

2016

## Long Structures in the Holy Script of Islam: Tweeting of Euphonies, Hash-tagging of # Inchoative Senses and You-tubing of Edible Words

Sami Heeh

Ahliya University College, Bethlehem, Palestine, samheeh@paluniv.edu.ps

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/anujr\\_b](https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/anujr_b)

---

### Recommended Citation

Heeh, Sami (2016) "Long Structures in the Holy Script of Islam: Tweeting of Euphonies, Hash-tagging of # Inchoative Senses and You-tubing of Edible Words," *An-Najah University Journal for Research - B (Humanities)*: Vol. 30 : Iss. 5 , Article 8.

Available at: [https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/anujr\\_b/vol30/iss5/8](https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/anujr_b/vol30/iss5/8)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Arab Journals Platform. It has been accepted for inclusion in An-Najah University Journal for Research - B (Humanities) by an authorized editor. The journal is hosted on [Digital Commons](#), an Elsevier platform. For more information, please contact [rakan@aarj.edu.jo](mailto:rakan@aarj.edu.jo), [marah@aarj.edu.jo](mailto:marah@aarj.edu.jo), [u.murad@aarj.edu.jo](mailto:u.murad@aarj.edu.jo).

**Long Structures in the Holy Script of Islam: Tweeting of Euphonies,  
Hash-tagging of # Inchoative Senses and You-tubing of Edible  
Words**

التعبيرات الطويلة في القرآن الكريم: تغريدات جميلة لإنظمة عذوبة الصوت، وتأشير إلى كبح  
المعاني المتنافرة، ومشاركة للمفردات المهضومة

**Sami Heeh**

سامي حيج

Department of English, Ahliya University College, Bethlehem, Palestine

E-mail: samheeh@paluniv.edu.ps

Received: (2/12/2014), Accepted: (23/12/2015)

**Abstract**

This evaluative paper attempts to explore the extent to which morphemes, i.e. the smallest units that carry meaning, can be incorporating in Standard Arabic. From different linguistic perspectives, the article quantifies as well as qualifies the long structures in the holy Script of Islam. The longest structure is identified as the unit of language that aggregates the verb phrase (VP) and some other noun phrases (NPs) functioning as subject and object(s) together on both the graphemic and phonemic levels. Euphonies, i.e. rules of sound concordance, are consulted. Meaning relations and values are calculated and drawn. The components of the long structure including the verb phrase (VP) and its arguments are investigated on both the functional, i.e. grammatical, and syntactic, i.e. structural, levels.

**Keywords:** Arabic and English Syntax, Phonology, Euphonies, Polysynthetic and Agglutinative Morphology, Semantics, Predicates and Arguments, Pragmatics.

**ملخص**

ترمي هذه الدراسة التقييمية إلى استطلاع المدى الذي من خلاله تستطيع المورفيمات (اصغر وحدات اللغة التي تحمل معنى) إلى المساهمة في تكوين وحدات لغوية عربية أكبر. ومن وجهات نظر لغوية متعددة، تكتمل الدراسة وتقيم التعبيرات القرآنية الأطول، حيث تم تحديد التعبير الأطول بالوحدة اللغوية التي يتكامل فيها الفعل والأسماء المصاحبة له ممن تقوم بالفعل أو يقع عليها الفعل تكاملاً تركيبياً عند المستويين النطقي والأبجدي. حيث تم استشارة أنظمة عذوبة الصوت، وتم احتساب علاقات المعنى وقيمها، وتم التحقق من مكونات التعبير المركب على المستويين التركيبي الوظيفي والبرغماتي اللغوي.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** علم بناء الجملة في اللغة العربية والانجليزية، علم وأنظمة عذوبة الصوت، المرفيمات التركيبية، علم المعنى والخبر وجدالاته، اللغة تحت الاستخدام الاجتماعي.

**Introduction**

In natural language, morphemes, the smallest units of language that carry meaning, manifest themselves most frequently in five different 'typological' classes (Katamba: 56). In some languages such as English and Chinese, morphemes tend highly frequently to be free. They isolate themselves into analytic morphs. In other languages, such as Turkish, morphemes often incline to agglutinate, i.e. to stick together. They are mostly bound ones. In a few other languages, such Greek and Latin, morphemes sound synthetic, so each morpheme is expected to help derive other morphemes so as to create another category of speech. In Semitic languages, such as Arabic and Hebrew, morphemes tend to infix as well as to circum-fix with one another in a word-formation process, known as *banyan*, resulting in a large number of morphemes at different levels and tiers. Finally, only can the languages of the Inuit and Yupik (also known as Eskimo) incorporate words together in one large structure on both the graphemic and phonemic levels. In such a language, morphemes are polysynthetic.

In terms of morphology, Arabic is a highly-derivational language. Generally speaking, it tends to benefit from a tri-to-tetra-root tier, in which both the consonants are assigned and reassigned by infixing other morphemes to alter meaning, and the vowels are used to change the category of speech. Affixing, whether prefixing, infixing, suffixing or

circum-fixing, does not segregate but aggregate morphemes. If so, then Arabic is not a fully isolating but agglutinative language. A considerable number of words stem from one another, so Arabic morphemes also sound synthetic. However, the questions that one may raise here: Can morphemes in Arabic integrate into one long structure as the Eskimos'? To what extent can they incorporate? For what reasons do they polysynthesize?

