself with the task of cross-theoretically contrasting the two theories so as to show the similarities and differences between them. Additionally, it attempts to find out some aspects of convergence between them. In association with the aforementioned aims, this study hypothesizes that the Western theory is a merely developed version of an antecedent version, namely the Arabic one. Though the two theories expose differences, they show similarities and share many linguistic areas where they meet. To achieve the aims of this study and test its hypotheses, it adopts a procedure which involves reviewing cohesion and coherence in the two theories in question, contrasting them, and, on the basis of the findings of the contrast, drawing some conclusions that accord with aims and hypotheses of this piece of research work. The conclusions are drawn to show whether the hypotheses of the study are verified or rejected.*

KEYWORDS: Arabic, English, contrast, cohesion, coherence.

INTRODUCTION

Cohesion and Coherence Theory plays a significant role in the field of discourse analysis. However, the linguistic roots of this theory have not been investigated in other linguistic cultures such as Arabic. It seems that in this specific context, there is a similar theory basically proposed by a classical linguist of Arabic called Al-Jirjani. He has named his theory as 'Al-Nadhm Theory'. Having these two theories in the literature of linguistics has prompted this study to concern itself with conducting a cross-theoretic contrast on them. This kind of contrast is done with the aim of finding out the similarities and differences between the two theories in addition to identifying some aspects of convergence between them.

In association with aims mentioned above, it is hypothesized that the Arabic version of the theory has the precedence over that of English in proposing a completely fully-fledged theory of Coherence and Cohesion. Furthermore, both Arabic and English versions of the theory make use of the main types of cohesive devices: Reference, Substitution, Ellipsis, Conjunctions, and Lexical cohesion. Still, the two versions show remarkable differences in their employment of these devices. The procedures to be followed for achieving the aims of the study and testing its hypotheses are as follows: (1) reviewing the theory in English, (2) reviewing the theory in Arabic, and (3) cross-theoretically contrasting the two theories.

Cohesion and Coherence in English

Cohesion and Coherence theory in English has been formulated throughout the work of one of the major figures of London School of linguistics, M.A.K Halliday, who co-authored his famous account on this theory with R. Hassan. Since then, the study of Cohesion and Coherence as well as the relationship that brings them together have seen several developments and treatments, which are to be tackled here taking into account the Hallidayan perspective upon which the theory is based.

Theoretical Background

According to McGee (2009:212), although the terms ‘cohesion’ and ‘coherence’ tend to crop up together in the literature, the relationship between the two is a contested one: Halliday and Hassan (1976: 2) assure that cohesion creates coherence, while Gramley and pätzold(1992:184) argue that coherence leads to cohesion. According to Oconnor (1996: 84) "to be coherent, texts need to make sense to the reader". However, many writers and scholars would accept the idea that the use of lexical in cohesive ties does not, necessarily, make a text more coherent, or ‘better’ than another. As McGee(2009:212)points out, a text lacking lexical cohesive ties may be better organized, or the points may have a better support than a text with more lexical ties. In their (1976: 4) seminal work "Cohesion in English", Halliday and Hassan argue that cohesion is a semantic concept, indicating meaning relations in text. Moreover, cohesion falls into two broad areas: grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. Halliday and Hassan’s (1976) account is mainly concerned with a comprehensive illustration of the abovementioned types of cohesive ties. Halliday and Hassan define cohesion as "the set of possibilities that exist in the language for making text hang together" (ibid: 18). Cohesion, in general, is a strategy a language offers to create texts. It refers to the ties and connections that exist within a text (Salkie, 1995: 12). A text may be oral or written and it may consist of one sentence or more. In Halliday and Hassan’s (1985:4) words, cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text.

Thus, for Halliday and Hassan and other authors in the Hallidayan tradition, the organizational structure of a text is composed of chains of relations that bring forth items in the text and those relations are realized by means of exploiting cohesive devices. Consequently, coherence is being created in this way from the Hallidayan point of view, which can be clearly tracked down and originated in the pioneering

formulation of Al-Jirjani Theory of Al-Nadhm (for more details, see (3) below). It seems that cohesion and coherence are two distinct interrelated concepts that incorporate textuality which in turn distinguishes written or spoken texts from random collections of sentences or utterances. Textuality of texts is thought to be formed by realizing several factors. Therefore, the context of situation and its features, linguistic context, context and meaning, text, and texture factors are discussed (See 2.2-2.6below) prior to illustrating cohesion and coherence as well as the relation between the two.

Context of Situation

Contemporary Western and ancient Arab scholars have thoroughly investigated the concept of "Context". Despite the various perspectives these scholars have adopted in examining the term context, they do generally admit that context have an essential part in determining the meanings of words and sentences since words, according to them, always occur in a context. In other words, this context contributes to the configuration of words (Belhaf et. al.,2014:222).Furthermore, context is based on the associating situation in which an utterance or a sentence is uttered or written. In this regard, context has been divided into two kinds, a linguistic context and a non-linguistic one, perhaps conventionally called "situational context". The linguistic context is simply the language surrounding the sentence or utterance; it is the specific language forms that come before as well as what comes after a particular feature we might be looking at. Situational context, however, as the name would imply, relates to the surrounding situation in which the utterance is produced. This includes the location, the audience, as well as what is actually occurring before and during the uttering of the utterance. They have taken an interest in both kinds of context by studying, researching, and considering them as effective factors to send the linguistic message. Likewise, Al-Jirjani took interest in context centuries ago, and emphasized the significance of context in the process of communicating the meaning as well as achieving comprehension, along with its importance in '*Al-Nadhm*' (See (3.1) below).

Features of Context of Situation

More recently, Halliday (1989:12), seemingly echoing Al-Jirjani's steps, introduces three distinguishing features of situational context:

1. The Field of Discourse: refers to what is happening, to the nature of the social action that is taking place, what is it that the participants are engaged in, in which the language figures as some essential component?
2. The Tenor of Discourse: refers to who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their statuses and roles: what kinds of role relationship obtain among the participants, including permanent and temporary relationships of one kind or another, both the types of speech role that they are taking on in the dialogue and the whole cluster of socially significant relationships in which they are involved?
3. The Mode of Discourse: refers to what part the language is playing, what it is that participants are expecting the language to do for them in that situation: the symbolic organization of the text, the status that it has, and its function in the context, including the channel (is it spoken or written or some combination of the two) and also the rhetorical mode, what is being achieved by the text in terms of such categories as persuasive, expository, didactic, and the like.

