Research in Language, 2018, vol. 16:4 DOI: 10.2478/rela-2018-0021

PARENTHETICAL CLAUSES IN THE QUR'ĀN

YEHUDIT DROR
University of Haifa, Israel
judror@gmail.com

Abstract
In the few traditional Arabic grammatical sources that address the term parentheticals it is usually defined as the insertion of a clause between two other clauses, or between two syntactic components, for ta'kīd "emphasis." In this article I examine Qur'ānic parenthetical clauses in the theoretical framework of relevance theory. It transpires that the parenthetical clause is placed where it achieves optimal relevance and therfore the conveyed utterance does not require the addresses to waste any efforts trying to procees the information and correctly interpret it. Optimal relevance also means having a contextual effect. The Qur'ānic parenthetical clauses have one of the following contextual effects: They serve to affirm God's omnipotence, indicating that only God produces suras, created heaven and earth. He is the forgiver and all depends on His will; to explain what it meant by a specific statement or to explain the reason behind a certain action; to qualify, to highlight a specific characterization, for example, one of the parenthetical clauses modify the Qur'ān as the truth from God; to provide background information, which could explain further developments in the narrative.

Keywords: parenthetical clauses, Relevance Theory, contextual effect

1. Introduction

1.1. General definition of the term "parentheticals"

This article investigates parenthetical clauses in the Qur'ān, a category which subsumes a wide range of forms and lacks a clear definition in either traditional Arab grammar or Western research on Arabic language. As a general characterization of parentheticals, the term *parenthesis* may be said to refer to any peripheral information, expressed through a single word, phrase or clause, and in terms of content the information is external to the sentence (Zewi 2007: 2).[1] Parentheticals are elements varying in length and complexity, category and function, as in:

a) One-word parentheticals: "Umm I don't have a sleeping bag *unfortunately*."
b) Nominal apposition: "She claimed that the new Prime Minister *Jim Callaghan* had offered his predecessor the job of Foreign Secretary in his government."

[1] Cf. Ziv (1985: 181).

c) Question tags: "He suffered great mental distress *didn't he* after the war?"
d) Clauses: "It's been a mixture of extreme pleasure *I've had hundreds of letters from all sorts of people who have enjoyed the book* and considerable irritation because of being constantly interviewed" (Dehé and Kavalova 2007: 2–3).[2]

As seen in these examples, parentheticals are linearly[3] integrated in the host sentence, i.e., they intersect with other structures in it on a linear plane, sharing with them a terminal string; nor are they are linked to the host by any syntactic nodes (Kaltenböck 2007: 26)[4] therefore they seem to be independent. It is also claimed that they interrupt the prosodic flow of the sentence by introducing intonational breaks in the host sentence (Dehé and Kavalova 2007: 1). Parentheticals are also characterized by the lack of a specified position in the sentence. They may occur in initial, medial or final position in the sentence. However, there are some restrictions regarding their position in it: for example, the following sentences are grammatically correct: "*As far as I know*, Bill sent her a lot of money"; "Bill sent her a lot of money, *as far as I know*"; "Bill, *as far as I know*, sent her a lot of money." However, a sentence like *Bill sent her, as far as I know, a lot of money" is ill-formed because it breaks an inseparable sequence; in other words, there are weak spots in the syntax of the host sentence which enable the insertion of a parenthetical expression more readily than others (Ziv 1985: 182).[5] For example, inserting a parenthetical between a subject and its verbal predicate is acceptable, while inserting it between a verb and its direct object is regarded as ill-formed (Peterson 1999: 239).

As for the syntactic relations between the parenthetical clause and its host sentence, some scholars[6] show that they do exist. For example, anaphors in a parenthetical can be bound by antecedents in the host clause. Other scholars, such as Peterson (1999: 230, 232),[7] argue that parentheticals are non-syntagmatic – i.e, they involve a lack of linkage between the elements and therefore do not constitute a grammatical construction.

The syntactic independence of the parenthetical from its host sentence can be demonstrated by a number of tests; I mention only a few:

(a) They can be deleted, e.g., "John talked to us, *it seems*, about literature and Mary did too." The intended meaning is that Mary talked about literature

---

2 For additional examples of parentheticals in English, see Kaltenböck (2007: 29–30).

3 Burton-Roberts (2006: 180) explains the term *linearity* as follows: "In syntactic order, linear order is generally held to be a function of hierarchical syntax structure: order is determined by, and within, constituent domain So, if one expression is contained by another expression on the linear axis, it should be contained by the expression on the hierarchical axis. In other words, it should be a syntactic constituent of that expression."

4 Cf. Dehé and Kavalova (2007: 1); Kavalova (2007: 145).

5 Cf. Kaltenböck (2007:42–43).

6 For example, Kavalova (2007) refers to Hoffmann (1998), Jackendoff (1977) and Potts (2002).

7 Haegeman (1988) is also mentioned in the literature as one of the scholars who support the unintegrated approach of parentheticals.

and not that Mary talked, it seems, about literature. The parenthetical does not form a component with the VP (talked) of the host.

(b) Parentheticals cannot be the focus of a cleft sentence, e.g., "Emmanuel Shinwell thought – *and he is after all a previous Defence Minister* – that you can't have informed opinion on this vital mater without…." It is impossible to construct this sentence as *It was (and) *he is after all a previous Defence Minister* who/that Emanuel Shinwell thought that you can't have….

(c) Parentheticals are not temporally subordinated to the host, e.g., "In fact it was very candidly told *and I repeat the acknowledgment of the candour* with which it was placed before him in January." The present tense in the parenthetical is independent from the past tense in the host (Kaltenböck 2007: 35).[8]

Finally, pragmatically parentheticals express a comment by the speaker or they may strengthen or weaken its force, or specify the form of the speaker's attitude to the content of the utterance (Ziv 1985: 182).

As for the definition of the term *parenthetical* in medieval Arabic grammatical treaties, we might refer to Ibn Ǧinnī (1913: vol. 1,339). In a chapter entitled *bāb fī l-iʻtirāḍ* "Chapter on parenthesis" [*lit*. "Chapter on the interception"] he says that it is a known feature which occurs in the Qur'ān, in poetry and in prose. Its main function is *ta'kīd* "emphasis," therefore grammarians, rhetoricians, poets and writers integrate in their writings sentences, where a syntactic constructor is interpolated between subject and predicate or between other components which may not be separated.