The studies that investigated incorporating morphology are quite limited in numbers for some good reasons. In general, the languages that incorporate morphemes in one longer structure are quite limited. Besides, those languages constitute some local varieties, but none is universal. In specific, a human language, whether universal or not, is always stigmatized by the most frequent processes that occur at the morphological level. For example, modern English is classified as an isolating (to a great extent) language because the vast majority of its words appear as free morphemes. In turn, Arabic is labeled as an infixing -or rather circum-fixing, derivational language due to the high percentage of the bound morphemes that take place at the structural level. This description means that Arabic sometimes segregates, but aggregates morphemes more frequently. In quotes 1A and 1B for instance, the bound morphemes are isolated with a dash and bracketed in the transliteration formats.

[Quote 1A] [qul Hwa Allahu ahadu<sup>①</sup> Allahu as-samadu<sup>②</sup> lam [ya-]lid wa[-lam] [yu:-]lad<sup>③</sup> wa[-lam] yakun la[-Hu] kufwan ahad<sup>④</sup>] Al-Ikhla:s 112:1-4.

[Say, "He is Allah , [who is] One, Allah , the Eternal Refuge. He neither begets nor is born, Nor is there to Him any equivalent."

[Quote 1B] [wa-al 'asri<sup>①</sup> inna al-insa:na la[-fi:] khusrin<sup>②</sup> illa: alathi:na a:man[-u:] wa-'amil[-u:] as-sa:lihati wa-tawas[-aw] [bil-]haqi wa-tawas[aw] [bis-]sabiri<sup>③</sup>] Al-'asr 103: 1-3

[By time,<sup>①</sup> Indeed, mankind is in loss,<sup>②</sup> Except for those who have believed and done righteous deeds and advised each other to truth and advised each other to patience.<sup>③</sup>]

Traditionally, the long structures are only examined at the syntactic level. Arab linguists have already identified them as longer expressions and classified them as verbal sentences. Specialists in Arabic syntax, i.e. the study of the sentence, have already identified the VP of the long structure as a transitive verb phrase (VP), but they don't attempt to check the properties of this VP. In 'external syntax', the VP has the general characteristics of both editability and 'edacity' (Baker: 49-112). That is to say, the specifications, i.e. the complements, that each VP triggers, may vary (in number and type) from one sentence into another according to the meaning that VP tries to convey. However, no efforts have been paid to check the VP and its arguments, i.e. the subject and object, from a unifying functional, semantic, morphological as well as phonological point of view.

This evaluative paper attempts to quantify as well as qualify the morphemes depicted in the longest structures of the 'Holy Script of Islam' [Available at: [www.quran.com](http://www.quran.com)] from different linguistic perspectives. Syntactically, the long structure is defined as a unit of language at the sentence level where the verb phrase (VP) and its arguments functioning as subject and object are all incorporated in one longer structure on both the graphemic level for spelling and the phonemic level for pronunciation. The paper benefits from first order logic, semantic values and meaning relations of the components of the incorporated, long structure. It also consults Arabic syntax to unearth the factors that help advance such structures. The paper also confers Arabic euphonies that do not curb the construction of such big structures.

Methodologically, the study benefits from both corpus linguistics (CL) and discourse analysis (DA). Corpora (plural of corpus) are 'large bodies of texts'. At first, the paper concordances the holy Script of Islam for 'key words in context' (KWIK). These will include certain quotes collected as data for more analyses. Then the paper makes use of DA to unearth the linguistic features of the texts under investigation. As the paper underlies pure linguistics as an approach, 'systemic functional linguistics' (SFL) is expected to leak a lot about the grammatical functions of the structures under study (Schmitt: 2002). As the paper

applies an integrative approach to the long structure, kinds, values and relations of meaning and the syntactic properties are supposed to be calculated and acknowledged.

The paper highlights to a great extent pure linguistics as an approach to study linguistic phenomena, though it stresses the importance of the social factors. From a sociolinguistic as well as a pragmalinguistic perspective, language has to be examined within a social context. The 'participants', i.e. the speaker and listener or listeners, their age, their roles, status, and relation will certainly affect people's use of language. They also affect the style used. Language styles vary a lot; they can be casual, formal, intimate or even frozen. The 'message content', that is how beneficial the message to both the speaker and the hearer, has a big impact on language selection. The 'communicative activity', a job interview or a complaint, for instance, has a considerable impact on the language choice, as it develops certain norms, such as the right to talk and ask questions, to structure discourse, and to determine the mood of the talk (Schmitt:74-91). This helps explain the author's tendency to quote from social media to entitle and conclude the paper.

### **Streaming of Ideas: Coordination vs. Subordination**

From a grammatical point of view, the clause, according to linguists, varies (Azar: 283-285). It can be either a subordinate or a super-ordinate one. The former cannot stand alone whereas the later can. Indeed, subordination is a linguistic process that allows unequal ideas in complex structures to further. In turn, coordination is another process that allows equal ideas in balanced structures to flow. The following verse quoted from The Noble Quran illustrates clearly how both coordination and subordination introduce an issue of debate about faith:

[Quote 2] [fa-in a:manu: bimithli ma a:mantum bihi faqadi ihtadaw wa-in tawallaw fa-innama hum fi: shiqaqin fasayakfi:kahumu Allahu..] Al-Baqarah 2:137.

[So if they believe in the same as you believe in, then they have been [rightly] guided; but if they turn away, they are only in dissension, and Allah will be sufficient for you against them..]

A close look at quote 2 reveals that Arabic flavors coordinated as well as parallel structures at the syntactic level. Arabic is actually a classic language of coordination. To a large extent, coordination is frequently exploited by the external grammar of large units of language whereas subordination is very limited to the internal structure of embedded clauses. This helps explain why the whole verse is a compound one, coordinated by [wa-] meaning (and) and its counterpart 'but' which is used to clarify the inclusive meaning of (and) in an English sentence. Hence, it is probable that coordination is the general umbrella Arabic syntax suggests for a native speaker or a writer to stream ideas.

Besides, a deep look at quote 2 reveals that subordination be employed differently. This process works on the very internal level of the subordinated clauses. Quote 2, referred to above, includes two complex clauses which can be both figured as conditional statements as follows:

**Example 1** '.. if they believe in the same as you believe in, *only then* they have been rightly guided..'

**Example 2** '.. but if they turn away, *only then* they are in dissension...'

The meaning postulates, calculated for the proposition (p) as well as for its consequence (q), presented in examples 1 and 2 above, show an if-only-then relation. According to Hurford, this meaning relation is 'temporal' (p:195), as one does not occur unless the other does (see table 1 below for more information about calculating the truth values for a temporal conditional in English). In the biconditional clauses presented in examples 1 and 2 above, each temporal relation is first subordinated internally, then re-coordinated with the other. This process of subordination is resulted in a parallel structure.

**Table (1)** shows the truth values for the English conditional sentence: If he actually commits the crime, he (only then) deserves to be punished.

Propositions		Consequences	p	q	p→q
He actually committed the crime,	and	he deserved to be punished	T	T	(T)
He actually committed the crime,	But	he didn't deserve to be punished	T	F	F
He actually didn't commit the crime,	But	he deserved to be punished	F	T	F
He actually didn't commit the crime,	and	he didn't deserve to be punished	F	F	(T)

### Negotiating, Loading and Packaging Meaning in Long Structures

From a semantic perspective, the predicate, i.e. what is said about the subject, helps convey different 'meaning relations' (Hurford: 198). In example 1, there are three predicates, namely BELIEVE, BELIEVE and TRULY GUIDE which are all assigned for three arguments (they), (you), and (they), respectively. In example 2, the second conditional sentence has two predicates, namely TURN AWAY and IN DISSENSION which are assigned for one predicate, namely (you). This interpretation can be figured as:

**Figure 1** BELIEVE (t), BELIEVE (y) → TRULY GUIDE (t)

**Figure 2** TURN AWAY (t) → IN DISSENSION (t)

The identical predicates, BELIEVE, which are assigned twice for two different arguments in figure 1 also reveal a symmetrical relation expressed by the prepositional phrase 'the same as'. Surprisingly, the predicate IN DISSENSION (in figure 2) does not express a reflexive relationship within the argument. It entails contradiction. These meaning relations can be figured in the following formulae:

**Formula (1)** BELIEVE: XPY → YPX

**Formula (2)** IN DISSENSION: XPX & ~XPX

Formula (1) can be interpreted as If X is the same as Y, then Y is the same as X. This shows that the predicate BELIEVE highlights a symmetrical meaning relation. Formula (2) differently shows that If X is in disagreement with himself, then X contradicts himself. The relation here is best referred to as an irreflexive one.

In concord, the clause that follows sounds an immediate comment. It starts with [fa-] which expresses immediate addition in Standard Arabic. This clause has one predicate, and it is assigned for three arguments, namely (God, you, them). Figure 3 below shows the composition of that commentary clause:

**Figure 3** WILL BE SUFFICIENT FOR/AGAINST (God, you, them).

Figure 3 reads as '..God will be sufficient for you against them'. Like the other predicates presented in examples 1 and 2 above, the predicate in figure 3 is a VP glossed as 'suffice' in modern English and means 'to provide as much as needed' (www.merriam.com). However, unlike the other predicates, SUFFICE is assigned for three arguments to negotiate. It also comments on a previous predicate, characterized by disagreement, preceded by another, and featured by hypothetical agreement. To settle such a swing between the previous predicates, which mirror some inchoative senses resulting from the agreement and disagreement between the arguments, this predicate has to be responsive. This means that BE SUFFICIENT FOR / AGAINST has to meet the heavy burdens of meaning. That is to say, it has either to alienate or not to alienate with its own arguments in order to solve clashes of meaning. Indeed, it does on both the syntactic level as a long structure and on the semantic level by fixing the waving sense of the previous predicates.

Consulting the Semitic morphology and phonology, it has been found that the arguments (ka) meaning 'you' and (hum) meaning 'them' constitute simple morphemes functioning as indirect and direct objects. The other argument (Allah) is a proper noun functioning as subject. Agglutinating the morphemes (ka) and (hum) would result in (ka-hum). Incorporating the output morpheme with (fa-sa-yakfi:) would result in (fa-sa-yakfi:-ka-hum) meaning literally (then-will-suffice-you-them).

Euphony, that is rules of harmony of sounds, tends only to block 'jarring' sound sequences in word-formation (Katamba:75). For a native speaker of Arabic, all the sounds depicted in the long structure (fa-sa-yakfi:-ka-hum) are euphonious and musical.

Besides, Arabic syntax positively responds. It marks this long structure with [a] and [u], the nominative as well as the simple present markers, respectively. It is a final syntactic touch that ends in (fa-sa-yakfi:-k<sup>a</sup>-hum<sup>u</sup> Allah). Functionally, the VP [yakfi:] meaning (suffice) is unlikely to be referential as it does not provide information. It is probably persuasive. According to Aristotle, tools of suasion can be 'ethos, pathos or logos' (Bizzell: 119). Ethos is a speaker's way of convincing people that he or she is a credible source. Credibility is attained by trustworthiness, sincerity and reliability. Pathos, in turn, is a speaker's way of connecting with audience's emotions. Logos, however, refers to the speaker's use of facts, information, statistics, or other evidence to make the argument more convincing. As the VP is assigned as a commentary one for a couple of facts, the tool of persuasion is a logos one.

Similarly, the VP of the long structure presented in quote 3 below does not behave as a referential one. It is part of everyone's schemata, i.e. stored background knowledge, that 'water' from 'the sky' can be used for drinking. Therefore, it is probable that the VP [fa-asqayNa:kumuhu] meaning (give it you to drink) serves suasion. The tools used for persuasion are a combination of logos, ethos and pathos. It is so because the whole verse presents a fact about the 'water', descending 'from the sky' as a 'reliable source' to give to people to 'drink' immediately and with pleasure. In specific, the VP of the long structure sounds emotional, as it entails taking in 'water' through senses with eagerness. Immediateness is, however, accomplished by [fa-] which is roughly glossed as (soon after) in modern English. In general, where all the semantic, phonetic, morphological and functional criteria are met, the long structure is not constrained.

[Quote 3] [..fa-'anzalNa: mina as-sama:'i ma:'an fa-asqayNa:kumuhu..]  
Al-Hijr 15:22.

[..and cause water to descend from the sky, and give it you to drink..]

### **Abstracting and Conveying Meaning in Long Structures**

From a stylistic perspective, long structures are probably not permissible at the level of the holy Script of Islam unless certain criteria have been met. A longer expression has to behave interdependently. It also has to accelerate streaming of some urgent but lucid senses. The components of the long structure should be featured by alienability and euphony. To quantify this linguistic phenomenon, one also needs to explore as well as to exploit other Quranic texts for further discussion.

[Quote 4A] [Wadawu:da wasulaymana ithyahkumani fi: alharthi ith nafashat fi:hi ghanamu alqawmi wakunna lihukmihim sha:hidi:n] Al-Anbya:' 21:78.

[And [mention] David and Solomon, when they judged concerning the field - when the sheep of a people overran it [at night], and We were witness to their judgment].

[Quote 4B] [Fafahamna:ha: sulaymana wakullan atayna: hukman wa'ilman..] Al-Anbya:' 21:79.

[And We gave understanding of the case to Solomon, and to each [of them] We gave judgment and knowledge..].

One can figure the clauses and negotiate their meanings in quote 4A and B. As shown in table 2 below, the predicates as well as their arguments reveal a narrative story (see the predicate for Q4A:1), a case (see the predicate for Q4A:4) that requires a judgment (see the predicate in Q4A:2) between a number of arguments. The predicate OVERRUN implies that the previous predicate JUDGE is perceived as MISJUDGE. The argument assigned for JUDGE explicates that (they: both Solomon and David) have already taken only one argument (mainly the field) into account (see the arguments in Q4A:2). In turn, the predicate OVERRUN is assigned for two arguments having different semantic features. Whereas the first argument (sheep) has the only general characteristics of animates, the second (field) has not; only its components, i.e. vegetation such as trees, may have (see the arguments in Q4A:3). The predicate

JUDGE can only be satisfied with notions, i.e. ways of understanding; however, the predicate OVERRUN (meaning spread quickly like fluffy wool in the Semitic Arabic) is epistemological, as it provides knowledge. One may note that the predicates confer, if not huddle, to convey some epistemologies (knowledge), concepts, and notions, i.e. ways of understanding.

Type of the clauses	Predicates	Arguments	No. of Arguments
<b>A</b>			
1) Main (Matrix)	MENTION	(you), David, Solomon	1
2) Subordinate (can 3) be super-ordinate)	JUDGE	they, field	2
3) Subordinate	OVERRUN	sheep, it (the field)	2
4) Main (comment)	WITNESS	we (God), judgment	2
<b>B</b>			
1) Main	GIVE UNDERST ANDING	we (God), Solomon, it (case)	3
2) Main (comment)	GIVE	We (God). them, judgment, knowledge	4
<b>Table 2</b>			

In table 2, the predicate GIVE UNDERSTANDING (meaning literally to make someone understand in Arabic) has settled the clashes between the previous predicates. This predicate sounds very cognitive, as its entity suggests. Therefore, it is referential, i.e. informative. This predicate has been assigned for three arguments, namely the unstated (we) and the case (it) and only Solomon (see the argument in Q4B:1). The last predicate GIVE is a behaviorist and more comprehensive one. It

addresses every single argument right from the unstated 'WE, the case, David, Solomon, and their personal, exclusive notion and knowledge (see the arguments in Q4B:2). In this sense, GIVE sounds a commentary phrase. Therefore, only a predicate such as GIVE UNDERSTANDING can only abstract the meaning and settle down argument.

In table 2, quote 4B:1 models a large structure. It is a main clause. As I mentioned earlier, the predicate GIVE UNDERSTANDING has manipulated the clashes taking place between some predicates in two subordinated clauses (see Q4A:2&3), and it has already processed the meaning of their predicates (see Q4B:1). Besides, this predicate highlights the arguments [na:], and the argument [ha:] as references for (we) and (the case), respectively. This morpho-phonological tactics excludes the third argument (Solomon) which can be also furthered (if at all) by (ah) in Arabic. The final result will be a long structure reads as (fafahamm-na:-ha: sulayman-a), glossed in English as (we made Solomon understand it). Including a third argument here is unlikely as it ends in a jargon. In longer structures, the number of references accounts. Only can three referents be inserted. The function of the argument is predictable. Once the first option is a nominative reference, the other might be any accusatives. The phonological rules may also be consulted in any optional cases. Finally, [fa], which can be roughly glossed as (then) in Modern English, is a coordinator that introduces immediate ideas.

Quote 4C also presents a long structure. The VP [dalla:] meaning (made someone fall) functions as a referential. It provides some knowledge about the fall of Adam and Eve from Paradise. In Standard Arabic, the VPs [dalla:] and [dalla] meaning (made someone fall) and (showed someone the way), respectively, behave differently. The former is a behaviorist verb whereas the later is a cognitive one. This helps explain why the VP [dalla:] used in the quote is specified by [bi-] meaning (with) phrase. The prepositional phrase (with deception) shows the 'means'. From a syntactic perspective, this prepositional phrase is pivotal to meaning as it modifies the meaning of the VP and provides some knowledge about the manner that 'fall' took place.

[Quote 4C] [fa-dalla:huma bighru:rin fa-lamma: tha:qa ash-shajarata,..]  
Al-'Ara:f 7:22

[So he made them fall, through deception. And when they tasted of the tree,..].

### Redirecting and Converging Meaning in Long Structures

Some other quotes may also help us grasp a full understanding of the subject under investigation. Quote 5 presents a long structure that has a VP functioning as a directive. The predicates of the quote as well as their arguments are drawn in table 3.

[Quote 5] [inna hatha: akhi: lahu tis'un wa-tis'u:na na'ajatan wal li: na'ajaton wahidatun wa-qa:la akfilni:ha wa-'azani fi:-l khitabi] (Sa:d 38:23)

[Indeed this, my brother, has ninety-nine ewes, and I have one ewe; so he said, 'Entrust her to me,' and he overpowered me in speech".

Type of clause	Predicates	Arguments	No. of Arguments
1) Main	HAVE (own)	my brother, 99 ewes	2
2) Main	HAVE (own)	I, one owe	2
3) Main (Matrix)	SAY ENTRUST	He me, her (the 1 ewe),	1 2
4) Main	OVERPOWER	he, me, (in speech?)	3?

**Table 3**

A close look at table 3 reveals that the predicate HAVE (used twice in clause 1 and clause 2) has been assigned for two sibling arguments, one of whom owns 99 ewes whereas the other has just one owe. The meaning relation each predicate creates can be that of synonymy (Hurford:199). The predicate HAVE (for both clauses) can be figured as:

Formula (3) If  $x(\text{HAS})y \equiv y(\text{BELONGS TO})x$

Formula (3) can be interpreted as: My brother has 99 ewes, and this entails that the 99 ewes belongs to him. And I have one owe, and this means that this ewe belongs to me. The reporting predicate SAY sounds directive, as it has one argument. It is similar in meaning to 'ask'. The predicate ENTRUST does not look straightforward because it models a long structure. This predicate is used in the translated version of The Noble Quran to refer to the Arabic stem [kafala] which can be roughly glossed as 'authorize to be' or 'entrust' in modern English. However, the predicate ENTRUST refers to an event or an action where 'something / someone is given to someone else for guidance and care', according to www.merriam.co. In this sense, the predicate ENTRUST has the general properties of the transitive meaning relations (Hurford:202-2030). Transitivity can be figured in example 2 below as:

**Formula (4)** If  $x(\text{ENTRUST S/T TO})y$  &  $y(\text{ENTRUST S/T TO})z$   
 $\rightarrow x(\text{ENTRUST S/T TO})z$

Formula (4) can be interpreted as: If X gives something to Y to look after and that Y gives that thing to Z to look after, this means that X indirectly gives his own X to Z to take care of. This property of transitivity addresses as well as conveys 'giving something to someone'. Indeed, it does not guarantee that 'someone takes care of that thing'. However, this guidance or care is not a subject matter of transitivity.

Transitivity is not the only property that the predicate ENTRUST manipulates clearly. This predicate is featured by ambiguity. The English counterpart for [kafala] is derived from (en-) and (trust). The isolated word (en-) is a homophonous morph which has two different meanings glossed as either 'to make' or 'to put in'. This ambiguity of meaning would also reflect itself in two ambiguous antonyms. That is to say, the opposite can be perceived as 'mistrust', i.e. trust badly, or 'distrust', i.e. lack of confidence. Checking the meaning relationship the predicate ENTRUST helps develop between the arguments would not result in a symmetrical property (see formula 5 below):

**Formula (5)** If  $x(\text{ENTRUST})y \rightarrow \equiv y(\text{ENTRUST})x$  or  $\sim y(\text{ENTRUST})x$ .

Postulates of meaning shows that if X entrusts Y, then Y either possibly entrusts or does not necessarily entrust X. ENTRUST is a predicate that highlights a mutual or an immutual rapport between people. If the interpretation of formula (5) is likely, then the predicate ENTRUST is an extraordinary one. From a logical perspective, this predicate has the priority of meaning transition between predicates, on one hand. On the other, it only manipulates the meaning related to not only presence and absence of mutuality but also of 'bad' mutuality, all of which appear differently in our linguistic behaviors as human beings. Indeed, ENTRUST doesn't assure full mutuality.

In table 3, the predicate ENTRUST also models a large structure. The Semitic counterpart ['akfala], which does not look straightforward from a semantic perspective as we have seen above, is assigned for the argument [ni:] meaning (me) which is a reference to the brother having 99 ewes, and [ha:] meaning (it) referring to the single ewe. The argument that refers to (I), having the single ewe may also shed some light on the denotations of that predicate. One may wonder if the truth value of the predicate ENTRUST can be achieved with the presence of the trustee argument as well as with the absence of the other argument (of the person who entrusts). As it mirrors itself in the syntactic level, the predicate ENTRUST does not entail any mutual trust between the parties (see formula 5 for that contradiction).

This unique long structure ['akfil-ni:-ha:] maintains the number of arguments, but sustains the weight to the genitive one (the ewe). The other argument (I) is kept for Arabic syntax not to explicate but to implicate as [(anta) ʔakfil-ni:-ha:] meaning '(You), entrust it to me]. In this sense, the verb ENTRUST is not referential because it fails to provide enough, clear information to one of the parties. Indeed, it exclusively functions as a directive. This party, namely that of the one ewe, still negotiates the possible meanings of the predicate ['akfil] meaning (entrust). In this sense, the VP is a 'metalinguistic' one, as it attempts to convey implicitly some different, if not contradictory, meanings related to 'lack of trust' or 'trust badly'. The VP that follows the long structure is rather 'expressive' or 'persuasive' than be 'informative'

(see table 3:4). It is derived from [‘aza] and [‘azi:z] meaning (dear or powerful). In the quote, it can be interpreted as ‘overpower’ or ‘beat’ someone in speech. The nature of this VP, however, suggests that it be perceptive as it attempts to tap the feelings of one party (see quote 5). If so, then the VP uses pathos as a tool of suasion to affect one of the parties’ emotions.

Quotes 6A and 6B also manifest two long structures. In both structures, the VP functions as a directive. In quote 6A, the VP [fa-inkihu:nna] is specified by a [bi-] meaning (with) phrase. This prepositional phrase readjusts the directive as it stresses the ‘agreement of women’s people’. In quote 6B, the VP [fa-‘ajirhu] meaning (then grant him protection) also functions as a directive. This VP is, however, not specified by any prepositional phrases that stress any conditions. In this sense, the whole phrase is a pure directive.

[Quote 6A] [.. ba’dukum mi(m) ba’ad fa-inkihu:nna b-‘ithni ahlihinna..]  
An-Nisa:’ 4:25

[.. You [believers] are of one another. So marry them with the permission of their people..]

[Quote 6B] [..wa-in ahadun min al-mushriqi:na istaja:raka fa-‘ajirhu..]  
At-Tawbah 9:6

[.. And if any one of the polytheists seeks your protection, then grant him protection..]

### **Accommodating Linguistic Strains in Long Structures**

In general, the components of long structures should meet the linguistic criteria at the four levels. From a syntactic point of view, a long structure (compared to a long phrase) must have a head word (HW) that can stand alone. And this HW is ‘pivotal’ to meaning (Katamba:10). What governs HWs is ‘the right-hand or left-hand head rules’ –according to one of Chomsky’s parameters (Katamba:9). In English as well as Arabic, the HW must be the most right, though it is the last in English, but the first in Arabic. As it is pivotal, the HW must carry most of the meaning. In this

sense, it is 'categorematic', i.e. it gives full meaning and cannot only modify meaning (Kearns:5).

Accordingly, the verb phrase (VP) in big structures is supposed to be the HW. Examining the quotes from the Holy Script of Islam, the VP sounds paradigmatic. Fairly frequently, the VP is either transitive or di-transitive. However, where the VP is intransitive, it is shifted to the other category by ['a-] which is an inflectional morpheme prefixed initially to the root. According to Katamba, all inflectional morphemes are grammatical as they do not change categories of speech (pp:47-48). They are syncategorematic words that modify meaning for a grammatical purpose. For example, if the category is a noun phrase (NP), a categorematic morpheme such as [-s] in English can only modify that category to be a plural NP. Phonologically, the Semitic syncategorematic morpheme ['a-] is glottal. It is so simple that it can be prefixed to the VP of the long structure as in ['a-kfil-ni:-ha:] meaning (entrust it to me).

In Arabic, future is modality. Only present tense can be marked for future. Future tense markers are namely [saw•fa] and [sa-] both roughly glossed as (will) in English. The former can, however, be assigned as a future-marker template, i.e. a basic form, due to its high frequency and free occurrence. The later [sa-] is, indeed, a contraction or a short form of the former and only can occur as a bound morpheme. In longer structures, only [sa-] is permitted because of its natural alienability and inseparability. Euphonies, i.e. rules of harmony of sounds, may also insist that [sa-] be more symphonic, melodic, and rhythmic than the template form [saw•fa]. The future-marker [sa-] is also an inflectional morpheme. It doesn't carry full meaning. It mainly fulfills a grammatical need where the VP should be shifted from the notion of present time to a future one. Being an inflectional, syncategorematic word, it can be only placed to the right of the HW as in the long structure [sa-yakfi:-ku-humu] meaning (will be sufficient for you against them).

Coordination is a frequent process in Arabic. Pure coordination is carried out by three morphemes including, [wa-, aw and la:kinna], meaning (and, or, and but), respectively. Among these, [wa] is used mainly to express addition. However, this [wa-] has other allomorphs,

namely [fa-] and [thum-ma] which both can be roughly glossed as (then) in English. They are syncategorematic words, as they modify meaning from just pure addition to immediateness or non-immediateness. Among these allomorphs, only [wa-] can be assigned as a template word because of its high redundancy in Arabic. Indeed, Arabic is referred to as a wa-wa language. This [wa-] is a glide, bound morpheme. All the morphemes with a medial glide in Arabic are not characterized by stability. That is to say, it can have the phoneme /a:/ in one word, a /ya/ glide or a /wa/ glide in another related forms as in [sa•a:•ma, ya-su:•m, and si•ya•m] meaning (he fasted, he fasts, and fasting), respectively. In turn, the allomorph [fa-] is also a bound word. As [fa] is labial, fricative and voiceless, it sounds more musical. The last allomorph [thumma] is both fricative and nasal, but voiceless and voiced, respectively. However, it is always free. Therefore, the linking morpheme [fa-] is the only morpheme that one can nominate for a very initial seating at long structures as shown in [fa-sa-yakfi:-ku-hum-u], meaning 'then immediately' God 'will be sufficient' for 'you' against 'them'.

The specifications for the VP are always 'predictable' and 'distributable' (Azar:269). In the long structures quoted from the Holy Script, the VP specifications must include two words functioning as direct and indirect objects. Indeed, they must be pronouns in the accusative case. There must also be another word functioning as a stated or unstated subject. In a long structure, the nominative word must also function as a pronoun. That is to say, the noun phrase (NP) is furthered into a pronoun phrase so that it can alienate with the VP to form one long structure. In Arabic, most pronoun phrases are very simple, rhythmic, and alienable. For example, the putative (but non Quranic) long structure [hal<sup>a</sup>:-ist&jal-tum<sup>u</sup>-ni:-ha:?] meaning '*Could you please ask her for me to hurry up?*', presents three pronoun affixes, namely [-tum-, -ni-, and -ha:], respectively. The infix [tum] meaning (you) is a second plural referent. It is a nominative NP marked by [u] on the syntactic level. The others [ni:] and [ha:] are accusative NPs. The former [ni:] meaning (for me) is a first pronoun, marked by [i:]. The later [ha:] meaning (her) is tagged by the third feminine marker [a:].

In relevance, a non-native speaker of Arabic could perceive [tum-ni:-ha:] in the putative structure and the other quotes discussed earlier, as a melody. It is a predictable mixture of both simple and musical referents. They are so short to the extent in which they can cluster together in a long structure without giving any extra burdens to pronunciation. However, Arabic syntax can sort out any phonological difficulties that may arise. See how, for example, the nominative syntactic marker [ʰ] in [tum<sup>ʰ</sup>-ni:-ha:] has broken the undesired, phonemic bundle of both nasals /n/ and /m/. Without this marker, phonemic consistency in this long structure is unlikely. See also how the interrogative word [hal<sup>a:</sup>] meaning 'could' is probably tagged with the polite marker [ʰ], roughly glossed by 'could or please' in English has also kept phonemic continuation of this word with the whole structure. These tactics take place at the syntactic level and exclude phonological processes, such as assimilation, suppletion or ablaut, for instance. Though in jeopardy, Arabic syntax looks very receptive and responsive.

The specifications for the VP of any structure are also characterized by variable 'edacity' and editability. According to Baker, edacity refers to readiness, that is the number of the specifications each VP triggers (pp:49-51). Editability refers to the potential seating on which each specification is welcomed. The specification for both verbs 'locked' and 'bathed', for instance in 'She locked / bathed her pet cat in the garage', vary a lot. Whereas, the preposition phrase is pivotal for full meaning after 'locked', it is not so essential after 'bathed'. Edacity is a meaning-oriented process. However, editability is a function-based process. The specifications for the head of the English sentence 'She submitted', for instance, can be: 'Prof Aziz her assignment', 'him her assignment', 'her assignment to Prof Aziz', 'it to Prof Aziz', or even 'it to him'. Only can a phrase like 'it to him' be too edible and edible to the bare minimum as well, to be integrated within a long structure in Standard Arabic. As the sentence is close-headed but open-ended, edacity and editability are some linguistic mechanisms through which people only twist the tail of the sentence in order to load, change, alter, and even tame the meaning.

### Conclusions and Implications

To conclude as well as to imply for pedagogy and research, incorporating morphology is not constrained in the Holy Script of Islam. The knowledge each VP provides can be either analytic or synthetic. In general, once the VP supplies full knowledge about the subject, the sentence inclines to be analytic. For example, the Arabic sentence [Muhammadun rasu:lu Allahi] meaning (Muhammad is the prophet of God) is analytic, as it entails contradiction (at least for some atheists). The predicate [be the prophet of God) clearly acknowledges who Muhammad is. The VP of the long structures is, however, combinatory, as it synthesizes knowledge. This knowledge is so summative that it denotes or adds -if at all- some epistemologies from the general life of the arguments under broadcasting. Each selective item of news is transmitted or rather integrated in one longer structure. The VP of the longer structure [zawwj-Na:-ka-ha:] meaning (We married her to you), for instance, introduces some encyclopedic knowledge of the general life of Muhammad (see quote 7). As a result, Arab researchers need to examine the nature of knowledge each VP activates.

[Quote 7] [..fa-lamma: qada: Zaydun minha: wataran zawwjNakaha:.]  
Al-Ahzab 33:37

[..So when Zayd had no longer any need for her, We married her to you..]

Language functions vary and may overlap. They can be referential, expressive, performative, phatic, affective, persuasive, metalinguistic, poetic, heuristic, and many others. The same sentence can be used to express more than one function. Generally speaking, language functions are determined by the participants, the linguistic activity and the purpose of the talk. For example, the Arabic prefabricated expression [al-hamdu lillahi] meaning (Thank God!) can be performative, i.e. an act, at the table after having a meal. In the Arab world, we thank God for food, and supplicate our guests for food and drink. It is so when a Moslem says his or her prayers. The same expression sounds expressive and affective when it occurs as a response to a question such as (How are you?). In

these senses, it expresses some good feelings as well as a desire to socialize. It can also be directive if it is intended for directing someone to say 'Thank God'. Language function is an area that is poorly investigated in Arabic.

In Standard Arabic, the long structure is furthered if certain criteria are met at the various linguistic levels. At the phonemic level, a long structure looks so musical that an Arabic teacher can tweet -to quote from social media- it sweetly to his or her learners as a good example for the structures that meet the Semitic euphonies. It clearly shows harmony of polysynthetic sounds in Arabic. On the phonemic level, there is a clear tendency towards clustering certain sounds. These sounds are unlikely to be pharyngeal. They are mostly dental, alveolar and nasal. Arab phoneticians need to check these sounds for further phonemic properties.

At the semantic level, the meaning relations that the predicate of the long structure usually tries to convey subsequently with other neighboring ones are too inchoative to be received and perceived. A researcher may hashtag # the inchoative meaning of the predicates, i.e. the VP, of the long structure for further debate and investigation. Can a long structure mirror the nominal style which reduces grammar to the bare minimum in order to package meaning? If so, then educational policy-makers, in cooperation with Arabic linguists, should revise the way through which language textbooks traditionally introduce the nominal 'sentence' to L1 learners as a type rather than a style. This makes Arab students focus on the form, i.e. structure, rather than focus on meaning. The nominal structure is not quite grammar-based but rather meaning-oriented. It will be relevant here to notify that the Holy Script tends so fairly frequently to use the nominal 'style' as a subsequent comment on a considerable number of previous but relevant ideas expressed by the verbal sentence. If so, then the nominal style is used to package meaning.

At the morphological level, the components of the long structure are so edible and editable that Arabic instructors can you-tube them to their Arabic foreign learners -if any, for further mastery learning. The long structure can easily help learners of Arabic as foreign language to

conclude that such a long structure is similar to multiple-affixation where some morphemes at different strata, i.e. layers of sound, are attached to change both meaning and category of speech. The components of long structures also help them learn the meaning of linking words, types of verbs, and references. They will grasp a full understanding that the Semitic VP can functionally be intransitive, di-transitive, or even tri-transitive. They will also grasp a full knowledge about how a referent spread exophorically or endophorically for a semantic purpose, but cataphorically or anaphorically for a syntactic one. Finally, such learners will face (to end again with social media) the Arabic syntax for further dedication and consultation. Indeed, difficulties vanish at the touches of Arabic syntax which was probably born for any arduous work.

On the pragmalinguistic level, researchers in sociolinguistics should examine the social context the long structure conveys. They can check the arguments. Arguments include the subject and the objects. These can tell a lot about the properties of the structure itself. They can also study the predicate, i.e. what is said about the subject. The predicate is supposed to tell about the content of the structure itself. It may also help grasp the senses conveyed as well as the functions intended for the verb of the long structure.

### References

- *The Noble Quran*. Available at: [www.quran.com](http://www.quran.com). [Accessed in July 2015].
- Azar, B. S. & Hagen, S. A. (2006). *Basic English Grammar*, Pearson: Longman.
- Baker, C. L. (2004). *English Syntax*. London: The MIT Press.
- Bizzell, P. & Herzberg, B. (2001). *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Second Edition. Phaedrus. New York: Bedford: St. Martin's
- English Dictionary. Available at: [www.dictionary.com](http://www.dictionary.com). [Accessed in July 2015].

- Hurford, J. R. Heasley, B. & Smith, M. B. (2007). *Semantics*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Katamba, F. (2006) *Morphology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Palgrave: Macmillan.
- Kearns, K. (2000) *Semantics*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Norbert Schmitt. (editor: 2002) *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. London: Hodder Education.
- Webster's English Dictionary: *Defining Words for English Language Learners*. Available at: <http://www.merriam-webster.co> [Accessed in November 2014].