Halliday (Ibid) thinks that the description of any text or discourse (written or spoken) in terms of a simple conceptual framework of three headings, the field, the tenor, and the mode suffices determining the context of situation in which the text (discourse) functions. Additionally, these concepts, according to him, help readers interpret the social context of that text, the environment in which meanings are being exchanged (Ibid: 14). Surprisingly, these three characteristic elements of situational context indeed bear a resemblance to *Al-Maqam*(situation) in the view of Al-Jirjani, since situation to him as well as to other Arab rhetoricians is embracing the circumstances of performing the situation as pointed out later in this work.

Hence, after the writer/ linguist fits in utterances with meaning, contextual relationships play a vital role in the whole process of configuring meaning. Al-Jirjani (2007:101) might be one of the earliest scholars who stress this fact as he argues that “ Attaching utterances and other textual and discursal elements is indispensable and a prior step in the process of applying meanings of grammar and order, which remains incomplete until the speech is attached one to another”. If we take into consideration Al-Jirjani's definition of ‘*Al-Nadhm*’ ,in his theory under this same name, as “attaching speech one to another” it becomes evident that context assumes a crucial part in identifying how discursal elements are attached, words are composed as well as sentences, the meanings are interrelated, and the denotations take place.

In the Hallidayan perspective, the context is seen as an interpretation-related phenomenon that is concerned with ideology, and the entire external world. Thus, context can be said to be a defining characteristic of the school of London and the Hallidayans due to the great attention given to context by these scholars. The school's pioneer and Halliday's teacher, Firth (1957:195)) is the first who concerns himself with pondering context. Firth considers context as "a combination of processes that characterize both the speaker and listeners' performance of the communicative functions of language". Consequently, he (Ibid) classifies context into two major types, linguistic context and context of situation. According to Firth it is the linguistic context that endows the word or the phrase with a particular meaning or textual feature in a conversation or a text. Furthermore, it rules out any further irrelevant meanings that might be suggested in some other discursal or textual conversations (Ibid). Thus, the other type of context needs to be further investigated in order to differentiate the two types of contexts set by Firth, on the one hand, and to elucidate the significance, function and part played by each on the other hand (See 2.3 and 2.4 below).

Linguistic Context

Linguistic context, alternatively labeled as co-text, which refers to the linguistic textual and discursal units coming before and/ or after a certain linguistic unit in a text or a discourse. Linguistic context is defined by Al-Kholi (1982:156) as “the linguistic elements that surround and accompany a sound, a phoneme, a word, a phrase, or a sentence”. Therefore, linguistic context is seen as an event expressed through speech which is composed of speech sounds uttered by speakers. Visualizations of possible intentions and goals usually introduce speakers' utterances. Consequently, the event as well as visualization are basic to the process of building up and structuring sentences and discourses. Moreover, it is the ultimate outcome of placing any linguistic unit or a word within a distinct stretch of words (a sentence) where words are contextualized

and harmonized with other words which grant them a particular and an exact meaning. For this reason, contextualized meanings differ from lexical meanings (i.e. the meanings provided by dictionaries), because lexical meanings found in the dictionaries might have many distinct possibilities, while the contextualized meanings usually come with a limited range of possibilities and special characteristics (Halliday, 1961: 22).

Al-Jirjani (2007:96) frequently talks over and argues about the linguistic context, dedicating much of his work to this field of study (See 3.3). In this regard, he points out “The linguistic essence of any word or a textual unit is to be retrieved from a complex network of interrelationships with the other words” (Ibid). Such interrelationships require a clear identification and approaching according to certain rules and principles. Furthermore, taking the contextualization of words into consideration is a decisive factor in figuring out their precise meanings and senses. Thus, this discussion asserts the need to examine the relationship obtaining between meaning and context, which is the major concern of the following sub-section.

Context and Meaning

Following Firth, Ullmann (1963) and Halliday (1985) Firth's prominent students, have directed their researching efforts toward the field of context by elaborating the work of their teacher on context and its relationship with meaning. Ullmann, for example, cited Firth's ideas which assert the fact that the theory of context has come up with the measures required for detailing and clarifying meanings by keeping to what his teacher labeled placing facts within recurring series of contexts. In other words, one context implicate the yet to come context in some kind of recursive complicated network. Hence, Each distinct context forms a part of a larger context, acquiring its exact position within the larger context, which is called by Halliday (1994:10) 'culture context'.

Additionally, Ullmann (1963) stressed the fact that the term ‘context’ is a multi-dimensional term that has been used recently to identify various meanings while the only meaning that concerns our study is in fact its conventional meaning. The role of context in the interpretation of a linguistic unit has long been considered, even if from different perspectives: from the view that regards context as an extralinguistic feature, to the position that meaning is only meaning in use and therefore, pragmatics and semantics are inseparable. Still, context, both linguistic and situational, is often considered as an a posteriori factor in linguistic analysis. In other words, “the complete meaning of a word is always contextual, and no study of meaning apart from a complete context can be taken seriously” (Firth 1935: 37). Thus, if a convergence is made between Ullmann and Firth's notions and what is stated by Al-Jirjani, it would be obvious that both share the same estimation of the value of the context, and both realize its role in clarifying the meanings of words and sentences through their positions. They also correspond in dividing it into two kinds, a linguistic one that concerns with utterances and a non-linguistic one that concerns with the non-linguistic elements or what is known as the situational context (See 2.2 above).

