

DOI 10.1515/linpo-2017-0011

Cohesive substitution in the Qur'ān

Yehudit Dror

Department of Arabic Language and Literature, University of Haifa
judror@gmail.com

Abstract: Yehudit Dror. *Cohesive substitution in the Qur'ān*. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences, PL ISSN 0079-4740, pp. 41-52

This article describes the use of *cohesive substitution* in the Qur'ān. In Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion, this term refers to the replacement of one syntactic item by another; this article asks several questions in this regard: How is *cohesive substitution* realized in the Qur'ān? What items does it replace? Why is it used? The study finds that there are only a few cases of *cohesive substitution* in the Qur'ān, and the nominal and verbal substitution operate in the Qur'ān as they do in English. In that language, the forms *one* and *the same* are employed for nominal substitution. In the Qur'ān the forms *'aḥad* "one" (sg. masc.), *'ihdā* "one" (sg. fem.) and *miṭlu ḍālika* "the same" can be considered equivalent to the English form *one* and *the same*. Verbal substitution in Arabic is realized by the verb *yaf'alu* "he will do," "he does" (and is not followed by the anaphoric pronoun *ḍālika* "that"), replacing only the verb without its complement. No occurrences of clausal substitutions were found because usually variations of anaphoric reference (e.g., *ḍālika* "that" or *ka-ḍālika* "like that") were used instead. From a pragmatic viewpoint, *cohesive substitution* is used to prevent repetition of the same word found in the immediately preceding clause.

Keywords: cohesion, substitution, Qur'ān, anaphoric pronoun

1. Introduction

In their monumental work, Halliday & Hasan (1976: 4) define the term *cohesion* as a semantic concept, which refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text. In every text there are certain cohesive ties or cohesive devices that signal the connections between sentences and help the sequence of sentences to hang together. These devices let the reader know how new information relates to old information and they provide a road map for the reader to follow in reconstructing the author's meaning. The essence of cohesion is the interpretation of one element depending on the other (Christiansen 2011: 16). Cohesive devices thus are usually linguistic elements that presuppose the existence of other elements appearing earlier in the text, later in the text or outside the text (Spiegel 1992: 57-59). Halliday and Hasan identified five distinct

cohesive devices through which connectedness in the discourse is achieved, which I outline only briefly here: (1) Reference: two linguistic elements are related in what they refer to; (2) Substitution: a linguistic element is not repeated but is replaced by a substitution item; (3) Ellipsis: one of the linguistic elements is omitted; (4) Conjunctions: a semantic relation is explicitly marked; (5) Lexical cohesion: two elements share a lexical field (Sanders & Pander 2006: 591). This article outlines cohesive substitution in Arabic generally and in the Qur'ān specifically. I start by clarifying the term *cohesive substitution*.

1.2. Substitution as a cohesive device

Halliday & Hasan (1976: 88-89)¹ define *substitution* as the replacement of one item by another. It serves as a place-holding device, showing where something is omitted and what its grammatical function would be. According to Christiansen (2011: 95), substitution is another form of anaphora because a pre-form can be interpreted only when its antecedent is taken into account. However, because reference pronouns such as *they*, *she*, *it* can also be regarded as a type of substitution, scholars distinguish reference from substitution: *substitution* is a relation between linguistic items (or a lexico-grammatical relation), such as words or phrases, while *reference* is a relation between meanings, i.e., the link between anaphora and its antecedent is based on a link between their respective referents (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 88-89).² Consider the following examples: *I like this watch. I would like to buy it* vs. *I like watches. Maybe I will buy a new one*. In the first example the anaphoric pronoun *it* refers to a particular watch and thus the two words refer to the same thing, i.e., *it* coreferences with its antecedent (*this watch*). In the second example, however, a noun (in plural) is replaced by another noun (in singular), which refers to no particular watch, and therefore *one* is not co-referential with *watches*. Furthermore, as a general rule the substitute item is equivalent to its antecedent grammatically and semantically; in *Bill got a first prize this year and I got one last year* (Quirk et al. 1986: 863) the nominal substitution *one* and the noun phrase *first prize* are both Head in the nominal group and function as direct object. However, the grammatical function of a reference item differs from that of its referent (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 89). In the example *I don't understand this subject. That is why I failed in the exam*, since the relation is semantic and not grammatical, the syntactic class of the reference item (*that*) does not match that of what it presupposes (the clause *I don't understand this subject*).³

In English the substitute may function as a noun, as a verb or as a clause, and therefore we distinguish three types of substitution in English:

(1) Nominal substitution: The substitutes *one* and *ones* function as Head of a nominal group and can substitute only an item which is itself Head of a nominal group, e.g.,

¹ Cf. Halliday 1996: 317; Keizer 2012: 400-401. Keizer summarizes at the beginning of this article the relevant literature on pro-forms, referring to, among others, the pro-forms *one* and *do*. However, in her pp. 407-411 she provides some evidence that pro-forms *one*, *ones* and *do* (*so*) are not necessarily used to replace a syntactic or semantic unit.

