

Coordination in the Arabic Language: Between Rhetorical Theorization and the Modern Functional Linguistic Approach

Salim Rouag –PhD-

Emir Abdelkader University – Constantine – Algeria

Email : salimrou33@gmail.com

Received: 19.02.2026 Accepted: 18.07.2026 Publishing: 12.08.2026

Abstract:

Coordination has been examined in both classical and modern linguistic scholarship from a variety of perspectives. A comprehensive account of the phenomenon therefore requires attention to the particular analytical perspective adopted by each tradition. This study, entitled “Coordination in Arabic: A Comparative Study of Classical Rhetoric and Functional Grammar,” compares two traditions of linguistic inquiry: the classical Arabic linguistic tradition, with particular emphasis on rhetoric, and modern linguistic scholarship as represented by Functional Grammar theory. It focuses on the principal points of convergence and divergence between the two traditions to provide a more comprehensive account of coordination and contribute to a clearer understanding of the phenomenon in Arabic.

Keywords:

coordination, structure, function, grammar, semantics, symmetry, tail, focus, actor

Introduction

A survey of linguistic inquiry in the classical Arabic tradition, particularly scholarship closely associated with the Qur’anic text, reveals methods of rule formulation and theoretical grounding that differ from those of modern linguistic theories. Modern approaches, for their part, employ distinct theoretical and analytical methods for examining linguistic phenomena according to particular methodological and intellectual premises. Coordination in Arabic is one such phenomenon. Classical Arab scholars, including grammarians, rhetoricians, and scholars of legal theory, established principles governing it, while modern linguists have analysed it within a range of linguistic frameworks. The present study therefore asks two related questions: How did classical Arabic scholars, particularly rhetoricians, approach coordination within their broader methodology of linguistic analysis? Conversely, what new theoretical principles has modern linguistics, especially Functional Grammar, proposed for analysing the same phenomenon?

To address these questions, the study first defines the linguistic phenomenon under investigation by examining the lexical and technical meanings of coordination in Arabic.

1.1. The Lexical Meaning of the Word ‘Atf

A survey of Arabic dictionaries and their treatment of the word ‘*atf*’ shows that its meanings may be divided into three groups:

a. **The first group:** bending, curving, inclination, folding, twisting, leaning, causing to incline, crookedness, limping, turning, curving, bending back, deviation, drooping,

crookedness, arching, swerving, contortion, twisting, turning away, turning, returning, repelling, rectifying, and deviating.

b. **The second group:** tenderness, affection, compassion, sympathy, pity, attachment, mercy, kindness, and solicitude.

c. **The third group:** attack and renewed assault.¹

These three groups share the general semantic notions of inclination and bending towards a particular direction. The inclination may be physical, as in the first group, or figurative and abstract, arising from social feeling or instinctive behaviour, as in the second. The meanings of attack and renewed assault in combat, included in the third group, likewise occupy a semantic field related to inclination and bending.

It should not, however, be assumed that complete synonymy exists among the meanings of the words included in these three groups, or between them and the lexical root 'atf. These meanings converge only within a shared semantic field, while each retains its own particular semantic domain beyond the area of semantic overlap.²

Among the Arabic uses of 'atf in the sense represented by the first group is the following verse by Ḥumayd ibn Thawr al-Hilālī:

فلما التقى الصفان كان تطارد*** و طعن به أفواه معطوفة نجل.

When the two ranks met, there was pursuit, and thrusting with it into the mouths of broad, curved weapons.

Labīd likewise uses the term in his Mu'allāqa:

زجلا كأن نعاج توضع فوقها*** وظباء و جرة عطا أرامها.

In clamorous motion, as though ewes were set above them, and the gazelles of Wajra, their white antelopes turning aside.

Among the uses of the word in the sense represented by the second group is the following verse by Abū al-Nashnāsh al-Nahshalī:

إذا المرء لم يسرح سواما ولم يرح*** سواما و لم تعطف عليه أقره.

If a man neither sends grazing livestock forth nor brings livestock home, and his relatives show him no compassion,

فللموت خير للفتى من قعه*فقدرا و من مولى يدب عقه.

Then death is better for a young man than remaining in poverty, dependent upon a patron whose scorpions creep about.

In the sense represented by the third group, Yashāma ibn Khazn al-Nahshalī states:

لو كان في الألف مئاة واحد فدعوا*** من عاطف خالهم إياه يعنونا.

Even if only one of us were among a thousand and they called out, they would think that whoever turned back to attack intended him.

The root '-t-f occurs in the Qur'an in only one passage, in the words of the Exalted: "Turning his side away, so as to lead others astray from the path of God" [Sūrat al-Ḥajj, 22:9]. It is reported that Ibn 'Abbās, may God be pleased with them both, said: "It refers to al-Naḍr ibn al-Ḥārith, who twisted his neck out of arrogance and pride." Al-Farrā' interpreted it as meaning "turning away from the remembrance"; Mujāhid and Qatāda said, "twisting his neck

¹ Muṣṭafā Ḥamīda, *Asālīb al-'Atf fi al-Qur'ān al-Karīm* (Cairo: al-Sharika al-Miṣriyya al-'Ālamiyya lil-Nashr, 1999), 14.