Text

A text is a unified semantic unit which refers to any spoken or written passage of whatever length (Djamila, 2010: 11). Halliday and Hassan (1976: 1).call it ‘super –

sentence', since it assumes a rather distinct grammatical form that is distinguished from that of the abstract units employed in linguistic analysis like the clause or sentence. They (Ibid:2) indicate that "a text is not restricted to number of sentences" rather it is "REALIZED BY or encoded in sentences". This reason leads Van Dijk (1977:03) to suggest that utterances should be reconstructed in terms of a larger unit, i.e. that of TEXT. He (Ibid) adds that the term TEXT is to be used to "denote the abstract theoretical construct underlying what is usually called a DISCOURSE. Those utterances which can be assigned textual structure are thus acceptable ".Consequently, a text is termed a text only when "utterances are restructured in accordance with larger units where they tend to be acceptable discourses of language" and "if they are really well-formed and interpretable". The meaning and unity of text are well represented by the textual features of (well-formedness and interpretability), which in turn refer to writer's preferences of certain linguistic patterns to transfer their ideas, thoughts and beliefs to people. "People "here refers to the readers or listeners who are supposed to decode or interpret the transferred intended meanings in the form of texts and discourses. In this respect, Widows (2007:04) points out that "any piece of language that has been produced for a communicative purpose is to be recognized as a TEXT. In other words, getting or delivering a message across is the central function of the text.

Thus, any text can be explained in terms of three important characteristics: first, **textis considered as a meaning**, i.e. although it looks as it is made of words and sentences, it is really made of meanings; second, it has to be coded in something in order to be communicated, but as a thing in itself, a text is essentially a **semantic unit**; and third, we need to see the text as a **product** and the text as **process** and to keep both these aspects in focus (Halliday: 1994:13).

Still, a full understanding of the text might not be achieved until the texture of that text or any text in general is reached.

Texture

Halliday and Hassan (1976:02) assert that "what distinguishes a text from non-text is its texture". Texture is essentially provided and constructed by the cohesive relations (represented by cohesive textual devices that are discussed in 2.6below) that are found among textual elements of texts. In other words, the presence of the cohesive textual devices in a linguistic stretch which consists of more than one sentence contributes to the whole unity of this text and grants it its texture. It seems that texture is a kind of meaning relations as Hassan (1984:71) puts it. She (Ibid) explains that the texture of a text is manifested by certain kinds of semantic relations between its individual messages. The feature of texture is relevant to the listener's perception of coherence, she adds. Therefore, handling texture must in turn tackle those relations or ties. The term tie implies a relation, consequently it is the most important concept in tackling the texture notion. Since the interpretation of two sentences (that form a text or a part of it) as a whole, for instance, is highly dependent on the interpretation of those linguistic ties (Djamila, 2010: 11).

Hence, Texture , according to (Martin, 2001: 35), is one aspect of the study of **coherence**, which can be thought of as the process whereby a reading position is naturalized by texts for listener/readers. And this texture is provided by the cohesive relations or ties which combine two sentences or more than two. A tie on the other hand

is a single instance of cohesion, or an occurrence of a pair of cohesively related items. The concept of 'tie' makes it possible to analyze a text in terms of its cohesive properties and gives a systematic account of its patterns of texture. It can further show the relationship between cohesion and the organization of written texts into sentences and paragraphs. However, cohesion occurs in texts where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another

Halliday and Hassan's (1976) Cohesion Taxonomy

In their classic study of cohesion in English, Halliday and Hassan (1976:72) define cohesion as "what occurs when the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it". Halliday and Hassan (1976:75-84) recognize five types of cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. The first four types belong to the category of grammatical cohesion. As for Lexical cohesion it refers to the relationships between any lexical item and some previously occurring lexical item in the text quite independently of the grammatical category of the items in question. These classificatory categories are treated below.

Grammatical Devices

Halliday and Hassan (1976) produce their taxonomy of the types of cohesive relationship in a way which can formally be established within a text. Therefore, the main cohesive devices which bind a text together are of two main categories: grammatical and lexical devices. The kinds of grammatical cohesive ties discussed by Halliday (1978:22) and later by Osibanwo (2005:55) are reference, substitution, Ellipsis and conjunction.

Reference

In some earlier studies such as that of Lyons (1968:404), the relationship which holds between words is called *reference*. This device incorporates utilizing language by speakers to refer to things and thoughts. What is referred to may fall within or outside a text. As for Halliday and Hassan (1976: 25), they argue that co-referential forms are forms which, instead of being interpreted semantically in their own right, make reference to something else for their interpretation. When the interpretation is within the text, this is an "endophoric" relation while in a situation where the interpretation of the text lies outside the text, in the context of situation, the relationship is "exophoric". However, exophoric relations play no part in textual cohesion. Endophoric relations on the other hand, form cohesive ties within the text. Endophoric relations are also of two types, those which look back in the text for their interpretation are anaphoric relations while those which look forward in the text for their interpretation are cataphoric relations (Ibid). To illustrate, we can consider the following examples as instances of reference.

1. There was an orange on the Table. So I ate it.
2. The woman prepared the dinner. She used a lot of seasoning. (Salkie: 1995: 20)

In the first sentence above, 'It' refers back to 'an orange' while 'She' in the second sentence refers back to 'the woman'. This kind of references is referred to as an anaphora (i.e. looking backward). The other kind of reference, where the pronoun is

given first and then kept in suspense as to its identity, which is revealed later, is known as cataphora (i.e. looking forward).

3. He was aggressive. My Boss.

4. He made tremendous impact. The Provost (Gramley and pätzold, 1992: 145).

Referring expressions help to unify the text and create economy because they save writers from unnecessary repetition.

Substitution

In an attempt to illustrate Halliday and Hassan's (1976) account of 'substitution', Salkie (1995: 35) states that "there are some special words in English which contribute to cohesion by substituting for words that have been already used by means of the substitution cohesive relation. "This relation resides mainly in the wording rather than in the meaning. This stipulates a principal rule: the substituting unit has a structural function that is similar to the one actualized by the substituted units or items. Three types of substitution can be identified: nominal, verbal and clausal.

5. I have eaten your meal. I must get you another one (Nominal substitution)

6. Do you play games? Yes I do (Verbal Substitution)

7. Does she say there is going to be a nationwide strike? Yes she says so. (Clausal Substitution)(Fowler and Aaron, 1998: 880).