² Cf. Halliday 1996: 316; Christiansen 2011: 95; Quirk et al. 1986: 863.

³ Cf. Halliday 1996: 322; Christiansen 2011: 96.

Which kind of *engines* do you want? *Ones* with whistles, or *ones* without? In this example, the substitute *ones* replaces the Head noun *engines*, yet the meaning of the nominal substitution *one* or *ones* is never exactly identical with that of the substituted noun (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 91-94).⁴ An additional nominal substitution is the word *same*, which is usually accompanied by the definite article *the*. *The same* usually replaces an entire nominal group, including any modifying elements, for example, *John sounded rather regretful. Yes, Mary sounded the same.* The substitute *the same* can be combined with the verb *say* or *do*. *Say the same* is used when a fact is involved and is being substituted, e.g., *John thought it was impossible. Yes, I thought the same.* When the nominal substitution *the same* is combined with the verb *do*, then it substitutes for the process that is seen as object or thing, e.g., *They all started shouting. So I did the same.* What seems here to be a verbal substitution is in fact a nominal substitution because the verb *do* has a general function, which occurs in utterances such as *What are you doing?* or *I have nothing to do* (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 107-108).⁵

(2) Verbal substitution: The verbal substitute in English is *do* and it functions as Head of a verbal group. It is usually associated with contrast and it seems that *do* substitutes not only the verb but also a verb plus certain elements in the clause, e.g., *Does Granny look after you every day? She can't do on weekends.* In this case, *do* substitutes for *look after me*, while the temporal adverb *every day* is replaced by *on weekends* and the second clause contrasts with the presupposed clause (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 113-115).⁶

(3) Clausal substitution: In clausal substitution the entire clause is replaced by *so*, e.g., *Is there going to be an earthquake? It says so.* Clausal substitution can take place only in three cases: report, condition, modality. The substitute form can be positive or negative. The positive is expressed by *so* (see the above example) and the negative is expressed by *not*, e.g., *Has everyone gone home? I hope not.* (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 130-134).

1.2. Cohesive substitution in Arabic

To the best of my knowledge, the term *cohesion*, as we understand it in our modern context, does not exist in traditional Arabic grammatical thought, although the traditional grammarians provide detailed discussions on the three most common cohesive devices: reference, e.g. demonstrative pronouns (*'asmā' al-'iṣāra*); ellipsis (*ḥaḍf*); conjunctions (*ḥurūf al-'atf*). However, according to El-Awa (2006: 9), the study of text relations, both inter-verse and inter-sentence relations can be traced back in Qur'ānic exegeses for example, Rāzī (1150-1210 AC), who in his work paid special attention to this aspect of the meaning of the Qur'ānic text. Furthermore, the commentators usually help in retrieving the reference of the anaphoric pronoun, particularly when there are two possible references that might make the interpretation of the text difficult, e.g.: *wa-'ātū l-yatāmā 'amwālahum wa-lā tatabaddalū l-ḥabūta bi-ṭ-ṭayyibi wa-lā ta'kulū 'amwālahum 'ilā 'amwālikum*

⁴ Cf. Christiansen 2011: 96; Quirk et al. 1986: 869-870.

⁵ Cf. Christiansen 2011: 109-110; Quirk et al. 1986: 873.

⁶ Cf. Quirk et al. 1986: 875.

'*innahu kāna ḥūban kabīran* (Q 4:2) “And give the orphans their property, and do not exchange something bad (of yours) for something good (of theirs), nor devour their property along with your own. Surely that is a great crime.” In his explanation of Q 4:2, Ṭabarī (1992: vol. 4, 286) refers to the suffixed pronoun *-hu*, saying that its antecedent is the verbal noun *al-'akl* “devouring (the property)” and not *at-tabaddul* “exchanging something bad for something good.”

El-Awa (2006: 11-12) also discusses the work of Zarkašī (1344-1392 AC)⁷ as a representative work in which the relations within a Sura are taken into consideration. Under the title *al-munāsaba bayna' āy al-Qur'ān* “The relation between the Qur'ānic verses” he distinguishes two different types of relation: those that are sufficiently clear and marked by conjunctions, such as by the conjunction *wāw* “and” and those that are not apparent, which are not connected by a conjunction, but have some kind of a relation, such as parenthetical clauses (El-Awa 2006: 12-13).