Ibn Hišām (1991: vol. 2, 21) refers to the term *ǧumla muʻtariḍa* "parentheticals clause," classifying it as one of the clauses devoid of syntactic status (*ǧumlatun lā maḥalla lahā mina l-'iʻrābi*)[9]. He explains this type of clause as follows:

> al-muʻtariḍatun bayna šay'ayni li-'ifādati l-kalāmi taqwiyatan wa-tasdīdan 'aw taḥsīnan, wa-qad waqaʻat fī mawāḍiʻa
> "The parenthetical clause [is inserted] between two things [i.e., between two clauses or between two syntactic constituents] to enhance the speech by reinforcing it, by focusing [on a certain meaning], or by embellishing it and it stands in [various] positions."[10]

---

8 Cf. Kavalova (2007: 158–160).

9 The term *ǧumlatun lā maḥalla lahā mina l-'iʻrābi* means that it has no specified syntactic function in the sentence that contains it. This clause does not function as head, complement or adjunct.

10 Gully (1995: 78) explains Ibn Hišām's definition as follows: "The function of parenthesis is the separation of two clauses by another clause; in essence, the reinforcement and sealing off, or embellishment of speech in a manner which actually enhances the meaning."
Reckendorf (1921: 382) also explains that parenthetical clauses (*ǧumla muʻtariḍa*) stand in the middle, i.e., between two clauses.

According to these definitions the basic criterion for identifying parenthetical clauses is that they are inserted between two clauses or two syntactic constituents. Both Ibn Ǧinnī and Ibn Hišām further indicate the most typical places of interpolation for parenthetical clauses, of which I will mention a few cases:

(a) Between subject and predicate: *wa-qad ’adrakatnī* ***wa-l-ḥawādiṯu ǧammatun*** *’asinnatu qawmin lā ḍi‘āfin wa-lā ‘uzli* “The spears [belonging] to the people, who are neither weak nor defenseless, have reached me, while the events are numerous” [*lit*. I was reached by — while the events are numerous — the leaders of the people, who are neither weak nor defenseless]” (Ibn Ǧinnī 1913: vol. 1, 340).[11]

(b) Between *protasis* (the clause containing the condition) and *apodosis* (the clause containing the *conclusion)*: *’in yakun ġaniyyan ’aw faqīran* ***fa-llāhu ’awlā bihimā*** *fa-lā tattabi‘ū l-hawā* (Q 4: 135) “[O believers, be upholders of justice, witnesses for God, even though it be against yourselves, or your parents or near relatives], whether rich or poor **God stands close to them, so** follow not [your] lust.” (Ibn Hišām 1991: vol. 2, 27).[12]

(c) Between a noun and its adjective: *wa-’innahu la-qasamun* ***law ta‘lamūna*** *‘aẓīmun* (Q 56: 76) “[I swear by the place of the stars] and that is a mighty oath, if you but know” [*lit*. and that is an oath, **if you but know**, mighty] (Ibn Ǧinnī 1913: vol. 1, 339).[13]

(d) Between a preposition and its governed noun: *ištaraytuhu bi****’arā*** *’alfi dirhamin*
“I bought it, **I think**, for a thousand dirhams” (Ibn Hišām 1991: vol. 2, 30).

(e) Between two clauses: *fa-’tūhunna min ḥayṯu ’amarakumu llāhu* ***’inna llāha yuḥibbu t-tawwābīna wa-yuḥibbu l-mutaṭahhirīna*** *nisā’ukum ḥarṯun lakum* (Q 2: 222–223) “[**They ask you about menstruation. Say: It is painful; so avoid (intercourse with) women during menstruation and do not approach them till they are clean. When they have cleaned themselves,] then you may go unto them as Allah has commanded you. Verily, Allah loves those who repent constantly, and (He) loves those who purify themselves. Your women are a tillage for you**” (Ibn Hišām 1991: vol. 2, 32).

Also, Ibn Hišām’s definition implies a connection between the host sentence and the parenthetical clause because it establishes some pragmatic link between them. The parenthetical clauses may reinforce, affirm or specify what has been uttered previously in the sentence.

---

11 Cf. Ibn Hišām (1991: vol. 2, 21).

12 The translation of the Qur’ānic verses is taken from Arberry (1964), while I made a few changes in the original translation.

13 Cf. Ibn Hišām (1991: vol. 2, 28).

1.2. Objectives and frame of work

Despite Arab grammarians' occasional references to the term ğumla mu'tariḍa,[14] this notion has not been explicitly defined – a fact that may explain three difficulties that arose during the research:

(a) To create a comprehensive list of parenthetical clauses I referred to the exegetical literature while trying to detect all occurrences of the term *ğumla mu'tariḍa*. It seems that the lack of criteria for syntactically identifying parentheticals has led to various options among the commentators, and in many cases one commentator identifies varied constructions of parentheticals which are not mentioned by the others.

(b) Another prominent problem in the exegetical literature is the complexity of determining the exact border between parenthetical units and clauses such as circumstantial clauses, e.g., *yurīdūna 'an yaẖruğū mina n-nāri* ***wa-mā hum bi-ẖāriğīna minhā*** *wa-lahum 'aḏābun muqīmun* (Q 5:37) "They will desire to come forth from the Fire, **but they will not come forth from it**, for them awaits a lasting chastisement." According to Šawkānī (1997: vol. 2, 55), the clause in bold might be analyzed as a circumstantial clause or as a parenthetical clause. Ibn Hišām (1991: vol. 2, 443) distinguishes these two types, saying *inter alia* that a parenthetical can be an interrogative clause or a clause expressing a command. A circumstantial clause, on the other hand, must be informative. However, this cannot be regarded as a clear-cut rule for distinguishing the two types because in various cases such as Q 5: 37 or 2: 83, there is an informative clause which commentators explain as both as parenthetical and circumstantial.

(c) The third problem concerns the relation between the position of the parenthetical clause and its pragmatics, as the following example shows: *wa-llaḏīna 'iḏā fa'alū fāḥišatan 'aw ẓalamū 'anfusahum ḏakarū llāha fa-staġfarū li-ḏunūbihim* ***wa-man yaġfiru ḏ-ḏunūba 'illā llāhu*** *wa-lam yuṣirrū 'alā mā fa'alū wa-hum ya'lamūna* (Q 3: 135) **"And those who, when they commit an indecency or do injustice to themselves, remember God and seek forgiveness for their sins — and who forgives the sins except God? — And they do not knowingly persist in what they have committed."** According to Ḥasan (2012: 84), the motivation for introducing the parenthetical clause into the sentence is to emphasize the idea that no one except God can forgive peoples' sins. I find that such an explanation is not sufficiently convincing and fails to explain the reason for the insertion. The idea of God as forgiver could

[14] References to the term *al-i'tirāḍ* are found in Arabic rhetoric. For example, 'Askarī (1971: 410) defines it as interruption of the host sentence. He explains that the insertion breaks the flow, hence there is structural incompleteness of the host. However, after this break the listener returns to the host sentence, which becomes a complete sentence semantically and syntactically.

equally have been uttered if the parenthetical clause had been in final-position.

This article contributes to the discussion of the relation between the host sentence and parentheticals in the Qur'ān. It has two goals:

1) To explain in what way parenthetical clauses are linked to their host clauses and whether the various types of parentheticals differ in this respect. This issue is addressed in section 2.
2) To draw attention to the reason for introducing a parenthetical clause into the main utterance. Using the framework of Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson 1996), in section 3 I explain what governs the use and the position of such structures in the Qur'ān.

Additionally, this study might contribute to the understanding of the relationship between phrases, clauses, and sentences in the Qur'ān. I refer to the relevance theory as a way which attempts to explain how parentheticals are related to the host sentence and how they contribute to the interpretation of the speaker's intention. However, I should mention in this context the pioneering work of Salwa El-Awa on textual relations in the Qur'ān. In this work, El-Awa also discuss the problem of textual relations in the Qur'ān according to the principles of the Relevance Theory.[15]

The methodology employed in the current study and in El-Awa's work might encourage future Qur'ānic studies dealing with word order, information structure and related issues.

A source which already identified parenthetical clauses in the Qur'ān is the exegetical literature. I used the search engine in the Internet site http://www.altafsir.com/index to collect all occurrences of parenthetical clauses. Out of 127 parenthetical clauses, only 22 are discussed here because I ruled out three types of clauses: first, clauses that can be analyzed as both circumstantial and parenthetical. For example, *wa-llāhu yaḥkumu* ***lā mu'aqqiba li-ḥukmihī*** (Q 13: 41) "And God judges, **no one repels His judgment**" is usually analyzed as a circumstantial clause; only a few commentators raise the option that it might be a parenthetical clause.[16] Second, clauses starting with the anaphoric pronoun *hāḏā* "this" or *ḏālika* "that" or *'ulā'ika* "those," for example, Q 65: 1. I could not understand what differentiated these clauses from other clauses of this type which are not analyzed as parentheticals. Third, sometimes I identified another function of the clause other than parenthetical. For example, in numerous cases the commentators regard a conjuncted clause as parenthetical, for example, Q 2: 200 (*fa-min n-nāsi*…). However, my examination showed that these clauses can be analyzed as coordinated clauses because they usually refer to a new subject. Parenthetical clauses, on the other hand, refer to the same subject mentioned previously in the host sentence.

15 See: El-Awa (2006: 1–2).

16 See: Šawkāni (1997: vol. 3, 125)

2. Two Types of Parenthetical Clauses

We can distinguish two types of parenthetical clauses in the Qur'ān: middle-positioned and final-positioned.[17] Each type has the following properties:[18]

2.1. Syntactic relation vs. non-syntactic relation

(1)
wa-man ʾaḥsanu dīnan mimman ʾaslama waǧhahu li-llāhi wa-huwa muḥsinun wa-ttabaʿa millata ʾibrāhīma ḥanīfan **wa-ttaḫaḏa llāhu ʾibrāhīma ḫalīlan** (Q 4: 125)
"And who is better in religion than he who submits his will to God, he being righteous and one who follows the creed of Abraham, a man of pure faith? **God took Abraham for a friend**."

Syntactically, the parenthetical clause seems connected to the host by the coordinating conjunction *wa-* "and"; however, the particle *wa-* functions here as *wāw al-isti'nāf*[19] "*wāw* of commencement," which indicates the beginning of a new sentence wholly independent from the sentence that precedes it. According to the commentators, the communicative value of the parenthetical clause is to emphasize the obligation to follow the creed of Abraham by stating that he is chosen as a friend of God. Had this clause functioned as *ǧumla maʿṭūfa* "coordinated clause" connected to the previous clause, it would have been meaningless (*law ǧaʿaltahā maʿṭūfatan ʿalā l-ǧumlati qablahā lam yakun lahā maʿnā*) (Zamaḫšarī 1947: vol. 1, 569).[20] It means that coordination of two or more clauses might indicate that the speaker, having mentioned one thing, wants to go on to talk about something else that is similar, but this is not the case in Q 4: 125. The parenthetical clause adds some information about a previous subject (Abraham).

While there is no syntactic relation between the parenthetical clause and the host, there is a semantic bond between the two which is achieved by the fact that one component (the name of Abraham) is shared by the host sentence and the parenthetical clause. The repetition of this name was probably intended to prevent any ambiguity as to the identity of the person who is considered God's friend. Had the proper name been replaced by a pronoun ****wa-ttaḫaḏahu llāhu ḫalīlan*** "God took him as a friend" the suffixed pronoun *-hu* could have had two possible antecedents: Abraham, or he who submits his will to God.

---

17 The occurrence of parenthetical clauses in final-position is mentioned in Arabic rhetoric, where they are also called *al-iʿtirāḍ at-taḏyīlī* "suffixed parentheticals" and "final-positioned parentheticals." For example, Qazwīnī (2002: 129) says that this type of parentheticals is introduced to complete the utterance.

18 Examples (8) and (9) are middle-positioned parentheticals even though they have the same properties as the final-positioned parentheticals – namely, there is no syntactic relation between the parenthetical clause and the clause which precedes it.

19 See: Yāqūt (1998: vol. 4, 288).

20 Cf. Nasafī (1996: vol. 1, 368).

In the following example, the connection between the host and the parenthetical is licensed by grammar. It is inserted between the subject and the predicate and it includes a pronoun-antecedent relation, where the suffixed pronouns *-him* (in *'alayhim*) and *-hum* (in *'anḏartahum*, *tunḏirhum*) refer back to the unbelievers:

(2)
'inna lläḏīna kafarū sawā'un 'alayhim 'a-'anḏartahum 'am lam tunḏirhum lā yu'minūna (Q 2:6)
"The unbelievers, it is all the same to them whether you have warned them or have warned them not; they do not believe."

2.2. Dependent clauses vs. independent clauses

Full interpretation of the parenthetical clauses, which are syntactically connected to the host in an anaphoric relation, can be achieved only in a given context, namely when they are integrated in the host sentence. On the other hand, parenthetical clauses without any syntactic relation are independent and *self-contained* clauses. This argument can be tested by taking the parenthetical clause out of its context:

(3)
fa-ltaqaṭahu 'ālu fir'awna li-yakūna lahum 'aduwwan wa-ḥazanan ***'inna fir'awna wa-hāmāna wa-ğunūdahumā kānū ḫāṭi'īna*** (28:8)
"Then the people of Pharaoh picked him out that he might be unto them an enemy and sorrow to them; verily Pharaoh and Haman [Pharaoh's vizier] and their hosts were sinners."

Q 28:8 belongs to a larger thematic unit which is the narrative of Moses (verses 1–44).

Verses 4–5 relate that **Pharaoh exalted himself in the land (of Egypt) and divided its people into sections, weakening a group of them; he slaughtered their sons and spared their females.** However, God **intended to bestow His favor upon those who were oppressed on earth by giving them power on earth, and to show Pharaoh and Haman what they dreaded from them**. In light of this information, we read in verse seven that Moses' mother is requested to breastfeed Moses and she is told that **when she feels fear for Moses she should cast him into the river without any hesitation because he will return as one of the apostles.** When we read verse eight we understand that Moses' mother indeed cast him away and now he is picked up by Pharaoh's people. This verse ends with the parenthetical clause, while no syntactic relation exists between it and the previous sentence. However, the semantic relation is clear: the parenthetical clause explains the reason for sending Moses to Pharaoh in order to cause them sorrow: both Pharaoh and Haman were sinners and they must be punished. However, I argue that even when the parenthetical is used outside its context it is a comprehensive utterance. **The clause "Verily Pharaoh and Haman and their**

hosts were sinners" is a statement which can stand by itself because the grammar and the semantics of the parenthetical clause in no way depend on the host. In example (4) we see the opposite case. The syntactic relation indicates that the parenthetical clause is a dependent utterance that must be linked to the host to be fully interpreted.

(4)
wa-la-'in 'aṣābakum faḍlun mina llāhi la-yaqūlanna ***ka-'an lam takun baynakum wa-baynahu mawaddatun*** *yā-laytanī kuntu ma'ahum fa-'afūza fawzan 'aẓīman* (4: 73)
"**But if a bounty from God befall you, he will surely say – as if there had not been any affection between you and him – If only I had been with them I would have achieved a mighty triumph!"**

The parenthetical clause *ka-'an lam takun baynakum wa-baynahu mawaddatun* cannot be taken out of its context because the anaphors in the parenthetical clause (*-kum baynakum* and *-hu* in *baynahu*) are bound by antecedents in the host sentence. Furthermore, unlike example (3), the parenthetical clause in example (4) can be characterized as the speaker's comment, a term which is explained in the following section.

2.3. Subject-oriented parentheticals vs. speaker-oriented parentheticals

Modern scholars suggest various terms for the distinct types of parenthetical clauses. Kaltenböck (2007: 42) distinguishes two sub-types of parentheticals based on the verb's semantic category: *comment parenthetical clauses*, which make use of verbs of thinking in first- and second-person present tense. *Reporting parenthetical clauses*, which make use of message-conveying verbs, in third person and not limited to present tense.

Reinhart (1983: 175–176) introduced the terms *parenthetical-subject oriented* and *parenthetical-speaker oriented*. The first can be used as an answer to the question *What did the parenthetical-subject say or believe?* while the second can answer a much wider range of questions on the subject matter of the main clause.

Referring to examples (1)–(4), we see that the parenthetical clauses which have no syntactic relation (examples (1) and (3)) display the following features:

- The verbs are in third person.
- The clauses answer the question *What is said about the parenthetical subject?*
- The parenthetical clauses are objective and informative propositions.

Examples (2) and (4) on the other hand, have a syntactic relation and they

- include verbs and pronouns in second person;
- convey the speaker's attitude to the content of the utterance; and in some cases they express judgment regarding the host's subjects.

Having established the criteria for the distinction between two types of parenthetical clauses in the Qur'ān, we next discuss the factors of the positional flexibility of parentheticals.

3. Context and relevance as factors determining the position of parentheticals

Both types of parentheticals above are related to a particular element of the host. I argue that they must be located right after this element even if it interrupts the syntactic string of the host sentence. As I will show, a correct interpretation of the utterance depends on the precise place of the parenthetical clause. If it is placed elsewhere it will lose its relevance, namely, its contextual effect, and this might cause the listener to misinterpret the speaker's intended meaning. Since one of the main goals is to explain the position of parenthetical clauses, it requires the consideration of various language factors involved in planning and producing the information, such as the reception, decoding and the interpreatation of the message. The Relevance Theory provided by Sperber and Wilson (1996) explains how these factors work in communication, and, as will be shown, this theory helps to interpret the pragmatics behind the use of parenthetical clauses in the Qur'ān. Thus, I shall first provide some background information regarding this theory and then some core principles of this theory applied in my analysis will be explained.

Relevance Theory is a cognitive pragmatics theory of human communication. For Sperber and Wilson, people developed an ability to maximize the relevance of the utterance/gesture that they process. Since the listeners cannot pay attention to all information that reaches them, people had to develop some linguistic tools which enable them to focus the attention of the listener, to select it and to interpret the intention of the speaker.[21]

Most of the studies of grammar which take the Relevance Theory as the theoretical framework take a dynamic and inference-centerd approach in which grammatical structures are supported or refuted according to contextual constraints. Namely, a pragmatic and context-centered view of grammar is proposed in order to explain the choice of a specific grammatical structure and to explain how it contributes to a correct comprehension of the compound sentence.[22] Considering the parentheticals, instead of the typical approach, which tends to explain the type of information expressed by them (explanatory, emphatic etc.), parentheticals can be regarded as constraints on relevance – namely, they guide

[21] Yus (2009: 753–754).

[22] Yus (2009: 768).

the listener toward a correct comprehension of the compound sentence, since they reduce the effort needed to access the correct interpretation.[23]

In order to put forward a full framework of communication and show the nature of communication, Sperber and Wilson (1996) provided fundamental principles. In what follows, the principles televant to this study are presented:

(a) **Optimal relevance** is defined in terms of the cognitive effect and processing effort of the information. Thus optimal relevance is achieved when the effort invested in the information process decreases but the communicative benefit increases (Sperber and Wilson 1996: 48). The insertion of a parenthetical clause may appear to burden the interpretive process, but I suggest that it eases processing the information because it helps the audience to recover the intention behind the utterance without too much effort.[24]

(b) **Ostention** means making manifest an intention or showing someone something.

It occurs "when the communicator produces a stimulus which makes it mutually manifest to communicator and audience that the communicator intends, by means of this stimulus, to make manifest or more manifest to the audience a set of assumptions" (Sperber and Wilson 1996: 49, 63). In our case, the informative intention is linguistically communicated,[25] namely, the linguistic phenomenon of breaking the linear order of the sentence by inserting a parenthetical clause is a case of ostention. This structure is used to make the audience pay attention to this irregular structure and to understand the intention behind it.

(c) **Contextual effect** means modification and improvement of a context by using information that exercises some effect on that context. The two types of contextual effects are new information providing new evidence, thereby strengthening old assumptions, and information that provides evidence against old assumptions. An assumption which has no contextual effect in a given context is irrelevant (Sperber and Wilson 1996: 109, 121–125). The contextual effect significantly impacts the parenthetical's position. The speaker, when making an utterance and thinking of the contribution of the various constructions to the context, must be sure to keep the structures in their right places or else they will have no effect on the context. I now develop the effect of the Qur'ānic

[23] Yus (2009: 768) mentions this explanation when he refers to discourse markes and how they are viewed in Relevance Theory.

[24] Kavalova (2007: 167) suggests the same regarding *and-parentheticals*: "The insertion of an additional element in the string of the utterance may be seen as burdening the process of interpretation because the processing cost is increased (…) *and*-parenthetical clauses assist the achievement of certain cognitive effects which would be otherwise be less of fully inaccessible to the listener to process."

[25] For the relation between linguistic form and relevance, see Sperber and Wilson (2013: 152).

parenthetical clauses, and explain how they give rise to an efficient inferential process.

3.1. parenthetical clauses as strengtheners of God's omnipotence

(5)
fa-'in lam taf'alū wa-lan taf'alū fa-ttaqū n-nāra llatī waqūduhā n-nāsu wa-l-ḥiğāratu 'u'iddat li-l-kāfirīna (Q 2:24)

"And if you do not – and you will not – then fear the fire, whose fuel is men and stones, prepared for unbelievers."

Q 2: 23 tells **the unbelievers that if they are in doubt about what God sent down to His servant Muḥammad, they are asked to adduce [at least] one Sura like those that God sent down** in the Qur'ān. The speaker (God), seeking to reject this ability by affirming that the unbelievers are unable to produce such a Sura, places the parenthetical in middle position. Hence the listener is aware that the speaker (God) not only refers to the possibility of producing Suras by the believers, but He (who knows all things – past, present and future) completely eliminates this possibility. By interrupting the main string with the parenthetical, the listener needs minimal effort to process this information and identify the intention behind the utterance. To prove this argument, we may read Q 2: 24, where the parenthetical clause is located at the end: **fa-'in lam taf'alū fa-ttaqū n-nāra llatī waqūduhā n-nāsu wa-l-ḥiğāratu 'u'iddat li-l-kāfirīna wa-lan taf'alū* (Q 2: 24) "And if you do not then fear the fire, whose fuel is men and stones, prepared for unbelievers and you will not do so." The conditional sentence leads the listeners to understand that the possibility of creating a Sura exists, but if they do not do so they will suffer punishment. Yet when reading the last part of the sentence, the listener understands that his/her interpretation does not yield the speaker's intention (hence his/her processing efforts were wasted) and he/she should process the information again.

(6)
qul 'a-ra'aytum šurakā'akumu llaḏīna tad'ūna min dūni llāhi 'arūnī māḏā ḫalaqū mina l-'arḍi 'am lahum širkun fī s-samāwāti (Q 35: 40)[26]

"Have you seen your associates on whom you call, apart from God? Show me what they have created on the earth; or have they a partnership in the heavens?"
Regarding Q 35: 40, the parenthetical clause is formed as a command, which of course cannot be fulfilled by the polytheists. This is done to prove to the polytheists that their faith is wrong by emphasizing that their idols are powerless and that the Creator of heaven and earth is the only God, and there will be no

[26] Similar cases are Q 2: 80; 41: 15; 30: 4

object of worship except Him. Had the parenthetical clause been introduced at the end, the listener could not have drawn any conclusion regarding the reason why the idols, whom they worship, cannot be associated with or likened to God. The absence of the parenthetical (or its placement elsewhere) triggers the assumption that the verse expresses a regular question which does not carry any admonition concerning the idols and the polytheists.

(7)

wa-mā n-naṣru 'illā min 'indi llāhi l-'azīzi l-ḥakīmi li-yaqṭa'a ṭarafan mina llaḏīna kafarū 'aw yakbitahum fa-yanqalibū ḫā'ibīna laysa laka mina l-'amri šay'un 'aw yatūba 'alayhim 'aw yu'aḏḏibahum fa-'innahum ẓālimūna (Q 3: 126-128)[27]

"Help comes only from God the Almighty, the all-wise; He will cut off a part of the unbelievers or frustrate them, so that they turned in their tracks, disappointed, no part of the matter is yours [you can do nothing against this], or He will turn toward them again, or chastise them, for they surely are evildoers."

There are two ways to interpret the parenthetical clause in example (7):[28] first, this clause starts a new sentence hence the utterance may be interpreted as: "It is not for you to decide whether He will accept their repentance, or chastise them for they surely are wrongdoers." Second, as a parenthetical clause placed in middle position between two connected clauses which can be interpreted as: "God provided His aid to you in order to cut off a part of those who disbelieved and frustrate them so that they retreat in disappointment –no part of the matter is yours – or He will accept their repentance, or chastise them, for they surely are wrongdoers." The intention behind verses 126–128 is to clarify that a triumph (in the battlefield), defeat of the unbelievers, forgiveness and punishment—all depend on God's will. Not only do people take no part in such actions, they can not do anything against God's decision. This idea is established in verse 126 (*wa-mā n-naṣru 'illā min 'indi llāhi*) and the parenthetical clause clearly manifests this intention. Still, a reservation must be made against this explanation because in this case, the same kind of contextual effect could be possible were the parenthetical clause placed at the end. The listener is informed that God cut off a part of the unbelievers or frustrated them; he turns toward them, or punishes them, and at the end the parenthetical clause states that whatever the case, the people can do nothing about it.

In the next example the parenthetical clause is inserted where it is most relevant because it strengthens a previous statement declaring that the people beg forgiveness from God when they commit an indecency. They do so because the only one who can forgive their deeds is God:

[27] A similar case is Q 30:2

[28] See, e.g., Rāzī (2000: vol. 7–8: 191).

(8)
wa-llaḏīna ʾiḏā faʿalū fāḥišatan ʾaw ẓalamū ʾanfusahum ḏakarū llāha fa-staġfarū li-ḏunūbihim ***wa-man yaġfiru ḏ-ḏunūba ʾillā llāhu*** *wa-lam yuṣirrū ʿalā mā faʿalū wa-hum yaʿlamūna* (Q 3: 135)
"Those who, when they commit an indecency or do injustice to themselves, remember God, and seek for forgiveness for their sins – **and who forgives sins except God**? – and do not knowingly persist in what they have committed."

3.2. Elucidating parentheticals

(9)
wa-llaḏīna ʾāmanū wa-ʿamilū ṣ-ṣāliḥāti ***lā nukallifu nafsan ʾillā wusʿahā*** *ʾulāʾika ʾaṣḥābu l-ǧannati hum fīhā ḫālidūna* (Q 7: 42)[29]
"And those who believe, and do deeds of righteousness – **we do not impose upon a soul [duties] but only according to its capacity** – those are the inhabitants of Paradise, therein dwelling forever."

The idea that Paradise is the reward of faith and good deeds occurs repeatedly in the Qur'ān. For example, Q 2: 82 has the same structure as Q 7: 42 except for the parenthetical. If the listener is already exposed to this idea it might be argued that s/he can easily process the information in Q 7: 42. However, this old information is connected to new information, expressed in the parenthetical clause, and this connection produces more new information, which can be derived by inference.[30] Thus, the listener may infer that the speaker's aim is not simply to communicate that those who believe and do good deeds will be rewarded, but also to restrict the definition of what good deeds are. The fulfillment of all good deeds is the best, but God knows that it might be a burden upon the people. Therefore, throughout the parenthetical clause He clarifies that every one is responsible for as many of the good deeds s/he is able to perform, and will still be rewarded.

(10)
wa-laʾin ʾaṣābakum faḍlun mina llāhi la-yaqūlanna ***kaʾan lam takun baynakum wa-baynahu mawaddatun*** *yā-laytanī kuntu maʿahum faʾafūza fawzan ʿaẓīman* (Q 4: 73)
"And if some grace from Allah befall you, He will surely say – **as if there had not been any affection between you and Him** – I wish I had been with them to attain a mighty triumph!"

Verses 72–73 describe the behavior of the hypocrites. When the believers return from the battlefield having suffered a failure or martyrdom, the hypocrites will happily say: What great bounty God has given them that they did not accompany the believers to witness their defeat and to suffer as they suffered. Yet as soon as the hypocrites are informed that the believers have gained the victory, and naturally have won some booty, they feign contrition, saying if only they had been with the believers to achieve a great triumph. The question is what is the

[29] A similar example is Q 18: 30-31.
[30] For old and new information in a process of inference, see Sperber and Wilson (1996: 48).

contextual effect of the parenthetical clause in this context? According to Rāzī (1993: vol. 5, 186), the parenthetical clause expresses wonder (*ta'aǧǧub*) about the (absurd) behavior of the hypocrites; even though there is no affection between the hypocrites and the believers, the hypocrites are willing to associate with the believers when it comes to booty.

(11)

wa-waṣṣaynā l-'insāna bi-wālidayhi ***ḥamalathu 'ummuhu wahnan 'alā wahnin wa-fiṣāluhū fī 'āmayni*** *'ani škur lī wa-li-wālidayka 'ilayya l-maṣīru* (Q 31: 14)

"And we did enjoin upon man concerning his parents – his mother bore him in weakness upon weakness, and his weaning takes two years, (saying:) 'Be thankful to Me and to your parents: unto Me is the ultimate return."

In Q 31: 14 people are commanded to show kindness and gratitude to their parents. Note, however, that the parenthetical clause refers only to the mother, while in the host sentence both parents are mentioned. The mother feels weak and the weakness gets worse in the course of pregnancy[31] because of natural changes that affect her body. Her tired physical condition lasts almost three years (the course of pregnancy and the suckling). According to the literature, the parenthetical clause emphasizes the mother's travails so as to attract peoples' attention to the mother's physical and emotional sacrifice during the pregnancy and suckling (Ḥasan 2012: 239). The problem is that such an argument refers to the parenthetical's content, and it fails to explain how it is linked to the host or how it contributes to understanding the complete verse. I would suggest two possible explanations for the insertion: first, the parenthetical is inserted after the opening clause to make the command relevant to all people. From reading the first part *wa-waṣṣaynā l-'insāna bi-wālidayhi*, it might be possible to assume that some people, who have cut their relations with their parents for familial or personal issues, or are constantly at loggerheads with their parents, might think that this command does not concern them. However, the parenthetical clause reminds those people that whatever the circumstances, they owe their lives to their mothers. For this reason they should be thankful to her and to the father, who accompanied the mother during her pregnancy. Second, in this case the parenthetical clause and the host are both required as input into the inferential process, which can be schematized as follows:

- Presentation of the command: The people are commanded concerning their parents.
- Why it is commanded: because the mother suffered during the pregnancy.
- What they are commanded: to be thankful to both the mother and the father.

Thus, the inferential process yields that the intended cognitive effect of this utterance is to command, but also to explain the reason for giving this command.

[31] For this explanation, see Zamaḫšarī (1947: 3, 494–495).

Finally, I go back to example (2)[32] (*'inna llaḏīna kafarū* ***sawā'un 'alayhim 'a-'anḏartahum 'am lam tunḏirhum*** *lā yu'minūna* Q 2: 6). It should be mentioned that some commentators, such as Rāzī (2000: vol. 1–2, 38) point to two options for analyzing Q 2: 6:

1) *llaḏīna kafarū* =subject; *lā yu'minūna* = predicate. According to this analysis, *sawā'un 'alayhim 'a-'anḏartahum 'am lam tunḏirhum* functions as a parenthetical clause and interpolates between the subject and the predicate.
2) *llaḏīna kafarū* =subject (*'ism 'inna*); *sawā'un* = predicate (*ḫabar 'inna*); *lā yu'minūna* = new sentence. In this option there is no parenthetical clause.

The insertion of the parenthetical clause in Q 2: 6 is crucial for the inferential process.

Placing the parenthetical at the end leaves little information to process. Stating that those who are infidels do not believe in God is an obvious declaration that requires no information processing. However, when the parenthetical clause is inserted into the host sentence the utterance starts from a set of premises and ends with the conclusion that unbelievers, warned or not, will always have the same (false) beliefs and the same (bad) habits.

(12)

fa-lammā waḍa'athā qālat rabbi 'innī waḍa'tuhā 'unṯā wa-llāhu 'a'lamu bi-mā waḍa'at ***wa-laysa ḏ-ḏakaru ka-l-'unṯā*** (3: 36)[33]

"And when she gave birth to her, she (the wife of Imran) said: Lord, I have given birth to her, a female, while God knew very well what she had given birth to; **the male is not as the female**."

In Q 3: 36 the commentators identify the clause *wa-llāhu 'a'lamu bi-mā waḍa'at* as parenthenthetical; [34] however, I argue that this clause functions as a circumstantial clause while the parenthetical clause is *wa-laysa ḏ-ḏakaru ka-l-'unṯā* for the following reason: in verse 35 we read that Imran's wife says to God that she **vowed to Him to dedicate her child to Him.** In verse 36 she says to God that she gave birth to a girl, but God already knew that. The question that arises here is why does she state that she has a daughter if God already knows that? The answer is found in the parenthetical clause, which explains that a male is not like a female, hence the audience may infer that the clause *'innī waḍa'tuhā 'unṯā* expresses regret and disappointment, because Imran's wife had hoped to bear a son. A male is not like a female because he can devote himself completely to the

[32] Examples one and three can also be classified under this category; their contextual effect is clarified in section 2.

[33] A similar case is Q 4:25.

[34] See e.g., Ibn 'Āšūr (1992: vol. 3–5, 233); Ṭanṭāwī (1992: vol. 2, 87).

service of God in the place of worship, and a female cannot fulfill the rituals as a male can.[35]

3.3. Parenthetical clause as a qualifier

(13)
wa-llaḏīna 'āmanū wa-'amilū ṣ-ṣāliḥāti wa-'āmanū bi-mā nuzzila 'alā muḥammadin ***wa-huwa l-ḥaqqu min rabbihim*** *kaffara 'anhum sayyi'ātihim wa-'aṣlaḥa bālahum* (Q 47: 2)
"But those who believe and do righteous deeds and believe in what is sent down to Muḥammad – **and it is the truth from their Lord** – He will absolve them of their evil deeds and dispose their minds aright."

Q 47:2 also speaks of the reward for those who believe and do good deeds, but it adds that one has to believe in the Qur'ān which was sent down to Muḥammad. Now the question is why is the parenthetical clause inserted between the subject and the predicate? It is introduced to modify the Qur'ān by saying that it is true, unchangeable, and steadfast.[36] The qualifier is placed immediately after the qualified component (*bi-mā nuzzila 'alā muḥammadin*). In this case, disconnection of the qualifier from the qualified noun will generate an ungrammatical structure, but also an incomprehensible utterance.

(14)
wa-'ini mra'atun ḫāfat min ba'lihā nušūzan 'aw 'i'rāḍan fa-lā ǧunāḥa 'alayhimā 'an yuṣliḥā baynahumā ṣulḥan ***wa-ṣ-ṣulḥu ḫayrun*** (Q 4: 128)
"And if a woman fears ill treatment from her husband, or desertion, there is no sin on them if the couple set things right between them, and right settlement/reconciliation is better."

Q 4: 128 states that it is better for the spouses to come to a mutual understanding so that the wife may remain with her husband. The parenthetical clause qualifies this situation as the best for both sides.

(15)
ittabi' mā 'ūḥiya 'ilayka min rabbika ***lā 'ilāha 'illā huwa*** *wa-'a'riḍ 'ani l-mušrikīna* (Q 6: 106)
"Follow what has been revealed to you from your Lord, **there is no God but He**, and turn away from idolaters."

---

[35] For this explanation of *wa-laysa ḏ-ḏakaru ka-l-'unṯā*, see Rāzī (2000: vol. 7–8, 24).

[36] Bayḍāwī (1996: vol. 1, 190), who identifies *wa-huwa l-ḥaqqu min rabbihim* as a parenthetical clause, explains that the Qur'ān is *ḥaqq* for being *nāsiḫ lā yunsaḫ* "[a book that] abrogates and is not abrogated."

The parenthetical clause in Q 6: 106 qualifies the noun *rabb* "Lord," but at the same time it explains the logic/reason behind the two commands, as inferred from Rāzī's explanation:

> ʿalā ʾannahu taʿālā lammā kāna wāḥidan fī l-ʾilahiyyati fa-ʾinnahu yağibu ṭāʿatuhu wa-lā yağūzu l-ʾiʿrāḍi ʿan takālīfihi bi-sababi ğahli l-ğāhilīna wa-zayġi z-zāʾiġīna[37]
> "Since God sublime is the only [real God among the divine entities] he [the prophet Muḥammad] must be obeyed and avoidance of fulfilling His commandments is impermissible because of the ignorance of the ignorant and the deviation of the deviators."

3.4. Parenthetical clauses as background information

In this section the parentheticals are relevant in the sense that they provide important information for understanding later developments in the story. This account is a departure from that proposed by Zewi (2007: 67), who argues that in Biblical Hebrew parentheticals introduces background information. She defines this term thus:

> "[Background information in this book] restricted to extra information inserted into the story by the scribe or narrator to facilitate understanding of certain developments that could not be understood without it."

(16)

wa-ğāʾahū qawmuhu yuhraʿūna ʾilayhi ***wa-min qablu kānū yaʿmalūna s-sayyiʾāti*** *qāla yā-qawmi hāʾulāʾi banātī hunna ʾaṭharu lakum ʾa-laysa minkum rağulun rašīdun* (Q 11: 78)

"And his people came rushing toward him; and previously they had been doing evil deeds. He said: 'O my people, here are my daughters – they are purer for you. So fear Allah, and do no degrade me before my guests! Is there not among you one upright man?"

Verse 77 states that when God's messengers came to Lot, he grieved for them and felt constrained to protect them. In verse 78 we discover that he worries about his people because they have committed evil deeds in the past. Furthermore, the parenthetical clause helps in understanding why Lot offers his daughter for marriage and then he asks them not to degrade him before his guests. Having known at the early stage of the utterance that the people are used to committing sins, the listener infers that Lot, throughout his words and actions, wants to prevent his people from doing what is forbidden.

[37] Rāzī (2000: vol. 13–14, 113).

(17)

'inna qārūna kāna min qawmi mūsā ***fa-baġā 'alayhim*** *wa-'ātaynāhu mina l-kunūzi mā 'inna mafātiḥahu la-tanū'u bi-l-'uṣbati 'ulī l-quwwati 'iḏ qāla lahu qawmuhu lā tafraḥ 'inna llāha lā yuḥibbu l-fariḥīna* (Q 28: 76)

"Verily Korah was of the people of Moses, and he oppressed them; and We had given him of the treasures so much that its keys would have been a burden to a company of men endowed with strength. When his people said to him: Do not exult, God does not love those that exult."

In Q 28: 76 we are introduced to Korah and we are informed that he belongs to the people of Moses. Then the parenthetical clause provides further information: the people have suffered injustice at his hand. In the last part of the verse he is described as a rich, arrogant man – a wealthy man, indeed the manifestation of wealth, accompanied by pride and deceit. Reading the parenthetical clause the listener cannot but wonder how a man who is negatively presented becomes so rich, and instead of being punished for his pride and his ignorance of the people's social condition, their need of help, he is still being rewarded. This contradiction is required as input into the inferential process that yields the real intention (or message) of the story of Korah. It shows the people that they can have wealth and property; the important thing is the way it is used. If it is to show pride, negligence, injustice and oppression, then the man will be punished. Furthermore, **people are usually dazzled by the wealth and the pleasures offered in this world, while modesty,** piety, and righteous deeds are the most important things that guarantee well-being in the hereafter.

4. Conclusion

Parenthetical clauses can be placed at the middle or final position. The middle-positioned parentheticals are syntactically integrated into the host by an anaphoric relation, while the final-positioned parentheticals are syntactically unrelated to the host.

It is claimed that parenthetical clauses interrupt the prosodic flow of the sentence by introducing intonational breaks in the host sentence; however, their insertion is a communicative act for reaching an optimal relevance. Namely, the addressees do not waste much efforts in the interpretation of the Qur'ānic verse. How is the principle of optimal relevance satisfied throught the insertion of the parenthetical clause?

The parenthetical's position is determined by the place of the component to which it refers. Only when it takes this position it has a contextual effect, which can be immediately identified by the addressees and hence he interprets the utterance correctly. Qur'ānic arenthetical clauses has various contextual effects: They serve to affirm God's omnipotence, indicating that only God produces Suras, created heaven and earth. He is the forgiver and all depends on His will; to explain a statement, for example, when people are required to do righteousness, the

parenthetical clause explains that it must be done in accordans to one's capability to perform righteousness; to qualify, to highlight a specific characterization, for example, one of the parenthetical clauses modifies the Qur'ān as the truth from God; to provide background information, which could explain further developments in the narrative.