Ellipsis

Ellipsis is defined as an omission of a linguistic element. It can be thought of as a zero tie or nothing owing to the fact that the tie is left unsaid. Yet, what is left unsaid is nevertheless understood. The idea of omitting part of sentences on the assumption that an earlier sentence will make the meaning clear is known as ellipsis. Ellipsis can be verbal, nominal, or clausal. For example:

8. Sade bought some oranges and Su some guavas (Verbal ellipsis).

9. Three members of staff went there and yet another three (Nominal ellipsis)

10. I left my meal in the kitchen and someone came in and ate it up without saying a word to me. I wish I could find out who (Clausal ellipsis)

In 8, the verb 'bought' has been elided, In 9, the noun 'members' has been elided while in 10, 'who' replaces 'someone' and the clause 'came in ...' has been elided.

Conjunction

Halliday and Hassan (1976:80) maintain that conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily intended for reaching out into the preceding or following text but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in a discourse. Halliday (1976) recognizes four types of conjunction. They are additive, adversative, causal and temporal.

Lexical Cohesion

Halliday and Hassan (1976:82) argue that lexical cohesion is established through the structure of lexis or vocabulary. Lexical cohesion encompasses reiteration and collocation. Also, it involves using the characteristics and features of words as well as the group relationship among them to achieve cohesion. Some words are used repeatedly whereas other words are used as umbrella terms under which some other words co-exist. Hence, there are two main types of lexical devices. These are

Reiteration and collocation. **Reiteration** implies saying or doing something several times. As a lexical device for achieving cohesion, it is manifest in three ways. Repetition, Superordinate/Hyponym and Synonyms or Near Synonyms.

Repetition: I met some young ladies at the conference. The ladies were good looking.

Superordinate/Hyponym: I bought plenty of fruits yesterday at the market. These fruits are oranges, pineapples and pawpaw.

Synonym: I was served with a good meal yesterday at the party. The food was delicious.

Collocations: This is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly occur. It also involves pairs of words drawn from the same order series.

Coherence in the Hallidayan Sense

Coherence in general is the quality of an effective text that helps readers see relations among ideas and move easily from one idea to the next (Fowler and Aaron; 1998:816). As Halliday (2003: 212) asserts, some basic steps or procedures should be taken into consideration for achieving text coherence :

- Organizing effective sentences.
- Using parallel structures.
- Repeating or restating words and word groups.
- Using pronouns.
- Being consistent in nouns, pronouns adverbs.
- Using transitional expressions that add or show sequence (Ibid).

It seems that the aforementioned ways of actualizing text coherence have so many things in common with what is raised by Al-Jirjani centuries ago as both scholars stress the importance of using and reusing, the repetition of words and lexical items as well as the employment of pronouns and paralleled structures and expressions. Such similarities and features of convergence require a full understanding and careful treatment of Al-Jirjani's work, i.e. Al-Nadhm Theory, which is the central concern of the following section.

Cohesion and Coherence in Arabic

Arab linguistic tradition is one of the significant traditions in the history of linguistics. However, some of its aspects are still unexplored (Al-Liheibi, 1999:1). Arab scholars' contributions, particularly those of Al-Jirjani, to the study of the linguistic phenomenon of Cohesion and Coherence represent a case of focal concern in this regard. Many Arab scholars stress the significance of the neighbouring words and sentences that precede and/or follow the text or discourse in comprehending the meaning of that text or discourse. Thus, contextually mentioned earlier in this paper works as a starting point in the comprehension of any kind of discourse. Al-Jirjani (1010: 44) explains the version of the Arabic theory of meaning under the name of 'Al-Nadhm Theory', i.e. 'theory of cohesion and coherence'. According to him, this theory is based on the unity of discourse at different levels: syntactic, semantic and pragmatic ones. Thus, he (Ibid) argues that there are two types of context: the linguistic context (neighbouring words الجارات) and context of situation (Al-Maqam المقام). He adds "an utterance is meaningful only when it coheres with other words in the context and relates to its social context". Consequently, the intended meaning is derived from such types of 'cohesive devices'

which relate parts of communication to each other. As such, he focuses on language use rather than usage.

It seems that Al-Jirjani has attempted to produce a fully-fledged theory of cohesion and coherence, which has come to be known to his followers and modern Arab grammarians as (Alsabk/ cohesion) السبك and (Alhabk/ coherence).

Theoretical Background of Al-Nadhm Theory

Al-Jirjani can take the credit for the expansion of the concept *Al-Nadhm* into a comprehensive theory for the analysis of Arabic sentences despite the fact that other linguists before him have used the same term. Ibn al-Muqaffa` (757/1960) argues that the essence of *Al-Nadhm* is the placing of words in their exact positions. Al-Jahiz (869/1961) has written a book on the subject entitled *Nadhm al-Qur'an* (The Construction of the Qur'an), but this book is lost. The literal meaning of the word *Nadhm* is defined as follows in *Lisan Al-'Arab* (one of the largest Arabic dictionaries):

Nadhm means composing ... The term nadhamtu means I arranged pearls[to make a necklace]. Its synonym is the word tandhim. Both can be employed to signal the meaning of writing poetry ... further, all the things placed or brought together alongside with something else belong with the same heading (Ibn Mandu'ur; 1956 vol. 12, 578).

Arab rhetoricians have come up with the term *Nadhm* in an attempt to formulate the right way of analyzing Arabic sentences, chiefly the Quranic verses. Arab rhetoricians consider the Holy Qur'an as an elevated or ideal form of the Arabic language, which should be investigated basically for religious purposes, so that the results and outcomes of such a study of the Holy Qur'an can be applied to the investigation and the analysis of other Arabic eloquent textual units found in poetry or prose. Al-Jirjani's aim is to produce a comprehensive predominant theoretical model of Arabic grammar that prevails in Arabic linguistics at that time through recognizing the efforts and works of the linguists before him to clarify and illustrate the interdependence quality of the linguistic items that form the sentence. Furthermore, he stresses the dire need for a further explanation of such interdependence relations that hold between linguistic units. The following statement ascertains his (1984: 412-413) tendency in this regard:

Perhaps that a language user who produces speech is like the craftsman who has pieces of gold or pieces of silver all placed together in one place, melting them down and fusing them so that they can become a perfect amalgam. That is why if you say "Zayd hit 'Amr on Friday very hard so as to discipline him", only one conception is indicated by this harmonized combination of words, which is the sole meaning of the whole group of words rather than various meanings in terms of what might other reader/listeners suppose.