While reference, ellipsis and conjunctions are addressed in grammatical and exegetical treatises, there are no traces of the fourth cohesive device, which is *substitution*, or as it is called in Arabic *'istibdāl*.⁸ This is what led me to ask whether cohesive substitution exists in Arabic generally and in the Qur'ān specifically. As for substitution in Modern Standard Arabic, only a few studies are dedicated to this issue. Elshershahi (1988) examines the cohesive devices used in the editorial argumentative discourse of American English and Arabic in the two categories of substitution and lexical cohesion. He tests Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion for its appropriateness to describe cohesion in Arabic. Elshershahi (1988: 20) focuses on substitution, distinguishing two types of this device: referential substitutes, which are realized by pronouns, demonstratives, adverbs, and reciprocal pronouns (each other, one another). Non-referential substitutes do not function as reference items but replace an item found in the previous clause. He found that no forms exist in the analyzed Arabic texts corresponding to the English forms *one, ones, some*. He discovered only one case in which the demonstrative pronoun *ḏālika* can be regarded as clause substitute, although it is used anaphorically to refer to the content of the previous clauses, and he holds that such usage seems roughly to correspond to the clausal substitution *so*. In the case of verbal substitution, Elshershahi found that it is realized in Arabic through the use of *ḏālika* or *hāḏā* preceded by the verb *fa'ala/yaf'alu*, which correspond to *do so, do that* or *do this* (Elshershahi 1988: 86).

Said (1988) examines whether the cohesive devices operate in Arabic differently from in English, and if so, how. Looking at Halliday and Hasan's conception of substitution in English, Said finds no corresponding word to *ones*, while *wāḥid* or *wāḥida* correspond to *one* (Said 1988: 62).⁹ Where English uses the substitute forms *do the same* or *say the same*, Arabic uses pronoun references, such as *ra'aytu n-nāsa yaḡrūna nahwa s-sāḥati fa-fa'altu miḡlahum* “I saw the people run towards the plaza, so I did the same.” As for the verbal substitution, both forms *yaf'alu* and *yaf'alu ḏālika* can be considered to correspond to the English verbal substitution form *do*, where *yaf'alu* substitutes for the action,

⁷ See: Zarkašī 1957: vol. 1, 35-52.

⁸ See: 'Arfa 'Abd al-Maqṣūd (n.y.: 24); Cf. al-'Alāwī 2011: 129.

⁹ Cf. Khalil 2006: 431.

as is shown in the following example: *ṭuliba 'ilayhi 'an yutimma ṣ-ṣafqata wa-lākinnahu lam yaf'al* “He was asked to finalize the deal, but he did not.” An additional verbal substitution is *do so*, but in Arabic there is no word that means *so* in the sense it is used in the form *do so*; in this case, Arabic would use the form *yaf'alu dālīka*, although according to Said this type of cohesion involves reference and not substitution (Said 1988: 66-67). Also, a few works discuss cohesive substitution in the Qur'ān. Ilyas (2014), for example, analyzes the cohesive devices found in the short Suras. His article is mainly based on Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion in English and while according to his analysis reference and conjunction are the most common cohesive devices, substitution does not occur in the analyzed Suras. aš-Šā'ir (2016) considers substitution in his article but he provides only a few Qur'ānic examples. For nominal substitution, he mentions Q 39:68;¹⁰ verbal substitution is exhibited by Q 2:24 and clausal substitution is found in Q 5:32.¹¹

1.3. Objectives

This study tackles cohesive substitution and it has two objectives:

(a) To investigate how cohesive substitution is realized in the Qur'ān. In the research literature the borderline between substitution and reference is unclear, and the question that arises is whether substitution in Arabic should necessarily be combined with the anaphoric pronoun *dālīka*.

(b) Substitute forms are regarded as replacing various components, and I would like to examine precisely which syntactic components they replace.

To provide a systematic description of this phenomenon, revealing all possible instances of substitution found in the Qur'ān, I first reviewed the Qur'ān to identify possible components which can be marked as *cohesive substitution*. I found various components such as *miṭlu dālīka* “the same”, *balā* “yes”, the verb *fa'ala* “did” (in its various conjunctions) and *'ihdā* “one”. Then to ensure that all instances of these components were collected I referred to the concordance of the Qur'ān. While analyzing the components I found that many occurrences should be excluded because, as I will explain later, each component may have several functions and indications.

For example, a reciprocal expression such as *ba'duhum ('awliyā'u) ba'din* (e.g., Q 8:72) “Friends one of another” is classified in Western treatises as anaphora. Alternately, the verb *taf'alū* “you will do” in Q 4:127 serves as the lexical verb “do” (see Section 2.2) and not as a verbal substitution. Thus, after a sorting process I reduced the number of cases under consideration to 31.¹² However, a thorough examination showed that only

¹⁰ aš-Šā'ir considers the word *'uḥrā* a nominal substitution. However, according to Rāzī (2000: vol. 27, 17) the underlying structure is *ṭumma nuḥḥa fihi naḥḥatan 'uḥrā* “**Then it shall be blown a second blow.**” Namely, the verbal noun was omitted and the adjective took its syntactic place. Thus it cannot be considered as a case of cohesive substitution.

¹¹ He considers the use of the anaphoric pronoun (*min 'aḡli*) *dālīka* as clausal substitution. However, I argue that *dālīka* is not equivalent to the English form *so* and it is used only as an anaphoric pronoun.

¹² For example, there are at least 77 occurrences of the verb *fa'ala* “did” (and its conjunctions) in the concordance and all were examined. After sorting them, 17 possible candidates were examined, out of which only five illustrate verbal substitution.

nine can illustrate cohesive substitution, and all are mentioned in the present study. Finally, all instances are contrasted with parallel translation data for English to examine whether the cohesive substitution forms in Arabic are translated by their equivalent forms in English.

2. Cohesive substitution in the Qur'ān

2.1. Nominal substitution

Core candidates for nominal substitution in English are *one*, *one* and *same* (the same).

In Arabic *one* can be realized by the cardinal numbers *'ihdā* (sg. fem.) and *'ahad* (sg. masc.).¹³ However, not every occurrence of *'ihdā* or alternatively *'ahad* (sg. masc.) in the Qur'ān can be regarded as a substitute form and the three cases should be distinguished:

(a) *'ahad* refers to one individual out of a group, e.g., *wa-'in 'ahadun mina l-mušrikīna stağāraka* (9:6) “And if any one of the idolaters should seek refuge with you.”

(b) *'ahad* is used as an impersonal pronoun or as general noun,¹⁴ e.g., *'a-yaḥsabu 'an lam yarahu 'ahadun* (90:7) “Does he think that no one saw him?”

(c) *'ihdā* functions as a substitute form, as is exhibited in example 1:

(1) *wa-stašhidū šahīdayni min riğālikum fa-'in lam yakūnā rağulayni fa-rağulun wa-mra'atāni mimman tarḏawna mina š-šuhadā'i 'an taḏilla 'ihdāhumā fa-tuḏakkira 'ihdāhumā l-'uhrā* (Q 2:282)¹⁵

“And call to witness two witnesses of your men; if not two men, then one man and two women from such witnesses you approve of, so that if **one of them** fails to remember, the **other one** would remind her.”¹⁶

In Q 2:282 *'ihdā* is annexed to the anaphoric pronoun *humā*, which refers to two women. *'ihdā* do not replace the head noun in dual form *'imra'atāni* “two women”, but rather in its singular form, *'imra'a*. Thus, the underlying structure should be **fa-'in lam yakūnā rağulayni fa-rağulun wa-mra'atāni mimman tarḏawna mina š-šuhadā'i 'an taḏilla mra'atun fa-tuḏakkira l-mra'atu l-'uhrā/t-tāniyatu l-'uhrā* “If not two men, then one man and two women from such witnesses you approve of, so that if **a woman** fails to remember, the **other woman** would remind her.”

The function of the cardinal numbers *'ihdā* and *'ahad* as substitute forms in the three mentioned occurrences (Q 2:228, 12:36; 28:23-25) is restricted in the Qur'ān to construc-

¹³ The masculine form *'ahad*, as opposed to the feminine form *'ihdā* (which always occurs in annexation), can occur in annexation or as an independent noun. See Reckendorf 1921: 293. Cf. Fleischer 1968: vol. 1, 688, 737; Ibn Ya'īš 2001: vol. 4, 26.

¹⁴ See Fleischer 1968: vol. 1, 737; Halliday & Hasan 1976: 106.

¹⁵ Additional occurrences are 12:36; 28:23-25.

¹⁶ The English translations of the Qur'ānic verses are based on four sources: Bell 1937; Arberry 1964; Fakhry 1998; the electronic translation of Al-Islam.org.

tions in which a noun in dual form referring to two unidentified/unspecified persons is involved and *'ihdā* and *'ahad* replace one of the two persons.

Regarding the nominal substitution *the same*, I found only one corresponding form:

(2) *wa-l-wālidātu yurđi 'na 'awlādahunna ḥawlayni kāmīlayni li-man 'arāda 'an yutimma r-radā'ata wa-'alā l-mawlūdi lahu rizquhunna wa-kiswatuḥunna bi-l-ma'rūfi lā tukallafu nafsun 'illā wus 'ahā lā tuḍārra wālidatun bi-waladihā wa-lā mawlūdun lahu bi-waladihi wa-'alā l-wāriṭi miṭlu ḍālika* (Q 2:233)

“Mothers shall suckle their children for two whole years; [that is] for those who wish to complete the suckling. Those to whom the children are born shall maintain and clothe them kindly. No soul is charged beyond its capacity. No mother should suffer on account of her child and he to whom a child is born should not suffer on account of his child. **The same** devolves upon the [father's] heir.”

An accurate translation of *miṭlu ḍālika* should be “like that/like of that,”¹⁷ where the demonstrative pronoun *ḍālika* refers to an extended passage in the discourse, namely a law consisting of a set of principles.¹⁸ Therefore, it would be correct to classify this construction as reference and not as substitution. However, I would suggest another possibility, which essentially is related to the syntactic character of *miṭl*. The substitution *the same* should have been constructed in Arabic as **al-miṭlu*, except that such a form does not exist in Arabic and *miṭl* occurs only in annexation.¹⁹ I argue that in Q 2:233 the demonstrative pronoun *ḍālika* does not function as anaphoric pronoun, but instead has the status of a dummy operator holding the place of the *mudāf 'ilayhi* “the annexed noun” by which *miṭl* becomes a definite noun. In other words, *the same* is not a borderline between substitution and anaphora (see Section 1.2) because the anaphoric function of *ḍālika* here is neutralized. Finally, *miṭlu ḍālika* substitutes for the verbal nouns *rizquhunna wa-kiswatuḥunna* “providing (sustenance) and clothing,” while the suffixed pronoun *-hunna* refers to *al-wālidātu* “the mothers.”

2.2. Verbal substitution

As in English, the verb *fa'ala/yaf'alu* “did/will do” does not always function as a substitute and is not necessarily cohesive. In the following example, the lexical verb *taf'alū* (“you do”) occurs:²⁰

(a) *wa-mā taf'alū min ḥayrin fa-'inna llāha kāna bihi 'alīman* (Q 4:127)

“Whatever good you **do**, Allah knows it very well.”

In the next example, the verb *yaf'alu* (do) is followed by the anaphoric pronoun *ḍālika*:

¹⁷ All other occurrences of *miṭl* are translated as “like,” e.g., Q 4:140 *miṭlahum* “like them,” – namely, they do not operate as nominal substitution.

¹⁸ See Dror 2016: 143-144.

¹⁹ Reckendorf 1921: 161.

²⁰ See Halliday & Hasan 1976: 124.

(b) *yā-’ayyuhā llaḏīna ’āmanū lā ta’kulū ’amwālakum baynakum bi-l-bāṭili ’illā ’an takūna tiḡāratan ’an tarāḏin minkum wa-lā taqtulū ’anfusakum ’inna llāha kāna bikum raḥīman wa-man yaf’al ḏālika ’udwānanwa-ḏulman fa-sawfa nuṣlihi nāran* (Q 4:29-30)²¹

“O’you who have Faith! Do not devour each other’s property among yourselves in vanity, except that it be a trade by your mutual consent, and do not kill your (own) selves (one another); verily Allah is Merciful to you. And whoever does this aggressively and unjustly, We will soon cast him into fire.”

The verb *yaf’al* in Q 4:30 does not replace any verb or action, whereas the anaphoric pronoun *ḏālika* refers to two actions: *’aklu ’amwālakum* “devouring each other’s property” and *qatlu ’anfusakum* “killing yourselves.” Halliday & Hasan (1976: 125-126) call this type *pro-verb do*, namely it does not stand for defined or specified actions or events. It is used endophorically, in that it functions as a carrier for anaphoric items, especially *it* and *that*. The expressions *do that* or *do it* function as compound reference verbs: since there are no “reference verbs” we must add to the verb an anaphoric pronoun and say *he did that/he saw it*.

In what follows, two cases are discussed, where the verb *yaf’alu* substitutes only for the verb and they are not followed by an anaphoric pronoun *ḏālika*.

(3) *yā-’ayyuhā r-rasūlu balliḡ mā ’unzila ’ilayka min rabbika wa-’in lam taf’al fa-mā ballaḡta risālahu* (Q 5:67)²²

“O’Messenger! Convey what has been sent down to you from your Lord; and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message (at all).”

In his explanation of Q 5:67, Zamaḥṣarī (1947: vol. 1, 658-659) says: (*wa-’in lam taf’al*) *wa-’in lam tuballiḡ ḡamī’ahu ka-mā ’amartuka* “(And if you do not) [this clause means] and if you will not convey them all as I ordered you.” This explanation reinforces the fact that in this case the verb *taf’al* in jussive (*tuballiḡ*) operates as a substitute for the verb *balliḡ* in imperative.

(4) *wa-’in kuntum fī raybin mimmā nazzalnā ’alā ’abdinā fa-’tū bi-sūratin min miṭlihi wa-d’ū ṣuhadā’akum min dūni llāhi ’in kuntum ṣāḏiqīna fa-’in lam taf’alū wa-lan taf’alū fa-ttaqū n-nāra llatī waqūduhā n-nāsu wa-l-ḥiḡāratu ’u’iddat li-l-kāfirīna* (Q 2:23-24)

“And if you are in doubt of what We have sent down to Our (faithful) Servant (Muḥammad), then bring forth one Surah the like thereof, and call your witnesses other than Allah, if you are truthful. And if you do not, and you will not, then fear the Fire whose fuel is People and Stones, prepared for the infidels.”

Q 2:23-24 is an additional example of verbal substitution. However, in this context I would like to refer to the exegesis of ’Abū Ḥayyān (1992: vol. 1, 173) for two reasons: first, he asserts that the two occurrences of the verb (*lam*) *taf’alū* “you will not do” replace the verb (*lam*) *ta’ṭū* “you will not bring forth.” However, later in his explanation he adds that the direct object *ḏālika* has been deleted and the clause should be reconstructed as *fa-’in lam taf’alū ḏālika wa-lan taf’alū ḏālika* “And if you do not do that

²¹ Under this category we can classify cases in which an anaphoric pronoun is suffixed to the verb *fa’ala*, e.g., Q 4:66 *mā fa’alūhu* “they would not have done it.”

²² Additional occurrences are Q 2:279; 2:282; 58:13.

and you do not do that.” As I explained previously, when the anaphoric pronoun *that* is attached the verb *do*, this expression should be classified as reference and not as substitution. I argue that the reconstruction (*taqdīr*) of *dālika* is redundant in this case because when the verb *yaf'alu* serves as a general verb, its valency still has to be satisfied,²³ but when it functions as a substituting form it needs no complement components. The reason is that the verb receives much more prominence in the discourse than the complements and the adjuncts.

Secondly, he connects the usage of the verb *taf'alū* with the so-called *kināya*:

wa-ma'nā (fa-'in lam taf'alū) fa-'in lam ta'tū, wa-'ubbira 'ani l-'ityāni bi-l-fi'li wa-l-fi'lu yağrī mağrā l-kināyati, fa-yu'abbaru bihi 'an kulli fi'lin, wa-yuğnīka 'an ṭūli mā tuknā 'anhu ('Abū Ḥayyān 1992: vol. 1, 173).

“And the meaning of (and if you will not do it) and if you will not bring forth, [the action of] bringing forth was expressed [was realized] by the verbal form *fa'ala* which operates like *kināya* [*lit.* “standing instead of”], and the form *fa'ala* can replace any verb, and it makes your lengthy expressions [which you intend to] replace by other expressions, dispensable [namely, it allows you the reduction of your lengthy/extended utterance by avoiding the repetition of the same lexemes.]”

'Astarābādī (1998: vol. 3, 232-233) distinguishes two types of *kināya*: The first is semantical *kināya*, where a lexical item is replaced by its synonym.²⁴ For example, in the expression *kaṭīru r-ramādi* “noble man,” “hospitable” stands for its synonymic expression *kaṭīru l-qirā* “[one who] frequently hosts.” The second type is the lexical *kināya*, where one item is replaced by another and there is a relation in wording, not in semantics. As an example he provides the following verse: *ka-'anna fi'lata lam tamla' mawākibuhā diyāra bakrīn wa-lam taḥla' wa-lam tahabi* “As if *fi'lata* did not fill the house of Bakr by her cortege, and she did not renounce [what was said] and did not donate [or give charity to people who asked for it]”²⁵ The form *fi'lata* denotes a name substituting for the proper name Ḥawla. Under the lexical *kināya*, 'Astarābādī (1998: vol. 3, 234-238)²⁶ classifies the following indeclinable forms (*kināya mabniyya*): the interrogative *kam* “how much,” *kaḍā/kaḍā wa-kaḍā* “so and so” and *ka-'ayyin/ka-'ayyi* “how many” as substitutes for unspecified numbers (*kināyatun 'ani l-'adadi l-mubhami*); *kayta wa-kayta* “thus and thus,” “such and such thing” function as substitute forms for an utterance; the verb *fa'alta* “you did” and the declinable noun *fulān* “John Doe” i.e., it refers to an unidentified person and substitutes a proper name.

²³ Kunz & Steiner (2013: 221) explain that the verbal substitution in German can be realized by *tun* or *machen*. However, these are highly general full lexical verbs and still must have their valency satisfied, therefore they are not a grammatical parallel to the English substituting *do*.

²⁴ Halliday & Hasan (1976: 318) call this type of lexical cohesion *Reiteration*: “This is the repetition of a lexical item, or the occurrence of a synonym of some kind, in the context of reference.” Ibn Ya'īs (2001: vol. 3, 165) calls this type *al-kināya at-tawriya* (*lit.*) “the concealed *kināya*,” a term which might correspond to the term “metonymy.” For the term *kināya* as a rhetorical device, see Dichy 2007: 578-583.

²⁵ This translation is based on the explanation found in *ṣarḥ ma'ānī šī'r al-Mutanabbī li-Ibn 'Iftīlī*; <http://shamela.ws/browse.php/book-37327/page-37>.

²⁶ Cf. Ibn Ya'īs 2001: vol. 3, 165-166.

The term *kināya* seems to be the term closest to substitution, although it does not denote cohesive substitution for two reasons: first, the substitution forms mentioned under the category of *kināya* “indirect expression,” “allusion” and “metonymy” do not correspond with the form presented in Halliday and Hasan’s model. Second, the *kināya* forms do not necessarily replace a presupposed item. For example, when saying *ḡā’a fulāmun*, the noun *fulān* replaces an unnamed person, but we do not know to whom it refers because there is no antecedent.

To summarize the case of Q 2:23-24: *kināya*, like cohesive substitution, replaces one item with another related word. However, while cohesive substitution requires an anaphoric relation between the items, *kināya* does not impose any constraint on such a relation. When ‘Abū Ḥayyān mentions the term *kināya* in his reference to the verb (*lam taf’alū*), he correctly identifies that this verb functions as a place holder for the verb (*lam ta’tū*). However, he seems unaware that there are two types of substitution: the first is called *cohesive substitution*, in which the verb *yaf’alu* replaces a previous verb, as seen in Q 2:23-24. With the second type, called *kināya*, in which the verb *yaf’alu* functions as the lexical verb *do*, as in *I did this work*, or as a general verb referring to almost to any kind of activity, as in *do something!* This usage is illustrated by the above examples Q 4:127 and Q 4:29-30.

Finally, we also learn from ‘Abū Ḥayyān’s explanation that the pragmatics of using this substitution simply abbreviates the speech, so instead of repeating the same verb: **wa-’in lam ta’tū bi-sūratin ka-miṭlihi wa-lam ta’tū bi-sūratin ka-miṭlihi* “And if you will not bring forth a Sura like this one and you will not bring forth a Sura like this one,” it was replaced by the substantive verb *taf’alū*, hence the statement is reduced (‘Abū Ḥayyān 1992: vol. 1, 173).

2.3. Clausal substitution

Clausal substitution of the kind found in English (*so*, and *not*) is not found in the Qur’ān. However, a possible candidate for clausal substitution could be the particle *balā*, which is used in giving an affirmative answer (*taqrīr*) to a negative question, so it has the same specification of *na’am* “yes” (Murādī 1983: 420-423),²⁷ e.g. *’a-wa-lam tu’mīn qāla balā wa-lākin li-yaṭma’inna qalbī* (Q 2:260) “Do you not believe? Yes, he said, but that my heart may be at rest.” According to Halliday & Hasan (1976: 137) *yes* and *no* could be thought of as a clause substitution, but they are considered more as elliptical forms and they only express the polarity of the presupposing clause.²⁸ Furthermore, the clauses that are replaced must be report, condition or modality clauses. Namely, they must be declarative, therefore there is no substitution for interrogative or imperative (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 131).

²⁷ Cf. Rummānī (1986: 151); Ibn Hišām 1991: vol. 1, 191-192; Zarkašī 1957: vol. 4, 261.

²⁸ Zarkašī (1957: vol. 4, 265) adduces this argument in stating that the verb in Q 2:260 is deleted, and should be reconstructed as *balā qad ’āmantu* “yes, I did believe.”

Conclusion

When we consider Halliday and Hasan's cohesive model, we see that the number of cohesive substitution forms is limited. According to Christiansen (2011: 118), the marginal existence of cohesive substitution in Arabic and other languages²⁹ seems reasonable, given that substitution is a lexico-grammatical relationship; languages can differ widely in their syntax and morphology and the use of substitutes in English may not be possible in all languages. Other cohesive devices, such as references and conjunctions, are universal because they are based on a semantic relationship, independent of lexico-grammatical structure.

Cohesive substitution in the Qur'ān is not restricted to a specific discourse. What characterizes this structure is that on the morpho-syntactical level substitution forms occupy an obligatory position in the discourse. They are lexically related to the item they replace but are not the same as this item (Keizer 2012: 412). Thus, the nominal substitutions *'ahad* and *'ihdā*, which can be regarded as equivalent to *one(s)*, are used when the presupposed noun is indefinite and in dual form (e.g., *fatayāni* "two young men" (Q 12:36) or *'imra'atāni* "two women" (Q 2:228)). In this case, *'ahad* and *'ihdā* stand for an indefinite noun in singular and the audience cannot know to which of the two it refers. The nominal substitution *the same* is realized in Arabic by the construction *miṭlu ḍālika*, where *ḍālika* operates as a dummy pronoun and not as an anaphoric pronoun. Additionally, *miṭlu ḍālika* in Q 2:233 does not substitute the same action carried out by the fathers (*rizkuhunnā* and *kiswatahunnā*), but the same general type of action (providing sustenance and clothing as being an heir bearing the responsibility of the fathers).

The verb *yaf'alu* (and its various conjunctions) is the only verbal substitution existing in the Qur'ān. However, three different cases should be distinguished: First, the verb *yaf'alu* can serve in the Qur'ān as the lexical verb "do"; second, *yaf'alu* is followed by the anaphoric pronoun *ḍālika* – it is called anaphoric compound structure; third, *yaf'alu*, when appearing without anaphoric pronoun, serves in five cases as a verbal substitution. As for the clausal substitution, no equivalents for the English forms *so* or *not* were found.

References

- Arberry, Arthur J. 1964. *The Koran Interpreted*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, Richard. 1937. *The Qur'ān*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Christiansen, Thomas. 2011. *Cohesion: A Discourse Perspective*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Dichy, Joseph. 2007. Kināya. In Versteegh, Kees (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, vol. 2, 578-583. Leiden: Brill.
- Dror, Yehudit. 2016. The Demonstrative Particle *ḍālika* and Its Anaphoric Function in the Qur'ān. *Studia Orientalia Electronica* 4.131-149.
- El-Awa, Salwa. 2006. *Textual Relations in the Qur'an: Relevance, Coherence and Structure*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Elshershahi, Muhammad Attis Hasan. 1988. *Substitution and Lexical Cohesion in the Editorial Argumentative Discourse of Arabic and American English*. University of South Carolina. (Ph.D. Thesis.)

²⁹ For Italian, see Christiansen 2011: 115. For substitution in German, see Kunz & Steiner 2013: 207.