If the parenthetical clauses would have been located elsewhere in the utterance then they would have been irrelevant, without a clear effect.

Scholars argue that the host is in no way grammatically dependent on the parenthetical clause and therefore it can be omitted. However, establishing the contextual effects of the Qur'ānic parenthetical clause can provide convincing evidence that parenthetical clauses do not carry peripheral information but contribute to a correct interpretation of the host; therefore, they cannot be dropped. The representation of the intended utterance is achieved by the fact that despite the interpolation the information is arranged in logical and sequential order, providing the listener the prerequisites that guarantee an efficient inferential process. In an inferential process, the listener should proceed from one premise to another, ending with a conclusion. This process can be demonstrated by example (1), which consists of three premises: first, a condition (if you do); second, the speaker's comment (you will not do); third, the result (you will be punished). The conclusion drawn by the listener is that the polytheists are definitely not able to produce a Sura, therefore they will be punished. Changing this sequenced order can create an utterance where the listener derives a certain intention even before reaching the end of the utterance; but then he/she might encounter a parenthetical clause that will require re-processing all the information in the utterance.

References

Arberry, Arthur J. 1964. *The Koran Interpreted*. London: Oxford University Press.

Burton-Roberts, Noel. 2006. Parentheticals. In: Keith E. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, 179–189. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Dehé, Nicole, Kavalova Yordanke. 2007. Parentheticals: An Introduction. In: Nicole Dehé and Yordanka Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals*, 1–25. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

El-Awa, Salw. 2006. *Textual Relations in the Qur'ān: Relevance, Coherence and Structure*. London and New York: Routledge.

Gully, Adrian. 1995. *Grammar and Semantics in Medieval Arabic: A Study of Ibn-Hisham's Mughni l-Labib*. London: Curzon Press.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1988. Parenthetical Adverbials: The Radical Orphanage Approach. In Satoshi. Chiba (ed.), *Aspects of Modern English Linguistics*. Tokyo: Kaitakushi, 232–254.

Hoffmann, Ludger. 1998. *Parenthesen*. *Linguistische Berichte* 175. 299–328.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1977. *X' Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2007. Spoken Parentheticals Clauses in English: A Taxonomy. In: Nicole Dehé and Yordanka Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals*, 25–53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kavalova, Yordanke. 2007. And-Parenthetical Clauses. In: Nicole Dehé and Yordanka Kavalova (Eds.), *Parentheticals*, 145–173. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Peterson, Peter. 1999. On the Boundaries of Syntax. In: Peter Collins and David Lee (eds.), *The Clause in English*, 229–250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Potts, Christopher. 2002. The Syntax and Semantics of As-Parentheticals. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 20(3). 623–698.

Reckendorf, Hermann. 1921. *Arabische Syntax*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Reinhart, Tania. 1983. Point of View in Language: The Use of Parentheticals. In: Gisa Rauh (ed.), *Essays on Deixis*, 169–194. Tübingen: Narr.

Sperber, Dan, Wilson, Deirdre. 1996. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sperber, Dan, Wilson, Deirdre. 2013. Linguistic Form and Relevance. In: Dan Sperber, Deidre Wilson (Eds.), *Meaning and Relevance*, 149–169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yus, Francisco. 2009. Relevance Theory. In: Heine Bernd and Narrog Heiko (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis, 753–777. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press

Zewi, Tamar. 2007. *Parenthesis in Biblical Hebrew*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Ziv, Yael. 1985. Parentheticals and Functional Grammar. In: Machtled A. Bolkestein et al. (eds.), *Syntax and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar*, 181–213. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Sources in Arabic

al-'Askarī, 'Abū Hilāl al-Ḥasan Ibn 'Abd Allāh. 1971. *Kitāb aṣ-ṣinā'atayni: al-kitab wa-š-ši'r*. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya.

al-Bayḍāwī, 'Abdallāh Ibn 'Umar. 1996. *'Anwār at-tanzīl wa-'asrār at-ta'wīl*. Cairo: Maktabat wa-maṭba'at al-mašhad al-ḥusaynī.

Ibn Ǧinnī, 'Abū al-Fatḥ 'Uṯmān. 1913. *al-Ḫaṣā'iṣ*. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-hilāl.

Ḥasan, Sāmī 'Aṭā. 2012. *al-Ǧumla al-mu'tariḍa fī l-Qur'ān al-karīm: mawāḍi'uhā wa-dalālatihā*. Amman: Dār al-furqān li-n-Našr wa-t-tawzī'.

Ibn 'Āšūr, Muḥammad aṭ-Ṭāhir. *at-Taḥrīr wa-t-tanwīr*. 1992. ad-Dār at-tunisiyya li-n-našr.

'Ibn Hišām, Ǧamāl ad-Dīn al-'Anṣārī. 1991 *Muġnī al-labīb*. Beirut: Dār al-Ǧīl.

an-Nasafī, 'Abdallāh Ibn Aḥmad. 1996. *Madārik at-tanzīl wa-ḥaqā'iq at-ta'wīl*. Beirut: Dār an-nafā'is.

al-Qazwīnī, Ǧalāl ad-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn 'Abd ar-Raḥman. 2002. *Talḫīṣ al-miftāḥ fī l-ma'ānī wa-l-bayān wa-l-badī'*. Beirut: al-Maktaba al-'aṣriyya.

ar-Rāzī, Muḥammad Faḫr ad-Dīn. 1993. *Mafātīḥ al-ġayb*. Beirut: Dār al-fikr li-ṭ-ṭibā'a wa-n-našr wa-t-tawzī'.

ar-Rāzī, Muḥammad Faḫr ad-Dīn. 2000. *Mafātīḥ al-ġayb*. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya.

aš-Šawkānī, Muḥammad 'Alī Ibn Muḥammad. 1997. *Fatḥ al-qadīr*. al-Manṣūra: Dār al-wafā' li-ṭ-ṭibā'a wa-n-našr wa-t-tawzī'.

Ṭanṭāwī, Muḥammad Sayyid. 1992. *at-Tafsīr al-wasīṭ li-l-Qur'ān al-karīm*. Cairo: Dār al-ma'ārif.

Yāqūt, Maḥmūd Sulaymān. 1998. *'I'rāb al-Qur'ān al-karīm*. Dār al-ma'rifa al-ǧami'iyya.

az-Zamaḫšarī, 'Abū al-Qāsim Muḥammad Ibn 'Umar. 1947. *al-Kaššāf 'an ḥaqā'iq ġawāmiḍ at-tanzīl*. Beirut: Dār al-kitāb al-'arabī.