Thus, he proposes his prominent theory, *Al-Nadhm* in his compilation of *Dala'il Al-E'jaaz* (*Signs of Inimitability*). This theory represents an indispensable reference with high credibility for Arab researchers who are concerned with rhetorical, critical, linguistic, and syntactic issues ever since its advancement.

Al-Jirjani's (Al-Maqam المقام)/ Context of Situation

Al-Kholi (1982:259). defines situational context as “the context setting in which communication occurs between two speakers. It comprises the conversational spatial and timing features, the relationship that brings the speakers altogether, the shared values of the conversationalists, and the conversation, which have already been made”. Thus, such a context is of a non-linguistic type that is concerned mainly with the environment surrounding the spoken act such as time, place, relationships, and values. It is closely related to *Al-Maqam idea*, i.e. situation which is highly stressed by classic Arab scholars, particularly, rhetoricians such as Al-Jirjani. Al-Jirjani(2007:71) frequently addresses *Al-Maqam المقام* the (situation) concept , especially when highlighting information or a particular story. So, he further elucidates that uttering an expression like "Subhaan Allah" - Glory Be to Allah- might be taken as a sin if it is uttered in a sin-related-situation. Such analytical instances advanced by Al-Jirjani in an attempt to establish that the crucial importance of *Al-Maqam* i.e. the situation to the process of transferring the meaning, and expressing it sufficiently to make sure that comprehension is definitely achieved. It is noteworthy that the meaning could turn upside down when ignored. It seems that Al-Jirjani precedes or, at least, inspires the work of Halliday's inspiring scholar Firth (1957) with whom The term "Context of situation" is often associated and the one who is regarded by many as the first who thinks of meaning in terms of the situation in which language is used.

Al-Jirjani's(Neighbouring Words الجارات) Linguistic Context

According to Belhaf et. al.(2014: 227) linguistic context, which is often alternatively termed as co-text, refers to the linguistic units preceding and/ or following a particular linguistic unit in a text. This idea might be based on earlier ones like that of Al-Kholi (1982:156) who defines linguistic context as “the linguistic surrounding that embrace a sound, a phoneme, a word, a phrase, or a sentence.” In this vein, it can be considered as a spoken event that is based on the sounds uttered by the speaker. Usually, the utterance is preceded by a visualization of what the utterance could intend. On the basis of the event along with the visualization, the sentences and oral phrases are built. In addition, it is the consequence of using the word within the order of the sentence when words contextualize/ become consistent with other words which give them a specific and a precise meaning. Therefore, the meaning in the context is in contrast with the meaning presented in the dictionary, because meanings in dictionaries can be various with many possibilities, while the contextual meaning on the other hand is a meaning with a limited range of possibilities and particular characteristics that cannot be diversified (Halliday, 1961:22).

Al-Jirjani (2007:96) frequently investigates the linguistic context, focusing his analytical efforts on the issue. He argues that “the word essence and its real values are reflected through its relationships with the other words”. However, there is a must to identify these relationships according to particular rules, principles, and approaches. Further, it is necessary to consider the meaning of the words in context; otherwise, speech does not make sense.

Context and Meaning

Al-Jirjani thinks that a writer should arrange his/her words in compliance with the syntactical rules and regulations. He/she is also required to cherish the fact that it is the

meaning what achieves *Al-Nadhm* and not the utterance. He (2007:102) elaborates on this view saying that:

“ In Al-Nadhm, composing utterances relies on the meaning, where Parts of speech are ordered in any utterance in accordance with the way the meanings are ordered inside the mind of the speaker/writer. Whenever utterances are produced with no distinct meanings, that is, they are uttered as mere sounds then they will not influence the mind of the hearer/reader. Moreover, “Once the process of ordering the meanings inside the mind is finished, minding the arrangement of the utterances is no longer required. Because, they will be already ordered on the basis of the arrangement of meanings. knowing the spots of the meanings in the mind necessarily implies knowing the utterances that speech denotes.”

Al-Nadhm to Al-Jirjani does require the presence of the meaning; yet, this does not necessarily stipulate Al-Jirjani's ignorance of the utterance role. It is clear that *Al-Nadhm* cannot be visualized without considering the utterance. In fact, *Al-Nadhm* is attained and actualized by writers/speakers through harmonizing meaning and utterance. Earlier studies conducted on meaning by the London linguists take into consideration this classic fact, stressing the view that any linguistic item that makes no sense is not to be taken as syntactically correct one; and Halliday is one of the prominent figures of this school reflecting its basic theoretical fundamentals in this regard. This can be taken as a case of convergence between the Hallidayan school of thought and the classic Arabic school of thought headed by Al-Jirjani.

Text

Al-Jirjani (1984) believes that testing the force of the sentence is one of the most important principles upon which *Al-Nadhm* is based. This testing or judging process must consider the entire text as a whole rather than some parts of it. This is evident through his words:

It is true that you might face some well constructed texts [as parts], ... however, you cannot pass a judgment saying that the writer is good and well-informed until you read the whole text up to the end (ibid: 88).

He thinks that text should be seen as a very intricate precise construct which is composed of psychological meanings and variable linguistic structures that are blended within one unified form. This very idea is deeply echoed by what has been stated in Van Dijk's theory of the intricate fabricated network of texts or (texture) of texts (discussed in 3.5 below).

Texture

It has been expressed earlier in this research that Halliday and Hassan (1976:02) point out that “what distinguishes a text from non-text is its texture”. According to (Djamila, 2010: 11) texture is said to be provided by the cohesive relations. That is to say, the presence of the linguistic features in a passage or a text of more than one sentence contributes in the total unity of this passage and gives it texture (Ibid).