² Ḥamīda, *Asālīb al-'Atf fi al-Qur'ān al-Karīm*, 15.

in disbelief”; al-Mubarrad stated that ‘*atf*’ denotes that part of the neck which bends; and al-Mufaḍḍal stated that ‘*atf*’ means “the side.” It is thus apparent that the interpretation of ‘*atf*’ in the verse follows two orientations: one assigns it the meaning represented by the first group, while the other assigns it to the second group.³

It becomes evident from this discussion that the semantic field within which the word ‘*atf*’ operates encompasses bending, inclination, and returning. This is the meaning intended by the early grammarians when they selected the word ‘*atf*’ as the technical term designating this grammatical category. Thus, when it is said that *wāw* is a coordinating particle in the example “Zayd and ‘Amr came,” this means that *wāw* bends, inclines, and refers ‘Amr back to Zayd, so that the same semantic judgement applied to Zayd is also applied to ‘Amr, namely, the attribution of the act of coming to him, as is the corresponding inflectional judgement resulting from this attribution, namely, the nominative case. Therefore, coordination may be understood as referring the second element back to the first with respect to both syntactic judgement and inflexion.⁴

1.2. The Lexical Meaning of the Word Nasq

Nasq derives from the expression *nasaqa al-shay’ yansiquhu nasqan*, following the morphological pattern of *naṣara*. Thus, *al-nasq* with a *sukūn* on the *sīn* is the verbal noun, whereas *al-nasaq* with a *fathā* is the nomen actionis corresponding in meaning to the passive participle *mansūq*. The form *al-nasq* is the one commonly used in grammatical works as the technical term designating this category.

A survey of Arabic dictionaries and their treatment of the word *nasq* reveals the following meanings:

- **Order, regularity, and sound arrangement:** *Lisān al-‘Arab*: “The *nasq* of anything is that which follows a single, uniform system governing its elements. *Nasaqa al-shay’ yansiquhu nasqan*: he arranged it evenly and systematically.”⁵
- **Asās al-Balāgha**: “He arranged pearls and other things in sequence; pearls arranged in a sequence; and his speech proceeded according to an orderly pattern.”⁶
- **Evenness:** *Lisān al-‘Arab*: “*Thaghr nasq* refers to teeth that are even and regularly aligned.”
- **Coordination:** *Lisān al-‘Arab*: “*Nasq* means coordinating something with what precedes it, the verb having the same meaning. *Nasaqtu al-kalāma nasqan*: I coordinated one part of the discourse with another.”
- **Succession and continuity:** *Lisān al-‘Arab*: It is related that ‘Umar, may God be pleased with him, said: “*Nāsiqū* between the pilgrimage and the ‘umra.” Shammar said: “*Nāsiqū* means follow one with the other and perform them successively. It is said: *nāsaqa bayna al-amrayn*, that is, he caused one of the two matters to follow the other. . . . It is also said: *nasaqtu bayna al-shay’ayn* and *nāsaqtu*.”
- **Asās al-Balāgha**: “The people stood in succession.”⁷

³ Ḥamīda, *Asālīb al-‘Atf fī al-Qur’ān al-Karīm*, 16–17.

⁴ Ḥamīda, *Asālīb al-‘Atf fī al-Qur’ān al-Karīm*, 16.

⁵ Ibn Manẓūr, Abū al-Faḍl Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Mukarram ibn Manẓūr al-Ifriqī al-Miṣrī, *Lisān al-‘Arab* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, n.d.), s.v. “nasq,” 86.

⁶ Al-Zamakhsharī, *Asās al-Balāgha*, ed. Muḥammad Bāsil ‘Uyūn al-Sūd (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1998), 2:266.

1.3. Syndetic Coordination in Grammatical Terminology

The grammarians constructed their discussions of syndetic coordination on the basis that it constitutes one of the five categories of dependents. This view relies primarily on a purely formal indicator, namely, correspondence in the inflectional marker. Consequently, they grouped ten particles with different meanings under a single category merely because the element following each particle corresponds to the element preceding it in its inflectional marker. When they sought to formulate an exclusive definition of syndetic coordination, they necessarily had to include an indication of dependency and then ensure that none of the other four categories of dependents could fall within it.⁸

Among the grammarians' definitions of syndetic coordination are the following:

Al-Rummānī: "A dependent of the first element on the basis of shared participation."⁹

Ibn al-Ḥāḓib: "A dependent intended in relation together with its governing element, with one of the ten particles intervening between it and that governing element."¹⁰

Ibn 'Uṣfūr: "The attachment of a noun to a noun, a verb to a verb, or a clause to a clause, on condition that one of the particles designated for this purpose intervenes between them."¹¹

Ibn Mālik, in his *Alfiyya*: "A following element introduced by a particle that causes dependency." **Ibn Mālik also, in *al-Tashīl*:** "That which is made dependent by means of one of its particles."¹²

Al-Raḏī: "A dependent between which and its governing element one of the ten particles intervenes."¹³

Ibn 'Aqīl: "A dependent between which and its governing element there intervenes one of the particles that we shall mention."¹⁴

2. Coordination According to the Rhetoricians

The grammarian examines Arabic discourse with respect to the inflexion of words and clauses, the structure of simple and complex sentences, permissible patterns of preposing and postposing, explicit mention and omission, substitution, and the basic meanings conveyed by nominal and verbal forms, their derivatives, verbal complements, and particles. The morphologist, by contrast, examines the structure of the Arabic word, the rules governing its formation, and the basic meanings associated with particular word forms. The two disciplines nevertheless overlap in several areas.

The rhetorician directs attention to the meanings conveyed by word forms and syntactic structures, including the effects of preposing and postposing, explicit mention and omission, restriction, and the substitution of one form of expression for another. Such substitutions

⁷ Al-Zamakhsharī, *Asās al-Balāgha*, 2:266.

⁸ Muṣṭafā Ḥamīda, *Asālib al-'Atf'fi al-Qur'ān al-Karīm*, 24.

⁹ Al-Rummānī, Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn 'Isā ibn 'Alī, *al-Hudūd fi al-Nahw* (General Establishment for Press and Printing, 1969), 39.

¹⁰ Raḏī al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Astarābādī, *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya li-Ibn al-Ḥāḓib*, commentary by Yūsuf Ḥasan 'Umar, 2nd ed. (Benghazi: University of Qaryūnis Publications, 1996), 1:331.

¹¹ Ibn 'Uṣfūr, Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Mu'min ibn Muḥammad al-Andalusī, *al-Muqarrib*, 1:229.

¹² Ibn Mālik, Abū 'Abd Allāh Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh, *Tashīl al-Fawā'id wa-Takmil al-Maqāsid*, 184.

¹³ Al-Raḏī, *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya*, 1:318.

¹⁴ Ibn 'Aqīl, Bahā' al-Dīn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Abd Allāh, *Sharḥ Ibn 'Aqīl 'alā Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik* (Cairo: Dār al-Ṭalā'i' lil-Nashr wa-l-Tawzī', 2009), 3:165.

include an explicit noun for a pronoun, a pronoun for an explicit noun, or a relative pronoun for a common or proper noun, together with other usages through which Arabic speakers convey intended meanings.¹⁵

Rhetoricians examined these and related matters to establish principles for producing eloquent and effective Arabic discourse. Their concern extended to explicit mention and omission, preposing and postposing, explicit and pronominal reference, the selection of appropriate forms of expression, careful lexical choice, the refinement of syntactic structure, and the precise arrangement of words and clauses. The aim was to produce discourse capable of conveying intended meanings, whether explicit, implicit, or inferential, while achieving the desired rhetorical effect, including effects of allusion and symbolism.¹⁶

This concern gave rise to what rhetoricians call the science of meanings. The discipline analyses the meaningful sentence into its constituent elements and examines the conditions governing each element in Arabic. It considers when an element is mentioned or omitted, preposed or postposed, definite or indefinite, unrestricted or restricted, emphasised or unemphasised, and when restriction is or is not employed. It also examines whether meaningful clauses are linked through coordination or left uncoordinated, the contexts and requirements of each choice, and the relation between the wording of a sentence and the meaning it conveys. The present study focuses on coordination, specifically syndetic coordination, and asks how rhetoricians approached it within this broader methodology.

This section concentrates on the most prominent representative of this rhetorical approach, Imām ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, as reflected in his writings on the subject.

2.1. Coordination According to al-Jurjānī

Al-Jurjānī treats coordination in its rhetorical dimension within the discussion of conjunction and disjunction. His analysis centres on determining when clauses should be coordinated and when coordination should be omitted so that each clause begins independently after the preceding one. He establishes a set of principles governing coordination from this rhetorical perspective, beginning with the grammatical basis outlined below.

2.1.1. Conjunction

A. The Grammatical Basis. Al-Jurjānī begins from a set of grammatical rules and constraints formulated by grammarians to regulate coordination. These include the prohibition against inserting wāw between an adjective and the noun it modifies or between an emphatic element and the element it emphasises, the restriction on coordinating clauses that lack a syntactic position with respect to inflection, and the distinction between coordinating individual constituents and coordinating clauses. The following constraints are particularly important to his rhetorical account of coordination:

A.1. Coordination of One Individual Constituent with Another: Al-Jurjānī maintains that the function of coordination between individual constituents is “to make the second share in the inflection of the first; and, once it shares in its inflection, it also shares in the syntactic judgement entailed by that inflection.”¹⁷ In other words, the inflectional judgement is

¹⁵ ‘Abd al-Rahmān Ḥasan Ḥabannaka al-Maydānī, *al-Balāgha al-‘Arabiyya: Ususuhā wa-‘Ulūmuhā wa-Funūnuhā* (Beirut: Dār al-Qalam, 1996), 137.

¹⁶ Al-Maydānī, *al-Balāgha al-‘Arabiyya*, 137–38.

¹⁷ ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 171.

transferred to the second constituent by means of the coordinating wāw, and the remaining inflectional judgements, such as the accusative and genitive, are established on the same basis. Examples include: “Zayd and ‘Amr came”; “I honoured Zayd and ‘Alī”; and “I passed by Zayd and ‘Alī.”

A.2. Coordination of One Clause with Another: In discussing the coordination of one clause with another, al-Jurjānī distinguishes between two cases. The first is “that the clause to which another is coordinated should have a syntactic position with respect to inflection.”¹⁸ If this is the case, coordinating another clause with it presents no difficulty, because the coordination of the second clause with the first is treated in the same manner as the coordination of one individual constituent with another, as in: “I passed by a man whose character is good and whose appearance is ugly.” Both clauses function as attributes of the indefinite noun, and the inflectional judgement is transferred to the second clause by means of wāw. The second case concerns coordinating a clause with another clause that has no syntactic position with respect to inflection, as in: “Zayd is standing and ‘Alī is sitting.” Commenting on this example, al-Jurjānī states: “There is no way for us to claim that wāw has made the second clause share in any inflectional status that had, in any respect, been assigned to the first.”¹⁹

From the foregoing discussion, the conditions governing the coordination of one clause with another in al-Jurjānī’s account may be summarised as follows:

Its syntactic status must be equivalent to that of an individual constituent; the first clause must have a syntactic position with respect to inflection; and wāw must extend to the second clause a judgement already established for the first.

It may therefore be said that al-Jurjānī takes the coordination of one individual constituent with another as a fixed principle upon which he bases the coordination of one clause with another, particularly when the coordination involves a clause that has a syntactic position with respect to inflection. His statement confirms this: “When this is the case, its status is that of an individual constituent, for a clause cannot have a syntactic position with respect to inflection unless it occupies the position of an individual constituent. . .”²⁰

From this rule, or fixed principle, upon which al-Jurjānī based the concept of coordination in its rhetorical dimension, he derived further principles concerning coordination, or, more precisely, the chapter on disjunction and conjunction, including the following:

Descriptive or emphatic nouns do not require a connective element linking them to the nouns they describe or emphasise. For example, one may say, “Zayd, the refined, came to me” and “The people, all of them, came to me.” The expressions “the refined” and “all of them” are not entities distinct from Zayd and the people, respectively. The former is an adjective describing Zayd, while the latter emphasises the people; they therefore require no connective between the adjective and the noun it modifies. . . .²¹

What applies to an individual constituent in this respect also applies to clauses when a clause confirms or explicates the one preceding it and, once expressed, constitutes nothing distinct

¹⁸ Al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 171.

¹⁹ Al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 171.

²⁰ Al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 175.

²¹ Muḥammad Khattābī, *Lisāniyyāt al-Naṣṣ: Madkhal ilā Insijām al-Khiṭāb*, 2nd ed. (Casablanca, Morocco: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-‘Arabī, 2006), 101.

from it. Al-Jurjānī offers the following example to clarify his position. God Most High says: “Alif, Lām, Mīm. That is the Book; there is no doubt in it” [Sūrat al-Baqara, 2:1]. The expression “there is no doubt in it” constitutes an explanation, confirmation, and reinforcement of “that is the Book,” further establishing its meaning and functioning as though one were to say, “It is that Book; it is that Book.” The reason for leaving it without a coordinating particle is that “there is nothing by which it is distinguished from what precedes it so as to require something to join it thereto or a coordinating element to coordinate it with it.”²²

The preceding discussion shows that al-Jurjānī takes the individual constituent as the starting point for his account of conjunction and disjunction and extends this basis to clauses. When coordination between clauses cannot be explained by the grammatical principle established for individual constituents, he appeals to other, non-grammatical principles. These principles form a further foundation of his rhetorical account of coordination.

2.1.2. Semantic Principles

B.1. The Meaning of Combination: Al-Jurjānī proposes this principle to account for coordination between two clauses when the clause to which the second is coordinated has no syntactic position with respect to inflection. The reason is that, since the justification for coordination between two clauses lies in the existence of a judgement shared by both, and since this principle cannot be applied in the present case, al-Jurjānī proposes seeking a reason or cause that justifies the coordination. He terms this the “meaning of combination.” To illustrate this semantic principle, he gives the example “Zayd is standing and ‘Amr is sitting,” explaining that the justification for this coordination is either that Zayd is connected in some way with ‘Amr, or that Zayd and ‘Amr are like counterparts and associates, such that “when the hearer learns the state of the first, it matters to him to know the state of the second. This is demonstrated by the fact that, if you coordinate with the first something that has no connection with it, that is not naturally mentioned when it is mentioned, and whose discourse is not connected with its discourse, the expression will not be sound. Thus, if you were to say, ‘I left my house today, and how excellent is the one who says such-and-such a verse’, you would have said something laughable.”²³

A motive must therefore justify coordinating the state of ‘Amr with that of Zayd. Al-Jurjānī’s formulation suggests that the hearer is itself a contextual factor: once the hearer knows the state of the first person, the association of the two persons in the hearer’s mind may create a need to know the state of the second. This provides one justification for coordination and explains al-Jurjānī’s description of Zayd and ‘Amr as counterparts or associates.

B.2. The Counterpart, the Similar, and the Opposite. This principle is closely related to the preceding one and concerns what al-Jurjānī calls predication concerning the first and the second. Coordination is licensed when the two predicates are similar, opposite, or corresponding, as the following examples illustrate:

A. Zayd is tall, and ‘Amr is a poet.

B. Zayd is tall, and ‘Amr is short.

²² ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 173.

²³ Al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 176.

C. Zayd is a poet, and 'Amr is a writer.

The coordination in the first example is anomalous under the preceding constraint because the two predicates belong to different semantic fields: nothing motivates coordinating Zayd's tallness with 'Amr's being a poet. Each predicate should instead be paired with a semantically corresponding predicate, such as tallness with shortness or composing poetry with writing a story.²⁴

B.3. Psychological Association and Rational Association: This principle differs from the preceding semantic principles in that it seeks to justify coordination not from a semantic perspective but from a pragmatic one. This is because al-Jurjānī views the clause, or discourse as a whole, from the perspective of reception, that is, through the recipient's relationship with the discourse or clause. According to this principle, therefore, the acceptability of coordination is not attributable to semantic causes but rather to pragmatic ones. To illustrate this principle, al-Jurjānī gives the following example: "'Amr is standing and Zayd is sitting.'" The two persons are inseparable in the recipient's mind to such an extent that, upon learning the state of one, he longs to know the state of the other. Thus, if they are "brothers, counterparts, or generally interconnected in their circumstances, the state of one of them, whether standing, sitting, or anything similar, is undoubtedly associated in the mind with the state of the other."²⁵ One of the most prominent characteristics of psychological association is its relativity. This is because the association of persons with one another in the recipient's mind differs from one recipient to another. It also derives from the fact that two persons, or a group of persons, are regarded as associated only for someone who knows them and is concerned with their circumstances; they cannot be regarded as such for all people. By contrast with this psychological principle, and in opposition to it, the principle of rational association is general because it is connected with facts, or with "meanings," as al-Jurjānī terms them. To illustrate this feature of rational association, the following examples may be cited:

Knowledge is good and ignorance is bad; justice is praiseworthy and injustice is blameworthy; diligence is good and laziness is bad.

The semantic justification for coordination in these examples lies in the fact that the predicate concerning the second is opposed to the predicate concerning the first. The pragmatic justification, meanwhile, lies in the fact that the two states of affairs are rationally associated for all nations that have established a "complex civilisation" and a system of values that attributes a positive quality to some values and a negative quality to others, to encourage individuals to adhere to positive values and reject negative ones.²⁶

Through this method of description and analysis, al-Jurjānī established a general principle through which he discussed coordination from a rhetorical perspective. He summarised it in the following words: "No sharing between two things can be conceived unless there is a meaning in which that sharing takes place."²⁷

²⁴ Muḥammad Khattābī, *Lisāniyyāt al-Naṣṣ: Madkhal ilā Insijām al-Khiṭāb*, 101.

²⁵ 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, *Dalā'il al-I'jāz*, 173.

²⁶ Muḥammad Khattābī, *Lisāniyyāt al-Naṣṣ: Madkhal ilā Insijām al-Khiṭāb*, 104.

²⁷ 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, *Dalā'il al-I'jāz*, 188.

The foregoing discussion shows that, in al-Jurjānī's account, coordination between individual constituents and between clauses is governed not only by the grammatical principle of sharing an inflectional judgement but also by other principles, including combination, similarity, correspondence, and opposition.

Psychological association varies from one person to another and is therefore relative.

Rational association concerns facts and is therefore general, in contrast to psychological association.

Al-Jurjānī then introduces further principles for cases in which coordination occurs in clauses or contexts not covered by the preceding constraints. The most important of these is coordination by analogy with the condition and its consequence.

2.1.3. Coordination by Analogy with the Condition and Its Consequence

Al-Jurjānī adopted this principle to account for the occurrence of coordination in a type of context that, in his own description, may at the very least be characterised as a particular and subtle mode of expression. In this regard, al-Jurjānī states: "Among the aspects of coordination to which people seldom give consideration is that a clause may occur and be coordinated not with the clause immediately preceding it, but with a clause separated from it by one or two intervening clauses. This is a particular and subtle mode of expression."²⁸

By this statement, al-Jurjānī means that coordination need not link adjacent clauses; it may instead connect two clauses separated by intervening discourse. To illustrate this type of coordination, he cites the following two verses:

تولّوا بغتة فكأنّ بينا * تهيبني ففاجاني اغتيالاً.

They departed suddenly, and it was as though separation.
had stood in awe of me, then caught me unawares by stealth.

فكان مسير عيسهم ذميلاً * وسير الدّمع إثرهم انهمالاً

Thus, their camels moved away at a swift pace,
while tears, following after them, flowed in torrents.

Al-Jurjānī analyses this second type of coordination by means of two procedures: explanation and analysis, and analogy with the relation between a condition and its consequence.²⁹

At first sight, the reader may assume that the coordination occurs between the poet's statement "Thus, their camels moved away at a swift pace" and the clause "then caught me unawares by stealth." In reality, however, the former clause is coordinated with his statement "They departed suddenly." The indicator upon which al-Jurjānī relies to preclude the first interpretation of coordination is *ka'anna* ("as though"), which conveys supposition. Hence, whatever falls within the scope of this particle of comparison belongs to the realm of what is imagined, whereas the statement "Thus, their camels moved away at a swift pace" belongs to the realm of actuality. For this reason, al-Jurjānī maintains that the latter cannot be coordinated with the former; that is, what is imagined cannot be coordinated with what is actual. The second indicator advanced by al-Jurjānī to justify the impossibility of such coordination is logical. He regards the clause occurring within the imagined situation, "and it was as though separation had stood in awe of me," as an effect, while the clause "They

²⁸ Al-Jurjānī, *Dalā'il al-I'jāz*, 189.

²⁹ Muḥammad Khattābī, *Lisāniyyāt al-Naṣṣ: Madkhal ilā Insijām al-Khiṭāb*, 105.

departed suddenly” constitutes its cause. The meaning would thus be: “They departed suddenly, and so I imagined that separation had stood in awe of me.” There is no doubt that this supposition arose because their departure occurred suddenly.³⁰ Al-Jurjānī further maintains that the relationship between the first and second hemistichs of the first verse is strong and, indeed, one of dependency, since each requires the other for the meaning to be complete.

If the relationship between the two hemistichs of the first verse is causal, as al-Jurjānī maintains, the two verses do not depart from this relationship. The evidence for this is that “the purpose of this discourse is to present their sudden departure, in the manner that caused him to imagine that separation had stood in awe of him, as calling forth his weeping and necessarily causing his tears to flow. He was concerned to mention the swift movement of the camels only in order to mention the flowing of the tears and to establish a correspondence between the two. . .”³¹

Having demonstrated the semantic interconnection between the first and second hemistichs and the connection of the second verse with the first, al-Jurjānī establishes the cohesion of the text as a whole, since the element to which coordination applies is not merely the first hemistich of the second verse, but the entire verse. About this type of coordination, his statement therefore holds: “The principle of coordination is thus such that, at one time, you coordinate one clause with another, while at another you take two or more clauses and coordinate some of them with others, and then coordinate the whole of these with the whole of those.”³²

The foregoing discussion represents the first procedure adopted by al-Jurjānī, namely, explanation and analysis.

We may now turn to the second procedure or principle employed by al-Jurjānī in this type of coordination, namely, establishing coordination by analogy with the condition and its consequence. Al-Jurjānī begins this procedure by citing examples from the Qur’an, stating: “What is done with the condition and its consequence in respect of this meaning should be taken as a principle by which this matter is judged.”³³ The Qur’anic example upon which al-Jurjānī relies is the words of God Most High: “Whoever commits a fault or a sin and then casts it upon an innocent person has indeed burdened himself with calumny and manifest sin” [Sūrat al-Nisā’]. The relevant point in this verse is that the condition lies in the two clauses together, namely, the coordinated clause and the clause to which it is coordinated, rather than in each clause independently. Al-Jurjānī explains this by stating: “For if we were to treat each of them independently, we would make them two conditions; and if we made them two conditions, they would require two consequences, whereas we have only one consequence.”³⁴ This justification offered by al-Jurjānī is based on the grammatical indicator. From the perspective of the semantic indicator, however, al-Jurjānī also provides evidence, stating: “The consequence, namely, bearing the burden of calumny and manifest sin, is necessitated

³⁰ ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 188.

³¹ ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 189.

³² Al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 189.

³³ ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 190.

³⁴ Al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 190.

by the totality of what results from the two clauses. It does not arise from committing the fault alone, nor from accusing an innocent person of a fault or sin in absolute terms, but rather from accusing an innocent person of a fault or sin committed by the accuser himself. .

”³⁵

In sum, al-Jurjānī draws an analogy between this type of coordination and the relation between a condition and its consequence to demonstrate the composite nature of coordinating one group of clauses with another. His analysis shows how each group depends upon the other for the discourse to be complete, the meaning to be coherent, and the clauses, or the discourse as a whole, to form a cohesive structure. As noted above, this interpretation depends upon careful attention to syntactic structure and to the way meaning is organised through it.³⁶

3. Coordination in Functional Grammar Theory According to Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil

Rapid developments in Western linguistic research gave rise to theories and approaches based on differing intellectual and methodological premises. Among the most prominent was the functional approach, which differed from earlier approaches by assigning particular importance to the functions of constituents within the clause and by relating language to its functions in context, its social environment, and the circumstances of use. Functional Grammar emerged as a major functional theory of linguistic structure. The Moroccan scholar Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil adapted this framework to Arabic and applied it to a range of linguistic phenomena, including coordination. This section therefore presents the concepts and terminology that underpin al-Mutawakkil’s treatment of coordination within Functional Grammar.

3.1. Functional Operational Terms and Concepts Related to Coordination

Before examining the patterns of coordination identified by al-Mutawakkil within Functional Grammar, it is necessary to review several operational terms directly relevant to coordination: predication, predicate, and term, together with functions at the three principal levels of analysis, namely, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic.

3.1.1. The Predicate

In the Arabic grammatical tradition, the concept of the predicate is generally identified with the predicative element, whether verbal or nominal. “In Functional Grammar, however, the predicate denotes a property or a relation, and its syntactic category may be verb, noun, adjective, or adverb, in addition to a number of terms.”³⁷

For example: Zayd stood up; reading is beneficial; ‘Amr is joyful.

“In Functional Grammar, the clause is built around the predicate, since it constitutes the nucleus that cannot be omitted, whether verbal or non-verbal. The predicate is therefore one of the most important constituents of the clause, together with a number of terms, and syntactically belongs to the category of verb, noun, or adjective.”

3.1.2. Terms

Simon Dik defines a term as “any expression that can be used to refer to an entity or entities in some world.” In this sense, a term represents a participant or entity involved in a state of

³⁵ Al-Jurjānī, *Dalā’il al-I’jāz*, 175.

³⁶ Muḥammad Khattābī, *Lisāniyyāt al-Naṣṣ: Madkhal ilā Insijām al-Khiṭāb*, 106.

³⁷ See Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil, *Dirāsāt fī Naḥw al-Lughā al-‘Arabiyya al-Waṣīfī*, 11.

affairs, either as the entity that acts or as one affected by it. The predicate, whether verbal or non-verbal, determines the semantic characterisation of the state of affairs, while the terms identify the participating entities.

3.1.3. Predication

The following schema represents the general structure of predication in Functional Grammar:

Predicate Argument₁ . . . Argument_n Satellite₁ . . . Satellite_n

“Accordingly, in Functional Grammar, predication represents the world under discussion, whether the actual world or one of the possible worlds.

Predication consists of a predicate, whether verbal or non-verbal, and several terms denoting the entities participating in the event.”³⁸

3.2. The Basic Functions in Functional Grammar Theory: Semantic, Syntactic, and Pragmatic

The operational concepts outlined above are defined in relation to the functions that constituents perform within the clause. Functional Grammar distinguishes three principal levels of function: semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic.

A. Semantic functions determine the roles assigned to the terms of a predication in relation to the state of affairs denoted by the predicate, whether an action, event, position, or state.

B. Syntactic functions are represented principally by Subject and Object. Subject is assigned to the term that provides the primary perspective on the state of affairs, whereas Object is assigned to the term that provides the secondary perspective.

C. Pragmatic functions concern constituents whose status is determined by the communicative relation between speaker and addressee. They differ from semantic and syntactic functions and include Theme, Tail, and Vocative, functions that display a degree of independence from the core predication.

These pragmatic functions may be described more specifically as follows:

- Focus: Al-Mutawakkil defines it as the function “assigned to the constituent carrying the most important or most salient information in the clause.”
- Topic: The Topic function is assigned to the constituent denoting what is being discussed within the predication.
- Theme: Al-Mutawakkil defines it as “that which determines the domain of discourse with respect to which the predication is relevant.”
- Tail: Apposition in Arabic may be regarded as the functional equivalent of the Tail function in Functional Grammar.
- Vocative: Al-Mutawakkil defines it as “a function assigned to the constituent denoting the entity addressed in a particular context.”

3.3. Rules and Constraints Governing Syndetic Coordination from a Functional Perspective

Among the linguistic phenomena examined by the Moroccan scholar Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil is coordination. His analysis identifies the constituents that may be coordinated and the semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic constraints governing coordination between them. The

³⁸ Al-Mutawakkil, *Dirāsāt fī Naḥw al-Lughā al-‘Arabiyya al-Waḏīfī*, 31–32.

aim is to provide a systematic account of the phenomenon through the constraints formulated within Functional Grammar.

In his 1980 work, particularly chapter 9, Simon Dik sets out the general principles underlying the proposed analysis and description of coordination in Functional Grammar. His account centres on three elements: the coordination rule, the patterns of coordination, and the constraints governing the rule.³⁹ To clarify the Functional Grammar treatment of coordination, the following discussion examines al-Mutawakkil's formulation of Dik's proposal in greater detail.

3.3.1. The Coordination Rule

Within Functional Grammar, coordinate constructions and clauses are derived by expanding an element within a structure into a sequence of elements of the same type. To derive this type of coordinate construction, Dik (1980) proposes the following rule:

$$a_1 C a_2 \dots C a_n \quad n > 2$$

In this rule, *a* denotes any element capable of assuming different values, such as a predication, predicate, or term, while *C* denotes the coordinating particle.⁴⁰ For example:

- Zayd and Khālīd travelled.
- 'Amr left, then 'Alī.
- I drink milk or yoghurt.
- Ibn Qutayba is a linguist and a critic.
- I saw Khālīd's father and uncle.
- Zayd was absent today and yesterday.

The rule is applied at the level of predication frames themselves "in deriving structures in which two terms are coordinated."⁴¹

Dik distinguishes three patterns of coordination: term coordination, coordination within terms, and predicate coordination. He also formulates semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic constraints governing these patterns. The semantic constraints require coordinated terms to bear the same semantic function. The syntactic constraints require, in addition, that the same syntactic function be assigned to the terms in the coordinate sequence. The coordinated terms must likewise be symmetrical with respect to pragmatic function.⁴²

Al-Mutawakkil extends Dik's proposals beyond term coordination to include predicate and predication coordination. He formulates constraints for each pattern under what he calls the "principle of symmetry" and also proposes a mechanism for integrating coordinating particles.

3.3.2. Patterns of Coordination

3.3.2.1. Term Coordination

As noted above, term coordination is governed by the general principle on which al-Mutawakkil bases his functional account of coordination, namely, symmetry between coordinated elements. Under this general principle, he distinguishes three types of constraint:

- Semantic constraints: coordinated terms must bear the same semantic function.

³⁹ Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil, *Dirāsāt fī Naḥw al-Lughā al-‘Arabiyya al-Waṣṭīfī*, 177.

⁴⁰ Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil, *al-Lisāniyyāt al-Waṣṭīfiyya: Madkhal Naẓarī* (Rabat: Manshūrāt ‘Ukāz, 1989), 260.

⁴¹ Al-Mutawakkil, *al-Lisāniyyāt al-Waṣṭīfiyya*, 260.

⁴² Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil, *Dirāsāt fī Naḥw al-Lughā al-‘Arabiyya al-Waṣṭīfī*, 178–79.

- Syntactic constraints: coordinated terms must bear the same syntactic function; for example, an Object cannot be coordinated with a Subject.
- Pragmatic constraints: coordination must occur between terms assigned the same pragmatic function, in accordance with the general symmetry constraint governing all patterns of coordination.

Al-Mutawakkil adds a further condition to pragmatic symmetry: symmetry of reference. He accordingly distinguishes between referring expressions, realised as proper nouns and definite nouns, and non-referring expressions, realised as indefinite nouns.

3.3.2.2. Predicate Coordination

In Functional Grammar, a predicate denotes a state of affairs belonging to one of four classes: action, event, position, or state. Syntactically, it may belong to the category of verb, noun, adjective, or adverb; in other words, a predicate may be verbal or non-verbal.

Predicate coordination is likewise governed by the general symmetry constraint, together with subsidiary constraints specific to this pattern of coordination.

Predicates may be coordinated when they denote the same type of state of affairs. Thus, an action predicate may be coordinated with another action predicate, as in “Aḥmad went and returned.” For al-Mutawakkil, identity of the class of state of affairs is the primary condition. He adds a second constraint: coordinated predicates must also be symmetrical with respect to their semantic field, a requirement he terms the “unity of semantic field constraint.” Thus, in “Zayd is intelligent and sad,” the two predicates belong to the same class of state of affairs, namely, state, but to different semantic fields.

3.3.2.3. Coordination of Predications and Clauses

Based on the distinction between simple and complex clauses, al-Mutawakkil identifies two further patterns. Coordination between simple clauses consisting of a single predication is termed “predication coordination,” whereas coordination between complex clauses containing multiple predications is termed “clause coordination.”

As with the preceding patterns, al-Mutawakkil establishes constraints governing predication coordination. Under the principle of symmetry, coordinated predications must be symmetrical, and that symmetry must extend to their constituent elements. He formulates the conditions as follows:

The predicates of two coordinated predications must satisfy the constraints that govern predicate coordination within a single predication. In addition to semantic symmetry between the predicates, their arguments must be symmetrical both semantically and referentially. In other words, the two predications must be symmetrical in propositional content, adopting the terminology al-Mutawakkil draws from ordinary-language philosophy. He also requires symmetry between their operators, which he terms the “illocutionary-force indicator.” Hence, two predications with different illocutionary forces cannot be coordinated, as in “I authored a book” (statement) and “Write poetry” (command).

3.3.2.4. Clause Coordination. Al-Mutawakkil uses the term “clause coordination” when the coordinated elements are complex clauses of the Theme–Predication or Predication–Tail type, as in “Khālīd authored a book, and ‘Amr wrote an article.” He formulates the relevant constraint as follows: “Two predications may be coordinated if they are symmetrical in terms

of their propositional content, their illocutionary force, and the two pragmatic functions that they bear or contain.”

3.4. Coordinating Particles from the Perspective of Functional Grammar

Al-Mutawakkil’s functional treatment of coordinating particles remains broadly continuous with the classical Arabic grammatical tradition. He treats wāw as the basic coordinating particle because of its frequency in coordinate structures and its relative neutrality in comparison with other coordinating particles. He therefore examines the particles available in Arabic according to the contexts in which they occur and the meanings they express, seeking to identify the conditions governing the use of each particle. His principal observations include the following:

- The particles require compatibility between coordinated elements because coordination is governed by the principle of symmetry and by its semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic constraints.
- The choice of coordinating particle depends on several factors, including whether the relation is conjunctive or disjunctive. Conjunctive coordination is expressed by wāw, fa-, thumma, and ḥattā, whereas disjunctive coordination is expressed by aw, bal, lākin, and am.

Al-Mutawakkil emphasises that “conjunction” and “disjunction” are used here in their logical, rather than rhetorical, senses. He further proposes a criterion for distinguishing the two types, which he calls the “coordinating-particle integration rule.” This rule operates according to the specifications contained in the general coordination rule.

4. Conclusion: Findings of the Study

4.1. Findings Concerning Coordination in al-Jurjānī

- Because rhetoricians take the sentence as a central unit of analysis and attend closely to contextual meaning, they treat coordination within the broader framework of conjunction and disjunction. Al-Jurjānī therefore discusses coordination within this general rhetorical framework rather than as an independent topic.
- Al-Jurjānī takes coordination between individual constituents as the basic model for analysing coordination between clauses, especially clauses that have a syntactic position with respect to inflexion.
- Al-Jurjānī extends the range of principles governing coordination to account for the different contexts in which it occurs.
- His account of coordination may be organised under the following grammatical and semantic principles:

1. Grammatical Principles and Foundations

- Coordination between individual constituents constitutes the basic case. Its function is to make the second constituent share in the inflexion of the first, thereby extending the relevant syntactic judgement to it.
- Coordination between clauses follows the same model when the coordinated clause has a syntactic position with respect to inflection; in such cases, the clause assumes the status of an individual constituent.

2. Semantic and Pragmatic Principles

- The meaning of combination: al-Jurjānī proposes this principle to explain coordination between two clauses when the clause to which the second is coordinated has no syntactic position with respect to inflexion. Pragmatic considerations enter the analysis through attention to the hearer as a constituent of context.
- The counterpart, the similar, and the opposite: this principle develops the meaning of combination by requiring an appropriate semantic relation between the two predicates, whether similarity, opposition, or correspondence.
- Psychological and rational association: this principle differs from the preceding semantic principles because its justification of coordination is primarily pragmatic. Psychological association depends on the recipient's relation to the discourse and is therefore relative, since associations between persons differ from one recipient to another.

Rational association, by contrast, is general because it is grounded in states of affairs and meanings rather than in the particular associations of an individual recipient.

Taken together, these principles show that al-Jurjānī does not explain coordination solely through grammatical sharing. His account also invokes semantic and pragmatic grounds, especially psychological and rational association.

Thus, coordination between individual constituents and between clauses is governed not only by grammatical principles but also by a range of semantic and pragmatic relations, including combination, similarity, correspondence, opposition, psychological association, and rational association.

These principles account for much of al-Jurjānī's rhetorical treatment of coordination. Other clauses and contexts, however, require additional explanation. Most notably, he introduces the principle of coordination by analogy with the condition and its consequence to account for cases in which coordination links clauses separated by intervening discourse rather than adjacent clauses.

Al-Jurjānī explains this principle through two methods:

A. Explanation and analysis. Al-Jurjānī first presents an example and then analyses it in detail to justify the type of coordination he describes as "a particular and subtle mode of expression."

The purpose of this analysis is to demonstrate the cohesion of the text as a whole. The element to which another is coordinated need not be adjacent to the coordinated element; it may occur at some distance within the context. As al-Jurjānī explains, coordination may link one clause to another or may first coordinate several clauses internally and then coordinate one group of clauses with another.

B. Analogy with the condition and its consequence. Al-Jurjānī treats the relation between a condition and its consequence as a model for this form of coordination. His explanation relies on contextual indicators and on the way meaning changes as those indicators change. The analogy reveals the composite nature of coordinating one group of clauses with another and the mutual dependence of the two groups. Such dependence is necessary for coherent meaning and for the cohesion of the clauses, or of the discourse as a whole, and therefore requires close attention to syntactic structure.

4.2. Findings Concerning Coordination in Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil

- Al-Mutawakkil's functional treatment of coordination begins from the theoretical principles established by proponents of Functional Grammar, foremost among them Simon Dik.
- His method of theorisation and application is highly formalised and is organised around three central components: the coordination rule, the patterns of coordination, and the constraints governing the rule.
- The principal aim of this approach is to provide a more precise and systematic account of linguistic phenomena in Arabic, including coordination.
- Al-Mutawakkil grounds coordination in a general "principle of symmetry between coordinated elements," which governs term coordination, predicate coordination, and the coordination of predications and clauses.
- Functional Grammar assigns analytical priority to semantic and pragmatic components over morphosyntactic and phonological components.
- Al-Mutawakkil's treatment of coordinating particles remains broadly consistent with the classical Arabic linguistic tradition in its basic classification and theoretical grounding of those particles.
- A significant point of divergence nevertheless emerges from al-Mutawakkil's application of the general symmetry principle to coordinating particles. This approach gives less attention to the contextual meanings that coordinating particles may acquire and to the effects of those meanings on interpretation. Classical Arabic rhetoricians, especially 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, place greater emphasis on this contextual dimension through the exceptional principles developed in the discussion of clause coordination within conjunction and disjunction, particularly in contexts he describes as "a particular and subtle mode of expression."
- A further difference concerns the terms "conjunction" and "disjunction." In classical rhetoric, they belong to a broad account of how meaning arises between clauses in different communicative contexts. In Functional Grammar, particularly in al-Mutawakkil's application of the theory to Arabic, the terms are used in a more restricted logical and technical sense consistent with the theoretical premises of the functional framework.
- The comparison also highlights the breadth and analytical precision of the classical Arabic linguistic tradition. Its comprehensive treatment of linguistic phenomena has enabled it to retain scholarly value across time, while also creating practical challenges for attempts to integrate modern linguistic theories into the analysis of Arabic. Al-Mutawakkil's functional applications to Arabic illustrate this difficulty.

Despite these differences between classical Arabic rhetorical scholarship and modern Functional Grammar, the two approaches also display important points of convergence and can illuminate one another. The principal areas of convergence identified in this study are as follows:

- The rhetorical tradition's attention to language in use, contextual meaning, and the communicative situation anticipates central concerns of the functional approach.

- In applying Functional Grammar to Arabic, particularly to coordination, al-Mutawakkil remains close in several respects to principles already developed by classical rhetoricians. His contribution lies chiefly in rendering the analysis more explicit and systematic through operational concepts and formal constraints, although this formalisation gives less attention to some contextual and rhetorical dimensions of coordination.