- Fakhry, Majid. 1998. *The Qur'ān: A Modern English Version*. Reading: Garnet Publishing.
- Fleischer, Heinrich Leberecht. 1968. *Kleinere Schriften: gesammelt, durchgesehen und vermehrt*. Osnabruck: Biblio Verlag.
- Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. 1996. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London, New York, Sydney, Auckland: Arnold.
- Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood & Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Ilyas, Asim Ismail. 2014. Cohesive Devices in the Short Suras of the Glorious Qur'ān. *Arab World English Journal* 3.135-146.
- Keizer, Evelin. 2012. English Proforms in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Language Sciences* 34. 400-420.
- Khalil, Esam N. 2006. Cohesion. In: Versteegh, Kees (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, vol. 1, 430-433. Leiden: Brill.
- Kunz, Kerstin & Steiner Erich. 2013. Cohesive Substitution in English and German. In: Aijmer, Karin & Altenberg, Bengt (eds.), *Advances in Corpus-Based Contrastive Linguistics: Studies in Honor of Stig Johansson*, 201-231. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Quirk, Randolph & Greenbaum, Sidney & Leech, Geoffrey & Svartvik, Jan. 1986. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, New York: Longman.
- Reckendorf, Hermann. 1921. *Arabische Syntax*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Said, Hanan As'ad Abdel-Karim. 1988. *The Cohesive Role of Reference, Substitution, and Ellipsis in Two Genres of Modern Literary Arabic*. University of Texas. (Ph.D. Thesis.)
- Sanders, Ted & Pander, Maat. 2006. Cohesion and Coherence: Linguistic Approaches. In Brown, Keith (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 591-595. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Spiegel, Lee Dixie. 1992. Linguistic Cohesion. In Irwin, Judith W. & Doyle, Mary Anne (eds.), *Reading/Writing Connections: Learning from Research*, 55-80. University of Michigan: International Reading Association.
- An Enlightening Commentary into the Light of the Holy Qur'an*. Translator: Mr. Sayyid Abbas Sadr-Ameli. Published by: The Scientific and Religious Research Center Amir-ul-Mu'mineenAli; <https://www.al-islam.org/enlightening-commentary-light-holy-quran-vol-3/surah-nisa-chapter-4-introduction> (Accessed 2017.01.29).

Arabic Sources

- 'Alāwī, al-'Ayd. 2011. at-Tamāsuk an-naḥwī 'aškāluhu wa-'āliyyātuhu: Dirāsa taṭbiqīyya li-namādiğ min šī'r Muḥammad La'id 'Al Ḥalīfa. *Mağallat qirā'āt*, 119-140.
- 'Abū al-Ḥayyān, Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī Ibn Yusūf. 1992. *al-Baḥr al-muḥīṭ fī t-tafsīr*. Beirut: Dār al-fikr li-ṭ-ṭiba'awa-n-našr wa-t-tawzī'.
- 'Arfa 'Abd al-Maqṣūd 'Āmir Ḥasan. (n.y). *Zāhirat al-istibdāl fī naḥw al-ğumla wa-naḥw an-naṣṣ*; <http://www.alukah.net/library/0/75467>.
- al-'Astarābādī, Rađī ad-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥasan. 1998. *Šarḥ kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥāğib*. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya.
- 'Ibn Hišām, Ğamāl ad-Dīn al-'Anṣārī. 1991. *Muğnī al-labīb*. Beirut: Dār al-ğil.
- 'Ibn Ya'tīs Muwaffaq ad-Dīn. 1994. *Šarḥ al-mufaṣṣal*. Beirut: 'Ālam al-kutub.
- al-Murādī, al-Ḥasan Ibn al-Qāsim. 2001. *al-Ġanā ad-dānī fī ḥurūf al-ma'ānī*. Beirut: Manšūrāt dār al-'āfāq al-ğādīda.
- ar-Rāzī, Muḥammad Faḥr ad-Dīn. 2000. *Mafātīḥ al-ğayb*. Beirut: an-Nāšir wa-l-kātib al-'arabī.
- ar-Rummānī, 'Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī Ibn 'Īsā. 1986. *Kitāb ma'ānī al-ḥurūf*. Mecca: Maktabat aṭ-ṭālib al-ğāmi'ī.
- aš-Šā'ir, Šālīḥ 'Abd al-Karīm. 2016. *Zāhirat al-istibdāl fī n-naḥw al-'arabī: 'āfaq ğayr maḥdūda*. http://www.alukah.net/literature_language/0/96991.
- aṭ-Ṭabarī, 'Abū Ğa'far Ibn 'Ismā'īl. 1992. *Ġāmi' al-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya.
- az-Zamaḥṣarī, Muḥammad Ibn 'Umar. 1947. *al-Kaššāf*, Beirut: an-Nāšir wa-l-kātib al-'arabī.
- az-Zarkašī, Badr ad-Dīn. 1957. *al-Burḥān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*. Cairo: Dār 'iḥyā' al-kutub al-'arabiyya.