In *Al-Nadhm* Theory, Al-Jirjani emphasizes the vital role played by Word order, stating that the internal structure is solely realized through the presence of inter-textual and intra-textual relationships that bring words together to form texts and discourses. It

seems that even if words are connected, linked or constructed, such processes and the like will be useless if we do not use a noun as the subject or the object of a verb, or relate two nouns by means of predication relationship. *Al-Nadhm* is mainly about the construction of speech to comply with the requirements and arrangements of grammar, and it also abides and functions according to its regulations and principles. Thus, *Al-Nadhm* heavily draws on opting out the right choice from a set of linguistic options that are available at the speaker's/writer's disposal. In addition, systematic verbal units and items have the function of providing the relevant linguistic context with syntactical-rules-controlled information. In the work of early Arab grammarians there are only a few examples where there is specific reference to semantic relations. It is possible to see a shift from total absence of treatments of semantic phenomena in Sibawayh's Book to an advanced interest in rhetorical works such as those of al-Jirjani. Sentence analysis for Sibawayh is not more than explaining the parsing signs.

Taxonomy of Cohesion Levels

The nature of cohesion in Arabic might have something in common with its English counterpart; however, it differs from English language texts in terms of the components employed to signal syntactic or semantic ties that hold among the linguistic forms in Arabic texts. Nevertheless, cohesive ties in Arabic, according to Al-Jirjani, are taxonomized according to three fundamental levels; namely: phonological, lexical and grammatical ones.

Phonological Level of Cohesion

Arab scholars in general and Al-Jirjani in particular think that writers/ speakers have three basic devices (as mentioned above) at their disposal to produce text/discourse. However, studies have focused on the formulation and refining of the first device. That is why, Arabic rhetoric has been preoccupied with configuring and elucidating different types of phonological ties in Arabic texts/discourses such as: homonymy, paronymasia, alliteration, identical rhyme, assonance, and metre (For more details, see (Al-Liheibi:1999, Shaheen: 2012, and Belhaf: 2014). In brief, at this level, ancient Arab rhetoricians, basically Al-Jirjani, have concerned themselves with what is nowadays called phonological cohesion in Arabic prose and poetry texts.

Al-Tajnees التجنيس/Jinas الجناس (Homonymy)

This phonological device has different titles according to various Arab rhetoricians; yet Ibnulmu'taz (cited in Al-Kholi, 1982:100) can be considered as the first Arab rhetorician to identify and define this concept stating that "it is found when two words have the same pronunciation". Al-Jirjani (2007:88) distinguishes three types of Jinas.

1. When two words are considered in a homonymy relation of derivation: فاقم وجهك (للدين القيم).

11-But set thou thy face to the right Religion.

2. A second type is that which signals a semantic derivational homonymy relation such as: (أرضيتم بالحياة الدنيا من الآخرة).

12- Ye cling heavily to the earth? Do ye prefer the life of this world to the Hereafter?

3. The third type of Jinas is mainly found in prose where the two homonyms are mentioned at the beginning and end of sentence. (وتخشى الناس والله أحق أن تخشاه)

13-*Thou didst fear the people, but it is more fitting that thou shouldst fear Allah.*

Al-Sajja'a (Assonance) السجع

Al-Jarim and Ameen (2011:516) indicate that there are some phonological ties employed in highly cohesive texts and discourses, particularly the Holy Quran. It is noteworthy that writing or talking in Arabic in a rhymed way is followed by intervals or colons. Rhymed prose comes in three distinct forms:

- a. In this type, there are two or more intervals rhymed but with different metres: (مالكم لا ترجون لله وقارا وقد خلقكم أطوارا)

14-*What is the matter with you, that ye place not your hope for kindness and long-suffering in Allah. Seeing that it is He that has created you in diverse stages?*

- b. Iso-colon type in which one of two items has the same rhyme and metre. (إن) بعد الكدر صفوا وبعد المطر صفوا

15-*After each storm, there will be calm.*

- c. Parallel type (Al-Mutawazi) is the third type which is characterized by having two items (clauses, phrases) with the same rhyme and metre. (فيها) سرر موضوعة وأكواب مرفوعة

16-*Therein will be Thrones (of dignity), raised on high. Goblets placed (ready).*

Lexical Level of Cohesion

Al-Lihei (1999:231) argues that the semantic relationships combine and group sentential elements show that Arab rhetoricians associate sentence analysis with lexical and grammatical meanings. This point in particular, meaning in general and meaning of grammar in particular, is the one which has drawn the attention of Al-Jirjani. Al-Jirjani (2007:300) thinks that one cannot know the position of words unless one knows their meanings; the writer or speaker's aim should be to use thoughts in order to deduce the meaning of the sentence. Consequently, lexical cohesion forms a cornerstone in Arab rhetoricians' formulation of the Sabk (cohesion) and Habk (coherence) theory. The lexical cohesion is realized in Arabic by means of two basic cohesive devices, namely, reiteration and collocation which are characterized by their interconnectivity on the lexical level.

Repetition (A-L-Tikrrar) التكرار

Words or lexical items (words, phrases, clauses) are repeated either partially or totally.

- 17- (word) سأعزف إن عزفت عن التصابي إذا ما لاح شيب

- 18- (clause) إن مع العسر يسرا فإن مع العسر يسرا

- 19- (phrase) (كلا سوف تعلمون، ثم كلا سوف تعلمون)

Collocation (Al-Tadham) / Al-Musahaba Almu'jamiya (المصاحبة المعجمية)

Shaheen (2012:80) assures that this kind of lexical cohesive ties received a great deal of attention in the Arab modern and classical treatment of the theory of cohesion and coherence. It has various sub-types:

a. Antithesis (Al-Muqabalah المقابلة)

Muqabalah is actualized in Arabic whenever there are two words with congruent content but rather different or contrasted meanings (Ibid: 81).

فليضحكوا قليلا وليكثروا كثيرا / (فأما من أعطى واتقى وصدق بالحسنى فسنيسره لليسرى وأما من بخل واستغنى وكذب بالحسنى فسنيسره للعسرى).

20-We shall facilitate the path to bliss. And believeth in goodness; We shall surely ease him to the Easing. But he who is greedy miser and thinks himself self-sufficient. And disbelieveth in goodness; Unto him therefore We shall Indeed make easy the path to hardship.

b. System Congruence (agreement) Al-Mutabaqa المطابقة

Al-Jarim and Ameen (2011:526) state that actualizing Mutabaqa in Arabic is exercised through the employment of opposites, i.e. two opposite lexical items of the same class, nouns for instance

(وتحسبهم أيقاظا وهم رقود) 21-Thou wouldst have deemed them awake, whilst they were asleep

Or two verbs with contrasting connotations, as in:

(تؤتي الملك من تشاء وتنزع الملك ممن تشاء وتعز من تشاء وتذل من تشاء).

22- Oh Allah! Possessor of the kingdom, You give the kingdom to whom You will, and You take the kingdom from whom You will, and You endue with honour whom You will, and You humiliate whom You will.

c. Lexical Harmonizing of Peers (Mura'atilnadeer مراعاة النظير)

Two or more lexically and contextually related lexical items are placed together, as in (الشمس والقمر بحسبان).

23 - The sun and the moon follow courses (exactly) computed

Grammatical Level of Cohesion

It has been previously stated that Al-Jirjani's theory of 'Al-Nadhm' is based on considering syntax and knowing its methods. In this regard, Al-Jirjani (2007:3) assures that 'Al-Nadhm' circulates around framing speech as syntax requires, following its rules and principles, and knowing its approaches that are put in such a way that its rules wouldn't be broken. In this regard different important grammatical ties are distinguished by Arab grammarians and rhetoricians. These grammatical ties play a central role in producing highly cohesive texts/ discourses, the most important ones of which are:

a. Fronting (Attaqdeem التقديم) and Postponing (Attakheer التأخير)

Al-Duri (2006:20) argues that Arabic sentence is basically built on placing certain parts of speech in very neatly chosen positions. In other words, ordering words within sentence is purposefully-oriented job. Thus, fronting and postponement are being appealed to for emphatic and rhetorical persuasive intentions and goals.

b. Ellipsis (Al-Idhmar الإضمار)

Ellipsis is a process that is precise in its way, eloquent where used correctly and like magic. In the case of ellipsis, not mentioning is more eloquent than mentioning (Al-Jirjani, 1984: 146). The rhetoricians' approach to ellipsis is characterized by heavy concentration on the rhetorical reasons that cause a speaker or writer to omit a given element or elements from a sentence.

Al-Liheibi (1999:224) indicates that this emphasis stems from the fact that rhetoricians are primarily concerned with the study of meaning; this has led them to believe that knowledge of what the speaker or writer wishes to convey by ellipsis is a basic principle

that needs to be investigated first, before any assumptions are made about which element or elements may have been elided. (Al-Jirjani 1984: 146) points out that ellipsis comes in different forms; therefore, there are elliptical clauses, phrases, words, letters and radicals in Arabic texts. Such textual indications signal a textual approach that goes beyond the sentence borders as elided sentences are implicated in the yet to come sentences.

This fact which is illustrated by Al-Jirjani reflects the fully-fledged level of linguistic theory introduced by Arab linguists' ages earlier to their modern western peers and therefore it verifies one the major hypothesis of the research regarding the classic Arab Rhetoricians precedence over their western modern peers.

Coherence in Al-Jirjani's Sense

The Arabic rhetorical theory stipulates that *Al-ta'alluq wa Al-tarabut* التعلق والترابط (association and bonding) hold between the meanings of individual words rather than between the individual words themselves. That is to say, the association between two words with no underlying meaning is not presupposed (Al-Liheibi, 1999:224). Rhetoricians stress the high significance of the psychological effects conveyed by the sentence. That is to say, they draw our attention to the fact that the sentence, whether written or spoken, is the outcome of the human mind where meanings are stored. The human mind, then, has the ability of showing and reflecting those meanings utilizing individual words. Hence, Arab rhetoricians believe that a whole complete unit of the text results from the semantic relations that hold between the components of the text. Coherence forms an essential part of Al-Jirjani's 'Al-Nadhm' Theory. It is one of the two premises upon which 'Al-Nadhm' Theory is built and advanced. Further, Al-Jirjani introduces significant linguistic pairs in his thorough treatment of Al-Habk الحبكة / Al-Inisijam الانسجام. These pairs include:

- Al-Nasj النسيج and Al-Ta'leef التأليف
- Siyagha الصياغة and Binaa' البناء
- Washii الوشي and Tahbeer التحبير

Al-nasj and Al-Ta'leef in Al-Jirjani's approach are said to match the modern term of texture proposed by Van Dijk (1977), while Siyagh and Bina'a are meant to stress the inter-textual relations established among lexical items in texts, i.e. the cohesive ties that form the internal structure of any text. As for Washii and Tahbeer terms they are oriented towards realizing the stylistic and aesthetic aspects of text and texture of that text. It seems that all the aforementioned elements represent in a way or another the coherence achievement factors in Al-Jirjani's terms of 'Al-Nadhm' Theory.

Cross-Theoretic Contrast

When contrasting the two theories with each other, several findings, whether similarities or differences, can be introduced

1. Arabic scholars, particularly Al-Jirjani, precede over English scholars in advancing the theory of cohesion and coherence.
2. The Arabic theory of cohesion and coherence has first been introduced by Arab grammarians and rhetoricians of the medieval ages; whereas in English it has been developed by both philosophers of language and linguists.
3. Both Arabic and English theories identify the main types of cohesive devices: reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction and lexical cohesion, to realize the coherent

function of texts. However, the two theories reveal that both Arabic and English languages show marked differences in their use of those devices.

4. Meaning constitutes an integral part of Al-Jirjani's *Al-Nadhm*, and meaning also seems to be favored by functional linguists, including Halliday, for whatever can be meaningfully incorrect cannot be considered structurally and syntactically correct.

5. Halliday and Hassan are concerned with the study of the linguistic meaning of texts, whether at the level of the sentence or at that of a group of sentences in a larger text. This is equivalent to the concern shown by Arab rhetoricians, who turned their attention to such linguistic meaning when they found that it was being neglected by grammarians.

6. In both English and Arabic, the context of situation and co-text contribute to the formulation of cohesion and coherence theory. However, Arabic scholars pioneer the concentration on these factors.

7. Both English and Arabic theories stress the significance of two basic levels of cohesion in forming cohesive texts: grammatical and lexical.

8. The Arabic Theory emphasizes the cohesive devices that repeat or explicitly point out the relation between linguistic items; while the English Theory tends to stress the less explicit conjunctions.

9. Substitution is one of the most frequent means of cohesion and coherence according to the English theory while it is a less frequent means of cohesion and coherence according to the Arabic Theory.

10. According to the Arabic Theory, Arabic frequently employs different forms of lexical cohesion, whereas the English Theory shows that English prefers exploiting various grammatical devices with distinct functions.

11. The Arabic Theory shows that text cohesion is more manifest in Arabic. In contrast, the English Theory reveals that English is more characterized with structural cohesion.

12. English modern theory of cohesion and coherence is based on two basic fundamental levels: grammatical and lexical. Alternatively, Arabic Al-Sabk and Al-Habk theory included in Al-Jirjani's *Al-Nadhm* asserts the significance of three-level approach of analysis, namely: phonological, lexical and grammatical.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the findings of the Cross-theoretic contrast conducted in the previous section, the following conclusions can be introduced:

1. The Arabic theory basically represented produces fully-fledged level (of three basic levels, namely: phonological, lexical and grammatical rather than two levels of lexical and grammatical cohesion and coherence) of linguistic theory introduced by Arab linguists, especially by Al-Jirjani, ages before their modern western peers and therefore it verifies the hypothesis of this study in this regard.

2. One of the major issues of convergence between classic Arabic and modern English versions of the theory is their employment of the main types of cohesive devices: Reference, Substitution, Ellipsis, Conjunctions, and Lexical cohesion. This confirms the validity of the hypothesis proposed by this study in this regard, namely: both Arabic and English versions of the theory make use of the main types of cohesive devices: Reference, Substitution, Ellipsis, Conjunctions, and Lexical cohesion.

3. The two versions show remarkable differences in their employment of these devices or their sub-devices. The Arabic version of the theory is preoccupied with certain subtypes of reference, for instance, leaving out other ones. This concluding remark verifies the second part of the hypothesis advanced by this study, namely: the two versions show remarkable differences in their employment of these devices. In fact, *Al-Nadhm* is produced and actualized by writers/speakers through harmonizing meaning and utterance. Studies conducted on meaning by the London linguists might have taken into consideration this classic Arabic theoretic fact, by excluding any meaningless item from their analysis and Halliday is one of the prominent figures of this school reflecting its basic theoretical fundamentals in this regard. This can be taken as another focal point of convergence between the Hallidayan school of thought and the classic Arabic school of thought headed by Al-Jirjani.

4. A third issue of convergence between the Arabic classic version of the theory and the English modern version of the theory shows that scholars of both schools agree upon the fundamental devices and linguistic components utilized in their analysis, namely: *linguistic context, Context of Situation, context and meaning, text, and texture*.

5. A fourth point of convergence is seen in the linguistic cohesive devices mentioned by both Al-Jirjani (centuries ago) and Halliday in terms of actualizing text coherence. Both scholars stress the importance of using and reusing and the repetition of words and lexical items as well as the employment of pronouns and paralleled structures and expressions. Such similarities and features affirm another issue of convergence with clear precedence of the Arab classical theory.

REFERENCES

- Al-Duri, M. (2006). *The Accurate Differences in the Rhetoric of Quran*. Beirut: Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyah.
- Al-Jahiz, A. U. (869/ 1961). *Al-Bayan wa Al-Tabyin*. Abdel-Salam Harun (ed.). Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanji Publication.
- Al-Jarim, A. and Ameen, M. (2011). *Al-Balagha Al-Wadiha*. Qum: Dar Al-Ghadeer Publishing.
- Al-Jirjani, A. (1010/1992). *Dala'il Al-I'jaaz*. Riyadh: Dar Al-Madani Publication.
- Al-Jirjani, A. (1010/2007). *Signs of Inimitability*. ed. M. R. Al-Dayah and F. Al-Dayah, Damascus: Dār al-Fikr.
- Al-Kholi, M. A. (1982). *Mujam Al-Lughah Al-Nadhari*, (Glossary of theoretical linguistics). Beirut: Maktabat Lubnān.
- Al-Liheibi, F. M. (1999). *Aspects of Sentence Analysis in the Arabic Linguistic Tradition, with Particular Reference to Ellipsis*. Durham: Durham University Press.
- Belhaf, A. F.; Al-Tamimi, O.M.; Attamimi, R. A. and Rock, D. (2014). *Aspects of Convergence between Abdul-Qaher Al-Jirjani's Theory of Al-Nadhm and Some Principles of the London School of Linguistics*. In *Language in India*. Vol.14, pp 212-241.
- Djamila, L. (2010). *Shifts in Translating Lexical Cohesion from Arabic into English*. Algeria. TiziWazo: Unpublished Thesis.
- Firth, J R. (1935). *The Technique of Semantics*. In *Transactions of the Philological Society*, pp. 36- 72.
- (1957). *Papers in Linguistics*. London: Longman.

- Fowler, R. H. and Aaron, J. E. (1998). *The Little Brown Handbook* (7thed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.
- Gramley, S. and pätzold, K. M.(1992). *A Survey of Modern English*. London and New York: Routledge Publishing.
- Halliday M. A. K. (1961). Categories of the theory of Grammar. In *Word*, vol. 17, No. 2
- (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.
- Halliday M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman
- (1985). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Hasan, R. (1984). Coherence and Cohesive Harmony. In J. Flood's (Ed.) *Understanding reading comprehension: Cognition, Language, and the Structure of Prose* (pp. 181-220). Newark. Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Ibn Mandu'ur, J. (1956). *Lisan al-Arab Vol. 12*. Beirut: Darilsadir.
- Ibn al-Muqaffa' (757/1960) *Al-Adab Al-kabīr*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanji Publication.
- Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGee, I. (2009). Traversing the Lexical Cohesion Minefield. In *ELT Journal*, No. 63, pp. 212-220.
- Salkie, R. (1995). *Text and Discourse Analysis* (1sted.). London: Routledge Publishing.
- Shaheen, A. F. (2012). *The Textual Principles in the Arab Critical and Rhetorical Heritage*. Iraq: University of Kufa/ Unpublished Thesis.
- Ullmann, S. (1963). *Words and Their Use*. London: Frederick Muller Publishing.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and Context. Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Widdowson, H.G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yowell, Y. A. (1998). *Topics in Translation with Special Reference to English and Arabic*. Benghazi: