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Abstract

The thesis is a study on classical Arabic phraseology on the basis of prose works by Lisān ad-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb (d. 776/1374). It reinvestigates the linguistic concept of a phraseme from a theoretical perspective and adopts the approach of cultural analysis to a selected corpus of classical Arabic phasemes. The results indicate that classical Arabic phrasemes, whether referential or communicative, have four main source domains: historical references, nature, material culture and habitus, and Islamic religious motivations (with either religious or non-religious target domains). The cultural phenomenon that motivates most of them is cultural modelling, although it does not contribute to their fixedness. Two other cultural phenomena – cultural symbolism and quotation – were found to have the strongest impact on phrasemes’ fixedness levels, albeit with some exceptions.
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10: Conclusion

10.1 Questions
A Note on Translation, Transliteration and Dating.

All translations are mine except where otherwise noted. For the Qurʾān, I have used my own translation that is based on the Saheeh International translation of the Qurʾān as provided in Qurʾān.com. to emphasize the link between the literal meaning of the source text and the idiomatic meaning of the phrasemes.

For transliteration, I have utilised IJMES transliteration system with some modifications as follows:

- *Hamza* is not included at the beginning of a word unless it is followed by a long vowel. I have used a phonematic contextual form of transliteration for phrasemes and quotes, in which:
  - *wasla* is omitted if the preceding word ends in a vowel like in *ni ma_l-wakīlu* and *fa-khshaw*.
  - If *wasla* is preceded by a consonant, an auxiliary vowel will be added like *ming _-āmāli* and *lahum _n-nāsu*. Long vowels in the end of words before consonant clusters are transliterated short like *ʿala_stihyāʾin*, *ayyuh_l-ladhīna* and *hādha_l-madjaʿu*. Long and short pronunciation of enclitic pronouns should be transliterated long when preceded by a short vowel like *lahū maʿīshatan* and *rawdiḥī baʿda* or after a short vowel at the end of the quote like in *zillu ṭāʿatihī*. They should be transliterated short in any other case like *dāqat lahu_l-ʿardu* or *ʿalayhī_l-masālikū*.

- In poetry, rhyming vowels are transcribed as long, according to the pronunciation rules of poetry. People and books names that are not included in the quotes, are transliterated in a pausal form but with diacritical marks. Words in the discussion context as individual words are transliterated in pausal form.
The article *al-* the particles *wa-*,* fā-*,* bi-*,* li-*,* ka-*,* 'a-* etc., are written separated from the word by a hyphen except when they occur with a pronoun like *ʿalaykum* or *lahu* (or *lahū* depending on what follows).

The *al-* article is assimilated before ḥurūf *shamsiyya* in both quotes and names, and assimilated when preceded by the particle *wa-* in both quotes and names like *Kitāb aṣ-Ṣināʿatayn al-Kitāba wa-sh-Shiʿr*.

All non-English words, with a few standard exceptions such as names and terms, have been rendered in italics. Conceptual metaphors are presented in all uppercase letters. Square brackets are used for literal translations, source domains, target domains, meanings and concepts. For metaphorical meanings or alternative translations, the equal sign is used.

I will use the Common Era in references to centuries and specific dates/years are Given in both CE and Hijra if both are available.
‘Good morning’ said Bilbo […] ‘What do you mean?’ he [Gandalf] said. ‘Do you wish me a good morning, or mean that it is a good morning whether I want it or not; or that you feel good this morning; or that it is a morning to be good on?’ ‘All of them at once’, said Bilbo.¹

Introduction

Speakers use specific words to indicate specific meanings, but the meaning of any word is ultimately established by a base of knowledge shared by the speaker and his or her interlocutor. Combinations of more than one word bounded by the syntactic system of a language – phrases – should express a semantic field that reflects the meaning of each linguistic unit they contain. Why, then, do combinations of words like ‘Good morning’ in the above example, despite their many possible meanings, tend to convey just one – which, moreover, is not directly implied by the semantic level of their lexemes? Why is ‘Good morning’ only used for greetings in the early part of the day? Why do potential synonyms like ‘Fine morning’ or ‘Well morning’ fail to convey the same greeting-meaning?

The situation is further complicated by the fact that speakers who combine lexemes from different semantic fields into a phrase can do so either to express a specific, i.e. literal, meaning that those lexemes convey together, or to communicate some other meaning that differs from it, either partially or entirely. Additionally, the co-occurrence of some lexemes is noticeable, and can give them arbitrary meanings termed ‘collocations’. This phenomenon gave rise to the linguistic field of phraseology – the study of fixed or prefabricated phrases – and with it, new questions. Which lexemes have a high probability of co-occurrence, and why do

they co-occur together rather than with others? Why do set-phrases – also known as phrasemes – reflect idiomatic meanings? Why do some phrasemes convey indirect meaning even though they are not figurative? And what are the distinctive phenomena of phraseology in each language?

As a theoretical sub-field of linguistics, phraseology traces its inception to the work of Bally in the 1930s, and in practice, it was taken up by English teachers in Japan in the same decade as a response to the difficulties they experienced teaching phrasemes to students there. It was subsequently developed further by Soviet linguists and, as a result of the political connection between the Soviet Union and East Germany, phraseology was also adopted by German linguists. Some of those pioneers are Amosova (1963), Černyševa (1964, 1975, 1980), and Klappenbach (1968). The first attempt to study English phraseology was made by Weinreich (1969). Then, beginning in the 1970s, the approach was first utilised in the study of English, as well as in brief, isolated introductory studies of other languages including Arabic, Chinese, and Icelandic. Pioneering works on phraseology not mentioned above were

---

Because phraseology is a relatively new linguistic field, its terminology is still in flux, with set-phrase, phraseeme, phraseologism, and restricted collocation all in simultaneous use. In this research, the term ‘phraseme’ will be used to identify a phraseological unit, following the terminology used by Dmitri Dobrovol'skij and Elisabeth Piirainen in Figurative Language: Cross-cultural and Cross-linguistic Perspectives (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2005), p. 30.

C. H. Bally, Linguistique générale et linguistique française (Paris: Klincksieck, 1932). I mention dates in this paragraph simply to illustrate the chronological order of the key works in the field.

Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen, Figurative Language, p. 30.


10 Mel’čuk and Reuther (1984),
11 Dobrovol’skij (1988),
12 Welte (1990),
13 Depecker (1999),
14 Fleischer (1997),
15 Mel’čuk (1998),
16 Cowie (1998),
17 Moon (1998),
18 and Gledhill, Christopher, and Frath (2007).

0:1 Phraseology in Arabic

0:1:1 Literature review

Apart from some broad studies of collocations, no dedicated comprehensive Arabic phraseological studies have been published. However, some have been published in German, for instance by Müller. Studies of it in English are even rarer; and Ghariani Baccouche’s work

---

15 W. Fleischer, Phraseologie der deutschen Gegenwartssprache (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1997).
18 Rosamund Moon, ‘Frequencies and Forms of Phrasal Lexemes in English’, in Phraseology, Theory, Analysis, and Application, pp. 69-100.
21 See K. Müller, Und der Kalif lachte, bis er auf den Ruecken fiel – Ein Beitrag zur Phraseologie und Stilkunde
on modern standard Arabic notably failed to recognise the need to study the uniqueness of
Arabic notions such as syntactic and morphological characteristics related to the formation of
phrasemes, and ignored the question of whether the criteria of phraseology can be applied to
them. Moreover, despite sketching a brief historical background of phraseology-related
studies in classical antiquity and the pre-modern era, Ghariani Baccouche did not link modern
ideas about phraseology to the fragments of it in classical Arabic morphological and
philological works. A more analytical approach was pursued by Avihai Shivtiel, who
discusses Arabic phraseology (idioms) within five main topics: 1) the source of the phraseme,
e.g., the Qur’ān, Ḥadīth, calque, etc; 2) the morphology of the phraseme, including some
important phenomena like naḥt [compounds]; 3) grammatical structure; 4) the semantic of
idioms; and 5) some stylistic aspects of idioms. However, Shivtiel failed to discuss the nature
of the elements of Arabic phraseology and the permissible distance between them, and his
decision to treat specific texts (rather than more general source domains) as sources is also
questionable. He divided the grammatical structures of what he called idioms, i.e., phrasemes,
into two main categories – phrasal idioms and idiomatic sentences – and he also provided a
list of rhetorical styles of phrasemes. That list focused on the category of idioms, rather than
other types of phrasemes including non-figurative ones such as lamma ltaqāl jamāni [when
the two groups/armies met] = a great event involving the meeting of two groups or individuals

---

des klassischen Arabisch (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1993), vols. 1 and 2; idem, Da war ihm, als muesse er fliegen
22 Moufida Ghariani Baccouche, ‘Arabic Phraseology’, in Phraseology: An International Handbook of
Contemporary Research, eds. H. Burger, Dmitrij Dobrovol’skij, Peter Kuhn, and Neal R. Norrick (Berlin:
23 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
26 The phenomenon of naḥt and its connection with Arabic phraseology will revisited in Chapter 2.
27 The issue of the permissible distance between the elements will be discussed in Chapter 2.
28 The problem of terminology will be discussed in Chapter 1.
30 Lisān ad-Dīn ibn al-Khaṭīb, al-Īḥāṣa fī Akhbār Gharnāṭa, ed. Muhammad ‘Abd Allāh ‘Anān (Cairo: Maktabat
or ya bna l-fāʾilati [O! son of a doer]\(^{31}\) = son of a whore, although his discussion of the morphology of ‘idioms’ also covered phrasal articles like ‘alā an [on the condition that].\(^{32}\) In short, Shivtiel made a concerted attempt to delineate the structure of Arabic phraseology, but neither did he differentiate between modern and pre-modern Arabic; nor discuss source domains and their role in phraseme formation, or explore the contexts of phraseme’s target domains and usage.

Another key study of Arabic phraseology, by Ludmila Torlakova,\(^{33}\) focuses more on phrasemes’ idiomaticity. Torlakova admitted that it was ‘difficult to draw a clear line between such idioms and other types of phrasemes’,\(^{34}\) and such uncertainty makes it essential for the present work to discuss this issue, which it does in Part One, below. Torlakova also briefly noted the operation of a cultural-specificity rule in the motivation of phraseological meaning, which is an important topic of the current study.\(^{35}\) Her research provides vital groundwork on the metaphorical meanings of classical Arabic collocations, notably based on ‘ilm al-bayān, in works such as Asās al-Balāgha by az-Zamakhsharī (583/1143) and Jurjānī’s (471/1078) theory of rhetoric.\(^{36}\) Az-Zamakhsharī in Asās al-Balāgha usually assigns a secondary meaning to words with certain roots; in the case of b-dh-kh, for example, he firstly provides the literal meaning ‘b-dh-kh: jabalun bādhikhun: ‘ālin […] wa-mina l-majāzi ‘izzun bādhikhun’ = [b-dh-kh: a ‘bādhikh’ mountain (means) high], and then the metaphorical one: [a high (bādhikh) honour].\(^{37}\) Regarding al-Jurjānī, Torlakova focuses on the idea of idiomaticity and the secondary meanings idioms convey, which can only be understood by decoding idiomatic


\(^{34}\)Ibid.

\(^{35}\)Ibid.

\(^{36}\)Ibid.

language. Though Torlakova’s discussion of idioms and the semantic levels of this category of phraseme is useful up to a point, her work’s value is limited by its conflation of modern standard Arabic and classical Arabic, as well as by its lack of in-depth analysis of the cultural specifics of phrasemes and the target domains of their usage. Nevertheless, it is vital to refer to Shivtiel’s and Torlakova’s work, as exemplars of the scholars’ attempts to deal with the issue of the metaphorical meaning: i.e., by attempting to decode it in a general way, rather than phraseologically.

Fragments of early investigations of the idiomatic meanings of Arabic phrasemes can be found in classical Arabic proverb collections such as al-Fākhir fī al-Amthāl of al-Mufaḍḍal ad-Ḍabbī (d. 168/784); in collections of restricted collocations like az-Zāhir of al-Anbārī (d. 328/940); in collections of annexed collocations, e.g., Thīmār al-Qulûb fī al-Mudāf wa-l-Mansūb of ath-Thaʿālibī (d. 429/1038); and collections of irreversible collocations, i.e. Ibn Fāris’s (d. 395/1004) al-Ittibāʾ wa-l-Muṣāwaja. However, while these and other early scholars of classical Arabic exhibited an interest in collecting phrasemes, and understood them as classifiable into at least three types, they did not try to understand the links between these different types, or to analyse phrasemes’ fixedness factors. For example, ad-Ḍabbī categorised communicative phrasemes side by side with referential ones. Likewise, these early scholars failed to distinguish the fixedness and semantic unity of phrasemes like maʿādha ʿllāhi [(I seek) God’s shelter] = to express rejection of something, and ḥamdala: a naḥt referring to the

---

38 Torlakova, ‘Idioms’ in Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics (electronic resource): http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_SIM_000280, accessed on 6 February 2018; see also ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, Dalāʾil al-(chip; see
42 Ahmad ibn Fāris, al-Ittibāʾ wa-l-Muṣāwaja, (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānji, 1947). I am here focusing on classical Arabic works whose subject matter is more in the nature of phrasemes than collocations.
43 Ad-Ḍabbī, al-Fākhir, p. 25.
phraseme *al-ḥamdu li-llāhi* [(all) praise be to God]. The same applies to all of the collections of collocations and proverbs. ath-Thaʿāliḥi’s *Thimār al-Qulūb*, for example, consisted of an attempt to collect set-phrases that could only be formed in *idāfa* [annexation], which clearly indicates his awareness of both the fixedness of the collocations he had collected and their idiomatic meanings. But while ath-Thaʿāliḥi expanded the general category of set-phrases to include ones like *rasūlu lāhi* [the messenger of God] = prophet Muḥammad – a phraseme I will discuss in Chapter 8 – his analyses were limited to the source domains that motivated them, regardless of their context or their levels of flexibility.

Other attempts to study set-phrases in classical Arabic have included collections of frequently used phrases that, in context, mostly convey secondary semantic levels: e.g., *Alfāz al-Kitābiyya* of al-Hamadhānī (d. c. 327/939) and the *Jawāhir al-Alfāz* of Qudāma ibn Jaʿfar (d. 337/948). Both these works and others of a similar type consisted mainly of lists of set-phrases categorised according to the usage target domain. For example, in Ibn Jaʿfar’s *Jawāhir al-Alfāz* ‘bābun fī maʾnā ašlāha l-fāsida’ [a section on the meaning of righting a wrong], he lists phrases like *aqāma l-awda* [(he) straightened the binding], *rataqa l-fatqa* [(he) joined the separated] and *sadda l-lathmata* [(he) blocked the break]. Al-Hamadhānī emphasised that he collected phrases that had been established as useful and eloquent in earlier

---

44 For further discussion of *naḥt*, please see Chapter 2.
45 The definition of *idāfa* is ‘[t]wo Arabic nouns […] linked together in a noun phrase in such a way that the second noun in the sequence determines the first by limiting, identifying, possessing, defining, or amplifying it. The two nouns in this phrase function as a closely knit syntactic unit’. See Karin C. Ryding, ‘*Idāfa*’, in *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* (electronic resource): http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_COM_vol2_0043, accessed on 6 February 2018.
46 He explains what the book includes by saying: ‘wa-binā u hāḍha l-kitābī’ alā dhiqri ashyā’ in muḍḍasīn wa-mansūbatin ilā ashyā’ in ukhrā yutamaththahu bihā wa-yakthuru fi n-naẓmī wa-n-naṭhī wa-ʾalā alṣanātī l-khāṣṣatī wa-l-ʿammātī ʾistīʾ māṭhā’ [and the structure of this book is (based) on mentioning things that are annexed and referred to other things, used as proverbs and highly used in the language of the public and of scholars]. See ath-Thaʿāliḥi, *Thimār al-Qulūb*, p. 13.
works. Ibn Jaʿfar followed al-Hamadhānī’s model closely, and neither writer investigated either fixedness forms or phrasemes’ types; and although their collections were meant to be used textually, they did not include transitive textual phrasemes like ammā ba’du [after all] = to separate the introduction from the main part, or alā inna [and that is] = to direct attention to what follows.

In short, medieval scholars of classical Arabic recognised the fixed nature of different types of phrasemes and their semantic unity. However, they did not differentiate between various types and often have simply described them as amthāl.

0:1:2 Criteria Problems in Classical Arabic

Because phraseology was initially applied to Russian, German, and Romance languages, its criteria must be adjusted to suit the characteristics of a Semitic language such as Arabic. However, scholars have not hitherto applied phraseology to Arabic for the purpose of solving issues like the nature of the elements and the permissible gap between the elements – arguably, due to definitional issues. The current literature defines a phraseme in one of the following two ways:

A combination of two words or more is phraseological if (1) the words form a unit that cannot be fully explained by the syntactic and semantic regularities of the combination and if (2) the word combination is commonly used by the speech community, similar to the use of a lexeme.

---

51 Al-Hamadhānī, al-ʾAlfāz, p. 10.
52 Ibn Jaʿfar, Jawāhir al-ʾAlfāz, , p. 2.
55 The overall scope of the surviving fragments of scholarship on phraseology in classical Arabic traditional works is ripe for further independent investigation, but is not of central concern to the present work.
56 See above, p. 2.
57 Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, Figurative Language, p. 31.
Or:

[T]he co-occurrence of a form or a lemma of a lexical item and one or more additional linguistic elements of various kinds which functions as one semantic unit in a clause or sentence and whose frequency of co-occurrence is larger than expected on the basis of chance.\textsuperscript{58}

According to Gries, who originated the second definition above, six parameters should also be considered when identifying a phraseme:

1) The nature of elements involved in a phraseme: words.

2) The number of elements involved in a phraseme: two or more.

3) The number of times it must co-occur before it is considered a phraseme: co-occurrence should happen more often than expected.

4) The permissible distance between the elements involved in a phraseme: they should co-occur adjacently.

5) The lexical and syntactic flexibility of the elements of a phraseme: the elements of the phraseme cannot be substituted, but one part can occur in a number of morphological forms.

6) The semantic unity and non-predictability of a phraseme: it should function as one semantic unit.\textsuperscript{59}

Applying these criteria to potential phrasemes in Arabic will require us to interrogate and reformulate some of them. Whether the first criterion coheres with the nature of the elements in a classical Arabic phraseme – e.g., whether a preposition (as in phrasal verbs like \textit{raghiba} \textit{fi} and \textit{raghiba} \textit{an}) – and other linguistic elements can be elements of phrasemes – will be discussed in Chapter 1-3. As to the second criterion, two special forms of words must be


\textsuperscript{59} Gries, ‘Phraseology and Linguistic Theory’, pp. 4-6.
considered before one can decide whether they are phrasemes or not. The first is *naḥt*, a type of phrase that is abbreviated to one word and functions as one semantic unit: e.g., *ḥamdala* referring to the phraseme *al-ḥamdu li-llāhi* [(all) praise be to God]. The second is one-word phraseme, in which one lexical element is uttered while the other is not. With regard to the third criterion, a corpus is needed before the number of co-occurrences can be identified. However, some geographic areas and historical periods of Arabic lack exhaustive corpora. Regarding the fourth criterion, Arabic shows flexibility in term of order, allowing the speaker to add words between the elements of a phraseme without causing it to lose its one-semantic-unit status. However, the distance between the elements is not absolutely free, and is thus worthy of close examination. For example, *as-salāmu ʿalaykum wa-raḥmatu llāhi wa-barakātuhū* [may the peace, mercy, and blessings of God be upon you] can be found in varieties like *as-salāmu l-ladhī yataʾannaq ʿabaqan wa-nashran ʿalā ḥaḍratikumu l-ʿaliyyati wa-raḥmatu llāhi taʿalā wa-barakātuhū* [the most attractively infused (with aroma and fragrance) may be with your great excellency, along with mercy and blessings of God almighty], as will be discussed in Chapter 2. And as to the fifth and sixth elements, in classical Arabic – especially in literature – synonyms can be used even in quotations, provided that they work as single semantic units. For instance, although the first element of the Qurʿanic phraseme *fāra t-tannūru* [the oven has overflowed] could be replaced with *fāda t-tannūru*, its semantic unity was still preserved, and the resulting collocation used as a phraseme that delivers an idiomatic phraseological meaning. It is expected that the detailed examination of such issues will yield adjustments to Gries’s criteria that will render them fully applicable to Arabic for the first time.

---

60 The phraseme occurs in multiple cites in the corpus in the same form. In such cases, I will refer to one cite to avoid unnecessary extension. Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *Rayḥānat al-Kuttāb*, vol. 1, p. 520.
62 Qurʿān (Ḥūd) 11:40.
This research will be divided into two main parts. The first will consist of an exploration of the notions of phraseology reflected by studies of the syntactic, morphological, and semantic levels of classical Arabic phrasemes, and the results utilised to establish a clear definition of and criteria for a classical Arabic phraseme, based on a corpus comprising the fourteenth-century Arabic writings of Lisān ad-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb (d. 776/1374). The second part is an empirical study outlined in the following section.

0:2 Cultural Analysis

0:2:1 Background

Establishing definitional criteria for phrasemes tailored to a specific language is itself an important contribution to phraseological scholarship; and studying phrasemes through the lens of a particular sub-field of phraseology can open new horizons for current and future research. The main aspects of phraseology that have been discussed are 1) phrasemes’ semantics, 2) the style and rhetoric of phrasemes, 3) phrasemes’ semiotic aspects, 4) phrasemes in discourse, 5) variation in phrasemes by type of text, 6) the phraseology of individual authors, 7) the phraseology of individuals other than authors (notably including learners of academic writing), 8) phraseology and translation, 9) cognitive aspects of phraseology, 10) phraseography, 11) computational linguistics and phraseology, 12) corpus linguistics and phraseology, 13) cultural analysis of phraseology, and 14) historical phraseology. Interdisciplinarity blends and blurs these aspects. For instance, working on a single language from the perspective of cultural analysis of phrasemes leads to the establishment of a base for studying the metaphorical usage of that language. Conceptual metaphor theory, as introduced

---

by Lakoff and Johnson, can then be a helpful methodology for linking cultural aspects with the making of a metaphor.\textsuperscript{65} Thoughts are conceptually systemised,\textsuperscript{66} and the resultant conceptual system is reflected in the language of a given speech community as conceptual metaphors.\textsuperscript{67} And those conceptual metaphors motivate metaphorical layers of the language,\textsuperscript{68} including its phraseology. For example, UP IS GOOD is a cross-cultural conceptual metaphor that can be observed either directly or as sub-metaphors: for instance, in English as ‘at the peak of health’ and ‘in top shape’.\textsuperscript{69} Similarly, ‘I’m feeling up’, ‘That boosted my spirit’, and ‘My spirit rose’ are all motivated by the conceptual metaphor HAPPY IS UP.\textsuperscript{70} The same conceptual metaphor motivates Arabic phrasemes like ṭāra farahān [happily flying] = extremely happy,\textsuperscript{71} while UP IS GOOD motivates ila r-rafiqī l-a’lā [(he was) transferred to the higher companion] = he died, but indicating a positive end in the afterlife, i.e., being with God in Heaven.\textsuperscript{72} As a field of research, in other words, phraseology is inherently interdisciplinary, to the point that trying to arrive at neat demarcations between its numerous branches may be difficult or, in some cases, impossible.

The second part of this dissertation is a corpus-based empirical study, using cultural analysis, of phrasemes in classical Arabic writing, in the context of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works. Cultural analysis of a phraseme is a method of linking its specific language with its cultural connotations. As phraseology is ‘a domain of linguistic study which to a high degree illustrates the correlation between language and culture’,\textsuperscript{73} novel contributions to this facet of

\textsuperscript{65} See George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, \textit{Metaphors We Live By} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), pp. 3-6.
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid., p. 3.
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., pp. 3-4.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., p. 3.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., p. 15.
\textsuperscript{70} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{71} A detailed study of the phraseme is provided by K. Müller, \textit{Da war ihm, als müsse er fliegen vor Freuden – Tausendundeine Nacht als Fundus fuer arabische Phraseologie} (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2001).
\textsuperscript{72} Al-Maqqarī, \textit{Nafḥ at-Tib}, vol. 6, p. 335; additional discussion and analysis will be provided in the current study’s Chapters 3 and 8.
phraseology in an understudied language are as important as establishing its structural aspects. Language, as a method of communication, represents the common knowledge of a community that has been formed over time. Thus, it is beyond question that language acts as an important part of culture and as a container of cultural heritage. Nevertheless, investigation of the cultural roots of individual lexemes is still an uncertain business, due to the variety of lexical units.\(^74\)

On the other hand, the connection between cultural connotations and phrasemes is clearer. According to Colson, this connection

\[
\text{is best revealed by proverbs and fully idiomatic set phrases, } \\
\text{because they tend to rely heavily on images, traditions or habits } \\
\text{that are characteristics of given culture[.]}\(^75\)
\]

For present purposes, therefore, culture needs to be carefully analysed and broken down into terms that relate to the various methods of phraseology. Although what culture is might seem to be common knowledge, this question is highly controversial, with Kroeber and Kluckohn listing no fewer than 164 distinct definitions.\(^76\) Some definitions are more widely quoted than others, e.g., Tylor’s: ‘The complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society’.\(^77\) Other definitions, however, cannot be neglected. If the present study is to be established on a solid foundation, it must arrive at a working meaning of the term ‘culture’, and will do so in Chapter 3 via a comparison of those definitions that have previously been accepted by phraseologists.

0:2:2 Approaches to Cultural Analysis of Phraseology

Cultural analysis has gained increasing acceptance as an approach to the study of

\(^{74}\) Ibid, p. 58.
phrasemes over the past two decades. It has two potential theoretical approaches. The first, corpus-based analysis, examines linguistic units within a specified collection of writings highly based on the cognitive theory of metaphor originated by Lakoff and Johnson, which holds that metaphors are formed by abstract concepts.\textsuperscript{78} Despite the noteworthy results that it has yielded in phraseology, the cognitive theory of metaphor is not always useful to analyse functional phrasemes that are characterised by ‘additional naming’.\textsuperscript{79} Cultural analyses of phraseology also is hard to be digital-corpus-based, because idioms and figurative phrasemes – such analyses’ main material – do not occur in corpora with sufficient frequency.\textsuperscript{80}

An alternative form of cultural analysis, proposed by Teliya, Bragina, Oparina, and Sandomirskaya,\textsuperscript{81} holds that culture is presented through five channels: 1) cultural scenes, 2) cultural concepts, 3) cultural connotations, 4) cultural background, and 5) discourse stereotypes.\textsuperscript{82} Finally, Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen developed an approach similar to Teliya et. al’s,\textsuperscript{83} albeit with cultural channels re-conceived of as ‘cultural phenomena’, and reduced to four main types, i.e., 1) social interaction, 2) material culture, 3) fictive conceptual domains, 4) cultural symbols. As well as having various sub-categories, some of these phenomena can be blended in one phraseme. Having examined the available alternatives, I concluded that Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen’s system of classification and its acceptance of phenomena-blending will facilitate the deepest analysis of cultural concepts in phraseology, and hence I adopted it for use in the present study. It should be noted that in this research, the material for analysis will be limited to phrasemes that actually occur in the corpus that has been selected.

\textsuperscript{78} Lakoff and Johnson, \textit{Metaphors We Live By}, pp. 3-6.

\textsuperscript{79} Colson, ‘Cross-linguistic Phraseological Studies’, p. 197; Additional naming, according to Piirainen and Dobrovol’skij, is an additional semantic layer added to the primary semantic layer of the lexemes of which the expression is composed. Additional naming can occur with an image, as in figurative units, or without one, as in synonyms: \textit{Figurative Language}, pp. 18-19.

\textsuperscript{80} Colson, ‘Cross-linguistic Phraseological Studies’, p. 197; Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, \textit{Figurative Language}, p. 18.

\textsuperscript{81} Teliya et al., ‘Phraseology as a Language of Culture’, p. 55.

\textsuperscript{82} Ibid, p. 58.

\textsuperscript{83} Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, \textit{Figurative Language}, pp. 214-43.
more details about which are provided in the following section. Likewise, Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen’s approach is only a classification system. In this research, I will examine this system’s usefulness as a guide to the fixedness level of the phrasemes in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s written works. For example, phenomena like quotation and cultural symbols would potentially be factors of fixedness in the formation of the phraseme because of their fixed nature: Quotation is a direct quote from the source text, and a cultural symbol is a fixed lexical element whose metaphorical meaning is the key to decode the phraseme’s metaphorical semantic level.  

0:3 The Scope of this Study

Given that classical Arabic is this study’s target language, it is essential to identify some concepts that are peculiar to or especially prominent in it. Although classical Arabic was standardised to some extent starting in the eighth century, a steady stream of stylistic alterations continued in the years that followed, and included the formation of the phraseological system. In terms of source domains, contributions to the phraseological system of classical Arabic included layers ranging from pre-Islamic social conventions to Islamic quotations, tribal Arab traditions and the nature of Arabia’s desert environment. Phrasemes’ target domains, on the other hand, mainly reflect a single metaphorical meaning but could also be multiplied as a result of contextual factors.

To investigate the culture-specific phenomena in classical Arabic and their functionality in their respective target domains, this study will use a corpus comprising the output of the fourteenth-century Andalusi writer Ibn al-Khaṭīb. Andalusi literature is closely related to eastern Arabic literature – i.e., that produced in the Arabian peninsula, Egypt, Iraq, Persia and the Levant – with both sharing the same main sources, e.g., the Qur’ān, Ḥadīth (narratives from

---

84 For more discussion see: Chapter 3.
the prophet Muḥammad’s sayings and deeds), and early classical Arabic poetry, alongside possible local influences. In al-Andalus, as in every region of the-Arabic speaking world, standard classical Arabic was high-register and the language of writing.86

By the Naṣrid period (711-897/1031-1492), however, geographic remoteness of al-Andalus’s and long delays in communication between it and the eastern Arabic speaking world led to the development of a flourishing and distinctive written culture in al-Andalus.87 Ibn al-Khaṭīb, an important literary figure of that period, was vizier to the Naṣrid rulers and responsible for writing the Sultan’s official letters. His poetry and prose works, unlike those of most other writers of the same era, have been preserved either as manuscripts, most of which have been published, or within the works of the North African Arabic scholar Ahmād al-Maqqārī (d. 1041/1632) from Telemcen, whose Nafḥ at-Ṭīb fī Ghuṣn al-Andalus ar-Raḥīb wa-Dhikr Wazīrihā Lisān ad-Dīn ibn al-Khaṭīb [The Breath of Aroma from the Fresh Branch of al-Andalus and of its Vizier Lisān ad-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb] was devoted to Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s writings. Accordingly, this study will utilise the writings of Ibn al-Khaṭīb as its main source of phrasemes, considered as indicators of the extent to which culturally specific phenomena were reflected in the language used in fourteenth-century classical Arabic writing. The works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb embody classical Arabic’s phraseological system at a critical point in its development, i.e., when cultural phenomena became detectable. It also provides us with a varied range of written genres including official letters written on behalf of al-Andalus’s rulers, personal letters, chapters of books on Sufism, biographies and philosophy, which provide us with phrasemes boasting a rich array of source and target domains.

Our focus will be on prose, since Arabic poetry is restricted by metre and rhyme, which oblige manipulation of its language syntactically, and limit it semantically in term of the use of

synonyms. Although classical Arabic prose also usually contains a large quantity of rhyme \([saj\]\), it seems unlikely that including such rhyme, in the absence of metrical considerations, imposed anywhere nearly the same restrictions.

0:4 Conclusion

Phraseology is a sub-field of linguistics that studies set-phrases (phrasemes) in syntactical, semantic, and lexical terms; and the primary aim of the present research is to establish one of the first useful theoretical framework for the discussion of phraseology in classical Arabic. However, no definition of what a phraseme is has ever been firmly established in this linguistic context; and this absence will require me to carefully review and modify existing phraseological theories’ criteria for what phrasemes are, in light of linguistic features that are specific to classical Arabic.

Among the various promising approaches used by phraseologists, analysis of culturally specific phenomena – specifically, as pursued by Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen – has been selected as highly appropriate to the present research, as it has been shown capable of explaining the linkages between a given language’s cultural basis and the formation and fixedness of its phrasemes. The cognitive theory of metaphor, meanwhile, enables metaphorical phrasemes to be studied and linked culturally; and the four elements of culture mentioned above, by which language represents culture, will be utilised throughout my analysis of phrasemes in the chapters that follow.
Part I: Theoretical Frameworks

This work is divided into X parts, each of Y chapters. The first part will discuss the theoretical framework of phraseology, the chosen analytical approach (culturally specific phenomena), and the scope of this study. The aims of this discussion are 1) to establish a definition of an Arabic phraseme within the context of classical Arabic; 2) to identify the typological system of phrasemes that will be most helpful in analysing the target corpus; 3) to explain the rationale behind the selection of Piirainen and Dobrovols’kij’s culturally specific phenomena approach; and finally, 4) to introduce the scope of this study and the corpus, i.e., the prose writings of Ibn al-Khaṭīb.

To maintain clear boundaries among the above-mentioned topics, Part I’s four chapters will be organised as follows. Chapter 1 will introduce the theory of phraseology as it has been discussed in prior scholarship, with a focus on settling terminology, definitions and typology. In Chapter 2, I will discuss some issues raised in Chapter 1 regarding phraseology in classical Arabic in greater depth. Chapter 3 explores the definition of culture before going on to explain the culturally specific phenomena approach pioneered by Piirainen and Dobrovols’kij and its potential applicability to classical Arabic. Lastly, Chapter 4 provides an overview of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s historical context, life and work, and why his prose writings were selected as this study’s corpus.
Chapter 1: The Theoretical Framework

Despite phraseology having constituted an independent field of linguistics for decades, its terminology, criteria, and definition remain controversial. Hence, this chapter discusses these three key aspects of phraseology, with the goal of arriving at a framework for all of them that is both coherent and appropriate to the current research aims.

1:1 Terminology

Phraseological studies are rendered more challenging by the variety of terms that are used for their elements. Cowie, for instance, listed five distinct names for the linguistic unit of phraseology:

1) phraseological unit
2) set-combination
3) phraseme
4) set phraseme
5) word combination

Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen later claimed that about seventy terms were used for the same unit. Of those seventy, the three most commonly used are fixed phrase, phraseologism, and idiom. Quite reasonably, Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen rejected ‘fixed phrase’ as failing to express that the nature of the unit is ‘flexible to some extent’; and also rejected ‘phraseologism’ (along with ‘phraseological unit’) due to its Russian origins and consequent irrelevance to the case of English. Finally, they critiqued the term ‘idiom’ as representing merely a sub-category of the unit with which phraseology deals, i.e., collocations and functional linguistic formulae.

---

89 Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, Figurative Language, p. 29.
90 Ibid., p. 30.
(fixed-form expressions). Hence, as a hyperonym (superordinate term), Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen preferred ‘phraseme’ over the other available terms. One additional argument in favour of its use is that units in linguistics are mostly formed using the suffix -eme, cf. lexeme, phoneme, and morpheme. In *Phraseology: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, the editors preferred to use the term phraseme when referring to idioms and collocations. However, a unit of phraseology, as a linguistic field, can arguably justify the linguistic form -eme in both the broad and narrow senses. Though it would be difficult to claim that the term phraseme has been widely used by phraseologists, it is one of the most common terms used for the purpose of identifying a unit of phraseology; and for this reason, it will be used hereafter as a hyperonym in this research.

1:2 Definitions

A brief definition of phraseology holds that it is ‘the study of the structure, meaning, and use of word combinations’. For a clear idea of what a phraseme is, I will utilise Cowie’s more precise and most detailed yet brief definition of phraseology: ‘the study of a prefabricated sentence on the semantic, syntactic, and morphological levels’. Cowie’s definition indicates the main characteristic of a phraseme: ‘prefabricated’; the element of a phraseme: the linguistic element that makes a ‘sentence’; and the three linguistic levels on which prefabrication have to be applied.

---

91 Ibid.
93 In *Phraseology: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*, an edited volume of twenty-five papers on phraseology, six chapters used the term phraseological unit (Omazic, Wikbery, Moon, Hied, Bretana and Nertan, and Sinclair), while five used the term phraseme (Granger and Poquot, Calson, Piirainen [in two chapters], and Sabban). The rest used an array of different terms including fixed phrase, phraseologism, and fixed expression.
96 Another, less useful yet unquestionably accurate definition of phraseology, but worth mentioning for the sake
Proceeding from the foregoing definition, a phraseme can be any linguistic formula (which might be a speech-act formula or gambit), restricted collocation, or idiom.\textsuperscript{97} To further clarify the definition of a classical Arabic phraseme, e.g., the number of elements it can involve and the permissible distance between them, I will adopt the six-parameter approach to defining a phraseme that was recommended by Gries. Gries provided well detailed criteria that not only cohere with Cowie’s definition, but also focus on important details in the formation of a phraseme on its three linguistic levels: semantic, syntactic and morphological. These criteria will help understanding, defining and spotting the issues we might face in a classical Arabic phraseme.

According to Gries, taking a stand on the six parameters in question – nature, number, occurrence, distance, lexical and syntactic flexibility, and semantic unity\textsuperscript{98} – allows ‘rigorous definition of co-occurrence phenomena in general, and phraseology in particular’.\textsuperscript{99} More specifically, the six parameters are defined as follows:

1) The linguistic elements involved in a [phraseme]: Gries suggested that his first criterion includes not only lexical items, but also grammatical patterns;\textsuperscript{100} and argued that lexical items and lemmas should be accepted as phraseological.\textsuperscript{101}

2) The number of elements involved in a [phraseme]: any phraseme must be created from two or more elements.\textsuperscript{102} The minimum number of elements in the Arabic case should be the focus of more scholarly attention, since the morphological concepts \textit{naht}, one word

\textsuperscript{97} Additionaly, Igor Mel’čuk provides a list of formulae by which he sets the borders of the of the definition: ‘Collocation and Lexical Functions’, in \textit{Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications}, pp. 26-27.

\textsuperscript{98} In Chapter 2, these categories will be examined as to their existence in Arabic and their appropriateness to Arabic linguistic structures.

\textsuperscript{99} Gries, ‘Phraseology and Linguistic Theory’, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., p. 5; accordingly, Gries’s definition corresponds to structural phrasemes as defined by Burger. See Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 38.

\textsuperscript{101} Gries, ‘Phraseology and Linguistic Theory’, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.; also, notably, Mel’čuk does not discuss this criterion, but it is implicit in the examples he gives in ‘Collocation and Lexical Functions’, p. 28.
A phraseme like *marhaban* – all of which originally contained two elements – are dealt with as single words. This will be discussed further in Chapter 2, below.\textsuperscript{103}

3) The number of times an expression must be observed before it counts as a [phraseme]: Gries claimed that a phraseme can be identified as such ‘if its observed frequency of occurrence is larger than its expected one’.\textsuperscript{104} This claim is risky, even according to Gries himself,\textsuperscript{105} as phraseme-frequency expectations can be subjective and dependent upon the individual scholar’s knowledge of a language. Although the strong tendency of certain pairs of items to co-occur has been mentioned in most of the published definitions of phrasemes, no one has proposed any specific threshold for the number of co-occurrences above which a word collocation should be considered a phraseme.\textsuperscript{106}

4) The permissible distance between the elements involved in a [phraseme]: Gries adopted a ‘broader perspective’ that allowed word collocations that contained discontinuous items to be identified as phrasemes.\textsuperscript{107} Arguments in favour of this approach can be found in papers based on N-gram studies of natural language processes.\textsuperscript{108} However, applying such approach to Arabic would tend to conflict with this language’s flexible order nature, as in the case of the phraseme *as-salāmu ’alaykum wa-raḥmatu llāhi wa-barakātuhū*, as will be discussed later.

5) The degree of lexical and syntactic flexibility of the elements involved: Gries’s fifth criterion (flexibility of the elements) revolves around the question of how flexible a phraseme ought to be. What tenses can it contain and still be considered a phraseme? What

\textsuperscript{103} *Al-murakkab al-mazjī* corresponds to the category of compounds in Granger and Paquot’s typology. See Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 43; and section 1.3.1 of the present chapter.

\textsuperscript{104} Gries, ‘Phraseology and Linguistic Theory’, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{106} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{108} N-grams, bigrams, and trigrams are the extracted results of a study that statistically analyses ‘recurrent continuous sequences of two or more words’. Phraseological studies based on N-gram analysis have usually advocated the continuity of the items of a phraseme: see Gries, ‘Phraseology and Linguistic Theory’, p. 5. Quotation from Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, pp. 38-39.
is the level of lexical flexibility for a phraseme? Completely inflexible forms (i.e., full phrasemes) are accepted, but the criterion also allows ‘relatively flexible patterns’, such as phrases that allow multiple tenses but exclude one particular tense. The criterion also includes ‘partially lexical-filled patterns’.

6) The role that semantic unity and semantic non-compositionality/non-predictability play in the definition: Lastly, the sixth criterion acts as the core of the definition of a phraseme, insofar as any word combination deemed a phraseme should function as a single semantic unit. However, a debate has arisen over whether a phraseme should be semantically non-compositional. Gries argued that this was unnecessary, but still advocated unity of meaning.

The final definition of a phraseme that he arrived at, based on the foregoing six criteria, was as follows:

[T]he co-occurrence of a form or lemma of a lexical item and one or more additional linguistic elements of various kinds which function as one semantic unit in a clause or sentence and whose frequency of co-occurrence is larger than expected on the basis of chance.[],

From the previously discussed six parameters and their definitions, we can summarise the criteria that need to be fulfilled before a word combination can be treated as a phraseme:

1) Its natural elements are words;

---

109 As in Melčuk’s typological system, set forth in ‘Collocation and Lexical Functions’, p. 28.
111 Gries, ‘Phraseology and Linguistic Theory’, p. 5. Thus, as per Melčuk’s definitions, semi-phrasemes and quasi-phrasemes are also included: ‘Collocation and Lexical Functions’, p. 29.
113 Ibid.
114 Ibid.
2) The number of such elements is two or more;\textsuperscript{115}
3) The frequency of co-occurrence is greater than expected;
4) The distance between elements is usually either short (interrupted by just one word) or non-existent;\textsuperscript{116}
5) No more than one element should be flexible; and
6) A phraseme should function as one semantic unit.

Taken together, Gries’s six parameters for defining a phraseme cover three broader concepts: the individual elements, the occurrence of these elements as a single unit, and the semantic unity of the phraseme. Although his definition provides a comprehensive definition of a phraseme, it needs to be carefully examined with regard to its applicability to classical Arabic.\textsuperscript{117}

1:3 Typologies

Phraseologists have agreed on a number of sub-categories of phrasemes, but their distribution remains highly debatable. The field of phraseology has originated a number of key typologies.

Beginning with Cowie, who classifies word combinations into two main categories: 1) composites and 2) formulae.\textsuperscript{118} Composites are further divided into three main sub-categories – 1) restricted collocations, 2) figurative idioms, and 3) pure idioms – and formulae are divided into two: 1) routine formulae, and 2) speech formulae.\textsuperscript{119}

The following examples clarify the meanings of the terms for composites. Restricted

\textsuperscript{115} This issue, in the specific context of Arabic, will be discussed further in Chapter 2, below.
\textsuperscript{116} The example that Gries provided showed one word intervening between the phraseme’s elements. Mel’čuk, too, allowed for phrasemes to contain non-relevant elements, but included only one such case among all his examples. See Gries, ‘Phraseology and Linguistic Theory’, p. 7, and Mel’čuk, ‘Collocation and Lexical Functions’, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{117} Further discussion of this matter will be included in the following chapter.
\textsuperscript{118} Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid.
collocations are combinations described by limited collectability and ‘specialized meaning of one of the elements’, e.g., ‘blow a fuse’\textsuperscript{120} or \textit{mihādun wathīrūn} [a soft resting place] = a comfortable bed. \textsuperscript{121} Figurative idioms can be interpreted literally in spite of their figurativeness, and have elements that are non-substitutable, e.g., ‘blow your own trumpet’\textsuperscript{122} or alqā ḍasa t-ṭisyārī [(he) dropped] the travelling-stick] = to end a journey or a long task.\textsuperscript{123} And pure idioms are non-compositional on the semantic level, e.g., ‘blow the gaff’ or fāra/fāda t-tannāru [the oven has overflowed]\textsuperscript{124} = a sign of an event that has just happened, or that it is too late to prevent.

As for routine formulae, they are speech-act functions, e.g., ‘good morning’ or \textit{as-salāmu 'alayka}\textsuperscript{125} [may the peace be upon you]. Speech formulae, on the other hand, ‘are used to organize messages and indicate the speaker’s or writer’s attitudes’, e.g., ‘you know what I mean?’, ‘are you with me?’ or \textit{ara'ayta kayfa} [have not you see]\textsuperscript{126} = a phrase used to attract the audience from a topic to another or to give an example.

Mel’čuk (1998) proposes the second noteworthy typology of phraseology,\textsuperscript{127} which classifies phrasemes into two main types:

1) semantic phrasemes, which are divided into three sub-categories:
   a) semi-phrasemes or collocations,
   b) quasi-phrasemes or quasi-idioms, and

\textsuperscript{120}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{121}Ibn al-Khaṭīb, \textit{Rayhān al-Kuttāb}, vol. 1, p. 70. The root \textit{w-th-r} has the meaning of describing smoothness. Hence, the \textit{wathīr} in this morphological pattern gained the meaning of ‘soft’ when combined with \textit{firāsh} or \textit{mihād}. For the literal meaning of the root see Mūḥammad ibn Maṇẓūr, \textit{Lisān al-ʿArab} (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%88%D8%A8%D8%B1, accessed on 13 March 2018.
\textsuperscript{122}Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{123}Ibn al-Khaṭīb, \textit{al-Iḥāja}, vol. 4, p. 363.
\textsuperscript{124}Al-Maqqārī, \textit{Naḥṣ al-Ṭīb}, vol. 6, p. 416; Qur’ān (Ḥūd) 11:40.
\textsuperscript{125}Al-Maqqārī, \textit{Naḥṣ al-Ṭīb}, vol. 7, p. 425; This phraseme occurs in various examples. For this context, I chose its most abstract variety, which occurs in. Another example of the phraseme is as-salāmu l-ladāhi yat annaqu 'abaqan wa-nashran alā ḥadratikum l-ʿalīyyati wa-raḥmatu llāhi ta alā wa-barakātuhū [The most attractively infused (with aroma and fragrance) may be with you great excellency, along with mercy and blessings of God almighty]. Ibid., vol. 7, p. 425
\textsuperscript{126}Ibid., vol. 6, p. 233.
\textsuperscript{127}Mel’čuk, ‘Collocation and Lexical Functions’, p. 30.
c) full phrasemes; and

2) pragmatic phrasemes (or pragmatemes).

Pragmatemes, which are not divided into sub-categories, correspond to Cowie’s formulae, while semantic phrasemes correspond to Cowie’s composites.\textsuperscript{128}

The third typological system in phraseology, devised by Burger, is perhaps the most influential.\textsuperscript{129} Unlike Cowie’s and Mel’čuk’s, which both focus on drawing distinctions between phrasemes according to either semantic or pragmatic considerations, Burger’s typology centres on ‘the function of phraseological units [phrasemes] in discourse.’\textsuperscript{130}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{burger_typology.png}
\caption{Burger’s Typology\textsuperscript{131}}
\end{figure}

Accordingly, as shown in Figure (1), Burger’s typology divides phrasemes into three main types: referential, structural, and communicative. Referential phrasemes are further divided

\textsuperscript{128} Granger and Paquot provide a three-ways comparison of Cowie’s, Mel’čuk’s, and Burger’s respective typologies, in ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, pp. 36-38.
\textsuperscript{129} Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{131} A similar figure can be found in Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 38; Burger provides separate figures to explain his typology in \textit{Phraseologie}, pp. 31-32 and 34.
into two sub-categories: nominative and propositional. Burger then follows Cowie’s and Mel’čuk’s typologies by dividing nominative referential phrasemes into 1) collocations, 2) partial idioms, and 3) idioms. Propositional referential phrasemes, on the other hand, are divided according to their function, either at the sentence or text level.

Burger’s communicative phrasemes correspond to formulaic word combinations in Cowie’s typology, and to pragmatemes in Mel’čuk’s. Burger’s category of structural phrasemes was established to indicate word combinations with grammatical links, such as ‘as well… as…’ or bayda ’anna = however. Burger’s third category, referential phrasemes, is divided – according to syntactic and semantic levels – into nominative and propositional sub-categories. Nominative referential phrasemes are essential to the sentence, and refer to facts of life, phenomena, or physical objects; but the remainder of this category does not differ from either Cowie’s composite category or Mel’čuk’s semantic-phraseme category. Propositional referential phrasemes also refer to statements about physical objects, phenomena, or facts of life, but are not essential to the sentence. Proverbs and idiomatic sentences are considered to belong to this category.

In terms of the function of phrasemes in discourse, the three typological systems described above are, for the most part, rooted in the semantic and syntactic levels. Some other typologies have been designed with distributional systems in mind, but they are fundamentally

---

133 Ibid., p. 34.
134 Ibid., p. 32.
135 Al-Maqqari, *Nafḥ at-Tib*, vol. 3, p. 58. I have not provided a literal translation of this phraseme because of the problematic interpretation of *bayda*. Although the root indicates the general meaning of [to efface], according to Ahmad ibn Faris, he admits that the word *bayda* in the collocation does not cohere with the general meaning of the root: *Maqāyīṣ al-Lughā* (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A8%D9%8A%D8%AF#3, accessed on 15 March 2018. Also, E. W. Lane describes *bayda* as ‘a noun inseparably prefixed to [anna] with its complement, (mughnee), but never otherwise than in accus. case, nor as an epithet, nor otherwise than as an exceptive in a case in which the thing excepted is disunited in kind from that from which the exception is made‘: *Arabic-English Lexicon* (electronic resource): http://ejtaal.net/aa/?ll=318,hw4=116,la=394,ls=5,sg=172,h=70,br=146,pr=28,aan=86,mgf=126,vi=86,kz=192, mr=95,mm=122,uqw=191,umr=152,ums=109,umj=88,ulq=420,uqa=63,uqq=39,bdw=h133,amr=h84,asb=h85,au h=h242,dhw=h70,mht=h68,msb=h34,tl=h33,amj=h77,ens=h221,ms=h84, accessed on 15 March 2018.
unhelpful to the present research because it is not statistically based.137

One other phraseological typology combines the semantic-/syntactic-based and
distributional approaches, and has been commended by Granger and Paquot as reconciling the
two.138 The same authors suggest that, in this combined typology, the term ‘collocation’ should
be used strictly as part of traditional typology, while the terminology of distributional typology
should be used when referring to the results of automated extraction.139 Up to a point, Granger
and Paquot adopted Burger’s classification,140 in that they divided phraseology into three main
categories:

1) referential function (referential phrasemes);
2) textual function (textual phrasemes); and
3) communicative function (communicative phrasemes).141

The referential function corresponds to Burger’s referential phraseological unit, and thus also
to Cowie’s composites and Mel’čuk’s semantic phrasemes. Referential phrasemes, as Granger
and Poquot explain, ‘are used to convey a content message’.142 Hence, this category includes:

1) collocations;
2) idioms;
3) irreversible bi- and trinomials;

---

137 The distributional typology system is based on the co-occurrence of a phraseme, regardless of its level of
idiomaticity. Thus, classification according to this typology is based on ‘the statistical uncovering of significant
word co-occurrences’: Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 38. Phrasemes in this
system are divided into two major categories according to the extraction procedure. These are 1) co-occurrence
analysis, which consists of counting the co-occurrences of a word collocation, and noting whether it contains no
free slots (i.e., is a cluster) or has one or more free slots (i.e., is a collocational framework); and 2) N-gram/cluster
analysis, in which phrasemes are extracted by cluster analysis using frequency-threshold recurrence, with co-
occurrence as the unit. For further details see Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 38.
138 Ibid., pp. 41–42.
139 Ibid., p. 42.
140 Ibid.
141 Due to the strong influence of Burger’s typological system on the one proposed by Granger and Paquot, no
examples will be provided here, all relevant ones having already been mentioned above. However, they will be
discussed in detail in the following section.
142 Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 42; detailed examples of each category will
be provided in the following pages.
4) similes;
5) compounds;
6) phrasal verbs; and
7) grammatical collocations.

Notably, however, the two sub-categories of referential phrasemes proposed by Burger have been omitted. Granger and Paquot’s communicative function corresponds to Burger’s communicative phraseological units, and thus to Cowie’s formulae and Mel’čuk’s pragmatemes. Communicative phrasemes, in Granger and Paquot’s system, are used to express thoughts about content, or to grab the attention of people who are the targets of speech, regardless of whether they are participants in the dialogue or merely impacted by it. This category contains speech-act formulae, attitudinal formulae, proverbs, fragments, commonplaces, slogans, idiomatic sentences, and quotations. Granger and Paquot’s textual functions or textual phrasemes correspond to Burger’s structural phraseological units (for which there are no corresponding categories in Cowie’s or Mel’čuk’s typologies). Lastly, in Granger and Paquot’s system, textual phrasemes are used to organise a discourse. This category therefore includes complex prepositions, complex conjunctions, linking adverbials, and textual sentence stems. Table (1) in the following summarizes the four main typologies for phrasemes and compares between them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cowie</th>
<th>Melčuk</th>
<th>Burger</th>
<th>Granger &amp; Paquot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composites:</td>
<td>Semantic phrasemes:</td>
<td>Referential phrasemes:</td>
<td>Referential phrasemes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) restricted collocations</td>
<td>a) semi-phrasmes/collocations</td>
<td>a) nominative phrasemes (collocations, partial idioms, and idioms)</td>
<td>collocations, idioms, irreversible bi- and trinomials, similes, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) figurative idioms</td>
<td>b) quasi-phrasemes/quas-idioms</td>
<td>b) propositional phrasemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) pure idioms</td>
<td>c) full phrasemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulae:</td>
<td>Pragmatic phrasemes</td>
<td>Communicative phrasemes</td>
<td>Communicative phrasemes: speech-act formulae, attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) routine formulae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) speech formulae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

143 Ibid.
144 Clichés can be added to this category.
Semantic-stylistic typology systems are convenient to this phraseological-analysis study because it is mainly concerned with the semantic bonding between the elements of the phraseme which help us with investigating the cultural phenomena of the phrasemes as will be discussed later. It also helps us distinguishing categories that are applicable to the cultural analysis approach (referential and communicative phrasemes) from non-applicable types of phrasemes (textual phrasemes).\(^{145}\)

Accordingly, Burger’s typological system and Granger and Paquot’s extended version of it will both be used to categorise the phrasemes that are extracted for analysis in the chapters that follow. The definitions of terms I have adopted are all Granger and Paquot’s, except in a few controversial cases that will be noted in the extended definitions of these terms that appear below.\(^{146}\) English examples are taken from Granger and Paquot, and Arabic ones from classical Arabic texts as provided by the corpus of this study.

---

\(^{145}\) See the discussion on p. 54.

\(^{146}\) Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, pp. 43-44.
1:3:1 Referential Phrasemes: Extended Definitions


2) Idioms: Word combinations that are marked for their ‘semantic non-compositionality, which can be the result of [their] metaphorical process’. For example, ‘spill the beans’ and *qalaba zahra l-mijanni* [(he) turned the back of the shield] = to betray.

3) Irreversible bi- and trinomials: These are fixed combinations of two or three words from the same part of speech with either ‘and’ or ‘or’. Examples: ‘bed and breakfast’ and *ath-thāghiyatu wa-r-rāghiyatu* [goats and camels] = everything.

4) Similes: Sequences of words functioning ‘as stereotyped comparisons’. According to Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, similes ‘can be singled out by their specific structure of comparison’. Examples: ‘as old as Hell’ and *asraʿu min Ummi Khārijata* [faster than Umm Khārij] = one who quickly changes his/her mind.

---

147 It is worth mentioning that, although the typology Granger and Paquot provide is well detailed, its borders between idiom and other types of phrasemes, i.e. collocations, remains vague. Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen noted this issue in their work on figurative expressions, in which they defined an idiom as ‘a phraseme with a high degree of idiomacity and stability’, adding that idioms ‘show a higher degree of irregularity’: *Figurative Language*, pp. 40-41, hence phrasemes like *irtakaba l-jarāʿ ima* [to ride crimes] = to commit crimes, (phraseme (53)) is a collocation rather than an idiom.

148 Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 44.


150 Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, pp. 43-44.


152 Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, pp. 43-44.


154 Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, pp. 43-44.

155 Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, *Figurative Language*, p. 44.

5) Compounds: These are ‘morphologically made up of two elements which have independent status outside these word combinations’. In Arabic, the term for compounds is murakkab mazjī, but we can also consider naḥt in this category. Examples: ‘goldfish’ and murakkab mazjī. The examples that are given for murakkab mazjī are based on folk-etymology, which cannot be scientifically accepted. For naḥt, ḥamdala, in which ḥamd- refers to al-ḥamd and -la refers to li-ḥlāḥi, can be an example for the phenomenon.

6) Grammatical collocations: Restricted combinations of a lexical word and a grammatical word. Examples: ‘depend on’ and ghayra anna [except that] = however.

7) Phrasal verbs: Each phrasal verb consists of a combination of a verb and an adverbial particle. Examples: ‘blow up’ and raghiba ‘an [he disliked something].

---

157 Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 43.
159 The corpus provides us with Hadramawt as an example of what is known as murakkab mazjī. See Ib n al-Khāṭīb, Rayhānat al-Kutāb, vol. 2, p. 159. Traditional Arabic grammars usually treat the etymology of Hadramawt as a compound of two words, haḍarā [it has come] and mawt [death]. However, it is in all likelihood based on the root d-r-m (cf. Arabic dirām “burning heat”), enlarged by a feminine termination -t and a prefix comparable [...] with the definite article encountered in the present-day [but also ancient] dialects of south-east Arabia, which fluctuates between ‘a-, ha- and ḥa-’; A. F. L. Beeston, ‘Haḍramawt’, in: Encyclopaedia of Islam, eds. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C. E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W. P. Heinrichs (electronic resource): http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_0251, accessed on 16 March 2018.
160 Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 43.
162 al-Maqari, Naḥf at-Ṭib, vol. 5, p. 284. The verb yarghab functions in various semantic ways according to the preposition that follows it, e.g., yarghabu fi [to fancy], and yarghabu ‘an, [to hate]. Shivtiel’s above-cited ‘Phraseology’ entry in Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics also considers this type of collocation to consist of Arabic phrasal verbs and phrasemes.

1:3:2 Textual Phrasemes: Extended Definitions

1) Complex prepositions: Two simple prepositions between which is a noun, adverb, or adjective; they are governed both by grammatical rules and grammatical sequences.\textsuperscript{164} Examples: ‘in addition to’ and \textit{bi-rughmi min}\textsuperscript{165} [inspite of].

2) Complex conjunctions: ‘Grammaticalised sequences that function as conjunctions’.\textsuperscript{166} Examples: ‘so that’ and \textit{alā inna}\textsuperscript{167} = a phrase used to direct the audience’s attention to what follows.

3) Linking adverbials: Grammaticalised phrases that act as conjunctions in specific textual contexts.\textsuperscript{168} Examples: ‘last but not least’ and \textit{ammā ba’du}\textsuperscript{169} [after all] = a phrase used to separate the introduction from the main text.

4) Textual sentence stems: Routinised fragments of sentences that are used to organise a text.\textsuperscript{170} Examples: ‘the final point is’ and \textit{lā gharwa fī anna}\textsuperscript{171} [no wonder that] = causation transition phrase.

\textsuperscript{164} Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{165} Al-Khaṭīb, \textit{al-Iḥāā}, vol. 2, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{166} Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{168} Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{170} Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{171} Al-Maqqarī, \textit{Nafḥ al-Ṭib}, vol. 4, p. 269.
1:3:3 Communicative Phrasemes: Extended Definitions

1) Speech-act formulae: Phrasemes that are used by a member of a language community to express certain functions involving or feelings towards others. Examples: ‘good morning’ and *as-salāmu ‘alayka*\(^{172}\) [may the peace be upon you].

2) Attitudinal formulae: Phrasemes that are used ‘to signal speakers’ attitudes towards their utterances and interlocutors’.\(^{173}\) Examples: ‘in fact’ and *abqāka llāhu* [may God save you]\(^{174}\) = a phraseme used after a verb to indicate politeness.

3) Commonplaces: Non-metaphorical sentences that express trite or platitudinous observations on everyday life. Examples: ‘we only live once’ and *lā ‘udwāna illā ‘ala z-ẓālimīna* [there is to be no aggression except against the oppressors]\(^{175}\) = to justify aggression against enemies.

4) Proverbs: Word combinations that are used to express general ideas ‘by means of non-literal meaning’.\(^{176}\) They are also defined in folklore studies as ‘elements or code of folk culture [and] ... subjects of paremiology.’\(^{177}\) Examples: ‘a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush’ and *al-ladhī fawqa t-turābī turābu* [all that is above earth is dust]\(^{178}\) = mortality.

\(^{172}\) Ibid., vol. 7, p. 425.

\(^{173}\) Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 43.

\(^{174}\) The context of the phraseme is ‘sa’ alaka abqāka llāhu l-wazīru (…) ‘ani l-mushibbī’ [the vizier has asked you, may God save you, (…) about (the word) al-mushibb]: al-Maqqarī, *Naḥḥaṭ-Ṭīb*, vol. 4, p. 77.


\(^{176}\) Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 43.

\(^{177}\) Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, *Figurative Language*, p. 49.

\(^{178}\) Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *al-Iḥāta*, vol. 4.
5) Slogans: Short phrases that have been repeated to the point that they are popularly known. Examples: ‘make love, not war’ and *wa-lā ghāliba illa llāhu*. [no victorious but Allāh] = the motto of the Naṣrid dynasty of Granada.

1:4 Conclusion

This chapter discussed three issues central to the study of phraseology, the first being its terminology. To establish a consistent and non-confusing system of terminology, I have chosen to use the term *phraseme* as a hyperonym in this study.

The next central issue to be addressed, the definition of a phraseme, was dealt with in terms of the definition of the field and the borders of the topic. I then examined the criteria for defining a phraseme using the framework provided by Gries. This established that Gries’s six parameters cover all the concepts that are necessary to this process – both in general, and in the specific case of Arabic phrasemes, as we will see in the following chapter.

The final central issue examined was the diversity of phraseological typologies, which can nevertheless be divided into just two major systems: traditional or distributional, and semantic-syntactic. I examined the classification proposals of these main systems, and argued for the superior utility of the typology devised by Granger and Paquot.

The chapter then examined how to define each type of phraseme. A list of such definitions proposed by Granger and Paquot was found to be useful; and because this first, theoretical part of the present study aims to provide a framework for the second, empirical part, a classical Arabic example of each of Granger and Paquot’s phraseme types was selected, to help clarify the links between phraseological theory and Arabic as the target language.

---

Chapter 2: Arabic Phraseology – Criteria and Definitions

This chapter proposes a definition for an Arabic phraseme, and discusses the criteria set forth in the previous chapter in light of the specific characteristics and difficulties associated with the Arabic linguistic context.

2:1 The Elements of a Phraseme

According to the definition proposed by Gries and adopted in this research, all elements of a phraseme should be words, which are ‘a form or lemma of lexical items and any kind of linguistic element’.\(^{180}\) In Arabic grammatical theory, a word (kalima) is sub-categorised as a noun (ism), a verb (fiʿl) or a particle (harf).\(^{181}\) A suffix pronoun – e.g., kāf al-khiṭāb, third person singular – is considered an independent element of an Arabic phraseme and can, with one other morpheme,\(^{182}\) form a phraseme due to its independent semantic role. As a result, any word of any word-class, whether ism, fiʿl, or harf, can form a phraseme under certain conditions.

\(^{180}\) Gries, ‘Phraseology and Linguistic Theory’, p. 5.

\(^{181}\) This categorisation of parts of speech goes back to Sibawayhi and has been adopted by the whole Arabic grammatical tradition: see Sibawayhi, al-Kitāb, vol. 1, p. 12. The concept of harf in Arabic does not correspond with anything in European linguistic systems. It ‘can be applied to elements of any size and length, as long as it denotes a quantum of enunciated and hence recorded information that is small in scale but not strictly limited […] its actual meaning depending entirely on the context’: Samvel Karabekyan, ‘Ḥarf’, in Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics (electronic resource): doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_SIM_vol2_0015, accessed on 16 March 2018. In traditional Arabic grammar, a noun is a word with an independent meaning but no tense; a verb is a word with an independent meaning and a tense; and a letter is a word with neither. See Bahāʾ ad-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAqīl, Sharḥ Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik, ed. by Muḥyī ad-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd (Cairo: Dār at-Turāth, 1980), p. 15.

\(^{182}\) Ideally, a root morpheme.
The Number of Elements

A phraseme, by definition, comprises a phrase. A phrase is defined as ‘any syntactic unit which includes more than one word and is not an entire sentence.’ Some phrasemes are formed of two elements, one explicit and the other implicit, i.e., understood from context and detected in the deep structure of the sentence. Applying this criterion to Arabic is somewhat problematic, as will be shown in the following: The word *marḥaban*, used as a greeting, is a good example of this phenomenon. Its root *r-h-b* originally indicated being in a wide or spacious place, as in *raḥaba* [wideness]. The use of the word *marḥaban* for greeting others is established on the cognitive metaphor WIDENESS IS COMFORT, as in expressions like *sharaḥa ṣ-sudūr* [widened the chests] = to feel comfort. In the following I will discuss how *marḥaban* is considered as a phraseme although it occurs as one explicit linguistic element.

Traditionally, *marḥaban* is classified as a cognate object, or what is known in traditional Arabic grammar as *mافع المتعلق*. The cognate object is a verbal noun derived from the main verb, used after a verb to either describe or emphasise it. Given the grammatical class to which *marḥaban* belongs, we can surmise that *marḥaban* has an element missing form in its surface structure. Syntactically, the cognate object requires a governor (‘َامِل), a verb, in this case, to justify the accusative case (*ناشَب) of the cognate object. Hence, traditional Arabic

---

184 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘Arab* (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%85%D8%B1%D8%AD%D8%A8, accessed on 1 November 2018.
grammarians reconstruct (taqdîr) the verb that is supressed (muḍmar). The concept of taqdîr has been usefully explained as follows:

The speaker ‘hides’ things in speech, and it is the grammarian’s task to reconstruct these hidden elements in order to explain the surface structure of the sentences. The most important aim of Arabic grammar is the explanation of the case endings (i’râb) in the sentence that are produced by the (āmil) [governor] of a visible element in the sentence. If no such element is available, the grammarian must have recourse to an underlying structure in which these elements are made explicit.

In the case of marḥaban, the reconstructed element is the governor, i.e., the form IV verb-phrase arḥaba. The deep structure of the phrase hence would be:

\[
\text{arḥabta marḥaban \[(you) found a spacious place\] = to feel welcome.}
\]

The previous analysis is based on the traditional Arabic grammar point of view. In the following I will discuss explanations proposed by contemporary linguists for this phenomenon.

Haddar and Ben Hamadou referred to it as ‘false ellipsis’, which can be understood without constructing the complete form. The same authors claimed that false ellipses ‘it isn’t necessary to construct the complete form’ and it ‘can be resolved at the lexical level’, and

---


193 Ibid.
gave two examples: ʿīdan sa ʿīdan [happy new year], and an-nāra an-nāra! [fire, fire!]. The elliptical element in the first example is the verb atamannā [I wish], and in the second, it is the verb ʾîḍhar! [be careful]. Although Haddar and Ben Hamadou’s examples include more than one word, both demonstrate the concept of the suppressed governor, ῦāmil muqaddar – the case with which we are specifically concerned.  

The elliptical element in the first example is the verb atamannā [I wish], and in the second, it is the verb ʾîḍhar! [be careful]. Although Haddar and Ben Hamadou’s examples include more than one word, both demonstrate the concept of the suppressed governor, ῦāmil muqaddar – the case with which we are specifically concerned.  

The other potential explanation that has been advanced is semantic ellipsis. This pragmatic approach requires that an utterance’s ‘face value’ be the main focus of analysis, and that its pragmatics – i.e., gestures and context – lead the receiver to reconstruct the missing

---

194 Although the examples given contain two words, this fact does not affect the aim of this discussion, i.e., the reason for writing the words in the accusative case.
196 The verb marḥaban has not been detected in classical lexicons of the Arabic language. ‘When al-Khalil was asked about the accusative case of marḥaban he said “in it [is] a hidden verb”; he meant: dwell or stay, so it became accusative by a hidden verb, then it became dead when its [the verb’s] meaning became well-known’: al-Farāhīdī, Kitāb al-ʿAyn, vol. 2, p. 105. We can see the reconstructed verb marḥaba in later dictionaries like Majd ad-Dīn al-Fayrūz ʿābādī, al-Qūmūs al-Muḥīṭ (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%B1%D8%B2%D8%AD%D8%A8, accessed on 4 November 2018.
elements and fill in the gaps.\textsuperscript{198} The non-linguistic context in which the elliptical phrase occurs fills in the semantic gaps in the utterance.\textsuperscript{199}

Stainton defends the pragmatics-oriented approach by arguing that reconstructed phrases may not suit the elliptic phrase, citing the following example. He gives three categories of a sentence:\textsuperscript{200}

a) Sentence\textsubscript{syntactic}: an expression with a certain kind of structure/form.

b) Sentence\textsubscript{semantic}: an expression with a certain kind of content/mening.

c) Sentence\textsubscript{pragmatic}: an expression with a certain kind of use.

According to Staiton, ‘fire!’ or, in our case, \textit{marḥaban} does not necessarily need a reconstructed verb coheres with its morphology to justify its function. Rather, the pragmatic usage and the context fill the semantic slot here with no need for a syntactic reconstruction.

Back to Staiton’s definition of a semantic ellipsis: semantic ‘ellipsis happens when an expression that does not satisfy [Sentence\textsubscript{syntactic}] nevertheless does satisfy [Sentence\textsubscript{semantic}].’\textsuperscript{201} Hence, \textit{marḥaban}, by applying to Staiton analysis, is just like ‘fire!’;\textsuperscript{202} a one word that is used to perform a speech act, which, by filling the slot, it becomes a sentence\textsubscript{semantic} in a semantic ellipsis that functions as sentence\textsubscript{pragmatic}.

Another approach to understand such a phenomenon is provided by Larcher. According to Larcher, \textit{mafʿūl muṭlaq} [cognate object] like \textit{shukran} [thank you] and \textit{marḥaban} is analysed as a \textit{mafʿūl muṭlaq} formed in an adverbial form with a true suffix, the adverbial marker -\textit{an}.

\textsuperscript{198} Stainton provides two ‘competing views’ of how to explain how the gap is filled. The first, advocated by Barton, ‘postulates (i) a sub-module of linguistic context, that operates exclusively on the sub-sentence uttered plus prior explicit discourse, (ii) a sub-module of conversational context, that takes the output of the first sub-module as input, and uses non-linguistic context […] to derive what the speaker meant to convey’. The other view, advocated by Stainton himself, is that while gap-filling does occur ‘via non-deductive inference’, there are no pragmatics modules at work, but rather ‘central system processes, inferential processes not specific to language, [that are used] to bridge the gap’: Stainton, ‘In Defence of Non-Sentential Assertion’, p. 386.

\textsuperscript{199} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{200} Stainton, \textit{Words and Thoughts}, p. 81.

\textsuperscript{201} Ibid., p. 82.

\textsuperscript{202} Ibid., p. 83.
with verbal function (=uraḥiba or arḥabta). Larcher argues that mafʿūl muṭlaq like marḥaban gains adverbial function where the verb exists but gains a full verbal function in the absence of the verb and functions with no need for a governor because the tense becomes superfluous in the context of the mafʿūl muṭlaq usage where the incidence is what fill the semantic slot.

However, can one uttered element of that phrase form a phraseme? And can we consider one non-polylexical word to be a phraseme? Considering any of the previous analyses, marḥaban can definitely be considered a phraseme, for it either functions as a phraseme according to the semantic-ellipsis approach, or has a verbal function in which the context and the incidence function as the phraseme’s other elements.

Lastly, attempting to apply the second criterion to Arabic phraseology rises the issue of naḥt: two or more words that are merged into one, losing some of their phonemes in order to cohere with the structure of the quadrilateral root. For instance, ḥamdala is coined from al-ḥamdu li-llāhi [(all) praise be to God] as a phraseme used to express comfort or relief. Such words function as phrasemes, since they adhere to all the criteria other than being coined as one word. Hence, naḥt is a phraseme written as one word as a compound composed of fragments of other words that together formed a sentence-long phraseme.

2:3 The Number of Co-occurrences Required Before a Phrase Can Be Considered a Phraseme

---

204 Ibid., pp. 145-146.
205 The root in Arabic is composed either of three radicals 1-2-3 (a-k-l), or of four, 1-2-1-2 (w-s-w-s)/1-2-3-4 (ḥ-n-z-l).
As briefly noted above, counting the instances of co-occurrence of a particular phraseme in classical Arabic literature would normally require the existence of an electronic corpus of that literature.\textsuperscript{207} In the absence of any such exhaustive corpus, two methods will be used: 1) examination of corpora of classical Arabic as much as possible, and 2) analysis of the metaphorical level. For the first method, collections of classical Arabic books such as Islamport.com will be referred to when needed, along with classical collections of idioms and proverbs including \textit{Amthāl al-ʿArab} by al-Mufaḍḍal aḍ-Ḍabbī, \textit{Thimār al-Qulūb fī al-Mudāf wa-l-Mansūb} by ath-Thaʿālibī and \textit{Majmaʾ al-Amthāl} by al-Maydānī (d. 518/1124), all of which are key repositories of phrasemes. Additional important sources for the study of classical Arabic phrasemes are lexicons, of which I will refer to two examples: the \textit{al-ʿAlfaẓ al-Kitābiyya} of al-Hamadhānī, and the \textit{Jawāhir al-ʿAlfāẓ} of Qudāma ibn Jaʿfar. However, as previously noted in reference to Gries’s work, none of the scholars who support the corpus-based method of identifying a phraseme have actually specified the number of times the lexemes that form a phrase must co-occur before they can be identified as a phraseme; with Gries stating only that this number should be ‘larger than [...] expected’.\textsuperscript{208} Given the potentially high level of ambiguity that such a standard implies, study of Classical Arabic corpora will be used as a supporting method only. Also, if a phraseme is mentioned by several sources and different authors, it must be a well-known and must occur in a number of times larger than expected, so it to be recorded more or less unanimously.

Accordingly, analysis of the metaphorical level will be the current study’s main method of identifying phrasemes. However, distinguishing metaphorical from literal meaning in Arabic can at times be problematic, due to chronological effects on the semantic level of a phrase.

\textsuperscript{207} See Chapter 1, above. Arabiccorpus, especially in its premodern collection, would have been of great help if it includes collections of collocations and idioms like those mentioned below. However, it lacks these, as well as chronicles and prose belles-lettres; while some, including Maktaba Shamela, are of such questionable authorship that their utility for scientific research is debateable although they can be used to show some frequency but to a limit.

\textsuperscript{208} Gries, ‘Phraseology and Linguistic Theory’, p. 5.
Under the following two conditions, dictionaries will be used to track original meaning. First, the source should have been written before this study’s fourteenth-century target era; and second, the original meaning of the phraseme’s elements (i.e., their literal meaning, if they occur in a secondary meaning) should be indicated. The dictionaries that are potentially most useful for this purpose are the *al-'Ayn* of al-Khalīl (d. 170/786), the earliest available Arabic dictionary; the *Maqāyīs al-Lughā* of Ibn Fāris, because of its attempt to provide a collective meaning of each root; and az-Zamakhsharī’s (d. 538/1144) *Asās al-Balāgha*, which distinguishes between literal and metaphorical meanings. The *Lisān al-'Arab* of Ibn Manẓūr (d. 711/1311) can also be used because it is a compilation of these works, with references to the source material. Additionally, the source domains of the phrasemes will be traced, with the aim of obtaining clear indications of their primary semantic levels.

2:4 The Permissible Distance between the Elements of a Phraseme

As explained in the previous chapter, the elements of a phraseme are (with certain exceptions) not substitutable, and they acquire metaphorical meaning by being attached to each other. In a restricted-order language such as English, the order in which an element occurs in a phrase is important to the reader’s understanding of that word’s grammatical class. Arabic has a relatively free word order. In some cases in Arabic, however, order is important to identifying the grammatical class of a word: for instance, when a case-ending does not show because it would render a long vowel at the end of a word unpronounceable. One example of this is *ḍarabaُ ʻĪsā Mūsā* [Isa hit Musa].

Both Mūsā and Isā end with long vowels that cannot be pronounced alongside the case-endings of either the nominative case /u/, or the accusative case

---

209 This example is theoretical and often appears in works of traditional Arabic grammar, such as Abū Saʿīd al- Ḥasan ibn Abd Allāh as-Ṣrāfī, *Sharḥ Kitāb Sibawayhi*, eds. Ahmad Mahdafi and ʿAlī Sayyid ʿAfī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al- ʿIlmiyya, 2008), vol. 1, p. 263; and Ibn Hishām, *Mughni al-Labīb*, vol. 1, p. 767.
Thus, only the word-order reveals that Isā is the subject and Mūsā is the direct object, as the default word order in Classical/Modern Standard Arabic is VSO.²¹⁰

This raises an important question: What are the limits of word order-change in an Arabic phraseme? To arrive at a definitive answer will require thorough analysis. However, from the examples provided by the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, it is reasonable to claim that a set phrase can be considered a phraseme as long as order-changes do not affect its metaphorical meaning. For instance, the phraseme as-salāmu ‘alaykum wa-raḥmatu llāhi wa-ḥarakātuhū [may the peace, mercy, and blessings of God be upon you],²¹¹ commonly used as a greeting, can be found in various other orders, including salāmu llāhi ‘alayka wa-raḥmatuhū wa-ḥarakātuhū²¹² and salāmun ‘alayka,²¹³ and al-ḥamdu li-llāhi [(all) praise be to God]²¹⁴ can be found as wa-ḥamdu l-ḥamdu.²¹⁵ In all three of these variants, despite changes to the word-order, the phrase retains both the same metaphorical meaning and the same conversational function.

The second issue that must be addressed with regard to the permissible distance between the elements of a phraseme, is the size of any gap between the elements of a phraseme. As discussed earlier, in a broad sense and up to a certain point, a gap between the elements of a phraseme can be accepted. To identify the specifics of such limits in Arabic, a survey study would be required. However, as noted above, the idiomatic meaning of a phrase is the main criterion for judging whether it is a phraseme or not. Consider, for instance, salāmu l-ladhī yata’annaqu ‘abaqan wa-nashran ‘alā ḥādratikum al-‘alīyyati wa-raḥmatu llāhi ta’ālā wa-ḥarakātuhū [the most attractively infused (with aroma and fragrance), may be with your great excellency, along with mercy and blessings of God almighty].²¹⁶ This example shows a gap of

---
²¹⁰ As-Sīrāfī, Sharḥ Kitāb Sībawayhī, vol. 1, p. 263.
²¹³ Ibid., vol. 7, p. 425; the phraseme is analysed in detail in Chapter 8, below.
seven words between the main elements of the phraseme, which comprise only four words. However, the phraseme’s idiomatic meaning can still be decoded and understood without recourse to any information extrinsic to it. This phenomenon is explained by the fact that the main elements of the phraseme are interrupted by an expansion, i.e. the qualifier/jumlat as-sifa after the subject, an NP that replaces that commonly used second person pronoun and the ta ʿālā which is often used after Allāh. Hence, the interrupting in this phraseme, if we exclude the replacement of the pronoun, is really just one expansion/element. Of course, this can only work with sentence-long phrasemes, and not with, for example, compounds (such as naḥt or tarkīb mazjī) nor one-word phrasemes.

2:5 The Lexical and Syntactic Flexibility of Phraseme Elements; Non-substitutability

The fixedness of an Arabic phraseme can be examined on two linguistic levels: the syntactic and the lexical. Syntactically, phrasemes that ‘break the conventional grammatical rules’, known as ill-formed collocations, are completely fixed.217 Ill-formed collocations can be idioms, proverbs, or even pragmatic phrasemes. A clear example of an Arabic pragmatic phraseme that is an ill-formed collocation is inna raḥmata llāhi qarībun [indeed, the mercy of God is near].218 Under the conventional grammatical rules of Arabic, qarīb should be used in the third person feminine: (qarība) in this instance.

In phrasemes that contain a suffix pronoun, the pronoun changes with context. For instance, ḥanānayka [your (dual) mercies] is grammatically fixed in the accusative case, and its pronoun changes depending on the person(s) to whom it is addressed, as follows: ḥanānayka, ḥanānayki, ḥanānaykumā, ḥanānaykum..etc, except if the pronoun refers to God, which becomes a fixedness factor.

218 Qurān (al-ʿAʾrāf) 7:56.
Thus, the fixedness level of an Arabic phraseme can either be complete (in the case of ill-formed collocations/pragmatic phrasemes) or semi-flexible; and its status as completely fixed or semi-flexible affects whether its pronoun morpheme varies with context.

The lexical flexibility of an Arabic phraseme also depends on its number of elements. Phrasemes with two elements, regardless of whether both are uttered or only one of them is uttered, are fixed. Two examples of this complete lexical fixedness are marhaban [(to be) wide] = welcome, and subḥāna llāhi [exalted is God]\(^{219}\) (both elements of which are uttered). In some, a phraseme formed of two elements shows a level of lexical flexibility due to its high occurrence, e.g. being a Qur‘ānic phrasme, like fāra t-tannūru [the oven has overflowed]\(^{220}\) that can be found as fāda t-tannūru\(^{221}\) or ašābū l-kahfī [the people of the cave]\(^{222}\) that can be found as ahlū l-kahf.\(^{223}\) However, the lexical flexibility of a phraseme that is formed of more than two elements is merely restricted, due to the ability of the receiver/audience to comprehend the metaphorical meaning intended by the phraseme’s formation. Take alqā̂hu l-yammu ila s-sāḥili [the sea cast him on the shore] = to be safe.\(^{224}\) If a speaker means to refer to being saved by a specific person or action, s/he can either use this phraseme as it is, or change the word yamm [sea] to the name of the referenced person or action, yielding for example alqā̂hu ʿamalūhū bi-s-sāḥili [his work cast him on the shore].\(^{225}\) The audience will comprehend the metaphorical reference because the semantic metaphorical meaning is still preserved in the remaining elements of the phraseme. Moreover, if the element yamm remains while ila s-sāḥili [on the shore] is changed to, for instance, bi-bayti rajulin sālihin [in a good man’s house] in the context of, say, escaping the phrase now being alqā̂hu l-yammu bi-bayti rajulin sālihin the intended


\(^{220}\) Qur‘ān (Ḥud) 11:40.

\(^{221}\) Al-Maqqrīṣī, Naḥf at-Ṭīb, vol. 6, p. 416.

\(^{222}\) Qur‘ān (al-Kahf) 18:9.


\(^{224}\) Ibid., vol. 3, p. 76.

\(^{225}\) This example and the following ones are all given as theoretical examples for the sake of explanation.
metaphorical meaning of the phraseme will still be obvious to Arabic speakers. In other words, lexical flexibility in an Arabic phraseme is dependent on two conditions: 1) the phraseme must be formed of more than two elements, and 2) its metaphorical meaning must remain intact.

2:6 The Semantic Unity and Unpredictability of a Phraseme

Arabic phrasemes that function as a single semantic unit show a fixedness level that is attributed to either:

1) when one of the element’s signified, i.e. (A), has a synonym in the dictionary, i.e. (X), but only (A)’s signifier forms the metaphorical meaning of the phraseme when it occurs with the other element, i.e. (B) of the phraseme. Baytu llāhi [the house of God]227 = the mosque in Mecca, or any mosque.

or

2) when one of the element’s signified, i.e. (A), includes an important part of the other element’s signified, i.e. (B), so (A) indicates a specific meaning only when it occurs with (B), hence only the co-occurrence of (A) and (B) can express the meaning of the phraseme. Kharīrū l-māʾi [the sound of falling water].

According to the first condition, bayt as an individual lexeme means house, but this individual meaning neither adds up nor predicts the overall meaning of its phraseme, i.e., ‘the mosque’. The dictionary definition of the first element of baytu llāhi corresponds to synonyms

---

226 Mel’čuk, ‘Collocation and Lexical Functions’, p. 30
including *manzil* and *makan*, but substituting a synonym for *bayt* will obscure the metaphorical meaning of the original phraseme.\(^{230}\) The same phenomenon can be observed with other figurative metaphors, and to a certain extent with non-figurative ones: e.g., *kharīru l-māʾi* [the sound of falling water], in which the word used for ‘sound’ (*kharīr*) is specific to the voice of water, as in a waterfall.

In the case of *kharīru l-māʾi*,\(^{231}\) the first element of the phraseme does not co-occur with any other lexeme, since it is part of it. This leads us to deem it a ‘cranberry collocation’: i.e., one of the elements – *kharīr*, in this instance – is unique to that collocation.\(^{232}\) Nevertheless, this unique element can be replaced by a synonym that gives a broad sense of the target meaning. Thus, though *kharīr* is a special term indicating the sound of falling water, a speaker who uses *ṣawt* [sound] in the same context will be understood, provided that the hearer recollects the meaning of the original substituted element, *kharīr*.

Both *baytu llāhi* and *kharīru l-māʾi* are coined via *iḍāfa* [annexation], which lends them even more fixedness, as we shall see. Semantically, *iḍāfa* has three meanings: ‘possession to its possessor’; ‘annexion of something to someone who is entitled to it or connected with it’; and ‘annexion of something to its genus’.\(^{233}\) Syntactically, *iḍāfa* is a phrase constructed of two nouns in which the second noun, the annexed element, is always in the genitive case.\(^{234}\) In addition to other restrictions to *iḍāfa* such as that the first noun does not carry the definite article or nunation *tanwīn*, or the nun suffixes in the dual and masculine plural, it cannot carry a possessive pronoun suffix.\(^{235}\) Moreover, *iḍāfa* in classical Arabic should neither be conjoined

\(^{230}\) Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab* [http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A8%D9%8A%D8%AA], accessed on 7 November 2018.


\(^{232}\) Moon, *Fixed Expressions and Idioms*, p. 21.

\(^{233}\) Some modern grammarians list up to six meanings for annexation. Ryding, ‘‘*Iḍāfa*’’ [http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-arabic-language-and-linguistics/idafa-FALL_COM_vol2_0043?s.num=0&es.f.2_parent=s.f.book.encyclopedia-of-arabic-language-and-linguistics&s.q=i%E1%B8%A8%8D%4C%81fa], accessed on 8 November 2018.

\(^{234}\) Ibid.

\(^{235}\) Ibid.
nor interrupted by a modifier such as an adjective.\textsuperscript{236} All of those restrictions add a level of fixedness to the construction of a phrase.

In short, Arabic phrasemes occur as single semantic units, and their meanings cannot be predicted from the individual meanings of their elements. In non-figurative phrasemes, and in figurative ones (albeit with more difficulty), one of the elements can have a synonym substituted for it. However, when this happens, the resultant phraseme 1) acts as a semi-fixed phraseme, and 2) requires the audience to recall the original element of the phraseme, if they are to understand the semantic unit that the collocation seeks to provide.\textsuperscript{237} Such phenomena will be investigated further in the following chapters.

2:7 Conclusion

This chapter has explored the challenges that emerge when the six established criteria for phrasemes set forth in Chapter 1 are applied to the Arabic language. The first criterion is affected by the fact that Arabic suffix pronouns are considered to be phraseme elements; and the second, by the existence of one-word Arabic phrasemes. The theory of semantic ellipsis and Larcher’s proposal of verbal-function \textit{māfʿūl muṭlaq} were found useful in overcoming the latter issue, insofar as a one-word phraseme can be construed as having two elements (linguistic and para-linguistic), only one of which is explicit. The reconstructed second element is explained according to the traditional grammatical theory in which, in this case, the verb is reconstructed, and according to modern approaches semantic ellipsis and Larcher’s verbal-function \textit{māfʿūl muṭlaq} interpretation.

With regard to the third criterion, a lack of corpora prevents direct counting of the co-occurrence of the elements of any given phraseme from classical Arabic literature. We

\textsuperscript{236} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{237} In the following chapters, we will investigate the fixedness system of Arabic phraseology using cultural evidence.
therefore utilised metaphorical fixedness as a key parameter of the phrasemes sampled from that literature, supported by comparison with collections of fixed Arabic collocations. In terms of the fourth criterion, the question of the distance between the elements of an Arabic phraseme will require further investigation; nevertheless, this chapter has established that Arabic phrasemes exhibit a degree of flexibility, depending on their context.

Regarding the fifth criterion, an Arabic phraseme can accept a substitute element if it is formed of more than one uttered element, and if its semantic unity remains intact. Finally, Arabic phrasemes fit the sixth criterion in the sense that they occur as single semantic units. This criterion also supports the fifth one, by demonstrating the possibility of substituting one or more of the elements in a phraseme, but only if the audience recalls the original element(s). In the following chapters, the fifth and sixth criteria will both be investigated in depth, in light of the cultural evidence for fixedness found in the sampled medieval texts.
Chapter 3: Culture And Cultural Analysis

Phraseology, as a field of study, requires the application of a variety of approaches. One such approach is cultural analysis, as proposed by Pirainen and Dobrovolskij, which is especially useful to scholars seeking to illuminate phrasemes’ cultural aspects.\[^{238}\] As the present study focuses on phraseology in the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb from the perspective of the cultural phenomena analysis approach, this chapter begins with an introduction to the concept of culture, and then proceeds to discuss the most suitable approach to cultural analysis of phraseology.

3:1 What is Culture?

Defining culture is no simple matter; the 164 definitions collected by Kroeber and Kluckhohn have already been alluded to.\[^{239}\] However, all of these definitions can fall into one of three distinct groups based on ‘the three senses of culture’: individuals, groups or classes, and whole societies.\[^{240}\] The present research takes a whole-society approach, as being the most suitable for attempting to analyse the phraseology of fourteenth-century Arabic written works through the lens of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s work. Language use varies strongly from one individual to another, but cultural concepts are embedded in the use of phrasemes because of their conventionalised nature. Nevertheless, confronting a great profusion of rival definitions, I will proceed according to the following three principles:

\[^{238}\] This approach will be discussed in detail in the following sections.
1) By culture, I mean all those historically created designs for living – explicit and implicit; rational, irrational, and non-rational – which exist at any given time as potential guides for human behaviour.\textsuperscript{241}

2) Culture also comprises the shared knowledge and schemes created by a set of people for perceiving, interpreting, expressing, and responding to the social realities around them.\textsuperscript{242}

3) Lastly, culture involves the shared patterns of behaviours and interactions, cognitive constructs, and affective understandings that are learned through a process of socialisation. These shared patterns identify the members of a cultural group, and at the same time distinguish those of at least one other group.\textsuperscript{243}

From this, it can be inferred that the common threads in defining culture are \textit{knowledge} and \textit{cognitive constructs}, though the classical anthropological understanding is also visible, especially in the importance assigned to behaviour. Importantly, collective knowledge and cognitive constructs are reflected in language, as will later be illustrated in some detail, especially with regard to figurative language usage such as in proverbs, an important phraseological sub-category. However, behaviour is also reflected in phraseological formulae.

In a phraseological sense, then, culture is the set of criteria that distinguishes and specifies a group of people, embodied in that group’s language and reflected in the usage of that language’s phrasemes.


3:2 Culture and Phraseology

A language is inextricably linked to its culture on multiple linguistic levels. Phraseology, in both its figurative and non-figurative units, is formed and influenced by the culture in which it functions. This is primarily because it is a part of the language’s system, which in turn is a part of its culture. Moreover, a phraseme’s fixedness is a result of its frequent usage by members of a given society. To be used frequently, a phraseme must rise to the level of a cultural convention in both a pre-fixation period (on a lexical level, by reflecting a cultural seme), and a post-fixation period (on an idiomatic level, when it becomes an element of culture reflected by language).

Most cultural-linguistic studies of phraseology are based on cross-cultural and cross-linguistic perspectives. Nevertheless, such studies – and especially synchronic ones – have tended to focus on figurative phrasemes rather than non-figurative ones; and it is readily observable that figurative phrasemes (idioms, figurative proverbs, etc.) are highly reliant on images or traditions from the culture of the language to which they belong.

Sabban identified the following obstacles to phraseological cultural analysis:

1) The type of phraseme: referential, or communicative.

2) The semantic level being considered: target domain (phraseological), or source domain (literal).

3) The definition of culture.

4) The synchronic or diachronic approach.

Every figurative phraseme is formed by and encompasses a cultural image, which is clearly visible. This figurativeness is a key characteristic of referential phrasemes, and makes them suitable for the application of cultural analysis. Communicative phrasemes, on the other

---


hand, are thought to be figurative rarely, if indeed ever, and not to reflect cultural phenomena. But such a claim is questionable in the case of classical Arabic. Consider the following communicative phrasemes:

1) marḥaban [(to be) wide] = greeting.\textsuperscript{246}
2) as-salāmu ʿalaykum [peace be upon you] = greeting.\textsuperscript{247}
3) al-ḥamdu li-llāhi [(all) praise be to God] = an expression of gratitude.\textsuperscript{248}
4) rahimahu llāhu [may God have mercy on him]\textsuperscript{249} = to express condolences.

All four constitute communicative phrasemes, and all are extensively used in classical Arabic. Phraseme (1) has already been discussed on a syntactic level: marḥaban is a cognate subject of the verb form IV arḥaba, meaning [to put you (someone) in a wide place]. This phraseme is used as a greeting in both formal and informal situations, rendering it a communicative phraseme. It reflects an old Arabic cultural concept that a comfortable home is a wide one, which is derived from the conceptual metaphor WIDE IS COMFORT/NARROW IS DISTRESS. In the Qurʾān, this metaphor is manifested in the image of unbelievers who will live distressed lives because they are far from the mercy of God: ‘wa-man aʿraḍa ʿan dhikrī fa-inna lahū ma ʿišhata ẓanḵan’ [and whoever turns away from My remembrance – indeed, he will have a tight life],\textsuperscript{250} and, ‘fa-man yurid ʿal yahdiyyahū ʾišhār ʿal ẓadrahū li-l-islāmī wa-man yurid an yuḍillahū yajʿal ẓadrahū ḏayyiqan ḍarajan’ [so whomever Allāh wants to guide – He expands his breast to (contain) Islam; and whomever He wants to misguide – He makes his breast tight and constricted].\textsuperscript{251} The negative connotation of being a non-believer is implied in the first verse with ma ʿišhata ẓanḵan, by describing his/her life as ḍanḵ [tight]. In the latter verse, a clear comparison is provided between ‘wide’ as a metaphor of comfort in

\textsuperscript{246} Ibn al-Khaṭīb, al-Ilḥāṣ, vol. 2, p. 349.
\textsuperscript{247} Al-Maqqarī, Naḥḥ at-Tīb, vol. 7, p. 425.
\textsuperscript{248} Ibid., vol. 2, p. 191.
\textsuperscript{250} Qurʾān (Ṭāhā) 20:124.
\textsuperscript{251} Ibid. (Iṣrāʿ) 6:125.
yashraḥ widen] and ‘tight’ as a metaphor of distress in dayyiq [tight]. The same image motivates a collocation of the verb dāqa and a word indicates a space, i.e., dāqat lahu l-‘ardu bimā raḥubat [the spacious world became narrow to him], and dāqat ’alayhi l-masāliku [the roads became narrow to him]. All the expressions in this paragraph so far arise from contexts of distress, and WIDE IS COMFORT and NARROW IS DISTRESS are both physically motivated metaphors, derived from physical experience. Wide spaces allow more freedom of movement to the body, signifying both comfort and freedom. Hence, a wide and spacious place is a sign of comfort and good hospitality, and so marḥaban was coined as a greeting phraseme that is both communicative and figurative.

Phraseme (2) is also a communicative phraseme used in greeting. It carries a religious connotation, for it is mentioned in the Qurʾān: salāmun ‘alaykum. Its literal meaning is [peace be upon you]. The literal meaning is suppressed by the idiomatic pragmatic meaning of the phraseme. The phraseme is figurative since peace does not reflect the meaning of greeting in its literal sense in Arabic. As a religiously influenced phraseme, it reflects a cultural indication in its essence, and is also figurative on a phraseological semantic level.

Phrasemes (3) and (4) both are communicative expressions. Al-ḥamdu li-llāhi conveys gratitude towards the Divine, yet is used as a response to pleasant events in general. Al-ḥamdu li-llāhi are the opening words of al-Fātiha, the first sūra of the Qurʾān and the one most recited, due to its being part of the five daily prayers: fajr [dawn], zuhr [noon], ‘asr [afternoon],

---

252 The phrases yashraḥ ṣadrāhū and yajʾ al-ṣadrāhū dayyiqan are both phrasemes motivated by the image of a wide chest containing more air, and hence gives comfort and has comfort conferred upon it. This image is motivated by physical experience that influenced the conceptual metaphors WIDE IS COMFORT and NARROW IS DISTRESS. For further discussion, see Chapter 6, below.
254 Ibid., vol. 5, p. 20.
255 Qurʾān (az-Zumar) 39:73.
maghrib [sunset] and ‘ishā’ [evening]. Phraseme (4) is a prayer taken from the Qurʾān conveying condolences.\(^{257}\) Praying to God to be merciful with the dead person became an expected accompaniment to mentioning such a topic.

Although neither of these phrasemes is figurative, each can be analysed by applying Dobrovolskij and Piirainen’s cultural-analysis approach. Phrasemes can also be analysed as a reflection of quotation.\(^{258}\) Phrasemes in this category are based on a quoted texts that gained an additional meaning within the cultural context.\(^{259}\)

The second problem identified by Sabban is the semantic level of a phraseme. By definition, a phraseme reflects two semantic levels: 1) the literal or source level, and 2) the phraseological or target level. The first is the meaning reflected by the constituents from which the phraseme is formed, and it is also the literal level of the lexemes. The second is the idiomatic meaning that the phraseme is used to convey. There is no consensus among cultural-linguistic phraseologists as to whether the focus should be on both these semantic levels or just one; and, if the latter, which one. Yet, it is hard to ignore one level whilst discussing the other. Phraseological studies that focus on the target level tend to adopt the cognitive-metaphor theory.\(^{260}\) In such research, phrasemes have generally been studied under the umbrella of a single target: for example, Maalej’s work on the conceptual metaphor ANGER in modern Tunisian Arabic.\(^{261}\) Even in such studies, however, the source semantic level is always touched upon, at least briefly. In the present study of the cultural roots of Arabic phrasemes in the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, both levels are of key importance in highlighting the cultural norms in phrasemes’ source levels; and it is essential to compare the two semantic levels against one

\(^{257}\) Qurʾān (ʿĀl ʿImrān) 3:107; ibid., (az-Zumar) 39:53.
\(^{258}\) Piirainen, ‘Figurative Phraseology and Culture’, p. 231.
\(^{259}\) Ibid.
\(^{260}\) The theory was developed by Lakoff and Johnson in Metaphors We Live By, as noted earlier.
\(^{261}\) Z. Maalij, ‘Figurative Language on Anger Expression in Tunisian Arabic: An Extended View of Embodiment’, in Metaphor and Symbol, 19(1), 51-75 (2004), cited in Piirainen, ‘Figurative Phraseology and Culture’, p. 218. The image of the metaphor ANGER in modern Tunisian Arabic is motivated culturally from the Qurʾānic story of Ibrāhīm and Ismāʿīl, from which (via the Ḥajj pilgrimage) are drawn many modern Tunisian Arabic phrasemes whose target semantic level is anger.
another if one is to achieve a profound understanding of the usage of a phraseme in its cultural context.262

Sabban’s third problem – defining culture – has already been discussed above, in section 3:1. Her fourth concern is whether the approach should be synchronic or diachronic. Choosing between these two approaches depends on the cultural impact being studied: a synchronic approach is suitable to a study focused on the target semantic level and the pragmatic level of phrasemes. A diachronic approach, on the other hand, is an effective method for examining the source domains of cultural phenomena indicated by phrasemes, even if the corpus is composed in a specific era. For purposes of the present study, then, the diachronic analysis will be adopted.

3:3 An Approach to Cultural Analysis

If one is to effectively analyse cultural themes in phrasemes, it is essential to devise a systematic approach to categorising the cultural phenomena they encompass. There are two potential approaches to cultural symbols. The first was provided by Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, which contains five cultural phenomena: culturally based social interaction; material culture; intertextual phenomena; fictive conceptual domains; and cultural symbols.263 Teliya et al., on the other hand, provided a five-part typology in their approach consisting of cultural semes; cultural concepts; cultural connotations; cultural background; and discourse stereotypes.264 In the following discussion, I will adopt and discuss Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen’s approach, on the basis that it is more convenient for the present study, more detailed, and additionally for its inclusion of the typology provided by Teli et al.

262 The source domain also plays a crucial role in the cultural-analysis approach, especially when it comes to the cultural phenomenon of quotation, as we will see.
264 On an analytical level, Teliya et al.’s alternative approach is no different from Dubrovol’skij and Piirainen’s, but the former’s typological system is more general: Teliya et al., ‘Phraseology as a Language of Culture’, p. 58.
Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen’s typology is mainly intended to be used with figurative units.\footnote{265} Nevertheless, its originators specified that the typology can include non-figurative phrasemes, which – as noted earlier – include communicative phrasemes.\footnote{266} The five parts of this typology are discussed below in the light of examples of Arabic phraseology provided by the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb.\footnote{267}

3:3:1 Culturally Based Social Interactions\footnote{268}

Culturally based social interactions are defined as the knowledge of social activities and interactions that is embedded in phrasemes. This category includes four sub-categories: cultural models; social conventions/taboo and bans; gestures; and gender-specific concepts.

3:3:1:1 Cultural Models\footnote{269}

The first sub-category of social interaction phenomena, cultural models, is an umbrella term for concepts that are particular to a given culture. Consider the following examples:

1) \textit{ta'khudhu bi-khiṭāmiḥā} [(you) grab its noseband]\footnote{270} = to guide someone or to master something.

2) \textit{yata'allalu mina l-āmāli} [(he) holds his thirst with (small sips of) hopes]\footnote{271} = to have hope.

In phraseme (1), the source domain [camel] is important in Arabic phraseology as a symbol of power and wealth. That image is clearly reflected in this phraseme. \textit{Khiṭām} is the camel’s

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{265} Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, \textit{Figurative Language}, p. 214.  
\textsuperscript{266} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{267} Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen excluded non-figurative expressions from their study. They emphasised the fact that non-literal but also non-figurative linguistic units, including phrasemes, were beyond their study’s scope (i.e., cross-cultural figurative language). Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen accepted, however, that non-figurative but non-literal linguistic units gain a metaphorical meaning within the context in which they occur: \textit{Figurative Language}, p. 20.  
\textsuperscript{268} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{269} Ibid., p. 216.  
\textsuperscript{271} Ibid., vol. 6, p. 233.}
noseband which the rider uses to steer. Thus, if a person grabs the noseband of a topic, s/he has full control of it. The image of this phraseme can be described thus:

The symbol: camel (hard to control) → topic

The action: to control camel behaviour → to have full knowledge of the topic

The cultural model of the phraseme here is therefore the ability to ride a camel.

Phraseme (2) is propelled by the concept of the importance of water in a desert climate like Arabia’s. Holding one’s thirst with small sips (the literal meaning of yata’allah) is the cultural model by which the notion of having hope, but not reaching the goal, is motivated.

3:3:1:2 Social Conventions: Taboos and Bans

This sub-category includes phrasemes that are influenced by social conventions, in terms of the methods speakers have developed to avoid mentioning matters that are taboo in their society. Let us consider the following examples:

3) ʿila r-rafiqī l-a’lā [(he was) transferred to the higher companion] = he died.

4) qaḍā nahbahū [(he) fulfilled his vow] = death.

Both of these phrasemes are used to avoid speaking directly about a specific topic, namely, death. Phraseme (3) refers to a loved person who has died, with the indirectness of this reference supplied by the collocation ar-rafiq al-a’lā. This phraseme therefore substitutes the negative concept of life ending with a positive, spiritual one: ar-rafiq al-a’lā [the higher companion] being, in this context, the Divine and Heaven. This concept is derived both from the Islamic image of Heaven and God being in the sky, and from the conceptual metaphor UP IS GOOD. It is also worth mentioning here that the constituent rafiq in this phraseme indicates that the Divine will be the substituent of the deceased person’s companions, i.e., family and

---

273 Al-Maqqari, *Naṣīḥ at-Ṭib*, vol. 6, p. 335.
friends, and thus avoids allusion to the religious concept of judgment in the afterlife, which could lead to either Heaven or Hell. In other words, the dead person will be with a ‘companion’, as opposed to a God/judge.

In phraseme (4), the indirect reference *naḥb* [vow] facilitates avoidance of direct reference to the semantic field of death. In this instance, death is represented as a vow the people make and which they must fulfil by/at the end of their lives. Social conventions are of great importance in Arabic phraseology, especially in fields such as religion and sex, where the speaker is forced to employ alternative methods of expressing his/her ideas - accomplished, in this case, through phrasemes.275

3:3:1:3 Gestures276

Gestures are clear, direct cultural phenomena that can be observed in phrasemes, and are closely linked to the social interactions of a given society, because they are based on a day-to-day interaction between its members. Consider the following examples:

  5) *shaqqa l-juyūba* [the chest of the dress is torn]277 = to be grieved.

The gesture in phraseme (5) is a sign of showing grief, as in pre-Islamic Arabic culture, tearing the chest of one’s garment was an expression a part of sadness or even lamentation.278 Although this tearing the chest of one’s garment was later prohibited by Islam,279 it retains the idiomatic meaning motivated by the original culturally-based interaction/gesture.

---

275 For sex as a taboo, a good example is the humoristic letter that Ibn al-Khaṭīb sent to Ibn Khaldūn imagining the latter’s night with a girl. See Al-Maqqarī, *Naḥf at-Ṭīb*, vol. 6, pp. 175-80. Also, the phraseme *al-mīlu fi l-makhalati* [the kohl stick in the ball] = to have a sexual interaction, is another established example found in early Islamic texts like the *ḥadīth*. See Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī, *as-Sunan al-Kubrā*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAṭā (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, 2003), vol. 8, p. 402.


3:3:1:4 Gender-specific concepts

This phenomenon can be observed in phrasemes which contain allusions to femininity. In Arabic, masculine indications cannot be distinguished in phrasemes that express general or abstract ideas. However, the female sex can be clearly pinpointed in those with a structure based on comparisons between male and female. For instance:

6) *rabbātu l-hijāli* [the (girls) with anklets] = young beautiful girls.

Phraseme (6) reflects a gender-specific notion that is associated only with women; anklets are accessories that women wear to engage in coquetry by the sound they make, as well as by their appearance. This behaviour is typically associated with young women. Hence, the idiomatic meaning of the phraseme became ‘young beautiful girls’.

3:3:2 Material Culture

This category refers to the material objects of daily life in a social community, or as Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen put it, ‘culture-specific artefacts’. The appearance of these artefacts in phrasemes is motivated by the collective memory of a given speech community. Therefore, the source semantic level of the elements of a phraseme encompassing them cannot be comprehended without clear knowledge of these artefacts’ symbolic representation in the particular culture concerned. Food, buildings and clothes are among the material objects that are expressed symbolically in classical Arabic phrasemes. For example:

7) *dībājatu l-kitābi* [the silk brocade of the book] = the introduction.

---

280 Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, *Figurative Language*, p. 221.
282 Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, *Figurative Language*, p. 224. In Teliya et al.’s approach, (cultural semes) is an umbrella term for phrasemes that contain ‘idioethnic realia’. Cultural semes are divided into two categories: 1) material realia, and 2) social and historical realia. Material realia correspond to material culture in Dubrovol’skij and Piirainen’s approach, while social and historical realia correspond to either intertextual phenomena or cultural symbolism. See Teliya et al., ‘Phraseology as a Language of Culture’, p. 58.
This signifies that, to make a book more understandable and easy to digest, its first part should be its smoothest, and perhaps most eloquent/beautiful one. However, the relationship between the introduction and smoothness to the touch, represented in ḍībāja, needs to be brought to the attention of the audience if they do not belong to the speech community of the culture represented in the phraseme. Thus, ḍībāja functions in this phraseme as a culturally specific artefact, unclear in meaning without prior knowledge of its features.

3:3:3 Intertextual Phenomena

Many phrasemes make reference to intertextual phenomena. Certain types of text, such as religious writings and belles-lettres, are the main sources of such phenomena in phrasemes. Examples of intertextuality in phrasemes include quotations (direct abstracts of a text), or allusion (references to an entire story).

3:3:3:1 Quotations

In classical Arabic, quotations make up a significant proportion of phrasemes. Due to the Qurʾān in Muslim-Arab culture regarded as the words of the holiest text and the most eloquent form of Arabic language (ʾiʿjāz) – it represents one of the main sources of phrasemes displaying intertextual/quotation phenomena. Another important source of quotations, however, is Arabic poetry, which features a complex system of meter and rhyme that renders it difficult to either change the order of words or to replace them. Nevertheless,

---

285 Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, *Figurative Language*, p. 230. The phenomenon of cultural connotation, according to Teliya et al., can be roughly linked with two phenomena of Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen’s approach: 1) intertextuality (namely, allusion), and 2) cultural symbols; while discourse stereotyping directly corresponds to Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen’s concept of intertextuality. See Teliya et al., ‘Phraseology as a Language of Culture’, p. 58.

286 Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, *Figurative Language*, p. 231.


Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen give examples of slightly modified phrasemes as examples of the cultural phenomenon of quotation, e.g., in English: to carry/to bring an owl to Athens, or in German: das (also) ist/war des Pudels Keren: Figurative Language, pp. 231-2.


Yuʾī mulkāh man yashāʾu [he gives sovereignty to whom he will]. Qur’ān (ʾĀl ʾImrān) 3:26.

As in many cases, in Qur’ānic verses that allude to a specific story.
fa-mā baʿda l-ʿashiyati min ʿarārī
[Enjoy from the aroma of the ʿarār of Najd/]

For after this evening, no ʿarār will be found]. 294

Importantly, the phraseme is not directly quoted from the original text, yet it preserves
the main elements of the collocation which retain its idiomatic meaning. It is therefore
still considered a quotation because it is derived from an original text that lent it its
idiomatic meaning, though it does exhibit a level of flexibility, as shall be discussed
further below.

3:3:3:2 Allusions295

The second type of intertextual phenomenon, allusion, is ‘the reference to an entire text
or a large passage of text, summarizing a certain situation described in that text.’296 Pre-Islamic
and early Islamic historical and religious texts are the key sources of allusion in classical Arabic
phrasemes – mostly in the form of idioms. 297 For example:

10) ḥarbu Wāʿilin [the war of tribe Wāʿil] = a long unfinished conflict. 298
11) wa-jiʿa ʿalā qamīshī bi-damin kadhibin [and they brought false blood on his shirt] 299
    = false evidence.

Both phrasemes allude to stories that are known by people who lived within the Muslim-Arab
culture, and possibly pre-Islamic Arab culture as well. Phraseme (10) refers to a pre-Islamic
story about a war known as Ḥarb al-Basūs [The War of The al-Basus], which is said to have
started after the death of athe legendary figure Kulayb Wāʿil and to have lasted for a

294 Abū ʿAlī al-Marzūqī, Sharḥ Dīwān al-Ḥamāsā li-Abī Tammām, ed. Ibrāhīm Shams ad-Dīn (Beirut: Dār al-
Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 2003), vol. 2, p. 869. Some later sources attribute the verse to the poet as-Ṣumma al-
Qushayrī, who lived during the Umayyad period. See Khālid ʿAbd ar-Raʿuf al-Jabr, as-Ṣumma al-Qushayrī
295 Dobrovolski and Pirainen, Figurative Language, p. 234.
296 Ibid.
297 And in other languages: ibid.
299 Ibid., vol. 6, p. 179.
considerable period of time.\textsuperscript{300} Phraseme (11) refers to the story of Joseph according to the Qur'\={a}n,\textsuperscript{301} in which Joseph’s shirt is a key element in many events.\textsuperscript{302} The action of bringing false blood on Joseph’s shirt is used as an evidence to convince Jacob that the wolf ate Joseph became a metaphor for any false evidence.\textsuperscript{303}

3:3:1:4 Fictive Conceptual Domains\textsuperscript{304}

This is an umbrella concept covering all types of unreal or fictive-world elements in phrasemes. Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen analysed this category in the sphere of modern spoken language, i.e., after the scientific disavowal of a number of phraseme elements.\textsuperscript{305} However, it can reasonably be held to apply to religious references in classical Arabic phrasemes in medieval Arabic written works. Thus, for the sake of convenience, this study accepts elements of phrasemes now known to be fictive as meeting Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen’s definition, regardless of the levels of acceptance accorded to such concepts by speakers of classical Arabic in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, i.e., in the context of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works. Two phrasemes traceable to fictive-world concepts are considered below.

12) \textit{aṭ-tā ’iru l-maymūnu} [the blessed bird] = good luck.\textsuperscript{306}

13) \textit{salāμatu l-jānībi} [healthy side] = one whose deeds are good.\textsuperscript{307}


\textsuperscript{301} Qur’ān (Yūsuf) 12:93-96.

\textsuperscript{302} Ibid., 12:18, 25-28, 93.

\textsuperscript{303} Ibid., 12:18.

\textsuperscript{304} Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, \textit{Figurative Language}, p. 236.

\textsuperscript{305} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{307} Ibid., vol. 1, p. 53.
One pre-Islamic Arabic superstition holds that birds flying to the right are a good omen.\textsuperscript{308} Although later, in the Islamic period, this concept came to be considered untrue, the collocation continued to be used in that period, as we came across (12) in the corpus of Ibn al-Khaṭīb.\textsuperscript{309}

Another pre-scientific fictive concept, that the heart is the container of one’s feelings and morals, is referenced in (13). As this organ is located to one side of the body, good deeds are associated with the health of one’s side.\textsuperscript{310}

3:3:1:5 Cultural Symbols\textsuperscript{311}

Before coming to grips with the phenomenon of cultural symbols, we must first define the term ‘symbol’.\textsuperscript{312} For Pierce a symbol is ‘a sign which refers to the Object that it denotes by virtue of a law, usually an association of general ideas, which operates to cause the Symbol to be interpreted as referring to that Object.’\textsuperscript{313} In a phraseme, a cultural symbol is a lexical element that reflects a concept which cannot be interpreted via the lexical meaning of the lexemes, but instead is motivated by the cultural notions of a specific society. Cultural symbolism needs to fulfil two criteria: it should 1) cohere with other cultural codes, and 2) be frequently used on its metaphorical semantic level.\textsuperscript{314}

In classical Arabic phrasemes, WATER functions as a symbol for ‘everything with a beautiful view and a great position’.\textsuperscript{315} As a precious commodity in the deserts of Arabia, water

\textsuperscript{309} Ibn al-Khaṭīb, \textit{al-Iḥāṣa}, vol. 1, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{310} For a detailed survey of the concept of ‘heart’ in pre-Islamic Arab culture, see Tilman Seidensticker, \textit{Altarabisch ‘Herz’ und sein Wortfeld} (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1992).
\textsuperscript{311} In Teliya et al.’s approach, cultural concepts and cultural background correspond to cultural symbols in Dobrovol’skij and Pirinen’s: Teliya et al., ‘Phraseology as a Language of Culture’, p. 58.
\textsuperscript{312} The pitfalls of attempting to define the term ‘symbol’ are similar to those of defining ‘culture’. See Dobrovol’skij and Pirinen, \textit{Figurative Language}, p. 256.
\textsuperscript{314} Dobrovol’skij and Pirinen, \textit{Figurative Language}, p. 239.
\textsuperscript{315} Ath-Tha’ālibī, \textit{Thimār al-Qalūb}, p. 207.
was adopted culturally to signify every domain which reflects beauty and high value. For instance:

14) māʿu sh-shābībatī [water of youth] = the power of youth.\(^{316}\)

15) māʿu l-ḥāyāʾī [water of shyness] = the value of shyness.\(^{317}\)

In both phrasemes, the target meaning of the cultural symbol WATER is motivated by a cultural value. WATER in this sense does not contradict its metaphorical meaning when it occurs alongside various other cultural codes, and so the first condition of cultural symbolism is fulfilled. With regard to the second condition, WATER is frequently used in the same symbolic sense, i.e., beautiful and valuable. For instance, in phraseme (14) WATER is a reflection of the beauty and the value of youth, just as it illustrates the abstract concept of happiness. Finally, shyness – especially on the part of females – is a key value in Muslim-Arab and pre-Islamic Arab culture.\(^ {318}\) Thus, in phraseme (15), once more, WATER functions as a representation of the value and beauty associated with this femininity.

3:4 Blended phenomena\(^{319}\)

In some cases, a phraseme can reflect more than one cultural phenomena both of which equally motivate the phraseological meaning. A good example of such occasion is in a phraseme like:

16) ahlu l-baytī [the people of the house]\(^ {320}\) = the family of the Prophet.


\(^{318}\) For instance, in the Qurʾānic story of Moses, Qurʾān (al-Qaṣaṣ) 28:25, the commentators and the Qurʾān itself praise the shy girl who came to Moses asking him to help draw water from the well.

\(^{319}\) Dobrovolskij and Piirainen, Figurative Language, p. 240.

The phraseme is motivated by a cultural symbol that is [house] is family, hence the people of the house is one’s family. Also, the metaphorical meaning in the phraseme is motivated by a quotation that is taken from the Qur’ān:

\[
\text{innumā yurīdu llāhu li-yudhibba 'ankumu r-rija ahla l-bayti wa-yuṭahhirakum taṭhīran}
\]

[God only wants to remove from you the impurity, O people of the household, and to purify you with (extensive) purification]321

The specific link of ahl al-bayt with the family of the Prophet was probably conventionalised by the Qur’ānic verse during the coining of the phraseme, adding a layer of a metaphorical meaning to it. Thus, the phraseme is motivated by two phenomena, each of which contributes to its metaphorical meaning, and neither of which can be ignored when decoding that meaning. We can also add one more phenomenon, regarding the Islamic context (Sunni or Shī‘a), by which the phraseme would gain a third cultural phenomenon, i.e. cultural modelling. Also, phraseme (16), that has been discussed above, reflects two cultural phenomena. It reflects an allusion to the story of Joseph and a Qur’ānic quotation.

3:5 Cultural Phenomena and Fixedness Levels

The system devised by Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen illustrates what types of cultural phenomena motivate the phraseological system of a given language. The phenomena themselves, however, have a potential influence on the fixedness level of phrasemes, especially if they are directly linked with their lexical forms. Quotation, for instance, is by definition an extracted sentence or phrase from a longer text, generally word-for-word.322 A quotation can therefore include very specific lexemes in a certain order that are only found in the original

322 Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, Figurative Language, p. 231.
quoted material, and/or are only used in the wider language on a very limited basis. However, quotation-based phrasemes can exhibit a limited, but notable, alteration in the form of the material they quote.

Cultural symbols also potentially apply high levels of fixedness to phrasemes. Such symbols reflect concepts that can neither be interpreted via lexical meaning nor replaced by other lexemes. Hence, a cultural symbol-motivated phraseme is expected to be fully or highly fixed.\footnote{Torlakova noticed such a phenomenon specifically when proper names function as a cultural symbol. See Torlakova, ‘Idioms’, in Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics (electronic resource): http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_SIM_000280, accessed on 20 March 2018.} This is especially marked if the symbol is coined as a proper name, as in wasiyyatu Luqmāna [Luqmān’s advice]\footnote{Al-Maqqari, Naṣīḥ at-Tīb, vol. 7, p. 394.} = wisdom, in which Luqmān is a cultural symbol of hikma [wisdom] whenever it is used; or daʿwatu Ḥātimin [the invitation of Ḥātim]\footnote{Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Rayaḥānat al-Kuttāb, vol. 2, p. 120.} = generosity, in which Ḥātim at-Ṭāʾī is a cultural symbol of generosity.

Gestures and gender-specific notions motivate the semantic level of phrasemes and influence their lexical formation. Gender-specific notions occur as artefacts or specific behaviours, and thus influence the fixedness of the phrasemes in which they appear.

Other cultural phenomena – such as cultural modelling or fictive worlds – do not tend to affect phrasemes’ fixedness levels. This is because their motivations are more related to the semantic level.

3:6 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the cultural-analysis approach that will be used in the second part of this study. It first proposed a three-part working definition of ‘culture’, and then assessed a promising approach to cultural analysis using Arabic examples. I also discussed the obstacles that would challenge phraseological cultural analysis and answered the questions raised by

\[\text{\footnotesize{73}}\]
Based on careful consideration of the aims and scope of the present research, Piirainen and Dobrovol’skij’s approach will be adopted, as featuring both a detailed exploration of the phenomena, and clear boundaries between them. It should also be noted here that the level of fixedness of a phraseme is affected by the cultural phenomenon – or in some cases, multiple phenomena – that motivate it. It will therefore be important to pinpoint the most affective and the clearest influence on each phraseme, while maintaining an awareness of inter-affectivity and its impact on the phraseme’s fixedness.
Chapter 4: The works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb: Historical, Cultural and Linguistic Contexts

The works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb not only provide us with the largest and most varied collection of classical Arabic from al-Andalus of the fourteenth century; they also shaped the stylistic characteristics of Arabic Andalusi writing for more than a century after the author’s death, i.e., until the fall of the Kingdom of the Naṣrid dynasty in Granada (711-897/1311-1492).326 Also, the quantity of al-Khaṭīb’s work that was preserved and the variety of the topics he wrote about render his literary output a sufficient corpus for the phraseological context of its time.

4:1 Historical Context

The Arabic term al-Andalus applies to the whole of the Iberian Peninsula and its surrounding islands.327 The name is believed to be a corrupt, Arabised form of vandalusia, referring to the Vandals, one of the East Germanic tribes that invaded western and southern parts of Europe in late antiquity.328 In 92/711, the Ummayad army led by Mūsā Ibn Nuṣayr (d. c. 97/716) and his lieutenant Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād (d. after 95/714) conquered Iberia. By 114/732, Ummayad forces reached Poitiers in modern France, where they were defeated in the battle of Balāṭ ash-Shuhadāʾ which determined the high water mark of Muslim Arab expansion in Iberia and Gaul.329

During the ensuing contraction of the Muslim/Arabic-speaking territories in al-Andalus, another major turning-point was marked by the battle of al-ʿIqāb [Battle of Las Navas de Tolosa] (609/1212), near La Carolina in modern-day Andalusia. It was fought between the
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326 I will discuss this claim in the coming sections.
327 Muḥammad `Abd Allāh `Anān, Tārīkh Dawlat al-Islām fī al-Andalus (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 1997), vol. 1, p. 27.
328 Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 17 and 50.
329 Ibid., vol. 2, p. 158.
Muslim Berber Almohad dynasty, who ruled al-Andalus for a century and a half (514-667/1121-1269), and the Christian armies led by Alfonso VIII (d. 611/1214), and resulted in the defeat of the Almohad army.330

Soon afterwards, however, Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf ibn Naṣr (d. 671/1273) established a kingdom in Granada that would endure for more than two centuries (636-897/1238-1492). It was in this Naṣrid kingdom, ruled by Banū al-Aḥmar, that al-Khaṭīb lived.

4:2 Cultural and Linguistic Context

The political history of al-Andalus illuminates its cultural imagery. Five culturally distinct groups formed the mosaic culture in al-Andalus:

1) Arabs: descendants of the tribes of which the first army of conquerors was formed;
2) Berbers: indigenous people of north Africa;
3) Muwalladūn: Christians who converted to Islam;
4) Mozārabes: residents of al-Andalus who remained Christian; and
5) Jews.

Although the Arabs were a minority in al-Andalus, their status as temporal rulers and bearers of the region’s dominant religion helped to establish an Islamic-Arabic based culture there.331

It is possible to separate the language of al-Andalus into two general types: language as a daily-life contact medium, and literature. The first type developed in the first century following the conquest, when some cultural groups kept using their own languages, but an Arabic-Andalusi dialect arose and acquired lexemes from neighbouring languages, especially

---

the Romance ones and Berber. It also developed distinctive phonetic characteristics including, for example, \(\text{imāla}\) and the changing of \(/n/\) to \(/m/\), \(/b/\) to \(/m/\), \(/dh/\) to \(/d/\), and so forth. Special characteristics that developed on the syntactic level included conjugating the first-person singular verb in the same way as the first-person plural, e.g., \(\text{asma' u} [(I)\text{ listen}]\) became \(\text{nsim 'ū} [(we)\text{ listen}]\) and many other Andalusi specific characteristics.

Later, this Arabic-Andalusi dialect became the lingua franca for dwellers in the Iberian peninsula. The Mozárabes and Muwalladûn lost most of their language when they adopted Arabic. However, some of the Muslim Arabs spoke Romance languages in addition to their own. Interestingly, although the majority of the Muslim group who dwelled in al-Andalus were Berber, there is no evidence that their language was widely used. Hebrew was not a spoken language in the medieval period, so Iberian Jews’ first language was Arabic. Literature, in both poetry and prose, had been written in classical Arabic until the advent of strophic poetry: \(\text{muwashshaḥ}\) and \(\text{zajal}\). The difference between these two forms is that

---


333 \(\text{Yūúsuf} \ 'īd, an-Nashāḥ fī al-Andalus\) (Beirut: Dār al-Jil, 1992), p. 56.

334 It is worth noting the influence of the stress on the last syllable in the word, which affected the classical pronunciation \(\text{nasma} u\) to \(\text{nsim} u\): Binshrīfā, \(\text{Tārīkh al-Andmāl}\), p. 360, and \(\text{Yūúsuf}\), \(\text{an-Nashāḥ fī al-Andalus}\), p. 61. Otto Zwartjes, ‘Andalus’ in \(\text{Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics}\), (electronic resource): http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_COM_0016, accessed on 26 September 2018; Wasserstein, ‘The Language Situation in al-Andalus’, p. 17; Palencia, \(\text{Tārīkh al-Fikr al-Andalusī}\), p. 141; ‘\(\text{Anān}\), \(\text{Tārīkh Dawlat-al--Islām}\), vol. 1, p. 254. For the full text of the famous letter of Alvaro Cardobenes, written in 239/854 to complain about the situation of Latin under Arabic dominion, see Wasserstein, ‘The Language Situation in al-Andalus’, p. 5.


336 Ibid., p. 13.


muwashshah is written in classical Arabic except for the last line or kharja (or, in Spanish, jarcha), which may be written in a Romance language or in colloquial Andalusi; whereas zajal is written entirely in colloquial Andalusi. Various theories have been advanced for the origin of Andalusi strophic poetry, some of which assign it a Romance origin. In any case, its two forms were widely understood by the ninth century; and two centuries later, most, if not all, Andalusians were at least bilingual. On the other hand, classical Arabic remained as the written language in most of the topics until the end of the Naṣrid Kingdom in 897/1492. Literature in its prose form followed the mainstream eastern originated Arabic forms of classical Arabic literature in general. We can see, for example, maqāma that was initially created in the east by Bāḍīʿ az-Zamān al-Hamadhānī (395/d. 1008), founds a reflection in works of by Ibn Shuhayd (d. 426/1035) and Ibn al-Ishtarkūnī (d. 537/1143). Even in other main written works of great Andalusi writers like the works of Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064) in his linguistic and literary writings, Ibn Zaydūn (d. 463/1071) in his letters or Ibn Ṭūfayl (d. 581/1185) in his philosophical literature, the language and the style reflected the characteristics of classical Arabic prose in general.

4:3 Ibn al-Khaṭīb

Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s full name was Lisān ad-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saʿīd as-Salamānī al-Gharnāṭī. According to a contemporary, he was the most famous and most
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341 Haykal, al-Adab al-Andalusi, p. 143.
343 Maqāma is ‘collections of short independent narratives written in ornamental rhymed prose (saj) with verse insertions, and share a common plot-scheme and two constant protagonists: the narrator and the hero’. R. Drory, ‘The maqāma’ in The Literature of Al-Andalus, pp. 190 and192-3.
influential adīb of his time. He was born in 713/1313 in Loja, and moved with his family to Granada at the age of five or six. He was well educated in al-Andalus as well as at al-Qarawiyyīn mosque in Fez, learning traditional Arabic language studies and literature, philosophy, Sufism, medicine, shawārī'a (Islamic law) and exegesis. The remarkable breadth of this curriculum was reflected in the wide range of topics he wrote about. When his father died in the Battle of Tarīfa [Salado] in 741/1340, he was appointed to the former’s post – secretary to Vizier Ibn al-Jayyāb (d. 749/1349) – and nine years later, to the position of vizier himself, when al-Jayyāb died of the plague. After the death of the Sultan Yūsuf (r. 733-755/1333-1354), Ibn al-Khaṭīb served Muḥammad V (r. 755-760/1354-1359) until the latter was deposed by Ismāʿīl in 760/1359. After a brief spell of imprisonment, Ibn al-Khaṭīb was sent into exile in Fez, where he found favour with the Marinid Sultan (r. 760-762/1359-1361) and befriended Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808/1406). Not long after arriving in Fez, however, Ibn al-Khaṭīb moved to Salé, remaining there until 763/1362 when Muḥammad V regained his throne and commenced his second reign (763-793/1362-1391).

As a result of hostile rumours spread by Vizier an-Nubāḥī (d. 792/1390) and two of his own students, Ibn Zamrak (d. 797/1395) and Ibn Farkūn (d. 820/1417), Ibn al-Khaṭīb was accused of heresy, and fled to the protection of the Marinid Sultan Abū Fāris (r. 767-773/1366-1372) in 773/1371. In Granada, Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s books were burnt. The Naṣrid government demanded that Sultan Abū Fāris returned Ibn al-Khaṭīb for trial, but was rebuffed. The Marinid Sultan, Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad (r. 776-786/1374-1384 and 779-795/1387-1393) complied with the Naṣrid request, influenced by his vizier, Ibn Ghāzī (d. 779/1378), who considered Ibn al-Khaṭīb a rival. In 776/1374, Zamrak managed to kill al-Khaṭīb in his prison. His body was later

345 Alexander Knysh, ‘Ibn al-Khaṭīb’, in The Literature of al-Andalus, p. 358. In his book al-Iḥāta, Ibn al-Khaṭīb included an autobiography, but the main source for his life is the extended biography that was written by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Maqṣūrī in Naḥḥ at-Ṭīb, which is dedicated to Ibn al-Khaṭīb. The biography given here is a synthesis and summary of these three sources.
buried in Fez.

4:4 The Works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb

Ibn al-Khaṭīb is the prime example of the *adab* literature of the twilight of al-Andalus. He ‘was a bright star in the pleiad of great minds of his age which consisted of such as Ṭabd ar-Raḥmān ibn Khaldūn, Ibn Marzūq (d. 842/1439), Ibn Baṭṭūta (d. 770/1369), and Ibn Zamrak.347 In addition to more than sixty works on an array of topics, Ibn al-Khaṭīb wrote official letters for the Naṣrid and Marinid sultans. None of his Andalusi contemporaries, and none who followed, left such a great quantity and variety of work; and thus he also profoundly shaped the prose style in al-Andalus for the following era. The greatest known writer of his time, Ibn al-Khaldūn, said in his chapter titled *Fadl al-Wazīr Ibn al-Khaṭīb* [The Excellency of Ibn al-Khaṭīb]:

\[ kāna l-wazīru bnu l-Khaṭībi 'āyatan min 'āyāti llāhi fi n-naẓmi wa-n-nathri wa-l-ma'ārifī wa-l-adabi lā yusājalu madāhu wa-lā yuhtadā fiḥā bi-mithli hudāhu \]

[the Vizier Ibn al-Khaṭīb was a miracle, of God’s miracles, in prose, poetry, sciences and belles-letters.348 No one (can) reach his level nor anyone can be enlightened in those (fields like those who would be enlightened) by him]

Ibn Zamrak, Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s student and killer, not only left less written works than al-Khaṭīb did, but most of it is poetry;350 and Ibn ʿĀṣim (d. 829/1426) is often called the second Ibn al-

349 I chose to translate *adab* as belles-lettres in this context, although in general the term would indicate a wider category of writings than belles-lettres implies.
Khaṭīb, not because he equalled al-Khaṭīb’s style, but because he mocked it. Nor was Ibn Marzūq considered on the same level as al-Khaṭīb in *adab* or philosophy, despite being acknowledged as a great scholar.

Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s work is the prime example of the *adab* literature of his time, for three reasons: 1) it represents the largest available corpus from fourteenth-century especially from al-Andalus and the western part of Arabic speaking world; 2) this corpus includes the broadest possible range of topics of writing from that time, and 3) its author strongly influenced the writers who came after him until the fall of al-Andalus in the latter part of the following century.

Three major sources for Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works have been utilised in the present research. First and foremost among these is Shihāb ad-Dīn al-Maqqarī’s eight-volume *Naḥṭ at-Ṭib fi Ghuṣn al-Andalus ar-Raḥib wa-Dhikr Wazīrīhā Lisān ad-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb* [The Breath of Aroma from the Fresh Branch of al-Andalus and of its Vizier Lisān ad-Dīn ibn al-Khaṭīb], which al-Maqqarī dedicated to Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s life and works. *Naḥṭ at-Ṭib* provides us with a broad array of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s writing on different topics and in different genres: official letters on behalf of the sultans, personal letters, chapters of books on Sufism, biographies and philosophy.

Secondly, our corpus includes Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s own book *al-Iḥāta fi Akhbār Gharnāṭa* [The Knowledge of Granada’s News], which at four volumes represents the second-largest collection of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works after al-Maqqarī’s *Naḥṭ at-Ṭib*. Chiefly a collection of biographies of famous people of Granada, *al-Iḥāta* also includes letters Ibn al-Khaṭīb wrote to those individuals, as well as his commentaries and judgments about them, ranging from elegies and laments to lampoons. All include the use of phrasemes with various cultural motivations.

Finally, the present work makes use of the *Rayḥānat al-Kuttāb wa-Najʿat al-Muntāb*.

---


[the Porfume of The Writers and The Goal of the Seeker], in which al-Khaṭīb compiled his official and non-official letters within the following categories, as he explains:

wa-qassamtuḥū ilā ḥamdaλaṭi dīwānīn wā-tahniʿati ikhwānīn wā-
taʿziyatin fī ḥarbīn lī-d-dāhri ʿawānīn wā-aqrādīn wā-alwānīn wā-
maqāmātīn anqā min Shī ʿbī Bawānīn wā-ghayrī dīlīka min aqrādīn wā-
alwānīn.\(^{353}\)

[and I divided it into a starter of a book, congratulation for a friend, a condolence in a conflict to help in (accepting) fate, (different) types (of writing) for (different) purposes, and situations that are more beautiful than the Gardens of Bawān, and more than that of genres and writing types.]

\(^{353}\) Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Rayḥānat al-Kuttāb, p. 20.
Part II: Empirical Application

In this dissertation’s Part II, which comprises five chapters, I will apply Piirainen and Dobrovol’skij’s cultural-phenomena approach to phraseme analysis to the selected corpus, i.e., the prose of Ibn al-Khaṭīb taken from three main works, \textit{al-Ihāṭa fī Ākhbār Gharnāṭa} and \textit{Rayḥānat al-Kuttāb wa-naj‘at al-Muntāḥ} (both of which are by Ibn al-Khaṭīb), and the collection of his work included by al-Maqqarī in \textit{Naṣḥ aṭ-Ṭīb fī Ghuṣn al-Andalus ar-Raṣīb}.

Specifically, applying Piirainen and Dobrovol’skij’s cultural-phenomena approach to the corpus involved extracting its phrasemes according to the definition established in Chapters 1 and 2, and categorizing them under the related domains. Following five domains could be established for this categorisation:

1) History and Collective Memory (Chapter 5);
2) Nature (Chapter 6);
3) Material Culture and Habitus (Chapter 7);
4) Islamic religious concepts with non-religious target domains (Chapter 8); and
5) Islamic religious concepts with religious target domains (Chapter 9).

This process of categorisation by domain provides a helpful indication of phrasemes’ cultural phenomena, regardless of whether a given phraseme reflects one phenomenon or several. It also usefully indicates the patterning of classical Arabic phrasemes vis-à-vis such source domains, and what cultural phenomena the phrasemes within each source domain tend to reflect. Next, I will investigate the cultural phenomena that the extracted phrasemes reflect, and which contributed to them being coined.
Chapter 5: History and Tradional Tales as a Domain of Cultural Phenomena in the Phraseology of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s Prose Works

History is perhaps the most common source domain for phrasemes in every language. Here, I will discuss phrasemes that are motivated by a reference to the source domain [history], which is to say history as an equivalent of the collective memory of Arabic speakers at the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, based on the evidence provided by his prose works. In other words, it includes every reference to events in the pre-Islamic, (or believed to have happened in the pre-Islamic era like traditional tales, e.g. The war of al-Basūs) and Islamic historical epochs of Muslim-Arab culture, as well as of other cultures that had an impact on the collective memory of Arabic speakers within the source domain [history]. For example, [history] is a source domain in the phraseme daʿwatu Ḥātim [the invitation of Ḥātim] = generosity, which is categorised as referring to a pre-Islamic source domain due to the fact that its referent is an historical event/person/series of events that took place in the pre-Islamic era. On the other hand, the phraseme nāwmu ahli l-kāfī [the sleeping of the Cave People] = a period of long sleeping, though likewise rooted in an historical reference to the pre-Islamic era, is clearly an allusion to an historical incident described in the Qurʾān’s sūrat al-Kahf, and thus its source domain refers to an Islamic religious-influenced concept. As such, this definition expressly includes myths, and even cultural materials that are related to other cultures or civilisations, e.g., Sasānid Persia (224-651), but which were still recognised as symbols in pre-Islamic and early Islamic Arab history. However, pre-Islamic events that were introduced into the language as phrasemes by the Ḥadīth or Qurʾān are excluded from this category.

The manifestations of this source domain in our fourteenth-century written corpus indicate that the classical Arabic of late al-Andalus preserved some tribal Arab cultural features

---

354 Qurʾān (al-Kahf) 18:9-29.
without changes or re-formations. The Islamic era’s history, especially incidents from the first two centuries of Islam, has played a central role in the coining of Arabic phrasemes. Thus, it is not unexpected that [history] is an important source domain for Arabic phrasemes found in the prose writings of Ibn al-Khaṭīb. It also reveals that, even in a corpus of fourteenth-century Arabic, the presence of early/pre-Islamic historical fragments remained strong in the collective memory of the speakers of Arabic, as manifested in the phraseological system.\textsuperscript{355}

All the phrasemes in this chapter are referential ones. The following three sections organise the phrasemes with historical references from our corpus into three categories: 1) references to pre-Islamic Arab history and traditional tales, 2) references to non-Arab elements that have become intertwined with pre-Islamic Arab history, and 3) references to Islamic history.

5:1 Pre-Islamic History and Traditional Tales as a Source Domain

References to pre-Islamic Arab history in phrasemes fall into two groups. Those in the first group reference major events, without specific mention of a sub-event or any specific person, whereas those in the second group do include such mentions.

\textsuperscript{355} The persistence of such material over many centuries, regardless of a community’s development of its own strong and distinctive cultural traits – language included – is remarkable. There are two possible reasons for it, 1) the nature of the language, and 2) the attitude of writers of Arabic literature in al-Andalus towards this earlier era of history. With regard to the first point, Arabic had developed phrasemes with references to pre-Islamic history long before Andalus literature, to which the corpus belongs, was established as a distinct branch of Arabic literature; this can be noted in phrases like \textit{bayna l-Khawarnaq wa-as-Sadīr} [between the palace of al-Khawarnaq and the palace of as-Sadīr] = in the most prestigious location within a place, or \textit{yawmu Khzāzin} [the day of Khzāz] = a great battle, as will be illustrated below.

With regard to the second point, the classical works of al-Andalus convey a sense of inferiority to the eastern part of the Arabic-speaking world. This can be observed in the first major work of Andalus belles-lettres, \textit{al Iqd al-Farīd} [The Unique Necklace] by Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīh (d. 328/940), who advocated the purity of Andalusi Arabic and Andalusians’ knowledge of \textit{akhbār} (stories and folklore from pre-Islamic collective memory), by way of suggesting that its literature was as great as that from nearer the core of the Muslim-Arab world. See Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīh, \textit{al- Iqd al-Farīd}, vol. 1, p. 6. A similar approach can also be noted in the honorific titles given to Andalus poets, which always refer to an earlier eastern Arab poet: e.g., Mutanabbī al-Andalus (Ibn Hānī’) (d. 362/973), Buḥṭūrī al-Andalus (Ibn Zaydūn) and Ṣanawbarī al-Andaus (Ibn Khaṭība) (d. 533/1139). As such, the presence of Arabic phrasemes containing references to the source domain of pre-Islamic Arab history can be linked, secondarily, to Andalus writers’ feelings of inferiority to their counterparts in the eastern Arabic-speaking world – even four centuries after the lifetime of Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīh.
In our corpus, two of the three phrasemes in the first group both refer to battles, or as they are called in Arabic *yawm* (a day), while the third refers to a whole war, *ḥarb*. They are:

1) *yawmu Ḥalīmata* [the day of Ḥalimah]356 = a very well-known event.

2) *yawmu Khazāzin* [the day of Khzāz]357 = a great battle.

3) *ḥarbū Wā‘īlin* [the war of tribe Wā’il]358 = a long unfinished conflict.359

The cultural phenomenon in all three phrasemes can clearly be categorised as allusion. The first phraseme, however, indicates the target domain [fame]. The limited (i.e., minimum required) number of elements in the second and third phrasemes, and the fact that one of the elements is a proper name and the other is not, help to maintain these phrasemes in a strongly fixed form.360 The fixedness of the first phraseme is explained not only by the two factors mentioned above, but also because the target meaning [fame] is indicated by its negated antonym.361

Phraseme (1) is linked to the traditional story of the Battle of Ḥalīma, which was fought between the Lakhmids in (300-602) al-Ḥīra (south-central modern Iraq) and the Ghassānids (c. 220-6638) in the Levant (modern Syria). The king of the Ghassānids, al-Ḥārith ibn Jabala (r. c. 529-569), promised his daughter to the knight who killed the king of the Lakhmids, al-Mundhir
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357 Ibid., vol. 2, p. 401.
359 Ibid.
361 It is worth noting that the negation of the antonym of the emphasised concept is a common stylistic touch in Arabic. Consider the following examples from in the Qurʾān: *wa-anna llāha laysa bi-zallāmin li-l-ʿabīdī* [and indeed God is not unjust to the servants] Qurʾān (*Yūsuf*) 10:22; *wa-mā hiya min zālāmin bi-haʿidī* [and it is not far from the unjust], (Ḥūd) 11:83 and *wa-mā gaawmu lūjin ʿankum bi-haʿidī* [and the people of Lut are not far from you], (Ḥūd) 11:89; *wa-mā kāna ʿażū u rabbika maḥāren* [and the giving of your Lord is never prevented], (al-ʿIsrāʾ) 17:20; *wa-mā kana rabbuka nasāyin* [and your Lord is not forgetful], (Maryam) 19:64; *wa-mā rabbuka bi-zallāmin li-l-ʿabīdī* [and your Lord is not unjust to the servant], (Fuṣṣilat ) 41:46; and *wa-mā ana bi-zallāmin li-l-ʿabīdī* [and I am not unjust to the servants], (Qāf)50:29.
ibn an-Nū’ mān (r. c. 505-554). In the event, al-Ḥārith’s nephew killed the Lakhmids’ king but refused to marry Ḥalima, and was then killed by the Lakhmids, although the Ghassānids won the war. The event became so famous that a proverb with an allusion to it was coined.

Yawmu Khazāzā in phraseme (2) was another battle, between the tribes of Rabī‘a and Ma‘ add on one side and the King of Yemen on the other. In traditional Arabic sources, it was remembered as one of the biggest battles of the pre-Islamic era due to the large number of different tribes that took part in it.

Phraseme (3) alludes to the story of War of Wā’il, also known as the War of al-Basūs: a long pre-Islamic series of battles between the tribes of Bakr Ibn Wā’il and Taghlib Ibn Wā’il in the wake of the assassination of Kulayb Ibn Rabī‘a, the leader of Taghlib, by his brother-in-law Jassās Ibn Murra, according to the pre-Islamic saga. The war became a metonym for long conflicts, the target domain of the phraseme. Another possible cultural phenomenon that the phraseme could reflect is quotation, if we accept that the phraseme was originally derived from a verse usually provided within the events of the saga. The verse is attributed to al-Ḥārith Ibn ‘Ubād, who, according to the traditional story, joined this war after his son was killed by

---


366 I do not attempt to establish the authenticity of such figures, I, however, discuss the background of the story as a described by Arabic literary and historical sources.


368 Anas ‘Abd al-Ḥādī Abū Hilāl, Dīwān al-Ḥārith ibn ‘Ubād (Abu Dhabi: TCA, 2008), p. 49. I do not discuss the authenticity of the of the verse but discussing the influence of such poetic verses on the fixedness of phrasemes.
al-Muhalhil, Kulayb’s brother. The verse is:

$qarribā marbiṭa n-Nāʾāmati minni$

$laqiḥat ḥarbu Wāʾilin ‘an ḥiyāli$

[Bring the reins of the horse an-Nāʾāma close to me]

The War of Wāʾil has been fertilised after a period of non-fertilisation]

The common name of the war is al-Basūs because Kulayb was killed by Jassās in revenge for Kulayb’s killing of Sarāb, al-Basūs’s female camel. The formation of phraseme (3) was likely influenced by the line quoted above, which contains ḥarb Wāʾil rather than ḥarb l-Basūsī, despite the latter being more commonly used as a phraseme in the chronicles. If so, the cultural phenomenon of phraseme (3) is a blend of quotation, primarily, and secondarily, an allusion.

In the context of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s writing, phrasemes’ metaphorical functions provide a clear indication that they had become conventionalised by the fourteenth century. Notably, his usage of phrasemes emphasises the secondary semantic level, so-called metaphorical meaning. For instance, the phraseme yawmu Halīmata is used in the context of praising a person by exaggerating his/her ability. He says: $adḥhab-ta yawma Halīmata mathalan$ [you made the day of Halima a proverb] = you, the praised person, are the one who made the day of Halīma famous. Although the Arabic word for ‘fame’, $shuhra$, is not used in any text by Ibn al-Khaṭīb, he used words relating to the semantic field of fame. A proverb is, by definition, a famous conventionalised phrase, and hence a phraseme. Mathalan is used in the context quoted above to cohere with the rhyme $mazzaq-ta ‘alā Muzayqyā ḥulalan$, $wa-adḥhab-ta yawma Halīmata$

---

370 Abū Hilāl, Dīwān al-Ḥarīth Ibnu Ubād, p. 199.
372 For example, in collections of collocations like Ath-Tha’ilībi’s Thimār al-Qulūb, we find only ḥarb al-Basūs as a restricted collocation alluding to the well-known war (p. 308); see also al-Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ al-‘Aṣhā, vol. 1, p. 391, and vol. 6, pp. 6 and 227; and al-Ḥasan al-Ŷūṣufī, Zahr al-Akām fī al-Amthāl wa-l-Ḥikam, ed. M. Ḥājjī and M. al-Ḳhāḏrī (Casablanca: ad-Dār al-Jadīda, 1981), vol. 2, p. 200. I have not been able to identify any occurrences of ḥarb Wāʾil as a restricted collocation, apart from in quotations of the verses.
mathalan [you tore dresses for Muzayqyā and you made the day of Ḥalīma an example]. 374

The second group of phrasemes from the source domain of history includes references to specific persons, whether those who played major roles in events to the point that they became symbols of them, or due to their distinguishing characteristics. Consider the following idioms used by Ibn al-Khaṭīb:

4) daʿwatu Ḥātimin [the invitation of Ḥātim]375 = a generous treatment.
5) fatkatu l-Barrāḍī [annihilation of al-Barrād]376 = a great act of annihilation.
6) qirtā Mariyyata [Mariyya’s earrings]377 = valuable jewels.

The referent in each of these three phrasemes is an historical event linked with a central character. Since one element of each is a proper name, all three have a high level of fixedness. In phraseme (5), fatka [annihilation] illustrates a specific meaning of an event that was not only an assassination, but a betrayal. Phraseme (4) shows more flexibility regarding the event daʿwa [invitation]. Ḥātim at-Ṭāʾī (d. c. sixth century) is remembered in the collective memory of classical Arabic speakers as an extraordinarily generous person, and generosity is one of the cardinal Arab virtues; and combining daʿwa with the name of such a figure expresses this deeper meaning. Ḥātim can also be found in various other phrasemes, all of which express generosity either in general or in terms of a specific action, e.g., an invitation. Consider, for instance, samāḥatu Ḥātimin [the allowance of Ḥātim], 378 karamu Ḥātimin [Ḥātim’s generosity], and akramu min Ḥātimin [more generous than Ḥātim] – or even the name itself, which occurs in/as the phraseme Ḥātimuni t-Ṭāʾī.379 Bearing that in mind, Ḥātim has been converted from a proper name into a cultural symbol, by which any lexeme of the semantic field ‘generosity’ or any action of giving would reflect the secondary meaning of the phraseme.

374 Ibid.
375 Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Rayḥānat al-Kuttāb, vol. 2, p. 120.
378 This collocation can also be found in al-Maqṣari, Nafḥ at-Ṭīb, vol. 5, p. 50.
379 Ath-Thaʿālibī, Thimār al-Qalūb, p. 105.
Phraseme (4) also implies a historical allusion. Unlike phrasemes (5) and (6), whose historical referents are single stories (as will be discussed later), the referent in phraseme (4) is a collection of stories that illustrate the characteristics of the cultural symbol, Ḥātim, as used in this phraseme.\footnote{Classical Arabic works such as chronicles, biographies, and proverb collections provide a large number of stories of Ḥātim’s generosity.} Similar phenomena are widely represented in Arabic phraseology: for example, in ‘ayyu Bāqilin [Bāqil’s dullness],\footnote{Ath-Tha‘alibi, \textit{Thimār al-Quṣūb}, p. 109.} balāghatu Qassin [Qass’s eloquence],\footnote{Ibid.} zakamu Iyāsin [Iyā’s intelligence],\footnote{Ibid., p. 82} and so forth.\footnote{More phrasemes of this type are included in ath-Tha‘alibi, \textit{Thimār al-Quṣūb}, p. 107.}

Phraseme (5) refers to the story of the legendary figure al-Barrāḍ ibn Qays al-Kinānī.\footnote{Al-Muhibbi, \textit{Mā Ḥu wwa’l-‘Alayh}, vol. 3, p. 2436.}

The chronicles state that al-Barrāḍ intended to lead and protect a camel belonging to an-Nu‘mān, king of al-Ḥīra (r. c. 580-602),\footnote{Irfan Shahidi, ‘al-Nu‘man (iii) b. al-Mundhir’ in \textit{Encyclopaedia of Islam} (electronic resource): \url{http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_5508}, accessed on 4 May 2018.} but ’Urwa ibn ʿUqba refused to allow him to do so, and took over the mission himself, on the grounds that it could not be accomplished by a ṣu ‘lūk who had been expelled from the tribe. As revenge, al-Barrāḍ killed ʿUrwa, and two other men sought to kill him.

In the case of phraseme (6), the sources do not reveal the story being alluded to. However, they do indicate the metaphorical/secondary semantic level of the phrase’s meaning as a phraseological one, insofar as Mariyya was Mariyya Bint Ẓālim ibn Wahib ibn al-Ḥārith ibn Muʿāwiya al-Kindī, the mother of al-Ḥārith, the king of the Ghassānids.\footnote{Ath-Tha‘alibi, \textit{Thimār al-Quṣūb}, p. 504; Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, \textit{al- Iṣq al-Fārid}, vol. 3, p. 12; Al-Muhībbī, \textit{Mā Ḥu wwa’l-‘Alayh}, vol. 3, p. 2505.} The core elements of the phraseme, qiṛṭā and Mariyya, never change with context. However, the phraseme occurs in two forms: anfasu min Qiṛṭay Mariyyata [more expensive than Mariyya’s earrings] and khudhhu wa-law bi-qirṭay Mariyyata [take it even with Mariyya’s earrings].\footnote{Ibn al-Khaṭīb, \textit{al-Ilāhī}, vol. 2, p. 401.}
The two forms both maintain the core elements of the phraseme, with a slight difference in the suffix to suit the grammatical case.

Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works present phrasemes (5) and (6) directly, i.e., with no emphasis on their metaphorical meaning, unlike phrasemes (1) through (4). In the case of phraseme (4), it is likely that the phraseological semantic level was understood by a high proportion of readers, due to the phenomenon of cultural symbolism in its formation, as has been explained earlier. Phrasemes (5) and (6), on the other hand, both represent the cultural phenomenon of allusion. In spite of this, I would argue that the high fixedness of these two phrasemes’ forms and their inclusion of proper names preserve their metaphorical meanings, and eliminate any need to guess on the part of the audience.

The following phraseme, in spite of its reference to a proper name, refers to a certain place that was built in the pre-Islamic era:

7) *bayna l-Khawarnaq wa-Sadīri* [between the palace of al-Khawarnaq and the palace of as-Sadir] = in the most prestigious spot within a place.

The source domain of this phraseme is two ancient palaces, are believed to be located in present-day Iraq, that were built by an-Nu’mān, the king of the Lakhmids in al-Ḥīra. The phraseological meaning of the phraseme is motivated by narratives that described the splendour of the two palaces. The phenomenon in this phraseme is material culture, because it refers to the greatness of these two palaces, although the source domain of the phraseme is pre-Islamic history.

Once more, Ibn al-Khaṭīb uses the phraseme in its metaphorical meaning with no emphasis, the lack of which indicates the establishment of the metaphorical meaning of the phraseme.

---

389 See Chapter 3.
The phraseme is structured as a binomial, with nouns linked by a preposition and a conjunction. Again, this reflects pre-Islamic history’s influence on classical Arabic writings in the fourteenth century even in Granada, to the point that its stories became part of the language itself.

The following phraseme is also motivated by a pre-Islamic story, but includes two cultural phenomena.

8) **samīru l-farqadayni** [the (one who) chats with the two pherkads] = to show arrogance.

This image is motivated by the cultural symbol *farqad* – an unreachably high entity – but also alludes to the pre-Islamic story of Jadhīma al-Abrash (r. c. third century), a great ancient Arab king. Specifically, phraseme (8) references part of a long story of Jadhīma and Queen az-Zabbā’ (r. c. third century) of Palmyra, in which they fight to determine which one of them is greater. For that reason, narrations of this tale start by describing Jadhīma as one who chats with the pherkads, symbolic of the concept of highness. However, it is fundamentally dissimilar to *aʾazz min az-Zabbāʾ* = [greater than az-Zabbā’], which indicates an exaggerated greatness.

The action in the phraseme is the motivator of the phraseological meaning’s image. The source domain of the phraseme is the story of Jadhīma, as reflected by the duality of the second element of the phraseme, which indicates the link to the story.

---


395 Ibid., p. 154.


397 *Az-Zabbāʾ* is the Arabic name of Zenobia. Here, I have retained the Arabic to better cohere with the phrasemes. See Irfan Shahid, ‘az-Zabbāʾ’, in Encyclopedia of Islam (electronic resource): http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_8058, accessed on 6 April 2018.

This phraseme occurs in most sources in the form *yunādimu l-farqadayni*, but Ibn al-Khaṭīb replaced *yunādim* with *samīr*, which is derived from *yusāmiru:* *yunādim*’s semi-synonym. Bearing that in mind, the second element of the phraseme *farqadayn* is the main element by which it gains its metaphorical meaning. Its flexibility could also be the result of its high frequency, and/or of its great age: two factors that tend to encourage writers to break the fixedness of the weaker element of a phraseme to demonstrate the richness of their vocabulary. Moreover, knowing that a phraseme will be clearly understood due to its ‘cranberry’ element might also lead to the same phenomenon.

5:2 Non-Arab Aspects Related to Pre-Islamic Arab History

The phrasemes in this group are idioms motivated by non-direct historical tales that were shared by Arab tribes and became part of their history even though they were originally derived from another culture: Persia in the Sasānid period, or the Byzantine Empire. Let us consider the following:

9) *tāju Kisrā* [Kisrā’s (the Persian king’s) crown] = magnificent sovereignty.

10) *ʾīwānu Kisrā* [Kisrā’s palace] = an impressive building.

11) *khamru Bābila* [Babylon’s wine] = the best wine.

Despite their origins in Sasānid Persia and Babylon, each of these three phrasemes entered classical Arabic phraseology and became established as metaphors. Although the source domain of all three phrasemes is the history of civilisations neighbouring Arabia – Sasānid Persia in phrasemes (9) and (10), and Babylon in phraseme (11) – their early establishment qualifies them as part of the pre-Islamic Arab historical domain. They also reflect material

---


culture (crown, palace and wine).

Kisrā is a corrupted form of the Persian King’s name Khusraw, influenced by Syriac.\(^{403}\) Kisrā’s crown and his palace became cultural symbols of exaggerated luxury, and phrasemes (9) and (10) were both generated by this concept. Thus, we can say that the word *Kisrā* in an annexation construction (*iḍāfā*) applies this metaphorical meaning to the phraseme. The same concept can also be noted in poetry from both the pre-Islamic and Islamic periods. In the pre-Islamic era, ‘Adiyy ibn Zayd (d. c. sixth century) – in the context of explaining a bereavement – asked:

\[
aynā Kisrā, Kisra l-mulūki Anūshirwana am aynā Sābūrū
\]

[Where is Kisrā, the king of kings, Anushiruwan or where is Shapur (today)‽]\(^{404}\)

Likewise, ‘Antara ibn Shaddād (d. c. early seventh century) wrote:

\[
wa-mulku Kisrā lā ashtahīhi idhā
mā ghāba wajhu l-ḥabibi ‘an n-nazarī
\]

[And I do not desire the sovereignty of Kisrā, if the face of the beloved is absent from the view.]\(^{405}\)

In both verses, Kisrā is used as a symbol of luxury, privilege and exaggeration. ‘Adiyy’s verse asks why, if Kisrā Anushiruwan and Shapur – figures of greatness – have died, we of lesser fortune would be attached to life. In other words, the verse reflects the literary motif *ubi sunt*. ‘Antara, meanwhile, links Kisrā’s sovereignty to irresistible desire, but places a higher value on the face of his beloved.


After the coming of Islam, a similar example from the Umayyad era is provided by Ṣa‘īd ibn Abī Rabī‘a (d. 93/712):

\[
\text{fa-laysa ka-mithli l-yawma Kisrā wa-Hurmuzin}
\]

[So neither Kisrā nor Hormizd is like me today]. 406

In the Abbasid era, Abū Nuwās (d. 198/814) wrote:

\[
\text{a-lam tara ma banā Kisrā}
\]

\[
\text{wa-sābūrun li-man ghabarā}
\]

[Don’t you see what Kisrā and Sābūr built to those who passed away?] 407

And in al-Andalus, Abū al-Baqā‘ ar-Rundī (d. 684/1285) said:

\[
\text{wa-ammā Kisrā fa-mā āwahu īwānū}
\]

[And Kisrā, his building did not save him]. 408

Ibn Abī Rabī‘a expressed his ultimate contentment by comparing his status to that of Kisrā, the ideal symbol of greatness in this context. 409 Abū Nuwās used the situation of what Kisrā had built to explain the effects of time and how it defeats any greatness: even what Kisrā had made has vanished now. The same greatness metaphor occurs in Andalusi poetry, as expressed in ar-Rundī’s elegiac poem, and in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works. 410 Once more, nothing is saved from the power of time: even Kisrā who built the īwān palace was not safe from death.

Phraseme (9) indicates a specific material object, tāj [crown], which can be interpreted as both a splendid cluster of jewels and as a metaphor for sovereignty. In the context of the


408 Al-Maqṣūrī, Ǧuḥṣ at-Ṭīb, vol. 4, p. 487.


phraseme, Ibn al-Khaṭīb praises his target by saying wa-kasarta tāja Kisrā [and you broke the crown of Kisrā]: i.e., by ascribing to the praised person an exaggerated, imaginary ability to break Kisrā’s crown, or in other words to defeat Kisrā and assume his power. This reveals the conceptual metaphor, SOVEREIGNITY IS A CROWN, also noted in classical texts: e.g., tanzi’u l-mulka min man tashā’u [and you dispossess sovereignty from whom you will].\footnote{Qurʾān (Āl Īmārān) 3:26.} This combination of a cultural symbol and a conceptual metaphor imbues phraseme (9) with a high level of fixedness.

The elements of phraseme (10) are Kisrā, as a cultural symbol, and ṭīwān, which means a palace, borrowed from the Persian eyvān;\footnote{O. Grabar, ‘Īwān’, in Encyclopaedia of Islam (electronic resource): http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/ivan-SIM_3713, accessed on 7 April 2018.} specifically, ṭīwānu Kisrā refers to a building in a place now called Taq Kasra. The phraseme reflects two phenomena, both of which imply a high degree of fixedness. It is a proper name, referring to the location in Taq Kasar; and it contains a combination of a cultural symbol, Kisrā, and a foreign word, ṭīwān. Cultural symbols, as explained previously, raise a phraseme’s degree of fixedness because lexemes of foreign origin tend to remain in a particular format after they have been Arabised. The objective of the phraseme is praising. When Ibn al-Khaṭīb wrote yā man ladā mawlidihi l-muqaddasi l-muṭahhari ṭīwānu Kisa rtajja [o you who for his birth, Kisrā’s palace (the ṭīwān) was shaken],\footnote{Al-Maqqarī, Naḥḥ at-Ṭīb, vol. 5, p. 400.} he praised his target figure by negating or contradicting the greatness of the metaphorical meanings that these phrasemes held. For this effect to be achieved, the metaphorical meaning of each phraseme had to be fully understood by the audience.

The last item in this sub-category, phraseme (11), deploys the expression Babylonian wine to express taste or good taste, especially of wine.\footnote{Ath-Thaʿālibī, Thimār al-Qulūb, p. 493.} The phraseme is motivated by a pre-Islamic Arab experience with Babylonian wine, found in several pre-Islamic texts. As al-Aʿshā
(d. 7/625) put it:

\[ \text{min khamri 'Ānata a'raqat bi-mizājihā/ aw khamri Bābila aw banāti} \]

\[ Mushayya'ā \]

[From the wine of 'Āna which became vintage by what it was mixed with
Or the Babylonian wine or the town of Banāt Mushayya].\(^{415}\)

And in another verse, by 'Adiyy 'Adī Ibn Zayd:

\[ hādhā wa-rubba musawwīfina sabāḥtuhum \]

\[ \text{min khamri Bābila ladhđhatan li-sh-shārībīn} \]

[This! And many late visitors I served in the morning
with the delicious wine of Babylon].\(^{416}\)

In the first verse, the wine of Babylon is mentioned as one of three types of preferred wine. In
the second, it is described using the adjective \textit{ladhđha} [delicious], which reflects the target
meaning of the phraseme. A cultural model applied a link between Babylonian wine and
deliciousness.

In terms of phraseme (11)’s context, Ibn al-Khaṭīb applies it in its metaphorical meaning
with no additions or emphasis. This lack of emphasis can be attributed to the phraseme’s high
level of conventionalisation in the context.

5:3 Islamic History

The following group of five phrasemes are motivated by Islamic history, mainly in its
first three centuries, which included the first century of the Muslims’ presence in al-Andalus.

12) \textit{asra' u min Ummi Khārijata} [faster than Umm Khārijah]\(^{417}\) = one who quickly changes
his/her mind.
13) *az-zuhdu bi-Uways* [asceticism (as shown) by Uways]418 = an ascetic person.

14) *idṭirābu l-Mukhtār* [the unsettlement of al-Mukhtar]419 = unsettled mind (negatively).

15) *miḥnatu l-Ḥallāj* [the affliction of al-Ḥallāj]420 = a great misery of a pious person.

16) *maʿrūfu Yahya bni Khālidin* [the generosity of Yahya Ibn Khālid]421 = great generosity.

All five of the phrasemes in this group refer to a specific person and to an event or an action for which that person is known. As mentioned earlier, the central characters in phrasemes became symbols of the abnormality of the event/action in which they were involved.422 The combination of allusion and cultural symbolism represented by each proper name results in a fully fixed phraseological form.

The first phraseme is formed in an elative simile (more…than…) form. It alludes to Umm Khārijja, a woman who lived in the seventh century and was known for marrying and divorcing in a very short period.423 As used by Ibn al-Khaṭīb, the phraseme is a short-form version of the original: *asraʿu min nikāhi Ummi Khārijata* [faster than Umm Khārijah’s marriage].424 The deleted element is an extra explanatory element that does not lend any additional meaning to the phraseme’s metaphorical level. In other words, the proper name Umm Khārijja became a signifier and a cultural symbol of an extremely short marriage, so the concept of marriage is indicated by the proper name alone. Also, since the phraseme refers to a larger set of narratives related to the how fast Umm Khārijja married and divorced, and not merely to a particular person known for that characteristic, it is definitely an allusion.425

A similar analysis applies to phraseme (13) on the syntactic and semantic levels.

419 Ibid., p. 419.
420 Ibid., p. 204.
421 Ibid., vol. 6, p. 418.
422 See Chapter 3.
However, the form used by Ibn al-Khaṭīb is formed as a binomial form with two nouns, one of which is a proper noun, linked by a preposition. Although the structure is not an annexation, it can easily be reconstructed annexation form, such as *Zuhdu Uwaysin*. Uways is Uways al-Quranī, a very ascetic who died in 37/658. We can note one additional condition in this phraseme that applies more fixedness to it: one of the elements, *zuḥd* [asceticism], is a non-metaphorical word that functions as a core element of the target meaning, i.e., is the core word for mapping the image of the phraseme. Although it functions literally, adding it to Uways applies an abnormality to the action that re-forms the phraseme’s target meaning. And, as we have seen, lack of any secondary meaning in one of its core elements means that an Arabic phraseme must remain fully fixed if it is to retain its unity of meaning.

Both Phrasemes (14) and (15), like the previous two, allude to an event and to a character who was intimately connected to that event, to the point that all the characters are considered cultural symbols of the action/characteristic to which they are related. In (14), al-Mukhtar ath-Thaqafī (d. 67/687) is represented as an unstable character who changes his loyalty, alluding to his biography.426 And, in (15), al-Ḥallāj (d. 309/922) was a Sufi poet who refused to change his faith, and suffered terribly for this decision, and thus became a symbol of keeping faith despite all misfortunes. Yaḥyā ibn Khālid al-Barmakī (d. 190/805), vizier to Hārūn ar-Rashīd (r. 170/786-193/809), is represented as a symbol of generosity in (16). Although Yaḥyā Ibn Khālid lived in the early Abbasid era, the story of the Barāmika became an Arab folk story.427 But unlike the previous two phrasemes, phraseme (16) refers to a characteristic of al-Barmakī himself, rather than to a specific story or collections of stories

---

426 The phraseme was coined according to the Sunni historical version of al-Mukhtar.
about him.428

In terms of grammatical structure, phrasemes (14), (15) and (16) are all *idāfa* [annexation] combinations, in which the proper name/symbol is combined with a literal core element that works as the medium in mapping the image. The fully fixed form of the phraseme results from its having 1) *idāfa* of a proper name, an element used literally, which is a condition of full fixedness, and 2) no more than two elements, which is a condition of high fixedness.

All of the events in these three phrasemes took place in the eastern part of the Islamic/Arab world. The historical allusion to an early Islamic event like the rebellion of al-Mukhtar in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works is culturally understandable in the context of classical Arabic literature, and especially in that of fourteenth century al-Andalus. The Islamic heritage of al-Andalus was a Sunni one, and its political heritage was pro-Umayyad; and although the Umayyad Caliphate had crumbled long before the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, it was the only caliphate that the population of al-Andalus had ever directly known. The phraseme refers negatively to al-Mukhtar, who rebelled against the Umayyads to support the right of the descendants of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib (d. 40/661) to be the caliphs (hence the Shi‘īs’ interpretation of the religious right to rule); and Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s use of the phraseme thus coheres with the political and religious cultural context of al-Andalus.429

The same analysis can be applied to phraseme (15), which alludes to the misery of al-Ḥallāj. Sufism was highly regarded in al-Andalus, especially in the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, who was Sufi himself, so referring to the misery of al-Ḥallāj again positively coheres with the cultural context of the phraseme’s deployment.

428 This should not be confused with the most famous allusive representation of al-Barāmika, *Nakbat al-Barāmika* [the catastrophe of Barāmika] = a disaster that happens after a long period of luxurious living.
429 Al-Ḥallāj lived between western Persia and Iraq, and in his lifetime – or perhaps earlier – al-Andalus was the scene of important events in which significant figures participated. Episodes like the fates of Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād or Mūsā ibn Nuṣair, (who came to the same end as Yahyā ibn Khālid) could have been material for such a phraseme: see `Anān, *Ṭārikh Dawlat al-Islām*, vol. 1, p. 193. The generosity of ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān ad-Dākhil could likewise have been an Andalusi equivalent of phraseme (16), or the misery of al-Qādī Yahyā al-Lakhmī (d. 478/1085) an Andalusi equivalent of phraseme (15). See Abū al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan an-Nubāhī, *Ṭārikh Qudāṭ al-Andalus*, ed. Lajnat ʿĪyāʾ at-Turāth (Beirut: Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadida, 1983), p. 88.
The following phraseme refers to a famous speech given by al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf ath-Thuqafī (d. 95/714) in Iraq:430

17) lá yu’ jamu ‘ūduhū [its stick is not bitten]431 = the perfect thing/person for a given purpose.

Sent to Iraq as a governor (wālī) for the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān (r. 65-86/685-705), al-Ḥajjāj gave a famous speech on arrival, from which this phraseme was extracted. The specific passage was as follows:432

wa-inna amīra l-mu’minīna ‘Abda l-maliki bna Marwāna qad nathara kinānatahū thumma ‘ajama ‘idānah ā fa-wajadanī amarahā ‘ūdan wa-aṣlabahā maksiran fawajjahanī ilaykum

[And the leader of the believers ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwān had emptied his quiver and spread his (quiver’s) arrows, then he bit them but he found me the bitterest and the hardest to break of them all, so he sent me to you]

The phraseme expresses three cultural phenomena: allusion and quotation. The allusion and the quotation are clear in the reference to the story of al-Ḥajjāj in Iraq, which implies a sense of determination on the phraseme’s metaphorical level. However, allusion may not be the main motivator of the phraseme, whose link with al-Ḥajjāj and a specific event cannot be ignored. Quotation, however, is the more obvious phenomenon in the phraseme. Neither the order nor the elements are changed, expect on a limited syntactic level where the verb changes to the passive voice.

The phraseme is a modified quotation, because of its high frequency of occurrence.433

---

430 At-Ṭabarī, Tārīkh al-Umam wa-l-Malik, vol. 6, p. 203.
432 At-Ṭabarī, Tārīkh al-Umam wa-l-Malik, vol. 6, p. 203.
433 For its occurrence in the corpus in islamport.com’s collection of adab works, see http://islamport.com/cgi-bin/w/adb/search.cgi?zoom_query=%DA%CC%E3+%DA%ED%CF%C7%E4%E5%C7+&zoom_per_page=10 &zoom_and=1&zoom_sort=0; accessed on 10 April 2018. For the variety ‘ajama ‘ūd see http://islamport.com/cgi-bin/w/adb/search.cgi?zoom_query=%DA%CC%E3+%DA%E6%CF&zoom_per_page=10&zoom_and=1&zoom_sort=0; accessed on 10 April 2018. In the collection of chronicles, see http://islamport.com/cgi-bin/w/tkh/search.cgi?zoom_query=%DA%CC%E3+%DA%ED%CF%C7%E4%E5%C7+&zoom_per_page=10
The modification is not major: we see it only in the syntax and the morphology of the words. In the phraseme we can discern a conflict between different factors affecting phrasemes’ freedom and fixedness. Factors that tend to result in fully fixed phrasemes are 1) quotation, 2) cranberry lexemes, and 3) non-figurativeness, while free phraseme factors are 1) high occurrence and 2) a cranberry combined with a concept that is culture-specific – in this case, biting an arrow to find out how strong it is.

The core elements of the phraseme, *yuʾjam* and ʿūd, are preserved because of the cranberry phenomena represented in ʿajam [to bite]; and non-figurativeness. But a high rate of occurrence, in combination with a cranberry lexeme featuring a cultural concept that exists only in the target culture, confers a certain degree of flexibility on the phraseme. As a result, the phraseme exhibits neither high flexibility nor full fixedness.

The context of phraseme in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s work is praise, and the grammatical subject of the praise is a person’s piety:

\[ \text{wa-dīnun lā yuʾjamu ʿūdūhū} \]

[and (whose) faith is not bitten] = whose faith is perfect/does not need to be tested

Although the original phraseological meaning for which the phraseme was coined referred to a human being, Ibn al-Khaṭīb developed it to refer to an abstract concept, piety. However, this piety is a quality of a praised person, so the reference here is grammatical only.

5:4 Conclusion

Phrasemes from the [history] source domain mostly reflect the cultural phenomenon of allusion, since all are linked to longer stories in the collective memory of the Arabic-speaking

\[ ^{434}\text{Al-Maqqari, Naḥḥ at-Ṭīb, vol. 6, p. 260.} \]
community. In some cases, for example phrasemes (4) and (13)-(15), the proper name in the annexation that forms the phraseme became a cultural symbol.

Phrasemes (1)-(16) are all of the referential type. Phrasemes from the pre-Islamic historical domain are represented in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works as conventional phrases that function metaphorically. A phraseme that refers to a historical event is emphasised by reference to its tertium comparationis, e.g., phraseme (1). On the other hand, phrasemes from the same source domain that include a proper name as an element are expressed with no emphasis. The reason for this difference is either that the proper name functions as a cultural symbol, or that it is conjoined with the other element of the phraseme in full fixedness as in elativ+min or annexation. Additionally, the inclusion of just one event – expressed via the name of one person and one action – makes recalling the phraseological meaning easier, as compared to the phraseological meanings of series of events, as in phrasemes (1) through (3). Understandably, the phenomenon of allusion is most common in phrasemes motivated by the [history] source domain.
Chapter 6: Nature as a Domain of Cultural Phenomena in the Phraseology of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s Prose Works

Phrasemes related to the source domain [nature] are influenced primarily by the interaction of one’s five senses and nature. As such, they were coined in the early stages of the formation of Arabic phraseology, and thus are deeply embedded in the language, some at the dead-metaphor level.435

The phrasemes in this chapter are all referential. They will be divided into two groups, according to the category of nature to which they refer: 1) the environment, or 2) animals.

6:1 The Environment

All the phrasemes in this section are referential ones and reflect one or more of five cultural phenomena: cultural models, cultural symbols, quotations, cultural artefacts and allusions. Cultural models are the dominating phenomenon in this group, and especially so among phrasemes that refer directly to a natural object or substance rather than to an action or event related to it. The cultural models that are embedded within the conceptual system of Arabic are clearly presented in phrasemes that are linked to nature in general, and to the atmosphere in particular. This can be attributed to the ways in which the development of classical Arabic language and the coining of its phraseological system were influenced by the connection between people and their environment, and especially the harsh surroundings of the Arabian desert.

6:1:1 Sky

Unsurprisingly, the sky is a profoundly cross-cultural concept that is found in the phraseological system of every language. Each culture has its own interpretation of the sky that

435 A dead metaphor is a well-established metaphor that is treated as having a literal meaning.
is incorporated into its language, especially on the metaphorical – and hence the phraseological – level.

In this context, the sky as a source domain includes stars, planets, thunder, clouds, and even what comes from the sky, e.g., the rain. Consider the following two idioms:

18) saḥābu ʂ-ṣayfī [the summer clouds]\(^{436}\) = an event that is not long-lasting.

19) saḥā ɪbu l-jūdi [clouds of generosity]\(^{437}\) = extreme generosity.

In a desert environment like Arabia’s, [clouds] are a sign of rain and fertility.\(^{438}\) This concept motivates the images in phrasemes (18) and (19). The first is motivated by the sighting of a summer cloud that does not last for long and has no results, i.e., no rain. Such a cloud might have a positive effect, in the form of shade; and the source domain [cloud] indicates positivity. Nevertheless, the phraseme is used in the context of a negative event that is brief and has only minor consequences, much as in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s Rayḥānat al-Kuttāb: fawālat riyāḥu l-ghaflatī wa-saḥābu ʂ-ṣayfī [and the wind of negligence blew and summer clouds (came)].\(^{439}\) The cultural phenomenon in phraseme (18) is a cultural model: the description of a cloud in summertime in Arabia.

Phraseme (19) is motivated by the concept of clouds as carriers of rain; again, given the equation between rain and fertility, cloud is a positive sign of goodness. Although the other element of the phraseme is generosity, which hints at its metaphorical meaning, saḥā’ib [clouds] indicates the meaning of an amount of cloud on its lexical level. Thus, the collocation became a phraseme; and again, its cultural phenomenon is a cultural model.

In both these phrasemes, the collocation remains fixed in all elements, albeit with a

---


\(^{437}\) Al-Maqqārī, Nahf at-Ṭīb, vol. 6, p. 384.

\(^{438}\) A detailed survey of some of the concepts in classical Arabic that are motivated by the source domain [cloud] can be found in Ali Ahmad Hussein, *The Lightning-scene in Ancient Arabic Poetry: Function, Narration and Idiosyncrasy in Pre-Islamic and Early Islamic Poetry* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009); and Kathrin Müller, *Der Beduine und die Regenwolke* (Munich: Bayrische Akademie Der Wissenschaften, 1994).

much higher level of fixedness in the second element. This can be attributed to the phrasemes’ grammatical form, *idāfa* [annexation]. The first element, *sahāb/sahāʾib*, retains the plural form, and is never replaced by any synonym like *ghuyūm*.

As mentioned above, context does not provide any exceptions with such source domains. If [cloud] is a symbol of fertility and goodness because it is the cause of rain, rain itself is represented in the conceptual metaphor AMENITY IS RAIN, which occurs frequently in Arabic, either indirectly as in the previous two phrasemes, or directly: for instance, in *saqa llāhu ardān qad ghadat laka manzilan* [may God irrigate the land which became your home],[^440] and *jādaka l-ghaythu* [the rain reached you (generously)],[^441] both of which express well-wishing on their metaphorical levels.

Another image motivated by the source domains [sky] and [clouds], as well as by the conceptual metaphor AMENITY IS RAIN, is the image of lightning.[^442]

20) *burūqu l-ʿamāli l-khullabi* [lightning of hope without a downpour][^443] = disappointment.

This phraseme is formed by binding together two others: *burūqu l-ʿamāli* [a glimpse of hope] and *burūqun khullabun* [lightning without a downpour]. The semantic field of *khullab* relates to the concept of catching.[^444] The root includes words like *mikhlab* [a claw], which express the semantic field, and *khullab* in this context can be translated as ‘captivating’.[^445] The source image is of lightning captivating one’s eyes because of one’s hope for rain, which nevertheless

[^441]: Ibid., vol. 7, p. 82.
[^442]: For more phrasemes motivated by AMENITY IS RAIN/WATER, see Ibn Jaʿfar, *Jawawir al-Alfāẓ*, pp. 94-96 and 102.
[^445]: Lane, *Arabic English Lexicon* (electronic resource): [http://ejtaal.net/aa/?hw4=306,ls=5,la=1220,sg=354,ha=191,br=300,pr=171,mgf=273,vi=135,kz=619,br=206,mm=357,umr=465,umr=332,ums=266,umj=218,ulq=662,ugq=121,ugq=93,bdw=h277,amr=h204,as b=h259,aub=h515,dliq=h161,mht=h251,msb=h75,da=h45,amr=h211,ens=h148,msb=h1696,accessed on 11 April 2018.](http://ejtaal.net/aa/?hw4=306,ls=5,la=1220,sg=354,ha=191,br=300,pr=171,mgf=273,vi=135,kz=619,br=206,mm=357,umr=465,umr=332,ums=266,umj=218,ulq=662,ugq=121,ugq=93,bdw=h277,amr=h204,as b=h259,aub=h515,dliq=h161,mht=h251,msb=h75,da=h45,amr=h211,ens=h148,msb=h1696,accessed on 11 April 2018.)
does not fall. The phraseological meaning reflects a specific cultural model linking the concept of non-raining clouds in a harsh environment like the Arabian desert with disappointment.

6:1:2 Mountains

Clarity or obviousness is an important positive concept in the Arabic conceptual system, reflected in many linguistic features. One example is *fuṣḥā* [the clearest], which is used to describe high eloquent Arabic; hence *faṣīḥ* [clear] means eloquent. When the Qurʾān asserts its Arabness, it emphasises its clarity: with the verse *bi-lisānin ‘arabiyyin mubīnin* [in a clear Arabic tongue]. CLEAR IS GOOD is the conceptual metaphor that motivates such phrases, but so does the source domain [mountain], the signifier of a person who is well-known in a positive sense. This concept is abstracted from the physical experience of travellers in the desert of Arabia, where mountains function as landmarks by which route maps are drawn. The following two phrasemes are derived from this concept:

21) *‘alamu l-mafāżati* [the mountain of the desert] = a well-known person with an excellent reputation.

22) *‘alamun min a’lāmi (hādha l-fanni)* [a mountain of the mountains of (this discipline)] = a well-known person in a particular field of endeavour.

Phrasemes (21) and (22) are fully fixed idioms, even though the cultural phenomenon they reflect is a culture-specific artefact rather than quotations. The lexical nature and semantic nature of the phraseme (21)’s elements explain its fixedness. Both of the phraseme’s elements are metaphorical signifiers. The root of the first element *‘alam* is *‘-l-m*, indicating the meaning of a sign or a distinguisher. According to Arabic dictionaries, *‘alam* refers to any item used

---

446 Ibn Fāris, *Maqāyīṣ al-Lugha* (electronic resource): [http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%81%D8%B5%D8%AD%23](http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%81%D8%B5%D8%AD%23), accessed on 11 April 2018.

447 Qurʾān (*ash-Shuʿ arā*), 26:195.


to mark a position, e.g., a flag or mountain. The second element, *mafāza*, is derived from the root *f*-w-z, the collective meaning of which is ‘to win’ or ‘to gain something positive’. It is common in Arabic to ascribe negative aspects to names that normally indicate positivity; in the case of *mafāza*, for example, the root and morphological pattern express the meaning [a place in which one wins or is fortunate], but it is often used to mean a deadly desert. The phraseme’s two elements work together to produce the target meaning of the phraseme by indicating the metaphorical meaning of each element. Thus, it functions in full-fixedness.

The images of phrasemes (21) and (22) are motivated by the same concept. In the latter case, the word *ʿalam* means a clear sign that guides one to a destination. Although there is no mention of the desert, the phraseme is formed in a common Arabic praising style. Specifically, the phrase *ʿalamun min ʿalamāi* is in the form [x>x’], and the occurrence of the word *ʿalam* in that form implies both that the phrase has a high level of fixedness, and that it is used metaphorically as praise. Though [mountain] as a target domain is an intercultural concept, and thus potentially confusing here, the twofold importance of [mountain] in the conceptual system of Arabic is its function as a landmark and its reference to the conceptual metaphor CLEAR IS GOOD.

However, the target domain [mountain] in the following phraseme is derived from a different characteristic: heaviness.

23) *jabalu ṣ-ṣabrī* [the mountains of patience] = the agony of waiting for a solution.

This idiom phraseme is motivated by the conceptual metaphor DISCOMFORT IS A HEAVY MATERIAL, which is reflected in many phrases including *nazalat muṣibatun* [a catastrophe.
fell\(^{455}\) = to face a catastrophe; \textit{baliyyatun ghalīẓatun} [thick problem]\(^{456}\) = great problem; \textit{shakhsun thaqīlan} [heavy person]\(^{457}\) = unwanted person; and \textit{athqala l-amru} [the issue (has been) heavy]\(^{458}\) = to face a difficult problem. Patience, in the sense of waiting for a problem to be solved, is a source of discomfort, discomfort is heavy, and mountains are a symbol of heaviness. Hence, [mountains of patience] is the suffering of being patient. Thus, the phraseme has a negative connotation, even though patience itself is a highly prized virtue in both pre-Islamic and Muslim-Arab culture.\(^{459}\) Patience, in this sense, gains its value because of the nobility of suffering in which it results.

The source domain [mountain] in phraseme (23) is motivated by the conceptual metaphor \textsc{discomfort is a heavy material}, which is established by the physical experience of heaviness rather than the figure of mountains.\(^{460}\) The image in this phraseme nevertheless indicates the phenomenon of the culture-specific artefact.

Like all environment-related source domains, [mountain] is deeply embedded in the language. So, regardless of whether a phraseme’s user (Ibn al-Khaṭīb, in this context) is familiar with the source domain or not, it continues to be used according to the original context in which it was formed.

6:1:3 Landscape

A spacious area is connected with freedom in the conceptual linguistic system of classical Arabic. As mentioned earlier,\(^{461}\) the conceptual metaphor \textsc{wide is comfortable} is generated by an image of an open horizon, implying the ability to move and make choices,
in other words: freedom. The concept of [wideness] as a representation of freedom can also be explained via the physical experience of breathing, as in expressions like the Qurʾān’s ‘wa-laqad naʾlamu annaka yadaqgu ṣadruka bimā yaqūlūna’ [and We know your breast is contracted because of what they say];\textsuperscript{462}`qāla rabbī shraḥ lī ṣadrī’ [(he) said: O God, expand my breast];\textsuperscript{463} and ‘wa-yadaqgu ṣadrī wa-lā yanṭiqu lisānī’ [and my breast becomes contracted, and my tongue does not speak].\textsuperscript{464} All such examples are motivated by NARROW IS DISTRESS, which also applies to being in a spacious land and therefore comfortable (or vice versa). Consider the following phrasemes:

24) ḍāqat lahu l-ʾarḍu bimā rahubat [the spacious world became narrow to him]\textsuperscript{465} = to be in agony.

25) ḍāqat ʿalayhi l-masāliku [the roads became narrow to him]\textsuperscript{466} = to be in agony.

Both phrasemes are idioms motivated by the conceptual metaphor NARROW IS DISTRESS which is motivated by a physical experience. But we can also note a cultural model reflected in phraseme (24), and more explicit in phraseme (25). Having the ability to freely move from one place to another is an important characteristic of nomadic cultures like that of the tribal Arabs, and this right of movement is conceived of as freedom of choice. Hence, when one is in agony, s/he has limited space. Interestingly, phraseme (24) shows a high level of fixedness. The other elements of the phraseme develop the image and add another layer of agony. The person in that image has a limited access to the land, which though naturally wide and spacious, a characteristic that can be described as raḥība [wide], has become narrow despite ‘all the wideness it contains’.

The analysis of phraseme (25) is similar to that of phraseme (24). Agony in the phraseme

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{462} Qurʾān (al-Ḥijr) 15:97.
\item \textsuperscript{463} Ibid., (Ṭībā) 20:25.
\item \textsuperscript{464} Ibid., (ash-Shuʿ arāʾ) 26:13.
\item \textsuperscript{465} Al-Maqqarī, Najḥ at-Ṭib, vol. 5, p. 462.
\item \textsuperscript{466} Ibid., vol. 5, p. 20.
\end{itemize}
is represented as having limited and narrow ways. Land is life, and when ways of life are limited and narrow, the situation is unpleasant. Wide land provides more choices of roads/ways to take, to suit the freedom linked with a nomadic lifestyle by tribal Arabs.

6:1:4 Shade

Due to Arabia’s harsh desert environment, shade is conceptualised within the Arabic semantic field [safe]. Additionally, the physical experience of shade being strictly limited in size and location motivates its image as a container. These two images are blended in the following idioms:

26) *tafayya'a ziyyahū* [to (be) shaded by (his) shadow]⁴⁶⁷ = to become obedient to someone.

27) *ziyyatī hūsūnī* [the shade of his sovereignty]⁴⁶⁸ = to be loyal to a sovereign.

Both phrasemes express a positive meaning of the concept [shade], alongside the shade-as-container idea noted above. Such phrasemes are only used in the context of indirect praise: the target person is compared to the shade in a desert, which provides relief from the heat of the sun, just as the person to whom one shows loyalty (e.g., the sovereign) provides various forms of protection in return. Cultural models – i.e., the importance of shade and the act of seeking it – are therefore the cultural phenomena that phrasemes (26) and (27) reflect.

The elements of phraseme (26) are all drawn from the same semantic field [shade], and this applies a high level of fixedness to the phraseme. It also renders it understandable on its surface semantic level, but context is still needed to decode it on a metaphorical level. Phraseme (27), on the other hand, includes another element: sovereignty, that works as a key to the target meaning, side by side with the conceptual image of (shade) in Arabic. Although it shortens the distance from the source domain to the target domain, this key element also applies full

fixedness to the phraseme. This phenomenon results from the retention of the metaphorical meaning of a phraseme that also has a literal meaning.

6:1:5 Air and the Atmosphere

The semantic field marked by the Arabic word jaww refers to the broad concepts of atmosphere, temperature, weather and climate. For this source domain, the corpus provides the following three phrasemes:

28) khala l-jawwu [the weather has become clear]\textsuperscript{469} = to have the best opportunity to do something.

29) najdiyyatu n-nafahāti [Najdi breezes like]\textsuperscript{470} = a pleasant atmosphere.

30) araqqu min nasīmi l-ashārī [more tender than the dawn breeze]\textsuperscript{471} = very tender.

Each refers to this source domain from a different angle. Phraseme (28) is an idiom that contains the word jaww in the meaning of weather, and clear weather in Arabic mostly means an absence of dust storms.\textsuperscript{472} In other words, in the deserts of Arabia, clear weather is an important condition for the routine practices of life without disturbances. This implies that the cultural phenomenon expressed in phraseme (28) is a cultural model.

Phraseme (29) is another idiom that contains an indirect reference to the [jaww] semantic field. Nafahāt in Arabic could mean breezes or pleasant smells, making the word pertinent to this source domain. In contrast to the previous phraseme, however, the cultural phenomenon in this one is quotation. All sources, including the earliest, attribute the following verse to a Bedouin poet:

\begin{quote}
tamatta’ min shamīmi ʿarārī Najdin
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{469} Ibid., vol. 1, p. 441.
\textsuperscript{470} Ibid., vol. 2, p. 253.
\textsuperscript{471} Ibid., vol. 3, p. 346.
\textsuperscript{472} An understanding supported by another phrasemes in Ibn Jaʿfar, Jawāhir al-Alfāz, p. 187; and al-Hamadhānī, al-Alfāz, p. 89.
fa-mā ba’da l-’ašiyyati min ‘arārī
alā yā ḥabbadhā nafāḥātu Najdin
wa-rayyā rawḍihī ba’da l-qitārī
[Enjoy from the scent of the ‘arār of Najd/
For after this evening, no ‘arār will be found
O! How lovely are the breezes of Najd/
And how pleasant is the scent of its fields after rain]. 473

The third phraseme of this group takes the elative (more…than…) form, *af’al at-taftīl*, which is common in Arabic phraseology. 474 The phraseme’s image is motivated by the physical experience of a breeze immediately before daybreak. In the desert, at this time of day, the breeze becomes pleasantly colder in summer and warmer in winter. In Arabic, such a breeze is conceptualised as physically smooth/tender, in contrast to the roughness and harshness of a dust storm. The phraseme thus illustrates a clear cultural-model phenomenon and, for the link with the poetic lines earlier discussed, quotation.

The level of fixedness in all three of these phrasemes is high. However, we can note some flexibility in the order of the first two. In our corpus, phraseme (28) occurs in its original order, but elsewhere it sometimes occurs in a different order, e.g., *jawwun sāfin*. 475 Phraseme (29), although a quotation, also occurs in an alternative order in works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb. This phenomenon is explained by these phrasemes’ high frequency of occurrence and their early, deeply embedded phraseological meanings, which led to their conventionalisation and tendency to become dead metaphors. The grammatical form of phraseme (30), however, implies the superiority of the target domain over the source domain; and to fulfil its

metaphorical function (which requires that the target, the compared concept, and the superiority be illustrated solely in this form), the phraseme retains the fixedness of its elements. It reflects a cultural model of conceptualising the dawn breeze as smooth and pleasant material. Therefore, the phraseme was coined as a comparison between what the speaker considers as physically very tender and dawn breeze. The phraseme, thus, is formed in an elative simile form.

6:1:6 Water

Water is an essential part of the conceptual system of classical Arabic, as indeed of every other human community’s conceptual system. It does, however, have a specific cultural representation that illustrates its importance in the desert environment of Arabia. Ibn al-Khaṭīb provides eight phrasemes from the source domain [water], which can be classified into four groups according to domain characteristics and the conceptual metaphor in which water functions as the source domain. Consider the first of these four groups:

31) *yataʿalla*lu *mina l-ʿāmāli* [(he) holds his thirst with (small sips of) hopes]⁴⁷⁷ = to be treated with hope.

32) *la yukaddaru lakum shirbun* [his drink is not turbid]⁴⁷⁸ = not to be disturbed.

In phraseme (31), hope is represented by water, which keeps a person alive even in the absence of food. Water, in this context, is a tool for prolonging one’s life until food can be obtained: a role also played by hope. As an important source of life, the fresher water is, the better it is; and this notion is related to in phraseme (32). When one has a source of clean, fresh water, there is no need to filter it or feel disgusted when drinking. Such water is therefore

---

⁴⁷⁶ Al-Andalus, where Ibn al-Khaṭīb lived, was a less harsh environment, and hence the [water] source domain in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works was influenced by the conceptual system of the language rather than by the Andalusi environmental context.


⁴⁷⁸ Ibid., vol. 6, p. 425.
conceptualised as a highly pleasant experience, or the greatest privilege, and fully enjoying this experience is among the highest privileges in classical Arabic conceptual system. Hence, both phrasemes reflect a cultural model of water.

The following phrasemes are motivated by the source domain [water] as a symbol of value:

33) māʾu sh-shabībatī [water of youth]\(^\text{479}\) = the power of youth.

34) māʾu l-ḥayāʾi [water of shyness]\(^\text{480}\) = the value of shyness.

Both phrasemes reflect the cultural symbol WATER. In both of them, it functions as a substitute for the value of life, youth and freshness. In phraseme (33), WATER indicates the beauty and value of youth, in part as a sign of health.

As mentioned earlier, shyness — especially on the part of females — is a key value in both Muslim-Arab and pre-Islamic Arab culture.\(^\text{481}\) In phraseme (34), water is once more a representation of the value placed on shyness associated with beauty. Thus, māʾ in phrasemes (33) and (34) functions as a signifier of the value of youth and and beauty, respectively. Such a symbol can be found in many phrasemes, including māʾu l-wajhi [water of face] = dignity, māʾu s-sayfi [water of sword] = the solidness of a sword, and māʾu an-naʾīmi [water of grace] = the best of grace.\(^\text{482}\)

The following group of phrasemes, in contrast, is motivated by water’s surfaces and depth rather than by its qualities as a drink.

35) khāʾidun fī ghimārī... [wading into the depth (of water) of...]\(^\text{483}\) = to determinedly enter, become involved in, or participate in something.

36) asbara ghawran [(he) fathomed the bottom of]\(^\text{484}\) = to know something very well.

---


\(^{481}\) For instance, in the aforementioned story in Qurʾān (al-Qaṣaṣ) 28:25.

\(^{482}\) Ath-Thaʿālibī, *Thimār al-Qulūb*, p. 563.


\(^{484}\) Ibid., p. 171.
Unlike the desert and mountains, the surface of water cannot be regarded as a characteristic component of the Arabian environment. In Arabic, the sea is typically presented as a locus of fear, mystery and greatness, and phrasemes (35) and (36) are both motivated by this conceptual image. The first illustrates determination to rise to a challenge, represented by ghimār, which indicates water that is both deep and difficult to enter. It is only applied to seas and oceans, and never to lakes, rivers, or other smaller bodies of water. Similarly, the image in phraseme (36) is coined by the conceptual image of [sea] within the main source domain [water]. As such, both these phrasemes reflect the cultural phenomenon of cultural model. Both are fully fixed, both on the lexicological level and in their order; and this fixedness is explained by the semantic field [water], to which the elements of the phrasemes belong.

Lastly, both members of our final group of phrasemes within the source domain [water] are motivated by a metonymy:

37) ʿadḥbu l-alfāzi [sweet/fresh words] = eloquent.
38) ghazīrū l-ḥifzi [abundant memorising] = one who remembers large amounts of information.

Words in Arabic are presented as having material form, or more specifically, as a liquid (or water in particular). The word ʿadḥb [sweet/fresh] is itself mainly associated with water, as shown in classical Arabic dictionaries like Lisān al-ʿArab, Maqāyīs al-Lugha and Asās al-Balāgha, or in a wider scope, with liquid. If we accept that the word ʿadḥb is mainly related

---

485 Ibid., vol. 7, p. 29.
487 The English phraseme ‘sweet water’ represents a similar case. In English, ‘sweet’ literally refers to a pleasant taste which is one of the main four tastes, i.e., not bitter, sour or salty. Thus, ‘sweet’ on its surface semantic level does not directly refer to clear water. However, the phraseme [sweet water] acquired the metaphorical meaning of non-salty water or clear water as an metonym of sweet taste: pleasant. See Oxford Dictionaries (electronic resource): https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/sweet, accessed on 13 April 2018.
488 Although the word adḥb is mainly connected with water, it is also correlated with other semantic fields, e.g., kullu mustasāghīn [every digested thing], as in Ibn Manzūr, Lisān al-ʿArab, (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%B9%D8%B0%D8%A8, accessed on 13 April 2018. However, the verb forms III and X of the verb adhāba are always linked with water in Ibn Manzūr, Lisān al-ʿArab, (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%B9%D8%B0%D8%A8, accessed on 13 April 2018.; Ibn Fāris, Maqāyīs al-Lugha, (electronic resource):
to water, we can analyse the phraseme as reflecting a metonymy of water by grafting its key characteristic onto the present target domain, i.e., words in the phraseme.

We can explain the link between words and water in Arabic on several levels. The physical experience of producing words with one’s mouth is a possible reverse explanation of the connection between taste and words. Thus, connecting the adjective ‘adhb [sweet (water)] to alfāz [words] indicates the clearest and most acceptable type of words. Additionally, Arabic conceptualises that CLEAR IS GOOD, and this conceptual metaphor gives rise to another: ELOQUENCE IS CLARITY. Hence, eloquent, highly standard Arabic is called fuṣḥā. These two conceptual metaphors jointly motivate the image in phraseme (37):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{‘adhb} & \text{ [fresh/digested/fresh] + associated with [water]= clear water.} \\
\text{and} \\
\text{CLEAR IS GOOD}^{489} & \text{ and ELOQUENCE IS CLARITY (as in the meaning of the root} \text{f-š-h} \\
& \text{from which } \text{fuṣḥā} \text{ is derived and b-y-n from which} \text{bayān} \text{ [clearance]}^{490} = \text{eloquence).}^{491} \\
& = \\
\text{‘adbu l-alfāz} & \text{ [ sweet/fresh words ]= eloquent.}
\end{align*}
\]

Words are of course carriers of information, but this basic function is perhaps even more marked in a culture that places a high value on oral tradition. In classical Arabic, information is conceptualised as words, and also – as per the previous analysis of phraseme (37) – as water. The image in phraseme (38) is motivated by this secondary conceptual metaphor, as in the

---

489 See the above analysis of phrasemes (21) and (22).
491 Lane, Arabic, (electronic resource): http://ejtaal.net/aa/#ll=323,hw4=115,la=392,ls=5/ag=172,ha=70,br=145,pr=28,aan=86,mgf=125,vi=86,kz=191,mr=94,rm=122,ucw=191,umr=130,ums=109,umj=88,ulq=419,uqa=62,auq=39,bdw=h132,amr=h84,msb=h33,ah=h239,dhq=h69,mb=h67,msb=h33,da=h33,amj=h76,ens=h148,mis=h1017, accessed on 13 April 2018.
following formula:

\[
\text{words are carriers of information} \, + \, \text{words are water} = \text{information is water}
\]

The primary meaning of the root \( gh-z-r \) is profusion, but it is especially linked to liquid in general and to water in particular.\(^{492} \) So we can say the source domain [water] is represented in the phraseme as a metonymy of water (profusion of water/liquid) coined with memorising: another metonymy of knowledge, since memorising is the tool of building knowledge.

Both these phrasemes reflect the phenomenon of cultural modelling. Their images cannot be decoded without previous knowledge of both the value of water, specifically in a dry desert environment, and the role of words/information in the Arabic conceptual system. Phrasemes (37) through (38) are all highly fixed due to the connection of their elements with the semantic field of the source domain [water], which functions has a cultural symbolic influence.

6:2 Animals

Animals have played important roles in every community; these roles are reflected in language, and hence in phraseology. Arabic phraseology, as expressed in the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, contains a number of phrasemes whose source domain is [animals].

The [animals] source domain can motivate phrasemes’ idiomatic levels in two ways. First, the motivation can be the animal itself or its characteristics. A good example of this is the phraseme \( nashaba zufruhū \) [(his) nail has stuck (into something)].\(^{493} \) The second motivation consists of cultural activities or rituals linked to an animal, as in the phraseme \( ḥādīhi amaluhū \)

---

\(^{492} \) The same argument presented earlier regarding the meaning of \( 'adhb \) is valid in the analysis of \( ghazura \) and its link to water. \( Ghazura \) in Lisān al-ʿArab is mainly linked with water, or specifically, rain-lakes: \( 'Arduhn maghāṣaratu in 'aṣābahī maṭarrun ghazīran' [maghāṣira land is a land that is affected by heavy rain], 'b ran ghazīratun kathīratu l-mā'i wa-kadhalika 'aynu l-mā'i wa-d-dam i' [a ghazīra well (is a well with) much water, and also (applies to) a spring of water and tears]. Ibn Manẓūr, Lisān al-ʿArab, (electronic resource): [http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%BA%D8%B2%D8%B1\), accessed on 13 April 2018. See also az-Zamakhshari, Asās al-Balāgha, vol. 1, p. 701.

\(^{493} \) Al-Maqṣūrī, Naḥḥ at-Tīb, vol. 5, p. 181.
[his hope was his instigator (by singing)].\textsuperscript{494} \textit{Hidā}' [to urge by singing] was originally an action targeted only at camels, but the phraseme indicates the idea of being motivated by hope, as if the motivated person is a camel. In other words, the motivation is an action linked indirectly rather than directly to the animal.

There are three sub-categories of animal phrasemes in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works, related to 1) birds, 2) riding animals, in particular camels and horses, and 3) lions and other dangerous beasts.

6:2:1 Birds

The source domain [birds] reflects several cultural phenomena: cultural symbolism, quotation, and fictive worlds. Moreover, some bird phrasemes’ variations reflect more than one cultural phenomenon. The following phraseme is the only one in this source domain that reflects the cultural phenomenon of quotation.

39) \textit{wa-stansara l-bughāthu} [small birds (act like) eagles]\textsuperscript{495} = the weak show their power only when they are with us.

Originally, the phraseme is taken from a verse by an unknown poet:\textsuperscript{496}

\textit{inna l-bughātha bi-arḍīnā yastansiru} [in our land, small birds (act like) eagles].\textsuperscript{497}

This phraseme compares two kinds of birds: the \textit{bughāth}, weak birds, and powerful birds as represented by eagles. Although being a quotation usually tends to apply a high level of fixedness to the formation of a phraseme, Ibn al-Khaṭīb used a reformed version of this one: \textit{wa-stansara l-bughāthu}.\textsuperscript{498} More specifically, he retained the morphological pattern of the

\textsuperscript{494} Ibid., vol. 6, p. 301.
\textsuperscript{497} The pronunciation of the word \textit{bughāth} is found as \textit{bighāth} in some sources: see al-Bakrī, \textit{Faṣl al-Maqāl}, p. 116. The phraseme can also be found in al-Maydāni, \textit{Majmā‘ u al-Athnā‘}, vol. 1, p. 26; and \textit{al-Yūsufī, Zahr al-Akam}, vol. 1, p. 97; and ath-Tha’ilibī, \textit{at-Tamthīl wa-l-Muhādara}, p. 219.
word yastansir, but utilised the past tense to link the verb with a series of past events: wa-
naṭaqa l-ʿayyyu wa-shaʿara l-bakiyyu wa-stansara l-bughāthu wa-tathaʾ bana l-ḥuffāthu [and
the stammerer spoke, the weeper (composed) poetry, small birds (acted like) eagles, and the
python (became a great) snake]. The relative flexibility of Arabic syntax also allowed Ibn
al-Khaṭīb to change the original subject-verb order into verb-subject order, to maintain the
rhyme of bughāth with ḥuffāth. Yet, bughāth is a cranberry lexeme that became highly fixed to
this phraseme. Finally, he deleted bi-arḍīnā. In spite of the phraseme having been altered in
these aspects, it preserved the main elements that reflected its metaphorical meaning: yastansir
as a verb derived from the root n-s-r, and bughāth in its plural form and not replaced by a
synonym. The author could have removed bi-arḍīnā because it did not contribute to the original
verse’s metaphorical meaning.

The following three phrasemes reflect two cultural phenomena that are linked to pre-
Islamic Arab culture: fictive worlds, and cultural symbols.

40) at-tāʾ iru l-maymūnu [the blessed bird]500 = good luck.
41) ghurābu sh-shuʾmi [misfortune’s crow]501 = evil omen.
42) ghurābu d-dimani [ruin’s crow]502 = evil omen.

These phrasemes are idioms motivated by cultural actions towards certain types of birds,
actions that in turn reflect the pre-Islamic beliefs of Arabia. Phraseme (40)’s two words each
carry their own metaphorical meaning that applies an additional metaphorical meaning to the
phraseme. In other words, the phraseme comprises two layers of meaning: the first on the
lexical level, and the second on the phraseological level. Moreover, its elements are derived
from roots that do not reflect their direct lexical meanings, because of their etymological

499 Ibid.
202.
development. The first element, тāʿ ir, is derived from the Arabic root т-т-т, which is primarily linked to flying and birds. However, this word subsequently gained an additional meaning, luck,

via pre-Islamic ʿiyāfa zoomancy: when seeking an augury, one needs to observe the direction of flight of the first bird you scare away. If it flies to the right, it is a good omen, and to the left, a bad one.

Тāʿ ir therefore became a signifier of whether to be optimistic or pessimistic because of something or someone, i.e., taṭayyara bi- [he took (it) as a bad omen].

The root of the second element, maymūn, is ʿ-ʿ-ʿ, which is linked to the orientation concept, right – a further reference to the pre-Islamic belief that, if a frightened bird flies to the right, it is a good omen. If we track this meaning, we can find many examples of the conceptual metaphor RIGHT IS GOOD: for instance, yumīn, which is derived from the same root ʿ-ʿ-ʿ, and took on the meaning of blessing. In other words, the separate metaphorical meanings of the two words are united again in phraseme (40), to introduce a unified metaphorical meaning: a good omen. As such, the cultural phenomena of this phraseme, on the phraseological semantic level, is a fictive world. However, the same phraseme’s cultural phenomenon can also be construed as cultural symbolism, insofar as the words function as symbols (maymūn).

In Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works, phraseme (40) occurs in three variants, all of which retain the elements of the two elements, while one adds the verb zajār [to drive the birds away].

---

505 When the preposition bi is added to the object of the verb taṭayyara, it implies one meaning: evil omen. See Ibn Manzūr, Lisān al-ʿArab (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%AA%D8%B7%D9%8A%D8%B1, accessed on 15 April 2018. Also, wa-kullu insānīn al zamānāhu tāʿ irāḥ [and every man we have obliged him with his fate/luck] occurs in Qurʾān (al-Ḥisārāʾ) 17:13.
506 Ibn Fāris, Maqāyīs al-Lugha (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%85%D9%8A%D9%85%D9%8A%D9%86, accessed on 15 April 2018.
is the verb used to describe the ritual; accordingly, it cannot be considered an emphasis, because other varieties of the phraseme occur without it.\textsuperscript{510}

Phrasemes (41) and (42) both refer to a pre-Islamic cultural concept related to a specific bird: the crow, a cultural symbol of an evil omen.\textsuperscript{511} Arabs even gave the crow the title ‘\textit{abu sh-shu ‘m}’ [the father of pessimism].\textsuperscript{512} Phraseme (41) includes the crow as cultural symbol, with no additions or references to any other cultural concepts, whereas phraseme (42) contains one additional, material cultural phenomenon, \textit{diman} [ruins]. Adding the crow as a cultural symbol of ill omen to the ruins of a place indicates that negative events forced the occupiers of that land to leave – referencing a pre-Islamic Arab belief that the crow brings bad news, so if you find it in ruins, especially of the house of your beloved, it means he/she was forced to depart under evil circumstances.\textsuperscript{513}

6:2:2 Riding animals

Although camels and horses retained a high cultural and monetary value at the time our corpus was created, the phrasemes of this source domain were coined in an early stage of classical Arabic phraseology’s evolution. Though it is perfectly reasonable to claim that the camel and the horse are the most important animals, especially in nomadic culture,\textsuperscript{514} it would be much more difficult to establish which of the two is the more important. The lexicon of their semantic field contains mutual lexemes because they are both used as riding animals, \textit{maṭiyya}; and for that reason, phrasemes from the separate source domains of [camels] and [horses] are combined in this section. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that many more words from the

\textsuperscript{510} The verb \textit{zajara} originally meant ‘to deter’, but an additional meaning has since been established for it in the context of \textit{tatayara}: ‘to drive out a bird in order to seek augury’. See Ibn Manẓūr, \textit{Lisān al-ʿarab} (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%AA%D8%B7%D9%8A%D8%B1, accessed on 15 April 2018.


\textsuperscript{514} Camels and horses are indeed also important in settled Arab culture in terms of their value. But their even greater value for nomadic people is reflected in the phraseological and cognitive system of the Arabic language.
semantic field [camels] have been adopted as a metonymy to describe people.\textsuperscript{515} For instance, ‘awd originally meant an old camel, but evolved to mean an old or prestigious man;\textsuperscript{516} and jadha’, a young camel, was adopted to indicate a young man.\textsuperscript{517} From such examples, consider:

43) salisu l-qiyādi [smooth controlling]\textsuperscript{518} = easygoing.

44) kabaḥa ‘inānahū [(he) reined it in]\textsuperscript{519} = to curb an impetuous person.

45) muṭliqu l-a’innati [giving free rein]\textsuperscript{520} = to give vent.

Phrasemes (43), (44) and (45) are idioms derived from the source domain [riding animal] with no specific connection to either camels or horses. They have been coined from four lexemes: salis [smooth], qiyād [controlling], kabaḥ [to rein in], and muṭliq [freedom (giver)]. In another context, Ibn al-Khaṭīb used the phraseme in two formulae, i.e., phraseme (43) and talqu l-a’innati [the free rein].\textsuperscript{521} Apart from salis, these lexemes are related to the semantic field [guiding or controlling] and are found in the semantic field [animals] as parts of actions performed when [dealing with an animal]. However, in the context of phrasemes (43)-(45), the target domain of those words has been fixed as [dealing with a human being].

The cultural phenomenon in these phrasemes is cultural modelling, whereby the reader or hearer decodes the riding-animal-related concept in the phraseme and links it to his/her cultural knowledge of the meaning of that cultural model. The cultural phenomenon in the phrasemes is not a cultural symbol because ‘camel’ is not explicitly mentioned, a crucial criterion of a symbol that would have to be fulfilled.

No exceptional observations arise from the context of these phrasemes or their varieties.

\textsuperscript{515} I will discuss this concept only briefly, but acknowledge that the conceptual metaphor MAN IS A CAMEL is worthy of a more detailed stand-alone study.

\textsuperscript{516} Ibn Manẓūr, Lisān al-ʿArab (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D9%88%D8%AF, accessed on 16 April 2018.

\textsuperscript{517} Ibid: (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%AC%D8%B0%D8%B9, accessed on 16 April 2018.

\textsuperscript{518} Al-Maqqārī, Naṭḥ at-Ṭib, vol. 3, p. 130; Ibn Jaʿfar, Jawahir al-Alfāz, p. 294; al-Hamadhānī, al-Alfāz, p. 239.

\textsuperscript{519} Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Rayḥān al-Kuttāb, vol. 1, p. 17.


\textsuperscript{521} Al-Maqqārī, Naṭḥ at-Ṭib, vol. 1, p. 523.
Such early-coined referential phrasemes can be expected to attain a high level of fixedness, and the varieties of forms taken by these particular ones are limited to changes in the pronoun suffixes.

The following three phrasemes are idioms motivated by the same [riding animal] source domain, but with a specific reference to camels:

46) *taʾkhudu bi-khiṭāmihā* [(you) grab its noseband]*522* = to guide someone or to master something.

47) *māliku zimāmī* [the owner of my reins]*523* = to have superiority over me.

48) *alqat ilayhi (ṣ-ṣināʿatu) zimāmahā* [(skill) has dropped its reins to him]*524* = to become well skilled.

The semantic field of the elements in phrasemes (46), (47) and (48) is specifically connected to camels by words like *khiṭām* and *zimām*, which are never used to describe horses’ reins, unlike *ʿinān or lijām* which are used on both types of animals. As we will see, camels as a source domain have the lion’s share of phraseme references.

Returning to the subject of cultural phenomena, the previous phrasemes also illustrate cultural modelling. To understand the metaphorical meanings of such phrasemes, it is necessary to recall various practices involved in riding and dealing with camels. These phrasemes are fixed in their elements; in other words, they are collocations in which an element A does not occur except with element B. Yet, the phrasemes do not merely reflect a cultural model; they also indicate specific meanings of cultural artefacts, i.e., *khiṭām and zimām*. As mentioned earlier, those two types of reins are specifically linked with camels, which as well as being of critical socio-economic importance in early Arabia are a main source domain in the Arabic language. Hence, *khiṭām and zimām* relate to control, as decoded from its relation with camels.

---

522 Ibid., vol. 6, p. 330.
523 Ibid., vol. 4, p. 549.
In other words, the cultural phenomena of the three phrasemes are a blend of cultural models and culturally specific artefacts. While their elements are fixed on the lexical level (i.e., the root), however, morphological changes can be applied to them according to the grammatical cases of the elements. Because the early conventionalised metaphorical meaning of each phraseme could be – but is not – considered a dead metaphor, each phraseme retains just one semantic usage in context.

The cognitive metonymy between camel, as a source, and man, as a target, is also implied in the following phraseme:

49) ḥādīhi amaluhū [his hope was his instigator (by singing)] = to be motivated by hope. Phraseme (49) is an idiom that clearly refers to a gesture related to [camel] not [horse]. In it, ḥādīhi, which comes from ḥidāʾ, is a practice related only to camels, and caravan camels in particular. Ḥidāʾ, perhaps the oldest type singing known to Arabs, is used specifically to drive camels. The image of the phraseme is mapped by a metaphor, in which a man would be driven by his hope, much as a camel is driven by ḥidāʾ. Thus, the image is only understood by those with a background knowledge of the power of ḥidāʾ over camels.

The cultural phenomenon in the following idiom differs from the previous group, although the source domain is still [camel]:

50) khabṭaʿ ashwāʾa [to stamp the ground like a blind (nyctalopic) female camel] = to act randomly.

---

525 Al-Maqṣarī, Naḍḥ at-Tīb, vol. 6, p. 301; for similar phrasemes, see Ibn Jaʿfar, Jawahir al-Alfūz, p. 323.
526 Ibn Manẓūr, Lisān al-ʿArab (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%AD%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%A1, accessed on 16 April 2018.
529 The literal meaning of ʿashwāʾ is nyctalopic, but in this context it is used to mean blind. It can also be translated as having to do with something random or aimless. See Lane, Arabic English Lexicon o Arabic, (electronic resource): http://ejtaal.net/aa/#ll=2145,hw4=733,la=2959,ls=5,sg=717,ha=487,br=648,pr=106,aan=419,mgf=606,vi=260,kz=1666,mn=433,mm=934,uqw=1089,ums=609,umj=537,ulq=1221,ugp=296,ugv=244,bdw=h598,amr=sh436,asb=h654,auih=h1067,dhq=h375,mht=h609,msb=h163,tla=h76,amj=h529,ens=h35,ms=1506, accessed on 16 April 2018.
A few points need to be discussed regarding this phraseme. Its most famous referent is the *muʿallaqa* composed by Zuhayr Ibn Abî Sulmâ (d. c. 609):

\[
\text{raʾaytu l-manāyā khabṭa ʿashwāʾ man tuṣib}
\]
\[
tumithu wa-man tukhṭiʿ yuʾammar fa-yahramī\]

[I have seen the Fates trample like a purblind camel; those they strike
They slay and those they miss are left to live on into dotage].

Phraseme (50) could have been coined before the *muʿallaqa* was composed. However, the scarcity of pre-Islamic literary sources, especially prose, and the frequent occurrence of the phraseme after the appearance of the *muʿallaqa* suggest that Zuhayr’s poem is the source of the phraseme. Although it has a pre-Islamic source domain in any case, the cultural phenomenon reflected by this phraseme depends on the source domain’s type. If we accept that it refers to the poem by Zuhayr, then its cultural phenomenon is quotation, and the full fixedness of its form tends to support this. ‘Ashwāʾ [blind] is conjugated in a feminine adjective form, which agrees with both feminine singular and non-human plural nouns. The collective noun for camels in Arabic, *ibil*, is treated as feminine singular. Hence, the adjective ‘ashwāʾ can refer to *nāqa* [a female camel], *nūq* [female camels] or *ibil* [a group of camels of both sexes]. The phraseme in Zuhayr’s verse is a metaphor in which *manāyā* [the Fates] are compared to a blind camel or camels, though commentators on the poem have tended to agree that the reference is to a single female camel. As such, the fixedness of the phraseme in this form, coupled with its grammatical conjugation, suggests that it is a quotation of the poem. Nevertheless, phraseme (50) also reflects the cultural phenomenon of cultural models, since to decode its metaphorical

---

531 I have retained A. J. Arberry’s translation from *The Seven Odes: The First Chapter in Arabic Literature* (London: MacMillan, 1957), p. 97, although some of the words would be translated differently today.
532 Arberry, *The Seven Odes*, p. 97.
meaning, the audience must understand how a blind female camel behaves.

The following phraseme is another example of the cultural-modelling phenomenon being motivated by the source domain [camel]:

51) ḥarbun darūsun [biting war]⁵³⁴ = harsh war.

Phraseme (51) is an idiom that adopts its second element from the semantic field [camel]. Lexically, ḏarūs means a camel that bites whomever milks it.⁵³⁵ The phraseme thus reflects an easily understood cultural model, but the connection between the biting camel and war is only understandable if one possesses a deeper knowledge of the culture. Such a phraseme was likely coined in a very early period. Components that occur in emphasised or non-basic morphological patterns, like ḏarūs, also apply a high level of fixedness to it.

The following three phrasemes are deeply embedded in classical Arabic language. Each is motivated by the source domain [animals], but its target domain is [actions].

52) ṛākibani l-khaṭara [to ride danger]⁵³⁶ = to deal with danger.

53) irtakaba l-jarāʾima [to ride crimes]⁵³⁷ = to commit crimes.

54) rukūbu l-baḥri [to ride the sea]⁵³⁸ = to sail.

The metaphorical meanings of the first two phrasemes are all strongly negative. All three phrasemes share the root ṛ-k-b, which indicates [ot ride something]. The second elements of phrasemes (52) and (54) are fully fixed, but phraseme (53)’s can occur with the singular form of jarāʾim [crimes], i.e., jarīma [a crime]. Although the first element is always derived from the root ṛ-k-b, it occurs in one morphological pattern, form VIII irtakaba, in phraseme (53). This morphological pattern, as Arabic grammarians explain, is reflexive: it indicates that one

---

⁵³⁷ Al-Maqṣarī, Naḥḥ at-Ṭib, vol. 6, p. 9.
⁵³⁸ Ibid., p. 82.
is making oneself perform the action.\textsuperscript{539} The second element of phraseme (53) is [crime]; hence, the verb is conjugated in the ifta\textsuperscript{ʿ}al pattern to reflect that the person being described is committed to the negative aspect of the action. On the other hand, the target domain of phraseme (52), [danger] – though itself negative – also implies courage: a highly prized virtue. The dead metaphor that motivates both the meaning of phraseme (53) and the morphological form of its verb makes it a collocation, rather than an idiom like phrasemes (52) and (54).

The source domain to be decoded in phraseme (54) is more direct. Riding an animal is compared to the act of ‘riding’ a boat, which in the conceptual system of classical Arabic is the riding animal (i.e., horse or camel) of the sea. Hence, the cultural phenomenon in this phraseme is a cultural model.

The final phraseme in this group is a irreversible phraseme:

\begin{align*}
\textit{55) ath-thāḥiyatu wa-r-rāḥiyatu} \ [\text{goats and camels}]\textsuperscript{540} = \text{everything.}
\end{align*}

The phraseme expresses the cultural model of wealth. Neither gold nor silver is mentioned in it, but two words refer to livestock: specifically, camels and goats. These two types of animals were common and important forms of livestock, and therefore of wealth in pre-modern time. Camel, specifically, has a special importance in the harsh environment desert of Arabia – though not in al-Andalus, where they were of decidedly minor importance in comparison to horses and cattle.\textsuperscript{541} Interestingly, the words are both descriptions of those animals’ voices, chosen mostly because of their rhyming qualities. While camels and goats here represent a specific model of wealth, especially in nomadic Arabian culture which motivates the image in the phraseme until the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb.

\textsuperscript{539} Abd Allāḥīf al-Khaṭīb, \textit{Mukhtasār al-Khaṭīb fī 'īm at-Taṣrīf} (Kuwait City: Dār al-‘Urūba, 2008), p. 58.
\textsuperscript{540} Ibn al-Khaṭīb, \textit{al-Iḥāṣa}, vol. 1, p. 255.
\textsuperscript{541} Al-Maqqarī, \textit{Naḥḥ at-Ṭīḥ}, vol. 1, pp. 198-9.
In the Arabic conceptual system, dangerous beasts can be represented not as evil but as symbols of power, with the lion being the most frequently referred to in such contexts. The works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb provide three idioms motivated by the source domain [dangerous beasts/lions]:

56) nashaba ẓufruhū [(his) nail has stuck (into something)]\(^{542}\) = to decide to harm someone or something.

57) tahārushu s-sibāʾi [beasts fighting]\(^{543}\) = aggressive fighting.

58) usūdu l-‘arīnī [the lions of the lair]\(^{544}\) = great protectors.

All three phrasemes are motivated by the image of these beasts’ characteristics. Phraseme (56) is most likely a quotation from Abū Dhu’ayb al-Hudhalī’s verse:\(^{545}\)

\[wa-idha l-manīyyatu anshabat azfārahū\]
\[alfayta kullā tamāmatin la tanfaʾū\]

[and when death sticks its claws]

you see no amulet is useful]

This claim is based on the phraseme’s high level of fixedness. Its two elements are exactly the same as those in the parallel phrase in the verse, and it carries the same negative connotation as the original. The phraseme also possibly reflects a gesture (to stick one’s nails into something), which is the original image that motivated the quotation. Yet, the fixedness of the phraseme’s elements, nashaba and adhfār – rather than mikhlab or makhālib [claw/claws], e.g. – was indeed coined by the quotation.

In phraseme (57), meanwhile, tahārush means exclusively fighting among beasts;\(^{546}\)

---

\(^{542}\) Ibid., vol. 5, p. 181.
\(^{543}\) Ibid., vol. 7, p. 404.
\(^{544}\) Ibid., vol. 5, p. 71.
\(^{545}\) Aḥmad az-Zayn, Dīwān al-Hudhaliyyīn (Cairo: ad-Dār al-Qawmiyya li-Ṭibāʾa wa-n-Nashr, 1965), vol. 1, p. 3.
\(^{546}\) Ibn Manẓūr, Lisān al-ʿArab (electronic resource):
and combining this term with the other element, *sībū*, indicates a sense of negativity. However, versions of this phraseme can include other elements such as *kilāb*, dogs.\(^{547}\)

Phraseme (58) contains the word [lion], which as a cultural symbol of power implies positivity on the metaphorical level; and the lion’s lair, being its home, is conceptualised as the most protected place. Both phrasemes (57) and (58) reflect the cultural phenomenon of cultural modelling, but phraseme (58) additionally reflects cultural symbolism, in the element *usūd* [lions].

6:3 Conclusion

Arabic phraseology is embedded with elements that reflect the natural environment of Arabia. The value of each such element to the classical Arabic conceptual system functions as the motivation for phrasemes’ metaphorical images. [Nature] is one of the earliest motivating source domains in any given language, due to humans’ direct physical experience of it. Bearing that in mind, we can explain a number of phenomena in nature-motivated phrasemes. A notable proportion of the images in such phrasemes are dead metaphors, which helps explain their high fixedness level. Additionally, some of the environment-related source domains of nature-motivated phrasemes, e.g., [water], reflect conceptual metaphors that were established and motivated by the same source domain. AMENITY IS RAIN and WORDS ARE WATER are two examples. Old-coined or well-embedded phrasemes are deeply woven into the conceptual system of every language, and this leaves no space for newly discovered or newly important natural elements to be inserted into such systems on the phraseological level. This explains why the nature-motivated classical Arabic phrasemes used in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works are all early-coined ones. Also, it should be noted that the dominant cultural phenomenon in

phrasemes from the source domain [nature] is cultural modelling, and as such, prior knowledge of various natural elements’ value in the culture is the key to decoding the images of [nature]-based Arabic phrasemes.

Within the source domain [animals], the phrasemes in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works occur in three main categories: 1) birds, 2) riding animals, in particular camels and horses, and 3) lions and other dangerous animals. As a general matter, phrasemes with these source domains were coined in an early stage of the Arabic language, and as such, they have become dead metaphors. This, in turn, lends more flexibility to the morphological level of such phrasemes’ elements. However, when a phraseme is motivated by the cultural phenomenon of quotation, it retains its fixedness – with phraseme (39), wa-stansara l-bughāthu [small birds (act like) eagles], being a rare exception to the rule. The fact that it had two core elements and (in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s context) rhymed, coupled with the flexibility of Arabic syntax and morphology, applied a level of flexibility to its formation.

Because of the fictive role that birds played in pre-Islamic Arab culture, most of the phrasemes with [birds] as a source domain reflect the cultural phenomenon of fictive worlds; and some [birds] phrasemes are motivated by the cross-cultural conceptual metaphor RIGHT IS GOOD. For the source domain [camels and horses], on the other hand, the dominating cultural phenomenon is cultural modelling. [Camels] as a source domain, however, is reflected in phrasemes not only in connection with cultural models, but also with the metonymy between camels and men. Likewise, cultural models are the main motivating force behind phrasemes mentioning dangerous predators in a negative sense, though lions are deployed as a cultural symbol of power in its positive sense.

It is not surprising to find cultural phenomena such as quotation and allusion in the corpus, because they reflect its author’s wide knowledge of poetry. Quotations from and allusions to pre-Islamic material are of potentially greater significance than other quotations
and allusions, in that they show not only the author’s knowledge of the Arabic language (whether general or local), but his linguistic identity, by linking his own text with what he considered to be the sources of Arabic. The occurrence of fictive cultural concepts in the corpus by the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, meanwhile, raises two important points. First, it highlights that classical Arabic phraseology is embedded in the language by its semantic level, such that the writer and the reader both had to cognitively deal with the secondary semantic level of these fixed phrases – regardless of the fact that their fictive concepts were forbidden under the prevailing belief-system of their linguistic community, i.e., Islam. And second, it illustrates the enduring strength of pre-Islamic concepts in classical Arabic writings, in spite of the profound cultural changes occurred by both the passage of time and migration to distant regions.
Chapter 7: Material Culture and Habitus as a Domain of Cultural Phenomena in the Phraseology of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s Prose Works

Material culture and habitus constitute one of the richest source domains of any language’s phraseology. As with their nature-motivated counterparts, material culture and habitus motivated phrasemes’ meanings are mainly driven by interpretation of an element, which might hold a culture-specific or a cross-cultural metaphorical meaning. In the present work’s system of categorisation, this Arabic phraseme belongs to the source domain [clothes], which includes all phrasemes related to the semantic field [clothes] in the widest sense. Hence, in spite of the existence of anklets, for example, in various cultures, the main element of the phraseme *rabbātu l-ḥijāli* [the (girls) with anklets]\(^{548}\) = well-groomed beautiful girls, the phraseme requires previous knowledge of what anklets are connected with in the given cultural context.

Other phrasemes occur with similar surface meanings across multiple cultures, but indicate different secondary meanings, according to culturally specific interpretations. This phenomenon can mostly be found in phrasemes centred on gestures. For example, the Arabic phraseme *al-mushāru ilayhi bi-l-banāni* [the one pointed at]\(^ {549}\) = a well-known/praised person, corresponds on its surface level to the English phraseme ‘to point the finger at’. Metaphorically, however, the English phraseme is about accusation rather than respect, fame or praise.

The phrasemes in this chapter are referential and communicative. They will be divided into two broad categories, a) material culture, including 1) home, 2) clothing, and 3) weapons; and b) cultural activities and habitus, comprising 1) poetry and writing, 2) genealogy, 3) travel and roads, 4) racing, 5) gambling, 6) giving praise, 7) taboos, and 8) miscellaneous categories.

---


7:1 Material Culture

This category includes all the phrasemes motivated by a source domain that falls within the semantic field of material culture. This can be as large and complex as a building or as simple as ink. To aid a comprehensive understanding of the cultural phenomena reflected in these phrasemes, I will divide them into smaller categories related to the main source domain, i.e., 1) home, 2) clothing, and 3) weapons.

7:1:1 Home

We define [home] as the source domain of every secondary meaning of a phraseme motivated by the concept of home or any object related to it. A word like majlis [meeting room] occurs in various source domains that motivate phrasemes. An example of a phraseme motivated by [home] category is waqīru l-majālisi [settled seat] = dignified; its motivation is a cultural action rather than the concept of majlis as such. Yet, it is considered in the category of [home] within the main source domain [material culture] because it is still mainly linked with the concept of majlis, which is primarily based on a physical place. The same analysis applies to a phraseme like ʿuqida majlisun [a meeting-room was knotted] = to convene a council, which is motivated by the concept of majlis as much as by the meeting itself, and thus will be considered part of this category. Also, some source domains that can be found either in homes or in home-like environments, e.g., bisāṭ [carpet] or biʿr [well], are also categorised under this main source domain.

The group of three idioms below illustrates the cultural concept of home:

59) ʿāmiru d-dārī [(one’s) well-built house] = a man from an honourable family.

---

551; the phraseme occurs as ‘ʿaqada majlisā...’ [(he) knotted a meeting of...]= to convene a council for a given topic. See: Ibid., vol. 1, p. 223.
552 Al-Maqqarī, Naǧf at-Tīb, vol. 6, p. 416.
60) *maqṣūdu l-manzili* [(one’s) house is desired]⁵⁵³ = honourable person.

61) *al-manzilu l-khashinu* [rough home]⁵⁵⁴ = humble lifestyle.

In Arab tribal society, a man’s family defines his social class, value and honour, and the house is the bond of the extended family. Thus, it is conceptualised as a symbol of family, to which all the related concepts are applied, as can clearly be seen in phrasemes like (59). The primary semantic level of phraseme (59) deals with the physical experience of encountering a well-built house, but symbolically indicates an honourable family. This symbol itself can be found cross-culturally, but applying the adjective ‘well-built’ appears to be an cultural-specific concept. A possible explanation of the root of the phraseme is the role of the leader in a patriarchal society,⁵⁵⁵ i.e., he who builds the house/tent and ensures that it protects his family; thus, a weak/ruined house implies a weak family. The cultural phenomenon of this phraseme is cultural symbolism. The word *dār* is used to express the meaning of house, but it can be replaced with other words like *bayt*, and this lends the phraseme a degree of flexibility.

In phraseme (60), *manzil* does not function as a cultural symbol. However, it does reflect a cultural practice of honouring someone by visiting him or it indicates one’s generosity and hospitality, both of which are great cultural values. Because it indicates the effort others make to reach the person they are praising, the phraseme’s cultural phenomenon is cultural model and gesture.

The image in phraseme (61) revolves around the concepts of comfort and discomfort as measures of luxury and humbleness. SOFTNESS IS LUXURY and its contrasting conceptual metaphor, ROUGHNESS IS POOR, motivate the image in the phraseme.⁵⁵⁶ As

---

⁵⁵³ Ibid., vol. 7, p. 283.
⁵⁵⁴ Ibid., vol. 6, p. 173.
one’s home is where one can find comfort, having a rough home is the ultimate manifestation of a humble lifestyle. Importantly, however, humble in this context means not only poor or low in status, but also the opposite of arrogant.

As mentioned above, the concept of [home] in Arabic applies not only to solid masonry constructions, but also to tents. The ruins of the tents of Bedouin Arabs became a central concept their culture, and influenced Arabic phraseology, as the following phraseme attests:

62) muḥiya-ti r-rusūmu [the marks have been effaced] = it has been demolished by time.

This is the only phraseme of its kind in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s written works, but other Arabic sources contain many references to the same notion. The verb daras [to efface] is found as a variety of the phraseme; or, to be more precise, the phraseme is a variety of the ṣṭlāl motif. Hence, the phraseme implies the ubi sunt motif. One of the most famous examples as a reference to the ṣṭlāl motif is ‘afati d-diyyāru [the campsites were effaced] = to lose someone because of travelling; a famous poem by Labīd ibn Rabī’a (d. c. 41/661). Both the phraseme and the verse of Labīd ibn Rabī’a’s poem, along with many more poems from throughout the classical Arabic era, are versions of the usage of ṣṭlāl motif or ubi sunt motif. Once again, prior knowledge of the importance of this motif in nomadic Arab culture is required to decode the link between the phraseme’s source domain and its target domain, and thus its cultural phenomenon is again a cultural model.

As well as the whole concept of [home], home-related items motivate various phrasemes. They can be parts of the structure, such as rooms, or objects that are most likely to be found in a home: beds, carpets, and so forth.

557 Al-Maqqarī, Naṣḥ at-Tīb, vol. 6, p. 289.
559 The famous poem starts with ‘afati d-diyyāru mahalluhā fa-muqāmuhā [‘The abode aredesolated, halting-place and encampment too’]. See az-Zawzantī, Sharḥ al-Mu’allaqāt, p. 89, and for a translation, Arberry, The Seven Odes, p. 142.
Our the works of Ibn al-Khafīb provide three phrasemes that make reference to a type of room: majlis [meeting room] = reception. The word itself lexically gained several different symbolic meanings that were added to the original lexical meaning. The most common secondary meaning of the word is ‘meeting’, which was established as a metonymy before it became a dead metaphor.

63) ‘uqida majlisun [a meeting-room was knotted] \(^{560}\) = to convene a council.

64) waqūru l-majlisi [(he is) sedate (in) the meeting-room] \(^{561}\) = one is sedate and respectful.

Because majlis is its key element, it is reasonable to claim that this phraseme is motivated by the source domain [house]. Although the word majlis functions in its secondary meaning here, it has become a collocation with a dead metaphor, dealt with by the speaker as polysemy. The semantic link between majlis and [meeting] is metonymy, as the meeting room is where meetings take place. The other element of the phraseme is derived from the conceptual image of gathering as knotting pieces together to prevent them from being lost. The metaphorical image is of the meeting room as a container in which whoever convenes a council keeps the participants, as if knotting them together there. The cultural phenomenon in the phraseme can be deemed a culture-specific artefact, in that majlis is where all major decisions are made. Yet, the concept is also related to a cultural model of hospitality. The reflection of more than one cultural phenomenon in a phraseme is what Piirainen and Dobrovolskij call ‘blending of cultural phenomena’. \(^{562}\) One of the highest values in tribal Arab culture and in both pre-Islamic and Islamic culture, hospitality is linked with the majlis because it is where one welcomes one’s guests. Such a phraseme is expected to maintain its fixedness, regardless of the morphological varieties mentioned earlier, due to its concept remaining relevant in the target culture.


\(^{561}\) Ibid., vol. 3, p. 377.

\(^{562}\) Dobrovolskij and Piirainen, Figurative Language, p. 240.
As noted in the previous discussion of [home], meeting-rooms represent more than mere interior spaces in both nomadic and settled cultural contexts. Rather, they are places where important decisions are taken, including (in the former context) decisions regarding where the tribe will travel to next. For that reason, the meeting-room became a cultural symbol of an official event. So, composing a collocation of majlis and another word inserts the meaning of that other word into the semantic field [official]. This cultural symbol retained its value at the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb in al-Andalus, in spite of the availability of newer official terminology like balāṭ [royal court].

Phraseme (64) combines a cultural symbol, a conceptual metaphor and a cultural model, and thus is highly fixed. Its cultural symbol is majlis, as explained earlier. Combining the idāfa of majlis with waqūr [sedate] applies an additional meaning to waqūr, i.e., [honourable and respectful], motivated by the conceptual metaphor SEDATENESS IS SETTLING. As a result, an idiomatic image is established that being settled in a meeting room means being sedate in council – in addition to the cultural model that joins both symbolic meanings of the two lexemes.

The domain [home] motivates phrasemes whose metaphorical meaning would be seen broad from the source domain, like the following collocation phraseme:

65) dāru ṣ-ṣanʿati [factoring house] = arsenal.

The key element of the phraseme that hints at its source domain is dār [house/home]. The collocation phraseme dāru ṣ-ṣanʿati became a term for an arsenal. As discussed earlier, dār is a cultural symbol for a source or main place. The second element of the phraseme

indicates its meaning; yet, the first element, *dār*, is key to the phraseological meaning, since it alone occurs in a secondary meaning. We can also say that the second element of the phraseme reflects a secondary semantic level, since *ṣanʿa* has an additional meaning, [to make ships], beyond its literal meaning, [manufacturing]. *Ṣanʿa*, in the context of the phraseme, only reflects the phraseological meaning [arsenal], and is more commonly found written as *dāru ṣ-ṣanʿati*.\(^{566}\) Such phrasemes should occur in fully fixed form. This one, however, exhibits a slight modification in its second element, which can be explained by the different dialect from which the word *ṣanʿa/šināʿa* was drawn.

Like the previous phraseme, the following one is motivated by [home] as a source domain, but it has [poetry] as a target domain:

66) *baytu l-qaṣīdi* [the poem’s home]\(^{567}\) = the main aim of the talk.

Although [poetry] will be discussed in the following sections, this phraseme is, for the sake of coherence, considered chiefly in light of its source domain [home]. I will discuss *baytu l-qaṣīdi* under this domain, since *bayt* is the core element of this phraseme and its motivator. Ibn Fāris interpreted *bayt* in the context of poetry as a non-literal usage of the word *bayt* to express the meaning of the individual unit of poetry that ‘is the container’ of the meaning.\(^{568}\) *Baytu l-qaṣīdi*, on its first metaphorical level, is the core verse of the poem and the core of the phraseme, since [home] – as explained above – is the central concept of Arab society: functioning conceptually as the summation of one’s life. The ‘poem’s home’ is therefore the verse that helps us understand


\(^{568}\) Ibn Fāris, *Maqāyis al-Lughah*, (electronic resource): [http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A8%D9%8A%D8%AA#3](http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A8%D9%8A%D8%AA#3), accessed on 29 April 2018.
the poem, the referent of the target of the poem and the summary of it. Regarding the second metaphorical layer of the phraseme, baytu l-qaṣīdī was adopted as a source domain for the idea of the most important or primary target of one’s talk in general. The phraseme became so well established that the Arabic term for a single verse is now bayt. In Asās al-Balāgha, az-Zamakhrī considered baytu sh-shi`rī as a literal usage of the word bayt.\(^{569}\) Hence, the phraseme is a collocation if it is used in the context of the main verse of a poem. Nevertheless, if it is used metaphorically to mean the main aim of the talk, as in the corpus, it is an idiom, according to Granger and Paquot’s typological system.\(^{570}\)

The cultural phenomenon associated with both the first and the second metaphorical levels of this phraseme is cultural modelling. For the first layer, one must understand the specifically Arab notion of [home] before one can decode the metaphorical meaning; while to decode the second requires two types of prior knowledge: of the notion of [home] and of the primary metaphorical meaning. Phrasemes with such a complex metaphorical layers tend to show high levels of fixedness on both the lexical and syntactic levels, but not necessarily on the morphological level.

Phraseme (67) refers to the concept of [hospitality] linked with one’s [living place]. It is represented in akarm [to honour] and a reference to one’s living place mathwā:

67) akrama mathwāhū [(he) was honoured someone’s living place]\(^{571}\) = to generously take care of someone.

Once more, [home] is a representation of one’s dignity and life. This phraseme may be a pre-Islamic coined collocation that gained the metaphorical meaning of taking care of someone or, more literally, being generous to someone by hosting them, as the elements of the phraseme suggest. If Ibn al-Khaṭīb had added innahū rabbī to the collocation, it would be

---

\(^{569}\) Az-Zamakhsharī, Asās al-Balāgha, vol. 1, p. 86.

\(^{570}\) Al-Maqqarī, Naḥḍ al-Tib, vol. 1, p. 521; Granger and Paquot, ‘Disentangling the Phraseological Web’, p. 44.

\(^{571}\) Ibid., vol. 5, p. 100.
considered a quotation and an allusion to the attempted seduction of Joseph by the wife of the
ing of Egypt as in the story of Joseph in the Qurʾān.\textsuperscript{572} Joseph refused her advances, on the
grounds that the king took good care of him:

\begin{align*}
\text{innahū rabbī aḥsana mathwāya innahū lā yuflīhu ẓ-zālimuna} \\
[\text{Indeed, he is my master, who has made good my residence. Indeed, wrongdoers will not succeed}]^\text{573}
\end{align*}

However, based on the phraseme as it stands, \textit{akrama mathwā}, it is hard to say whether it was established in this verse. In any case, (67)’s phraseological meaning does not connect with the meaning [faithfulness] in the context of the Qurʾānic story of Joseph without an additional lexical reference like \textit{innahū rabbī}. Thus, this phraseme is a cultural model.

The works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb also provide phrasemes that refer to household objects like querns, beds, and carpets. Other objects that are considered belonging to the semantic field [house] in a wider sense include wells, mirrors, cups and furnaces. Let us start with querns as a source domain.

\textit{68) raḥā jaʿ jaʿ atin} [noisy quern]\textsuperscript{574} = to speak a great deal, but take no action.

\textit{69) dārat ʿalayhi (…) raḥā} [a quern has moved upon him]\textsuperscript{575} = to enter a bad situation.

Both phrasemes represent a culturally specific artefact via the word \textit{raḥā} [quern]. Phraseme (68) is modified from an older one, \textit{asmaʿu jaʿ jaʿ atan wa-lā arar ṭaḥnān} [I hear a grinding noise but I do not see any ground flour],\textsuperscript{576} which expresses the same image. Here, we are dealing with an unusual definitional issue, insofar as the original version of phraseme (68) does not explicitly contain the word \textit{raḥā}, yet has the same metaphorical meaning. The earlier phraseme does, however, refer to \textit{raḥā} via words related to its semantic field: i.e., \textit{jaʿ jaʿ} [noise] and \textit{ṭaḥn}
[grinding]. If we accept that the phrase in example (68) is a phraseme, it is easy to accept that it references the original phraseme. Hence, it contains the cultural phenomenon cultural artefact. The cranberry lexeme *ja’ja’a* is the core element of the older phraseme that preserves its metaphorical level and reflects both cultural phenomena. Combining *ja’ja’a* with *raḥā* produces the metaphorical meaning of the phraseme. This issue reveals the high flexibility level of this phraseme, which is the result of two conditions. First, its early coining rendered it a well-embedded text in the language, which may have encouraged writers to manipulate its fixedness; and second, the image evoked by the phraseme and the cranberry lexeme together facilitate the audience’s decoding process.

The original context of phraseme (69) is *wa-dārat ʿalayhi yawma malaka s-sulṭānu l-madhkūru raha l-waqīʿati* [and the quern of the (bad) event has ground him in the day when that aforementioned sultan died].577 The phraseme seems to be motivated by the physical experience of querns. Phraseme (69)’s lexical elements are more fixed than those of phraseme (68), although none of phraseme (69)’s elements function as a cranberry lexeme, like *ja’aja’a* in phraseme (68). However, phraseme (69) is semi-flexible in terms of order. This is explained in part by the Arabic language’s flexible order system, and in part by the fact that the order of an Arabic phraseme with more than two elements including a preposition tends to be flexible. Prepositions are always combined with a noun/pronoun and conjugated to the person being referred to; and *raḥā* is always indefinite, which means that it is combined in *iḍāfa*. The concept that to be in a bad situation is to be ground up could be the cultural model that motivates the phraseme. Yet, the motivation here is not a special concept related to crushing, but rather the quern as a metonym of grinding; and hence, the cultural phenomenon of this phraseme is a cultural artefact.

The source domain [carpet] is represented in the act of folding, which often indicates a

metaphorical meaning, e.g.:

70) ṭuwiya l-bīṣātu [the carpet has been folded] = an end of an event.

This phraseme refers to the conclusion of an event via a gesture that would only happen after the participants had left the majlis [meeting room]. We can link this phraseme with the cultural practice of designating special rooms in which tribal leaders discuss great issues, like Dār an-Nadwa in Mecca. Such places were well-furnished by the standards of that era, and would certainly have contained both cushions and carpets – both of which are mentioned in the Qurʾān in the context of describing Heaven. As a representation of luxury, they also occur in the following verse: wa-namāriqu masfūfatun wa-zarābiyyu mabthūhatun [and lined up and carpets spread].

The secondary meaning of the gesture in phraseme (70) can only be understood with reference to the cultural context; and the artefact [carpet] does not reflect any culture-specific notion, either directly or metaphorically, except in such context. Hence, we can see that the cultural phenomenon of the phraseme is gesture.

Another home-related source domain of Arabic phraseology is qirba [waterskin]. Like bisāṭ [carpet], qirba does not in itself indicate any culturally specific notion. Rather, the experience of physical actions related to waterskins motivates the image in the following phraseme:

71) tamakhkhudu l-qirbati [the waterskin churns (milk)] = to obtain a result after a long process.

Both words in the phraseme are unique to the structure of its context. In other words, tamakhkhud is a verb that only occurs in the meaning of churning when it is combined with

578 Al-Maqqari, Naḥf at-Tīb, vol. 6, p. 319.
580 Qurʾān (al-Ghāshiya) 88:15-16.
581 Al-Maqqari, Naḥf at-Tīb, vol. 6, p. 283.
qirbati, which in turn does not indicate ‘containing milk’ except in partnership with a word referring to the semantic field [milk], such as makhaḍa. According to classical Arabic dictionaries, makhaḍa reflects, in general terms, a process taking place in a container that leads to the extraction of one thing from another. The image in the phraseme is motivated by prior knowledge of the process of churning milk to produce butter by shaking it in a waterskin. Yet, the target domain of the phraseme would also be interpreted within the Arabic system of cultural concepts, leading us to suggest that the cultural phenomenon in the phraseme is cultural modelling. As previously noted, phrasemes with a source domain that still exists in the writer’s own time and environment tend to retain their structure with no lexical additions.

The following phraseme includes another home-related source domain, [bed].

72) muqiddu l-maḍājiʿi [to make] the bed piercing = to be anguished.

The lexical meaning of the first element of the phraseme relates to small pieces of rock. Bed is a cross-cultural symbol of comfort and relaxation, derived from the physical experience of members of various speech communities. Anguish leads to lack of sleep because the anguished person’s mind races when he or she is meant to be resting, and this problem is at its most acute in places designated specially for rest and sleeping.

The cultural phenomenon in this phraseme appears to be quotation. It is constructed of lexemes that are unlikely to be replaced with synonyms, especially in the case of maḍājiʿ. One would never, for example, find synonym like firāsh in this phraseme. It can, however, take a different verb: tatajāfā [to shun], which appears in the Qurʾān in the verse tatajāfā junūbuhum

---

This might suggest that the expression was known in the pre-Islamic era. However, given phraseme (72)’s inclusion of qadd and madja’, it can be attributed to a well-known verse by Abū Dhu‘ayb al-Hudhalī (d. 27/648):

\[
\text{am mā li-janbika lā yulā'imu madja'an} \\
\text{illā aqaḍda 'alayka ḥādha l- madja'ī}^{587}
\]

[But why whenever your back touches a bed, 

The bed pierces you]

This verse includes words derived from the roots of phraseme (72)’s elements. In the verse the collocation of aqaḍḍ and madja’ express the same metaphorical meaning as that phraseme. Accordingly, it would seem that the origin of the phraseme is Abū Dhu‘ayb al-Hudhalī’s verse, or at any rate that the verse supports the fixedness of the phraseme. The fully fixed structure of the phraseme supports the idea that its cultural phenomenon is quotation. The metaphor that maps the image of the phraseme is motivated by a daily-life experience, but that experience cannot be shown conclusively to have established the phraseme, other than via the fixedness associated with quotation, especially when linked with the context of the language of fourteenth-century Arabic literature.

Unlike with the previous phrasemes in this section, the image of phraseme (72)’s source domain does not contribute to the way it is used in the corpus. Using the phraseme in its fully fixed form and with no additional elements is motivated by the cultural phenomenon, rather than by the existence of the elements of the phraseme in the writer’s day-to-day environment.

The next source domain is asbāb [well-ropes]. Wells per se do not motivate the following phrasemes, insofar as their images are created by the idea of reaching the water at the bottom of a well, and not by the well as a place or object. Thus:

---

586 Qur’ān (as-Sajda) 32:16.
73) *asbābu [l-kufri] l-wāhiyati* [the feeble ropes of (infidelity)]\(^{588}\) = weak arguments/causes.

74) *at-tamassuku bi-ābabsihi* [holding its ropes]\(^{589}\) = to be loyal to an idea.

The Arabic root *s-b-b* includes three main semantic fields: 1) to cut, 2) to cause, and 3) well-ropes.\(^{590}\) Classical Arabic dictionaries relate words like *sabb* [to insult] and *sabba* [a piece (especially of time)] to the first field.\(^{591}\) The third field can also be merged with the first, because each piece of a well-rope is in fact a cut-piece of a longer rope. The second field [to cause] can be merged with the third because both are used to describe reaching a goal, either physical or abstract. We can also argue that *sabab* [cause] is derived from *sabab* [rope], which in turn is derived from the first field of the root. This implies that the root originally meant to cut or to make pieces; ropes are made from pieces that are bound together, and because they are used to reach water in a well, the eventual meaning [to cause] was derived from the same root. The choice of a word referring specifically to a well can be explained by the importance of water in Arabia’s environment.

The concept to which one is loyal is conceptualised as water, while one’s link to that concept is the rope whereby water is reached. This image is represented in both of the above phrasemes. The first is coined by the word *asbāb*, which can be interpreted as causes or ropes, but its second element, *wāhiya* [feeble], supports the concrete, physical interpretation of the word. This leads us to interpret *asbāb* as a well-rope rather than as abstract causes. Of course, it can be interpreted as causes, and the bond between the two elements *asbāb* and *wāhiya*


\(^{589}\) Ibid., vol. 2, p. 77. It also occurs as ‘*al-Mutamassikīna bi-ābabsihi*’ [the holders of the ropes of…’]: ibid., p. 375.

\(^{590}\) Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab* (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%B3%D8%A8%D8%A8, accessed on 2 May 2018. For more phrasemes motivated by the source domain [ropes], see Ibn Jaʿfar, *Jawahir al-ʿAlfāẓ*, pp. 139, 144 and 255.

\(^{591}\) Ibn Fāris, *Maqāīṣ al-Lughā* (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%B3%D8%A8%D8%A8, accessed on 2 May 2018. Linking such words to just one of the three fields is contentious, however. *Sabba*, for example, can be a negative reference to time rather than to a period; e.g., a ‘piece’ of time that is ‘cut’ from a longer period.
interpreted as a metaphorical one, without the phraseological structure being affected. However, the choice of interpretation would affect the cultural analysis of the phraseme.

The above discussion of the semantic interpretation of *asbāb* helps us to understand phraseme (74), in which *tamassuk* [to hold] guides interpretation of the metaphorical meaning. The phraseme shows alteration in the weaker elements of the phraseme — *tamassuk*. It occurs as ‘*tashabbuth*’, which is a synonym of *tamassuk*. The aim of the physical action [holding] is *asbāb*, ropes/causes. Thus, either *asbāb* means [ropes] on the surface semantic level, and the source domain of the phraseme is therefore explicitly [well-ropes]; or, *asbāb*’s surface meaning is [cause], and the source domain is, implicitly, [well-ropes]. If we accept the latter interpretation, then the image is a comparison between two elements, one on each side of the image.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{*tamassuk* [to hold]} & / \text{*wāhiya* [feeble]} & \leftrightarrow & \text{mental action of being loyal to an idea} \\
& & & \text{Or, weakness in general} \\
\text{*asbāb* [ropes]} & & & \leftrightarrow \quad \text{causes/argument}
\end{align*}
\]

In this view, the cultural phenomenon in phraseme (74) is cultural symbolism. The verbs cohere with the semantic field of the cultural symbol, and do not indicate any additional meaning for the target domain.

On the other hand, if we accept that *asbāb* occurs on the surface semantic level as [cause], then the phrasemes’ cultural phenomenon would be cultural modelling. To understand well-ropes’ metaphorical bond with the concept of [cause], the audience must have prior knowledge of the importance of wells and well-ropes in the context of speech community lifestyle.

---

In terms of structure, phraseme (73) exhibits a higher level of fixedness than phraseme (74) in our corpus. The reason for the former’s high fixedness is debatable. Wāhiya occurs within different semantic fields related to physical objects that have become weak: e.g., a wall, a piece of clothing, or in this context, ropes. The correlation can be explained by a specially developed semantic link between the two words. The classical Arabic conceptual system applies co-occurrence to one synonym of asbāb – i.e., ḥibāl – to differentiate the structure of the phraseme from the adjective that would be expected to co-occur with the lexeme ḥibāl. Hence, the co-occurrence of the two lexemes, asbāb and wāhiya, functions as the key to decoding the metaphorical meaning of the phraseme. Phraseme (74), in contrast, is marked by high flexibility even on the lexical level; and we can find varieties of it in which tamassaka is replaced by a synonymous verb, tashabbatha. This flexibility can be explained by the fact that the polysemous nature of asbāb shortens the mapping process of the metaphor’s image. As a result, writers deal with elements of the phraseme more flexibly, because of their expectation that the audience will understand the target domain regardless of whether the core element was metaphorically or literally deployed.

7:1:2 Clothing

Phrasemes in this source domain are distributed across four categories. The first is motivated by the general concept of dress, but also includes cultural gestures centred on cloth. The second group includes phrasemes that are related to gender-specific clothes, e.g., turbans and anklets. The third involves footwear; and the fourth, with the concept of wearing rather than with clothes per se.

Before commencing the discussion, it is necessary to briefly consider the Andalusī

594 See http://www.alwaraq.net/Core/SearchServlet/searchall and http://islamport.com/cgi-bin/wadb/search.cgi?zoom_query=%CA%D4%C8%CB+%C8%C3%D3%C8%C7%C8&zoom_per_page=100 &zoom_and=1&zoom_sort=0, accessed on 3 May 2018.
costume tradition at the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb. [Clothing] is a source domain that functions within the general Muslim-Arab culture source domain, yet Andalusi clothes had evolved in their own distinctive direction, as al-Maqqarī explained. The non-wearing of turbans was highly characteristic of al-Andalus, especially in the east (including Granada where Ibn al-Khaṭīb lived), and even in the presence of the sultan, who did not wear one either. Also, as al-Maqqarī noted, soldiers did not wear turbans in either the east of al-Andalus or the west.

Dating from the lifetime of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, the people of all ranks of society in fourteenth-century al-Andalus, although they used phraseology that retained simple conceptualisations of Arab dress that could be traced back to the pre-Islamic era, had little connection with such dress in reality.

In terms of the first category of clothing-related phrasemes, consider the following:

75) shaqqa l-juyūba [the chest of the dress is torn] = to be grieved.
76) ittasā’ a l-kharqu ḫala r-rāqi’i [the hole (in the dress) is bigger than the patch-maker’s ability] = an insoluble problem.

In each phraseme, the image is motivated through a different process, depending on how [dress] is represented. Phraseme (75) is an idiom in which the reference to [dress] is provided by juyūb. Juyūb occurs in various meanings, all linked to the semantic field [dress]. In the context of this phraseme, it is interpreted as a piece of women’s clothing that covers the chest. The act of tearing this to express grief is a ritual that was well known and widely practised in pre-Islamic

595 Al-Maqqarī, Naḥf at-Tib, vol. 1, p. 222.
596 Ibid., p. 223.
597 See the analysis of phraseme (78), below.
599 Ibid., vol. 4, p. 245.
600 The collective meaning of the root, according to Ibn Fāris, is to make a hole. Other meanings are derived from this one, depending on whether the action of making a hole is connected to the secondary meaning. In the context of phraseme (75), jayb is generally – according to the lexicons – a garment worn by women and/or on the chest; and either meaning expresses the target domain of the phraseme. However, the source domain would be [body] or specifically [chest], if we accept ‘chest’ as the meaning of jayb. See Ibn Fāris, Maqāyis al-lugha (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A7%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%A8, accessed on 3 May 2018.
Arab communities. Although this ritual is still practised today, and was known in fourteenth-century al-Andalus also, it is forbidden among Sunni Muslims, who dominated al-Andalus in the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb. So, whether people by the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb practised this ritual or not, it is reasonably clear that phraseme references to it are evocations of pre-Islamic rather than fourteenth-century society.

The cultural phenomenon in phraseme (75) is a gesture, as the piece of cloth itself does not convey any symbolic meaning. The phraseme has a high fixedness level, in which one of the elements always retains a morphological pattern, i.e., the plural. Although the phraseme is motivated by a pre-Islamic source domain, its form of words was most likely influenced by the Prophet’s narrative: specifically, the latter’s use of shaqqa l-juyūba, which maintains the fixedness of the phraseme (apart from its order), which as explained earlier is to be expected in Arabic phrasemes. We also find phraseme (75) in a verse from an older text than the Prophet’s narrative, the Muʿallaqa of Ṭarafa Ibn al-ʿAbd (d. c. second half of the sixth century), where it occurs with juyūb in a singular form:

\[
\text{fū-in mittu fā-n ṣīnī bimā anā ahlūhū}
\]
\[
\text{wa-shuqqī ʿalayya l-jayba ya bnata Maʿbadī}
\]

[So if I die, lament me with what I deserve
And tear the chest of the dress, O! daughter of Maʿbad].

This indicates that the image of the phraseme was formed before the phraseme itself adopted the Prophet’s form of words.

Within our corpus, the context of phraseme (75) is the target domain [exaggeration], but

---

603 One could argue that jayb is important insofar as the chest was usually covered, especially in the later Islamic context, as in Qurʾān (an-Nūr), 24:31 the Qurʾān: ‘to wrap their covers over their juyūb’. However, further study would be required to conclusively demonstrate a link with phraseme (75).
604 An-Nawāwī, Riyad as-Ṣāliḥīn, p. 1665.
605 Az-Zawzanī, Sharḥ al-Muʿallaqa, p. 66.
this is contradicted via an additional word: *ṭaraban* [happiness]. The breaking of early-coined and well-embedded phrasemes is to be expected, because of the ease with which the audience can decode their target meanings. Additionally, the act described can be seen as an unconscious action resulting from sadness, but which the writer adapts to happiness. As such, the medium linking these two meanings is unconsciousness. Ibn al-Khaftib uses a word that, although the context restricts its meaning to happiness, could equally well be linked to sadness. This manipulation of the word keeps the phraseological meaning within the frame of the original target domain, but applies the new phraseological meaning that is expressed by *ṭaraban*.

Phraseme (76) is formed as a proverb. It has a metaphorical meaning that seems to be motivated by a cross-cultural concept. However, the image in the phraseme and its fully fixed structure are linked with a verse that is attributed to a pre-Islamic Arabic poet from the tribe of Sulaym, regarding the aftermath of a battle between his tribe and King an-Nu`mān of al-Hīra. The tribe of Ghaṭafān, Sulaym’s cousins, had helped the king against Sulaym, but Sulaym nevertheless won the battle and captured the leader of Ghaṭafān. According to the traditions, when the members of Ghaṭafān asked for the release their leader for the sake of their kinship, Sulaym refused, and their poet answered with the following lines:

\[ lā nasaba l-yawma wa-lā khullatun/\]
\[ ittas’a l-kharqu ’ala r-rāqiʾi\]

[No kinship today nor friendship (has a value)]

the gap (in the dress) is bigger than the patch-maker’s ability]

The second hemistich of the verse became a proverb. Thus, the cultural phenomenon of

---

606 Dictionaries give the lexeme *ṭarab* two opposite meanings – happiness and sadness – but attempt to link them together in terms of the great intensity with which they are felt. Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisaṅ al-ʿArab* (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%B7%D8%B1%D8%A8, accessed on 4 May 2018; az-Zamakhshārī, *Asās al-Balāġa*, vol. 1, p. 597.

phraseme (76) is quotation, which explains its high structural fixedness. In our corpus, this phraseme also occurs in a short version, *ittasa‘a l-kharqu*. Although still a quotation, its main elements – in terms of the motivation and establishment of the image – are *ittasa‘* [to be wide] and *kharq* [the gap]. Ibn al-Khaṭīb maintained all levels of the phraseme, namely its order, morphology and syntax. The deletion of the rest of the older, longer version was made possible by its well-established idiomatic meaning and by the full fixedness of its main elements.

Each of the next two idioms contains a gender-specific object that functions as its motivating cultural phenomenon:

77) **rabbātu l-ḥijāli** [the (girls) with anklets] = young beautiful girls.

78) **shaqqa l-‘imāmata** [(he) cut off the turban] = to rebel.

Phraseme (77) includes a word that functions semantically as a gender-specific object. *Ḥijāl* [anklets] is a type of jewellery that relates specifically to women. The secondary meaning of the image arises from a cultural context in which those who wear anklets are young girls showing off their beauty, and is decoded by the audience via their knowledge of who wears such items. Following this logic, we can identify multiple possible cultural phenomena in this phraseme, including a gender-specific concept (anklets are worn by females), cultural artefact (anklets as an artefact) and a cultural model (anklets are worn by young girls).

Phraseme (77) has a fully fixed structure on both the syntactic and semantic levels, and this high level of fixedness has two potential explanations. First, any phraseme that includes a very well-known cultural element tends to be coined with a particular word, *rabbāt* [owners] in this instance, that is correlated with its core element. The second explanation is that the phraseme could be a quotation, given that it appears in a seventh-century speech attributed to

---

609 Ibid., p. 245.
610 Ibid., vol. 3, p. 3.
'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. Other narratives in earlier works, namely al-Aghānī, mark the semantic secondary level of the phraseme as already established, but do not attribute it to 'Alī. The phraseme occurs in a narrative of a conversation between 'Umar ibn Abī Rabī’a and a girl who uses the phraseme in its metaphorical meaning: wa-tatanāvalu bi-lisānika rabbāta l-ḥijāli [and you speak with your tongue about anklets’ owners] = you falsely accuse young beautiful women. As such, I would suggest that the phraseme was likely coined prior to this speech. This is further supported by the phraseme’s relation to a cultural feature that was general, making it fairly unlikely to have been coined in a speech about war. It is conceivable that the phraseme originated as a quotation from a now-lost pre-Islamic text.

Phraseme (78) includes a reference to a well-known type of clothing, 'imāma [turban], a cultural symbol of manhood and honour that also functions as a sign of murū’a [manliness]. Accordingly, taking off one’s turban willingly is a highly significant gesture. The phrase expresses this meaning through the image of cutting off one’s turban, and thus indicates two distinct cultural phenomena – a gender-specific object and a gesture – both of which are equally important to it.

This phraseme is very clear evidence of how Arabic phraseology was motivated by the collective memory of early Islamic and pre-Islamic Arab culture, even centuries afterward in far-distant Muslim-Arab culture areas such as fourteenth century Granada, and even when such areas’ own cultural features and concepts contrasted strongly with it. As noted above, turban-wearing in al-Andalus was relatively rare, and its relation to murū’a had been lost by the time of the corpus. Accordingly, for phraseme (78) to have been decodable there, it must have been deeply established in the language’s phraseology. This phraseme is related to the notion of a turban’s value, and thus I argue that it was coined in an eastern (in comparison to al-Andalus)
region, and possibly in the pre-Islamic period. It exhibits a high degree of fixedness, occurring only in the form shown above, in which the idiomatic meaning is preserved by the co-occurrence of the collocation; i.e., it is non-analyisable on the surface semantic level if synonyms are substituted for any of its elements.

The third type of [clothing]-motivated phraseme, derived from the semantic field [to wear], consists of just one example:

79) at-taḥallī bi-l-waqārī [wearing jewels of sedateness] = to be sedate.

This phraseme is more fixed on the syntactic level than on the semantic level. Its structure is governed by the verb hallā [beautifying] in form V, faʿala, which usually occurs with sedateness, as in this case; and the phraseme as a whole is based on the Arabic conceptual metaphor VIRTUES ARE CLOTHES. Various characteristics, especially positive ones, are represented in Arabic by images derived from clothing: for instance, riḍāʿu l-ʿafwi [the wearing of forgiveness], libāsu l-karāmati [the wearing of dignity], and libāsu t-taqwā [the wearing of piety]. In some phrasemes, the specific item of clothing that evokes the image is chosen according to the level of virtue. The referent of the conceptual metaphor is the social-class experience of the cost and appearance of one’s clothes, as illustrated especially in phrasemes that contain ‘crown’ as an element: e.g., tāju l-ʿizzati [the crown of glory] and tāju l-waqārī [the crown of dignity]. Accordingly, the cultural phenomenon of phraseme (79) is cultural

---

617 Ibid., vol. 4, p. 219.
618 Ibn Ḥamdūn, at-Tadhkira al-Ḥamdūniyya, vol. 4, p. 117; and a reference to al-Ḥalabī (d. c. 799/1396) in al-Hūshāni, Jawāhir, vol. 1, p. 78.
620 Qurʾān (al-Aʿrāf) 7:26.
621 See for example ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān as-Ṣūfī, Nuẓhat al-Majālis wa-Muntakhab an-Nafāʿīs (Beirut: ad-Dār al-Lutub al-ʿIliyya, 1998), vol. 1, p. 107; and al-Ḥusayn al-Muẓhirī, al-Mafāṭīḥ fi Sharḥ al-Maṣābīḥ, ed. Nūr ad-Dīn Tālib (Kuwait City: Ministry of Awqāf and Islamic Affairs, 2012), vol. 4, p. 356. Of course, it should be borne in mind that crowns, as symbols of glory, are cross-cultural.
modelling.

As briefly noted above, the level of fixedness of this phraseme is due to the structure \( tāhāllā \ bi+ \) [virtue (most likely sedateness or patience)]. So, it is syntactically fixed and, broadly speaking, semantically fixed: with one lexical core element and two substitutable core elements, a phenomenon for which there are three explanations. First, its image is deeply established in the Arabic conceptual system, as explained earlier. Second, its structure is fully fixed on the syntactic level, in addition to being highly fixed on the lexical level. And third, its target domain is illustrated in the second element of the phraseme.

Finally, the following phraseme is motivated by the source domain [clothes], but was coined to refer to a part of a book:

80) \( dībājatu l-kitābi \) [the silk brocade of the book] \(^{623}\) = the introduction.

The cultural metaphor of the phraseme is straightforwardly cultural material. \( Dībaj \), the first and main element of the phraseme, is a term for a specific type of fabric: silk brocade.\(^{624}\) The \( dībāj \) is the most important aspect of whatever it is added to, and hence needs to be better than the rest. For example, az-Zamakhsharī, under the heading of idiomatic expressions with the root \( d-b-j \), listed expressions like \( fulānun yāṣīnu dībājatayhi \) [someone preserves his (two) silk brocades] = he saves his dignity.\(^{625}\) Similarly, az-Zamakhsharī refers to a person’s cheeks, i.e., face, as the two \( dībaj;\)^\(^{626}\) and \( li-hādhihi l-qāṣīdati dībājatun ḥasanatun \) [this poem has a nice silk brocade] = a well-written poem.\(^{627}\) Therefore, the \( dībāja \) of a given thing is the most important part of it, which needs to be both well made and well looked after. The \( dībaja \) of the

\(^{623}\) Al-Maqqarī, \( Nafḥ at-Ṭib \), Vol. 1, p. 103.

\(^{624}\) Ibn Muṣṭur, \( Lisān al-ʿArab \), (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A8%AF%D9%8A%D8%A8%D8%A7%D8%AC, accessed on 8 May 2018.

\(^{625}\) Az-Zamakhsharī, \( Asās al-Balāgha \), vol. 1, p. 277.

\(^{626}\) Ibid.

\(^{627}\) Ibid. Interestingly, az-Zamakhsharī uses another phraseme to explain \( dībājatu l-qāṣīdati \), saying ‘ay \( muḥabbaratun \). \( Qaṣīda muḥabbara \) [a well-inked poem] = a well-written poem. This idiom is also motivated by material culture, i.e., ink, and possibly a cultural model related to concept of a poem being written – an interesting difference from the usual model of phrasemes within the domain [poetry] in our corpus. However, cultural modelling is still the main cultural phenomenon within that domain.
book is its introduction, which is the first part of it that the reader encounters; and like the best fabric used to make a garment, it should be well made.

7:1:3 Weapons

The source domain [weapons] is, of course, another cross-cultural one, though the symbolic meanings of each weapon and weapon-related gesture vary widely. In the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, phrasemes are motivated by three weapons: swords, spears, arrows and shield. Such phrasemes can be further categorised into two groups, according to whether their references to weapons are direct or indirect.

As representatives of the first group, consider the following four phrasemes:

81) ḥusāmuḥu l-māḍī [the cutting sword] 628 = the order that is not rejected.
82) rimāḥu l-Khaṭṭi [the spears of al-Khaṭṭ] 629 = well-made/well-used spears.
83) saddada llāhu sahmarka [may God (guide) your arrow to (the target)] 630 = to complete a mission successfully.
84) yuwalwiçu sīhāma (l-fukāhati) [(he) is making the arrows’ ends (of humour)] 632 = making a good well-prepared (joke).

The two elements of phraseme (81) can be used either literally or metaphorically. However, they both remain fixed: the phraseme never appears with a synonym for sword in place of ḥusām or a synonym for cutting/sharp in place of māḍī. Although phrasemess with this level of fixity tend to be quotations or having a proper name as one of the elements, we have no positive evidence of this in regard to phraseme (81). However, another cultural phenomenon can be noted in the phraseme: [sword] functions as a cultural symbol of power. This can be seen in

628 Al-Maqqari, Naḍḥ at-Ṭib, vol. 6, p. 131.
630 Ibid., p. 328.
631 For similar phrasemes see al-Hamadhānī, al-Alfāz, p. 284, and Jaʿfar, Jawahir al-Alfāz, p. 92.
632 Al-Maqqari, Naḍḥ at-Ṭib, vol. 6, p. 96.
expressions like *salla s-sa’du husāmahū* [(may) happiness pull (the praised’s) sword]⁶³³ = to be supported by the power of happiness; *sayfuka l-maslūlu* [your (God) sword]⁶³⁴ = Khālid ibn al-Walīd (d. 21/642), a well-known leader in the early Islamic wars of conquest; and *salla z-zamānu ’alayhi sayfan* [fate pulled a sword against (someone)]⁶³⁵ = fate comes for someone.

Phraseme (82) is fully fixed because of its second element, a proper name. Al-Khaṭṭī is a place, most likely a city in al-Yamāma (in central modern Saudi Arabia), which was known for producing the best spears.⁶³⁶ As we have seen, a proper name in a phraseme applies a high level of fixedness to it. The cultural phenomenon in this phraseme is cultural modelling; to understand the link between al-Khaṭṭ and spears, the audience needs to recognise that the place was known for them within the cultural context of pre-Islamic Arabia. A spear in and of itself does not have a symbolic meaning, but it gains a metaphorical one due to its linkage to al-Khaṭṭ, which alters the overall meaning of the phraseme on its secondary semantic level, i.e., its metaphorical/phraseological meaning. Al-Khaṭṭ here functions as a cranberry lexeme.

The third phraseme of the direct reference to [weapons] group relates to arrows, which reflect the conceptual metaphor A SUCCESSFUL DECISION IS AN AIMED ARROW. Phraseme (83) is a communicative phraseme with a level of flexibility that allows it to be used in various forms: *sadiḍu r-ramyi* [well-aimed shot]⁶³⁷ = successful aim, or with an opposite meaning: *akḥṭa’a saḥmu (l-maniyyati)* [(death’s) arrow (was) mistaken]⁶³⁸ = to fail in the mission (of death). Nevertheless, it remains fixed on its lexical level, and the fact that one of its elements is a cultural symbol is the reason for this.

One of the elements of phraseme (84) is an abstract name for arrow, and the other,

---

⁶³⁴ Al-Maqqārī, *Naḥf at-Ṭīb*, vol. 6, p. 360. See also the analysis of phraseme (89).
yufawwiq, a description that is not found except in this context. The second element, sihām, does not apply fixedness because it is a commonly used word in its literal meaning; thus, yufawwiq is the core element of the phraseme. Fūq is the pointed end of an arrow, and fawwaq therefore lies within the semantic field of [arrow]. Yufawwaqu is morphologically fixed, and the verb form II faʿʿala indicates the meaning of intensive and iterative value; hence, the verb emphasises the high quality of the arrows. I would also suggest that the stem fawwaqa in this phraseme is a cranberry lexeme. Taken together, these conditions render the phraseme fully fixed, making it reasonable to assume that it was coined in the early stages of the Arabic language. That a good arrow must have a good end-piece is common sense; yet, the phraseme’s limitation of the category of good arrows to those with well-made end-pieces, combined with the coining of the word yufawwiq in a particular morphological pattern, reveal that phraseme (84) is based on a gesture that is supported by a cultural model.

Overall, the four phrasemes in the first, direct-reference group of the source domain [weapon] function with high levels of fixedness, explained either by their inclusion of cultural symbols, or because of the nature of their elements, i.e., a proper name or a cranberry lexeme.

The three phrasemes in the following group, in contrast, are motivated by the source domain [weapons] indirectly.

85) nafadha l-amru [his order has come through] = the order has been obeyed.
86) raʿyun sadīdun [well-guided decision] = good decision.
87) sayfu kalimatika [the sword of your word] = determination.

Phrasemes (85) and (86) are both influenced by the conceptual metaphor A SUCCESSFUL

---

639 Ibn Manẓūr, Lisān al-ʿArab (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%81%D9%82%D9%88%D9%82, accessed on 10 May 2018.
642 Ibid., p. 678; for similar phrasemes see Jaʿfar, Jawāhir al-Alfāż, p. 92.
DECISION IS AN AIMED ARROW. Both are motivated by a dead metaphor that renders the metaphorical meaning well-established, to the point that *nafadha* and *sadid* are only used specifically to mean ‘happening’ and ‘successful’, respectively. Hence, I consider both phraseme (85) and (86) to be collocations. In the case of the former, the order of a powerful person is a thing that cannot be stopped, and in that sense resembles an arrow or sword cleaving through a person or object. As symbols of power, swords are more commonly encountered than arrows, as well as being arguably better suited to this particular image. Phraseme (86), however, cannot be interpreted as referring to anything other than an arrow, because it incorporates *sadid*, which is related directly to the semantic field [arrow]. The cultural phenomenon in both of these phrasemes is cultural modelling, motivated by the above-mentioned conceptual metaphor.

*Ta’an* [to stab] is only used in reference to edged weapons such as swords and daggers. The image in the phraseme is of life as a tunnel or a container that has an end, and that when one is deep inside it, with no way back, one is stabbed in it. One collective meaning of the root *t-*‘-*n* is of entering something deeply, starting with the tool’s head;644 and another is to make an error.645 This second meaning can be attributed to the original meaning, stab, from which all the other usages are derived metaphorically (or vice versa). Alternatively, we could accept the collective meaning suggested by al-Khalil: that simply in going through life one is making an error, i.e., getting old. Either way, the word *ta’ana* has been semantically determinate to the meaning [to stab] since the early stages of the Arabic language.

All the phrasemes in the second, indirect-reference group of the source domain [weapon] reflect the cultural phenomenon of cultural modelling. It should also be noted that the phrasemes in this group agree in terms of their level of fixedness. For instance, in the corpus we find phraseme (86) in two varieties: *al-musaddadatu r-ra’y*i [the (fem.) guided decision].646

644 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab* (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%B7%D8%B9%D9%86, accessed on 10 May 2018
and *musaddadu n-nażari* [well-guided seeing]. The first variety is on the morphological level, which is expected, due to the lack of conditions that would tend to cause fixedness, e.g., quotation or cultural symbolism. Likewise, it comes with a metaphorical substitution *nażar* of the second element *ra’y* [decision], which maintains its semantic fixedness, but on the metaphorical level: the eye functions as a tool to collect the facts that help a person make a decision. Hence, ‘to see’ is ‘to decide’, and the eye becomes a mytonomy of thinking – a shift that leads to the conceptual metaphor THINKING IS SEEING.

Phraseme (87) *sayfu kalimatika* [the sword of your word] is an idiom that expresses the same metaphorical meaning as phraseme (85), and on its lexical level is not fixed; yet, it preserves the same metaphorical meaning, by combining metaphorical substitutions of its elements. ‘Sword’ replaces ‘to get through’, maintaining the semantic field [sword] but with the main word in it; and ‘word’ replaces ‘order’ via metonymy: a word is a tool for making an order. The two cultural phenomena in phraseme (87) are a cultural symbol, represented in [sword], and a cultural model that is introduced in the image of the metaphor: words/opinion are/is as sharp as a sword (a symbol of power) is, and as sharp as one’s determination ought to be.

Finally, one phraseme indicates a reference to shields:

88) *qalaba zahra l-mijanni* [(he) turned the back of the shield] = to betray.

Needless to say, that the image of the phraseme is direct: illustrating a gesture that reveals an intention to betray someone. Its motivation is a battlefield situation in which, when someone in great need of his allies’ help, they turn their shields around to indicate that they now consider him an enemy.

In short, the phrasemes in this group are semi-fixed on the morphological level, but their

coined metaphorical meanings are fixed, as shown by the fact that their meanings remain unaffected by the substitution of their elements. The source domain [weapon] is well-established in classical Arabic. Phrasemes that make direct reference to it, e.g., by naming a particular weapon, tend to be more fixed than those whose references are indirect. In terms of cultural phenomena, the phrasemes with this source domain are dominated by cultural modelling, though some include [weapon] as a cultural symbol and of course cultural artefact. The contexts in which these phrasemes are used in our corpus do not change any of their metaphorical meanings; and this fixedness in meaning can be explained by their early establishment, as well as by the occurrence of symbols and proper names.

7:2 Habitus

Phraseology in any language is fixed by early-established cultural features. Many actions and concepts dating to pre-Islamic and early Islamic Arab society functioned as conceptual bases for Arabic phrasemes even in the cultural context of fourteenth century classical Arabic, hundreds of years later. No matter how the surface meaning of a phraseme had changed or how long ago it had been established, and regardless of whether the speech community still engaged in the practices it expressed, language perpetuated these practices on a metaphorical level.

One would not expect those phrasemes motivated by physical experiences or human actions that had not changed since they were coined to gain any additional cultural meaning in the context of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s work.

7:2:1 Poetry and Writing

Poetry has been one of the most important aspects of both nomadic and urban both pre-Islamic and Islamic Arab culture, both before and after the advent of Islam. Originally it was recited, but in being written down, it developed a new importance in terms of its influence on
Arabic phraseology. Here, poetry and other writings have been gathered together in one group because both source domains share key aspects.

This group includes two sub-categories: first, writing and poetry as a concept that motivates phrasemes; and second, poetic phrasemes whose source is a poetic text. Most of the latter sub-group’s phrasemes are motivated primarily by the fact that they are quotations of poems or longer poetic texts.

7:2:1:1 Poetry and writing as concepts

Each phraseme in this group is categorised according to its target domain rather than its source domains, to illustrate the linkages between them on the target-domain level. Additionally, comparing the different source domains, which are all related to the domain [habitus], of phrasemes in this way will help us understand how the target domain is conceptualised, as well as how such a complex target domain is fixed in a different, much later cultural context.

The following phraseme illustrates the process of composing a poem:

89) *naẓmu sh-shiʿri* [organising poetry]\(^{649}\) = to compose poetry.

Arabic poetry is composed in a complex system of metre and rhyme. This complexity is conceptualised as organising random objects to create a *naẓm* [an organised object (string or necklace)], by which the concept of [organising poetry] is motivated. The image of phraseme (89) is motivated by three concepts: first, the conceptual metaphor WORDS ARE OBJECTS, which is also reflected in expressions like *alqā ʿawlan* [he throws words]\(^{650}\) = to talk tough, or *qawlun thaqīlun* [heavy speech]\(^{651}\) = serious talk that is hard to accept. Second, composing a

---

\(^{649}\) Ibid., vol. 4, p. 130.


\(^{651}\) Qurʾān (al-Muzzammil) 73:5.
A great poet is described in three different ways in these three phrasemes, all of which are motivated by natural elements. The first phraseme of the group uses *maṭbūʿ* [(to be something by) nature], here meaning a person whose poetry is a part of his nature, and therefore is not artificial. Indeed, according to concept of *shāʾirun maṭbūʿ un*, poetry should not be intentionally made at all, but a natural by-product of the poet’s talent.655

The second phraseme is motivated by a physical experience: cracking open a hard object to discover what is inside it. A poet is a person who opens what others cannot – i.e., hard meaning – and uses it in poetry to show a new way of using that same well-known material. This image is also motivated by the cross-cultural conceptual metaphor TO OPEN IS TO DISCOVER.

_Fuḥūl_ in the last phraseme is interpreted as the males that can reproduce: a symbol of masculinity, and so of power. A poet described as a stallion is one who is better than the rest because of his masculinity/productivity.

---

655 Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889) coined and defined the concept and term of *shāʾir maṭbūʿ*, which became highly accepted in the classical Arabic scholarship of the pre-modern era. See Muḥammad ibn Qutayba ad-Dinawarī, _ash-Shiʿr wa-sh-Shuʿarāʾ_, ed. Maḥmūd Shākir (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1982), vol. 1, p. 90.
The cultural phenomenon in phrasemes (90), (91) and (92) is cultural modelling, as all require their hearers to have a base level of knowledge of the importance of nature and masculinity in tribal Arab culture. In the case of phraseme (91), the idea of opening something hard is a cross-cultural concept, but it is necessary to know something of the aesthetic standards of Arabic poetry to comprehend it thoroughly.

All three phrasemes are highly fixed, and this is explained by the fact that in each case, one of their elements is the non-metaphorical word \textit{\textit{shā}'ir/shu'arā'}} [poet/poets]. Because the first element is used on its literal semantic level, the second remains the same to maintain phraseological fixedness. As the metaphorical key to the phraseme, this second element – the adjective, in these examples – applies a level of fixedness.

The description of poetic ability as organising contrasts with Arabic descriptions of prose writing, for while poetry is meant to be memorised and recited, prose is expected to be written. For this reason, Ibn al-Khaṭīb provides the following idiom:

93) \textit{sayyālu l-midādi} [flowing ink]\textsuperscript{656} = a good writer.

Its surface meaning is read literally, but its secondary one is understood by mapping the image of [ink flowing from a pen], as a metonym, onto [a good writer]. The two sides of the metaphor are clearly understandable because of the metonymical connection between them. Two possible cultural phenomena are reflected in the phraseme, and may be considered a blended phenomenon. First, ink in a cultural context is linked with the idea of writing down important thoughts, but usually not poetry which is linked with composing and performing. \textsuperscript{657} Thus, ink can be considered a culture-specific artefact. Yet, to access this artefact status, we need to apply our knowledge of the connection between prose and writing as its medium, on the one hand,

\textsuperscript{656} Al-Maqqari, \textit{Nafh at-Tib}, vol. 7, p. 283.

\textsuperscript{657} \textit{Anshad} [to sing/to perform] is the verb used for performing poetry, examples of which are too numerous to be listed. See for example the search results for \textit{anshada ahi ran} on islamport.com: \url{http://islamport.com/cgi-bin/1/search.cgi?zoom_sort=0&zoom_xml=0&zoom_query=%C3%E4%D4%CF&zoom_per_page=10&zoom_and=1&zoom_cat%5B%5D=-1}, accessed on 14 May 2018.
and memorising and recitation as poetry’s medium, on the other. Thus, the other cultural phenomenon in this phraseme is cultural modelling.

Phraseme (93) occurs in a single fixed form on the lexical and syntactic levels. The surface level of the phraseme is read literally, which requires a high level of fixedness if it is to be distinguished from similar literal phrases. Sayyāl is formed in the faʿʿāl pattern, which indicates intensive and iterative value on the meaning of the word. The usual collective abstract word for ink in classical Arabic is hibr, but the phraseme instead uses the synonym midād. According to the dictionaries, midād does not apply additional meaning to the general meaning of hibr [ink]; so combining the two words in a non-abstract pattern and full fixedness makes them function as a single unit that reflects the phraseological meaning.

Writing, learning and books are all semantically connected in Arabic. Kitāb [book] and ʿilm [knowledge] are substitutable in some phrasemes, as will be shown below.

94) ʿakafa ʿala l-kitābi [(he) bowed to a book] = to study hard.

The image in this phraseme is motivated by a physical experience. Bowing to read and focus on a book is a gesture that shows one is interested in and studying it carefully. Although the phraseme’s form is considered fixed, kitāb [book] and ʿilm [knowledge] can be substituted for each other. It is easy to see that ‘book’ precedes ‘knowledge’ in the phraseme’s formation, and that the connection between the two words is metonymical. The phraseme is motivated by the conceptual metaphor KNOWLEDGE IS A BOOK, so one learns when reading, as in expressions like qaraʿa ʿalayhi [(he) read to him] = to be taught by someone. There is also a gesture in the phraseme: to bow, which indicates a dedication to reading and learning. This gesture, coupled with the mention of a book, illustrates a physical experience of seeing students bowing to a book while studying, and this motivates the phraseme’s metaphorical meaning.

---

658 In traditional Arabic grammar, faʿʿāl is called šīghat mubālaga [exaggerating form]: al-Khaṭīb, Mukhtaṣar al-Khaṭīb, p. 75.
To sum up, poetry is conceptualised as a process of organising or arranging pre-existing objects (i.e., words) in an artistic manner, chiefly in the mind and in speech. Prose, on the other hand, is linked more definitely to the process of writing, as illustrated by ink metaphors. [Poetry] as a target domain is motivated by different source domains, depending on context. The main cultural phenomena reflected in this group of phrasemes is cultural models.

7:2:1:2 Poetry as a source text of phrasemes

It is preferable to analyse all of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s phrasemes that were abstracted from original poetic verses collectively, as this allows us to highlight the differences between them, both chronologically and culturally. And, having already established that the original source of these phrasemes is poetry, their main cultural phenomenon is, by definition, quotation.

Poetry is one of the most common sources of quotations in classical Arabic works, perhaps even on a par with the Qurʾān in quantitative terms. The quotations that are considered here are only those that fulfil the criteria of Arabic phraseology. Each may be either a hemistich or a full verse, depending on where the meaning of the phraseme is completed.

Of the nine Islamic-era poetic phrasemes found in our corpus, one is derived from the works of Abū Tammām (d. 231/846), one from those of Ibn al-Jahm (d. 249/863), six from al-Mutanabbī (d. 354/965), and one from Ibn Nubāta as-Saʿdī (d. 405/1015). Let us take Abū Tammām first.

660 Although Ibn al-Khaṭīb quoted well-known Andalusi poetic verses that later became signifiers of the loss of al-Andalus to the Reconquista, none of those verses fulfilled the metaphorical-meaning criterion for classification as phrasemes. Nor did he use any Andalusi poetic verses phraseologically in the corpus, even from earlier eras or from prestigious Andalusi poets such as Ibn Zaydūn (d. 394/1071). Two poems by Ibn Zaydūn, māʿ alalā zamīya bāsi and Adḥa t-tanāʿ ʿan tadānīnā, are a major source of phrasemes that, though considered later, could have been known to Andalusi writers at the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb: see Abū al-Walīd Aḥmad ibn Zaydūn, Diwan Ibn Zaydūn, ed. Yusuf Farajjū (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1994), pp. 138 and 298. Although Ibn Zaydūn lived three centuries after the conquest of al-Andalus, there were historical events from the early history of the Arabs that he could have alluded to, though not necessarily as phrasemes. In any case, their phraseological meanings were not established, and they were not used metaphorically, in the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb.
95) naqqil fuʿādaka ḥaythu shiʿta mina l-hawā/ma l-ḥubbu illā li-l-ḥabībi l-awwali
[transfer your heart to wherever you like/love is only to the first love]661 = no matter how much you change your opinion, you will always return to the initial decision.

When deployed as a proverb, the full verse is used, because the meaning would not be conveyed in the absence of the second part, which includes the main or core phrase ma l-ḥubbu illā li-l-ḥabībi l-awwali. This verse became conventionalised as a phraseme earlier in the east than in the west,662 and it appears likely that Andalusi literature inherited the verse as a phraseme from the east via collections of eastern literature.

The following phraseme was taken from the poetry of Ibn al-Jahm as a phraseme:

96) min ḥaythu adrī wa-lā adrī [from what I know or I don’t know]663 = a sudden event (usually positive) happens to you for reasons beyond your control.

The beginning of this verse, which was sometimes included in the phraseme (albeit not by Ibn al-Khaṭīb), is ‘uyūnu l-mahā bayna r-Ruṣāfati wa-l-jisri [the gazelle’s eyes between ar-Raṣāfa and the bridge].664 While the phraseme is non-figurative, it is referential. Being a quotation and a non-figurative phraseme renders it fully fixed. The same analysis applies to the following proverb phraseme, drawn from the poetry of Ibn Nubāṭa as-Saʿdī:

---
664 The narratives provide a myth-like background story for this verse: that Ibn al-Jahm came to the caliph al-Mutawakkil to praise him and be rewarded for doing so. As al-Jahm came from the desert, he composed a piece of poetry influenced by the so-called ‘touch imagination of Bedouins’. Two verses are always given as an example of this lost poem:

*anta ka-l-kalbi fi ḥifżika li-l-widdi / wa ka-t-taysi fi girāʾi l-khuṭābī*

*anta ka-d-dalwi lā adhinnāka dalwan/ min ʿazīmi d-dillā i wāfī d-dhanābī*

[You keep your love as a dog and as tough as a billy-goat with problems
You are a bucket; we may not lose you as a bucket, of great buckets with great capacity.]

After al-Mutawakkil heard this, he sent al-Jahm to one of the caliph’s gardens. When Ibn al-Jahm came back, he wrote the poem that starts with the verse that includes the phraseme. See Muḥyī ad-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī, Muḥādarāt al-ʿAbrār wa-Muṣāmāt al-Akhyār fi al-Adabiyyāt wa-n-Nawādīr wa-l-Akhbār (Beirut: Dīr al-Yaqzā al-Arabiyya, 1968), vol. 2, p. 8. This story could have been made up to explain the difference in the style of the two pieces of poetry that al-Jahm wrote; or, the first piece could have been invented as part of the story, by way of making the surviving poem look even better by comparison.

169
97) ṭabībun yudāwi n-nāsa wa-hwa ‘alīlu [a doctor who cures people while he is ill]⁶⁶⁵ = one who can solve other people’s problems, but not his own.

Abstracted from its original poetic context, phraseme (97) occurs as a second hemistich in the following verse:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bi-rūḥiya dhayyāka n-nasīmu idhā sarā} \\
\text{ṭabībun yudāwi n-nāsa wa-hwa ‘alīlū} \\
\text{[may my life (be sacrificed to) that sick (soft) breeze} \\
\text{[(that is like) a doctor who cures people while he is ill]
\end{align*}
\]

Specifically, in this context, the phraseme functions as the second part of a simile *secundum comparatum* that is established via word manipulation. The word ‘alīl means sick on its primary semantic level, but became a dead metaphor for [soft breeze], in the sense of lacking in strength, and so came to mean [sick]. The poet used this semantic relation as common ground for the two parts of the simile.

The key difference between phraseme (96) and phraseme (97) is that the first part of the verse is not mentioned in connection with the format of the phraseme, as the corpus shows.⁶⁶⁶ This could be because the phraseological meaning of phraseme (96) became wider than the limited semantic scope it would be allowed if the first part of the verse were included. Unlike the phraseme based on Ibn Nubāta’s verse, the one based on Ibn al-Jahm’s is used in a positive context, and can be linked to its original, poetic context. Thus, although both phrasemes are used by Ibn al-Khaṭīb without their first parts, the context is rather different:

Phraseme (96):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{...wa-lammā ra ’aytu d-dahra māṭalanī bihā wa-shawwaqanī min ḥaythu adrī} \\
\text{wa-lā adrī}
\end{align*}
\]

[...and when I found time postponing it (the kiss), and it (time) made me crave it].

Phraseme (97):

\[
...wa-law šadaqa l-wā'izu l-athara l-lāhumma lā akthara, tabībun yudāwi n-nāsa wa-hwa 'alilun, wa-t-tafaqqunu qalīlun
\]

[...and if only the preacher was honest in looking (at himself), only that no more, (but he is like) a doctor who cures people while he is ill, and lack of intelligence].

The context of phraseme (96) emphasises the original context of the poetic lines, which is love, although the phraseme occurs without the first part of the verse. Phraseme (97), on the other hand, occurs in the context of a criticism of preachers based on metaphorical meaning, and mentioning the first part of the verse would not have made sense. On the whole, the use of these two phrasemes by Ibn al-Khaṭīb does not appear to reflect an alternative pattern to their original uses.

As noted above, the lion’s share of poetic phrasemes in our corpus goes to al-Mutanabbī, with the following six examples:

98) ‘alā qaḍrī aḥli l-ʾaẓmī tāʾī l-ʾaẓāʾ iṃu [according to men’s wills strength comes]

= the action is a reflection of one’s intentions.

99) bi-diddihā tatabayyanu l-ʾashyāʾu [by their juxtaposition, things became known]

= to use the opposite as a proof.

---

667 Ibid.
669 The following phrasemes are transliterated as prose texts because they occur in prose contexts rather than poetic ones.
100) **gharību l-wajhi wa-l-yadi wa-l-lisāni** [a stranger in face and hand and tongue]672 = someone who is a stranger/foreign, either in a real or an abstract sense.

101) **khudh mā tarāhu wa-da’ shay’an sami’ta bihī** [take what you see, leave what you hear]673 = to take the guaranteed opportunity rather than waiting for the non-guaranteed one.

102) **al-ladī fawqat-tūrābī turābun** [all that is above earth is dust]674 = mortality.

103) **ḥasiba sh-shahma min dhī waramin** [(he) thought fat one whose fat is a tumour]675 = to be fooled by appearances; superficiality.

In four of these cases, the phraseme is a hemistic of a verse, while phraseme (102) is an incomplete hemistich, and (103) a flexible phraseme extracted from a hemistich. Phraseme (98)’s proverbial structure delivers its meaning, without any need to combine it with the rest of the verse,676 as its generalized statement – of praise for the ruler of Aleppo Sayf ad-Dawla (r. 333-356/946-967) – renders it easier to extract from its context.

The analysis of phraseme (98) also applies to phraseme (99), except insofar as the latter occurs without the *wa* at the beginning of the hemistich that is essential to the metre, but not to the meaning. However, the meaning of phraseme (99) is abstract and independent from the first hemistich of the verse.677

Phraseme (100) is a full hemistich from the opening of the poem *Shu‘b Bawān*, in which al-Mutanabbi describes his journey in an unfamiliar land. In the verse, he describes the place as *malā’ibu jinnatin* [the Jinn’s playground], where even Solomon would need a translator.678

Thus, the young Arab man, al-Mutanabbi, would be **gharību l-wajhi wa-l-yadi wa-l-lisāni** [a

---

676 The second hemistich is wa-ta’tī ’alā qadri l-kirāmī l-makārimu.
677 The first hemistich is wa-yudhimuhum wa-bihi ‘arafaḥā faḍlahā.
678 King Solomon, according to the Islamic tradition, dominated the Jinn and had the ability to speak all languages. See J. Walker and P. Fenton, ‘Sulaymān b. Dāwūd’, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (electronic resource): http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_7158, accessed on 20 May 2018.
stranger in face and hand and tongue]. The phraseme functions as a Ḥāl [circumstantial clause], leading us to categorise it as an idiom rather than a full proverb.

The verse from which phraseme (101) is taken is related to preceding verses, as it provides the reason people should believe al-Mutanabbī’s praise, rather than accepting received opinion about the greatness of ancient characters like Kulayb. Al-Mutanabbī says:

layta l-madāʾiḥa tastawfī manaqībahū
fa-mā Kulaybun wa-ahlu l-aṣurī l-uwālī
khudh mā trāhu wa-daʾshāyan samīʾat bihī
fī ṭalʿatī l-badri mā yughnīkaʾan Zuḥalī

[Would that praises equalled his virtue
Not as Kulayb or people of early times
Take what you see, leave what you hear
Full moon rising dispenses with (Saturn)].

The phraseme is a proverb taken from a full hemistich; it is extracted from the verse because its metaphorical meaning is completed without the second hemistich, which functions as an additional secundum comparatum to the primum comparatum.

Except for (99) with its minor reduction, phrasemes (98) through (101) all occur as full hemistiches, and all express general concepts. The use of a complete hemistich is explained by two points: first, both the surface and the deep semantic level of the phraseme is expressed by the full hemistich; and second, none of these phrasemes contain a cranberry lexeme, or any linguistic specification either on the syntactic or morphological level. The uniqueness of al-Mutanabbi’s style and the level of respect with which his works were treated could also have contributed to this phenomenon, as discussed further below. However, phrasemes (102) and

---

680 Ibid., p. 321.
(103) tend to refute this.

The original text of phraseme (102) is wa-kullu l-ladḥī fawqa t-turābī turābu [and all that is above earth is but dust]. The phraseme retained the core sentence that reflected its phraseological meaning in a proverbial form, but deleted the amount indicator wa-kullu [and all]. This indicator does not apply an additional meaning because the grammatical formation of the sentence, as a nominative sentence, indicates generalisation.

Phraseme (103) is an idiom that exhibits a high level of flexibility in terms of order, and breaks the metre of the original text:

\[
\text{u' idhuhā nazaratīn minka šādiqatan} \\
\text{an taḥsaba sh-shaḥma fī-man shaḥmuhū waramū} \\
\text{[I took refuge in your trusted glances} \\
\text{Not to think fat one whose fat is a tumour]}^{681}
\]

The phraseme retains the main elements of the original text by which the meaning is expressed, including shaḥm [fat], waram [tumour], and the verb that functions as the connector between the two, taḥsab [(you) think]. We can note flexibility in the phraseme’s order and morphological level, but not its lexical level. The maintenance of the semantic bond between the main elements preserves the phraseological semantic level in spite of both the addition of elements like dhī [that of] and modifications on the syntactic level. Phraseme (103)’s flexibility raises another question. If the cultural phenomenon in a phraseme is quotation, how can that phraseme exhibit such a high level of flexibility?

The short answer is that, although the phraseme is a quotation (a full-fixedness condition), it became very common as a phraseme, which applied a limited level of flexibility to it.\(^{682}\) Its new form retains the main structure that carries the phraseological meaning, but

---

\(^{681}\) Ibid., p. 317.  
\(^{682}\) The poem from which the phraseme is extracted is one of the most famous by al-Mutanabbī. For how common the phraseme is, see its occurrence in belles-lettres works on Islamport.com: http://islamport.com/cgi-bin/w/adb/search.cgi?zoom_query=%C7%E1%D4%CD%E3+%E6%D1%E3+%E6%D1%E3&zoom_per_page=100&zoom_an
modifies the order within the limits of the metaphorical meaning and the ability of the audience to decode it. Thus, instead of being either fully fixed or fully flexible, the phraseme became semi-flexible (i.e., in order and syntax).

To conclude, we can see that all the poetic phrasemes in our corpus were taken from eastern Arabic poetry. Ibn al-Khaṭīb used phrasemes from the era of post-conquest al-Andalus, as late as the eleventh century.

In terms of structure, we can see that the majority of the Arabic poetic phrasemes used by Ibn al-Khaṭīb were fully fixed, which is understandable insofar as all such uses reflect the cultural phenomenon of quotation. The exception occurs in the most common phraseme of the group, which was transformed over time from a fully fixed to a semi-fixed status by its frequent occurrence. Interestingly, both of the semi-fixed poetic phrasemes that the corpus provides are derived from the work of al-Mutanabbī. In both the eastern and western parts of the Arab world, al-Mutanabbī is considered a phenomenal poet, so perhaps we should not be surprised that his verses’ popularity led eventually to the creation of a quotation phraseme that was nevertheless flexible. In other words, we can conclude that the more conventional and well-established a classical Arabic phraseme is, the more flexible it can be, even if it is a quotation.

7:2:2 Genealogy

In a tribal society like the one in which classical Arabic originated, genealogy is a central concept that keeps the tribe and its members bonded to one another. Having a pure bloodline also guarantees privilege, which is more important than wealth, in the sense that wealth can be

---

gained but a pure bloodline cannot. As a result, a pure bloodline became equated with nobility, which in this context includes virtues and ethical values. Consider the following phrasemes:

104) ṣarīḥu n-nasabi [the pure bloodline]⁶⁸⁴ = nobility.

105) an-nasabu l-ḥurru [the free bloodline]⁶⁸⁵ = honourable.

Both include a core component, nasab, which is used literally, and a second component that operates as the metaphorical motivation. Also, both phrasemes are categorised as collocations. The image in the first phraseme illustrates nobility by mapping purity onto it. CLARITY IS GOOD motivates the concept of ṣarīḥ. Combining purity, which is conceptualised as GOOD, with genealogy results in the meaning [good person]. In addition, one’s bloodline is conceptualised as a visual image that should be clear, which is the lexical meaning of the root ṣ-r-h. Both images are blended to represent the target domain [nobility].

In phraseme (105), the metaphorical tool is ḥurr [free/noble], which in this context is directly linked with the concept of a noble bloodline as the opposite of slavery (considered primarily, in this case, as a lost genealogy).⁶⁸⁶ However, the linkage between freedom and honour is motivated by the conceptualised image in the previous phraseme. Purity is good; freedom is a pure bloodline; and a free bloodline guarantees goodness. Thus, being honourable is a product of being free or having free will.

In both these phrasemes, the metaphor is decoded via a prior knowledge of the Arab concepts of freedom and purity, on the one hand, and of nobility and honour, on the other. Thus, the phenomenon in the phrasemes is cultural modelling. This tends to explain the lack of figurativeness in both elements of each phraseme.

---

⁶⁸⁶ ‘Alī, al-Muṣafṣal, vol. 7, pp. 253 and 357-8. For more details on freemen’s and slaves’ genealogy in pre-Islamic Arab culture, see ibid., p. 390.
In spite of the fact that settlements existed in all historical periods, itinerant nomadic life dominated the scene of many Arabic-speaking communities until the time of Ibn al-Khattab. [Travel] as a source domain therefore profoundly influenced Arabic phraseology. Our corpus provides five [travel]-based phrasemes:

106) \textit{alqāʾ āṣa t-ṭisyāʾir} [(he) dropped the stick of travelling]\textsuperscript{687} = to end a journey or a long task.\textsuperscript{688}

107) \textit{ānasa ghurbatahū} [(it) amuses (him in) absence from home]\textsuperscript{689} = to amuse someone in a difficult situation.

Phraseme (106) is an idiom that is motivated by an image directly related to a long journey: the laying down of the walking stick that a nomadic Arab traveller would use. The stick itself does not function as a symbol in this context; rather, the action is the gesture of dropping the stick in the context of travelling, both of which in this combination form a cultural model. Travelling – considered as long, difficult, and necessary – can represent any other action that fits the same three descriptions. This phraseme combines three words, of which the first two has an abstract meaning. \textit{Tisyāʾir} is the only element in the phraseme that is a secondary word for [travelling], and it preserves the phraseme’s metaphorical unity. The phraseme also reflects a gesture that indicates the end of one’s trip. It also, indicates a third cultural phenomenon that is a cultural artefact: a stick that is used as a multi-use tool in long trips.

Phraseme (107) is another idiom that illustrates another major consequence of travelling in a tribal community like that of Arabia, where family ties are so vitally important. In such a context, nostalgia becomes more than just a feeling; it is a representation of the worst feelings that remain following any difficult event. In other words, the phraseme refers to amusing

\textsuperscript{687} Al-Maqqari, \textit{Naḥḥ al-Tib}, vol. 4, p. 363.
\textsuperscript{688} al-Hamadhānī, \textit{al-ʾAlfāz}, p. 196.
\textsuperscript{689} Al-Maqqari, \textit{Naḥḥ al-Tib}, vol. 6, p. 412.
someone who suffers from grief, and its cultural model can be decoded only via an understanding of the significance of both travelling and family in tribal nomadic Arab culture.

The following idioms are all related to [travel] as a source domain, but their images are motivated by both a gesture and an artefact:

108)  ḥuṭṭat riḥālūhū [his saddlebags have been put down]\textsuperscript{690} = to settle (emotionally).
109)  alqat bi-bānika raḥlahū [(it) handed down its saddlebags at your gate]\textsuperscript{691} = to be intended.

Phrasemes (108) and (109) both clearly refer to a gesture linked to travel and to materials used in travelling, i.e., riḥāl/raḥl [saddlebags/saddlebag].

Riḥāl is mainly understood as camel saddles, although it might be construed as saddlebags in general, and is used as a metaphor for travelling. The image that is recalled by phrasemes (108) and (109) is of taking saddlebags down from the main riding animal in the desert of Arabia, i.e., the camel, after a journey. Hence, the gesture in both phrasemes is similar, but the additional element in phraseme (109) alters the phraseological meaning by adding the additional meaning ‘settling’. Bi-bānika [at your gate] implies the meaning of an intended target of the long journey, understood via the gesture ‘to hand down saddlebags’. So phraseme (109) adds a layer of meaning: a highly desired goal that is worth a long journey to reach.

These two phrasemes embody the cultural phenomenon of cultural modelling, insofar as the act of putting down saddlebags illustrates having reached one’s destination or goal, and a culturally specific artefact (saddlebags), which motivates the meaning of travelling in both of them. In neither phraseme could another artefact be substituted for ‘saddlebags’. Although raḥl as the core element implies a level of fixedness, the action element (ḥaṭṭ/alqā) in both phrasemes could be substituted for it. In phraseme (109), however, another core element, bi-

bābika [at your gate], limits the flexibility of the phraseme because it plays a main role in mapping its image.

The final phraseme in this category is motivated by a gesture related to determination to reach one’s goal: in this case, a person one is pursuing.

110) tunḍī ilayhi r-rikāban [(you) overtiring the stirrup to (reach him)]\(^692\) = to relentlessly pursue someone.

The two elements of this idiom are andā and rikāb. To overtire, i.e., over-use, a stirrup implies its use over a lengthy period. Interestingly, the root n-d-w indicates the meaning of stripping or slimming something.\(^693\) Therefore, the meaning of andā r-rikāba can mean to overuse, to overtire, or even to wear out the stirrup. All of those interpretations motivate the same metaphorical meaning of the phraseme: to make a long journey that results in damaged stirrups to reach one’s goal, or simply: to relentlessly pursue someone. The cultural phenomena in the phraseme are a cultural model (the concept of going on a long journey regardless of how hard and deadly it would be in a harsh environment), and an artefact (a stirrup that is not meant to be easily worn out). So, the word yunḍī in phraseme (110) motivates the meaning of relentlessness in the target domain of the phraseme. The phraseme is highly fixed due to its non-figurativeness and its inclusion of one words (yunḍī) that is only used with the other (rikāb) to indicate a specific meaning, which no synonym could deliver.

7:2:4 Racing

The following phrasemes are all idioms motivated by special reference to a noteworthy cultural activity: racing. A good example of the importance assigned to horse-racing is provided

\(^692\) Ibid., vol. 4, p. 409.
by the story of the war of Dāḥis and al-Gḥabdāʾ, which broke out because of a race.\textsuperscript{694}

111) \( lā yuṣḥaqqū gḥubāruḥū \) \[his dust cloud is unbreakable]\textsuperscript{695} = incompatible.

112) \( fārasā rihānīn \) \[two racing/gambling horses]\textsuperscript{696} = two competitors.\textsuperscript{697}

113) \( ḥārayta (māʾāhū) fī maydānīhī \) \[you ran with (him) in (his) race course]\textsuperscript{698} = to compete with someone.

114) \( ḥalbatu s-sabqī \) \[race course]\textsuperscript{699} = competition.

115) \( ḥāʾizun qaṣaba s-sabqī \) \[(he) owns the baton of winning]\textsuperscript{700} = he is the first.

The audience can directly decode the target domains of each of these five phrasemes because of the concept shared between their source and target domains. Phraseme (111) recalls the perceptual experience of a dust cloud made by a fast-running horse; a cultural model. In phraseme (112), the target domain corresponds to the elements of the phraseme in terms of both the number indicated in the element and the concept of laying a wager/competition (another cultural model). Phraseme (113) also indicates racing and competition, which are represented in \( maydān \) \[race course\] and \( ḥarā \) \[to run\], or – as the latter is conjugated in the phraseme – \( jarayta \) \[(you) ran\]. In phrasemes (114) and (115), \( sabq \) \[race\] implies the concept of competition. These two collocations are considered phrasemes because their elements are non-substitutable, and the target domain is not horse-racing but human competition; hence, they have metaphorical meanings. The phenomenon of phrasemes (114) and (115) is cultural modelling, due to their reflection of a cultural conceptualisation of racing, though we can also consider running as a gesture that motivates phraseme (113). Lastly, phraseme (115) includes a unique element: \( qaṣab\). This cranberry applies a high level of fixedness to it, and also reflects


\textsuperscript{696} Al-Maqqārī, \textit{Naḥf at-Tīb}, vol. 6, p. 217.

\textsuperscript{697} Al-Hamadhānī, \textit{al-Alfāz}, p. 167.

\textsuperscript{698} Al-Maqqārī, \textit{Naḥf at-Tīb}, vol. 2, p. 121.


\textsuperscript{700} Al-Maqqārī, \textit{Naḥf at-Tīb}, vol. 7, p. 68.
a specific cultural model: the use of batons in racing.\textsuperscript{701} Building on the foregoing analysis, we can say that this phraseme reflects two cultural phenomena: a cultural model (racing) and a cultural artefact (baton).

This group of phrasemes from Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works is decodable via references that are embedded in the language, but also ascribable to an abstract concept: the conceptual metaphor FIRST IS BEST. Phrasemes (111) through (115) imply the idea of [being the first] as a positive aim, bound up in the concept of racing. Of course, FIRST IS BEST is a universal concept, a fact that helps explain why these phrasemes were conventionalised.\textsuperscript{702}

7:2:5 Gambling

Gambling was a common practice in pre-Islamic Arabia,\textsuperscript{703} yet some successful gamblers would donate what they won to the poor, due to a societal prejudice that money derived from gambling was dishonourable.\textsuperscript{704} Gambling was clearly forbidden in Islam, as illustrated in the Qur’ānic verse, ‘wine, gambling, [worshipping] idols, and [dividing] arrows are filth from the work of the devil’.\textsuperscript{705} Although this verse covers two types of activities that are both considered gambling in Islam, it differentiates between gambling for money and gambling to arrive at a decision. The latter is termed \textit{azlām} as in the verse, and \textit{qidāḥ} in the following pair of idioms:

116) \textit{lahu l-qidhū l-mu’allā} [the highest arrow is his]\textsuperscript{706} = to have an advantage.

117) \textit{ajāla qidāḥa r-ra’yi} [he spined the arrows of opinions]\textsuperscript{707} = to think about and examine different opinions.

\textsuperscript{701} ‘All, \textit{al-Mufaṣṣal}, vol. 8, p. 273.
\textsuperscript{702} FIRST IS BEST is a cross-cultural conceptual metaphor. It is mentioned here by way of arguing that when such a condition is combined with a culturally specific concept, it supports the conventionalisation of the occurrence of the phrasemes in late Andalusi literature.
\textsuperscript{703} ‘All, \textit{al-Mufaṣṣal}, vol. 9, p. 126.
\textsuperscript{704} Ibid., p. 127.
\textsuperscript{705} Qur’ān (al-Mā’ida) 5:90.
\textsuperscript{706} Ibn al-Khaṭīb, \textit{al-Ilḥāta}, vol. 4, p. 145.
\textsuperscript{707} Ibid., p. 301.
In both phrasemes, *qidh* (singular) and *qidāh* (plural) literally mean arrow(s), and reference a form of gambling in which fourteen arrows were each assigned certain odds, the one with the short odds being known as *muʿallā* [the highest].708 The mapping of the image is that the person who has the *muʿallā* has an advantage within the group. Although there is no positive evidence that gambling with *qidāh* was known or practised in al-Andalus at the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, the occurrence of the phraseme shows that its metaphorical meaning was known to the Arabic speech community among which Ibn al-Khaṭīb lived, or at least among its educated class. This phenomenon is explained by the fact that the phraseme had become a dead metaphor in the language.

The same concept applies to phraseme (117). In this case, however, the phraseme was coined by combining *qidāh* with *ajāl* [to spin] and a decoding element, *raʿy* [opinion]. The mapping of this image links the act of examining and thinking about various opinions with that of observing different arrows to choose the right arrow/opinion. Phraseme (117)’s core elements *ajāla qidāha* are fully fixed, but we can also observe two modified versions, in which the third element is replaced with something that suits the context: *ijaalat qidāhi l-ʾādābi* [the spinning of ʾādāb (good disciplines’) arrows],709 and *ajāla qidāha s-siyāsati* [he spined the arrows of politics].710 The first is the title of a book that Ibn al-Khaṭīb mentioned when referring to Ibrāhīm an-Numayrī (d. after 768/1366).711 Although the title uses two of the elements of phraseme (117), the third is replaced with something more suited to the concept of the book, i.e., the forms of discipline that one should adhere to whilst travelling.712 It can be argued that, although titles are meant to break conventions to grab the reader’s attention, the core elements

---

708 Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab* (electronic resource): [http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%89](http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%89), accessed on 23 May 2018.
710 Ibid., vol. 4, p. 40.
711 Ibid., vol. 2, p. 179.
712 Ibid., p. 181.
of the book-title phraseme are those of phraseme (117). Nevertheless, this claim raises the issue that the phraseme does not occur except with a third element that lends figurativeness to it.

Phrasemes (116) and (117) are fully fixed because both include cranberry lexemes that had lost their contextual meanings, but gained metaphorical ones within their respective phrasemes’ unified meanings. Although the full-fixedness factor apply to phraseme (117), and qidāh is a cranberry lexeme, the fact that there are three elements in the phraseme implies a level of flexibility regarding its third element. Both phrasemes combine two cultural phenomena, i.e., a culture-specific artefact (qidh/qidāh) and cultural modelling (the practice of gambling with the qidāh).

7:2:6 Giving Praise

As a target domain, [praising] is motivated by a number of different source domains. Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works include four phrasemes that indicate the giving of praise, all of which are early coinages idioms containing cultural models. The first phraseme in this category figuratively describes the abstract meaning of [praising]:

The following three phrasemes all express [praising] with a reference to a male target.

118) fata l-qawmi [the young man of people]\textsuperscript{713} = a praised man.
119) salāmatu l-jānibi [healthy side]\textsuperscript{714} = one whose deeds are good.
120) damithu l-akhlāqi [(one with) flabby morals]\textsuperscript{715} = a nice, ethical person.

Phraseme (118) is motivated by the idea of the a strong young man whose tribe depends on him. Fatā [a young man] is the first element, which in combination with the other element qawm [his people] works as an idāfa syntactic form. Joining the first element to the second in idāfa indicates that the man is the representation of his people. Although fatā literally means [a young

\textsuperscript{713} Ibid., vol. 3, p. 228.
\textsuperscript{714} Ibid., vol. 2, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{715} Ibid., vol. 3, p. 147.
man, when used in this context it no longer has any bearing on a person’s chronological age. It is possible that this word was chosen for this expression because youth is a cultural model of the representation of power, and thus bound up with the notion of masculine power. Once more, lack of figurativeness is associated with a high level of fixedness, due to the need to preserve the phraseme’s metaphorical meaning.

Another mode of praise operates by reference to morality. In phraseme (119), good morals are represented in jānib [side] as metonym for heart. The pre-modern fictive notion of the heart is that it is the container of all the emotions, and thus the source of one’s actions. In this phraseme, the heart is alluded to by reference to its location within the body. The first part, salāma, is literally translated as [safe] or [healthy]. When the container/source of one’s beliefs and actions (which shapes one’s morals) is healthy, good results follow. The phraseme’s second element occurs in two varieties, reflecting two distinct conceptualisations of the heart and its metonyms. Although the phraseme is motivated by a cross-cultural phenomenon, fictive conceptual domains describing the heart as healthy/safe (as a target domain for morality) render this an Arabic-specific phenomenon. We can also argue that, in this phraseme, jānib as a metonym for heart is a symbol of one’s virtues, feelings, thoughts and emotions. Hence, we can identify phraseme (119) as including another cultural phenomenon, i.e., a cultural symbol.

In phraseme (120), morals are conceptualised as material that may be either soft or hard. Interestingly, while hardness in the Arabic conceptual system is a positive concept, softness is positive also. Here, the difference between them lies in the context. Soft morals do not imply flexibility or ease of manipulation, but rather reflect a physical experience in which tenderness is needed to avoid causing harm. The word akhlāq carries the abstract meaning [morals], so the unified metaphorical meaning of the phraseme is underpinned by its second element and key motivator, the cranberry lexeme damith. In other expressions, the conceptual metaphor TENDERNESS IS NICENESS is represented by layyin [flabby]: e.g., in layyinu l-jānibi [a
flabby side\[^{716}\] = nice person, and layyn \(I-\text{arīkati}\) [flabby nature\[^{717}\] = a nice personality. The special image of morals in a specific cultural context renders this phraseme a cultural model.

The following two phraseme is formed is another cultural model reflecting praising communicative phraseme:

121) \(li-\text{llāhi darru...}\) [to God (may his) produce (to be)...\[^{718}\] = praising.

The phraseme is a sentence in which \(darruhū\) is the subject and \(li-\text{llāhi}\) is the predicate, and literally expresses a wish that everything the target person produces should be dedicated to God. The metaphorical meaning of the phraseme can be decoded via cultural model represented in the idea of linking your deeds to God guarantees goodness. The phraseme became a praising phraseme whose literal meaning is dead. Also, the phraseme is fully fixed, apart from the pronoun. Habing the phraseme coined in nominal phrase in which a reference to God is mentioned and including a word that can definitely considered as a cranberry lexeme in this context \(darr\), all of those factors makes the phraseme fully fixed.

Phrasemes (118) through (121) are all well-established and embedded in classical Arabic, and occur in their original metaphorical contexts. Also, the high value placed on the concept of praising in pre-Islamic and Islamic Arab culture, applies a high level of fixedness to them. Such early-established phrasemes were dead metaphors by the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb.

7:2:7 Taboos

Taboos fall into the general category of social conventions. Many pre-Islamic tribal Arab taboos persisted in Arabic-speaking Islamic societies, and thus are well represented in


\[^{717}\] Ibn Manzūr, \textit{Lisān al-ʿArab} (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%B1%D9%8A%D9%83%D8%A9, accessed on 24 May 2018; Ibn Fāris, \textit{Maqāyīs al-Lugha} (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%B1%D9%8A%D9%83%D8%A9%1, accessed on 24 May 2018; az-Zamakhshári, \textit{Asās al-Balaghā}, vol. 1, p. 648.

Arabic phraseology. Nevertheless, influenced by Islamic ideas, additional taboo concepts were introduced into the culture and motivated new phrasemes.

Perhaps because the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb examined in this study include very little personal correspondence, as compared to official work, biographies, religious writing, and adab, they do not include many taboo-motivated phrasemes. The four examples that could be identified are as follows:

123)  lā araba laḥū fi n-nisāʾ i [he has no purpose in women] = he is not sexually attracted to women.
124)  raybu manūniḥī [unpredictable turn of his fortune] = death.
125)  qadā naḥbahū [(he) fulfilled his vow] = death.

These four phrasemes’ three target domains are [insults], [sexuality] and [death]. Phraseme (122) is a speech-act formula that functions as a cursing phraseme, in which the main element that refers to [abuse] has been replaced by one referring to the general meaning [doing]. The metaphorical meaning of the phraseme resides in its structure. Syntactically, it is coined as a nidāʾ [call] or vocative structure: its first element being a call used only in the context of trying to attract attention. Calling a person by referring to his mother with an ambiguous abstract verb that can be interpreted as [whoring] is a cross-cultural insult, due to the cross-cultural nature of [mother] as a symbol of [honour]. However, correct interpretation of phraseme (122) requires that the hearer understand both the structure that is used for such insults, and the abstract verb that agrees with the insult that has been substituted into the phraseme’s element. Unsurprisingly,

720 Ibid., p. 290.
721 Ibid., p. 235.
722 Ibid., vol. 4, p. 205.
723 For additional similar phrasemes on [death], see al-Hamadhānī, al-ʿAlfāẓ, pp. 299-300.
724 This phenomenon exists in Arabic in specific target domains like [abuse], as in this phraseme, and [swear], e.g., by adding the wāw to that which is sworn, as in wa-llāḥi. W. Wright claims that wāw al-qassam, wāw rubba, bāʾ al-qassam and tāʾ al-qassam are all remnants of words: A Grammar of the Arabic Language (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), vol. 1, p. 279, and vol. 2, pp. 175 and 216.
this phraseme is fully fixed, due to both its figurative grammatical form and the figurativeness in the function of the abstract word fāʾila.

Though phrasemes (122) and (123) are linked by the target domain [sexuality], the latter does not express an insult or abuse. Here, ‘purpose’ is substituted for the taboo term meaning ‘sexual intercourse’. In the patriarchal community of pre-Islamic Arabia, women were seen as having one purpose, sexual intercourse for the purpose of reproduction. In non-figurative phrasemes like this one, semantic structures and prior knowledge of society’s conventions hold the metaphorical meanings, and thus they are fully fixed.

Phrasemes (124) and (125) express the concept of [death] as their target domain. The source domain of each phraseme is different, but both are culturally motivated. The source domain of phraseme (124) is [fate], which in Arabic is, metaphorically, a person with free will: an idea expressed in the cross-cultural conceptual metaphor FATE IS A PERSON. For instance, ad-dahru idhā māla [fate kneels to him]725 = fate is in his favour, and alwā  bihimu d-dahru [fate took them itself]726 = to kill them. Although the image in phraseme (124) is motivated by FATE IS A PERSON, it is established by a distinctively Arab model of fate as broadly negative, in which any unexpected action by fate is also unwanted, with death being the prime example. The phraseme is fully fixed on all of its linguistic levels, though it sometimes occurs in a semi-flexible structure, as in Abū Dhuʿyab al-Hudhalī’s verse:

a-mina l-manūni wa-raybihī tatawahja ʿū

[Is it from fate and its unpredictability (that) you suffer]

The structure of the phraseme in the verse preserves phraseme (124)’s elements as well as the


semantic bond between them. This likely indicates that phraseme (124) preserves the earlier coinage, although its most common structure is *raybu l-manûni*, which occurs in the Qurʾān. In any case, there is no doubt that poetry applies flexibility to fixed Arabic structures, including phraseology, and this can explain the rarity of the phraseme from the verse, relative to the Qurʾānic form.

The source domain of the final phraseme of this group, (125), is [vows]. *Nahb* lexically is a vow, but it is a cranberry lexeme. Seeing life as a temporary event that one has promised to give back is a cultural model, reflective of how life was viewed in harsh environment like that is in Arabia. In other words, life was a method for achieving glory, rather than an end in itself.\textsuperscript{727} As such, the cultural model implicit in this phraseme is that one meets death as the compulsory fulfilment of a solemn agreement.

As well as relating to the three target domains [death], [insults], and [sexuality], most of the [taboo] phrasemes in the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb are figurative. However, there are some exceptions in which the metaphorical meaning is preserved by the structure. Phrasemes whose target domain is [death] are highly fixed, and can be divided into those governed by the conceptual metaphor FATE IS A PERSON, and those reflecting the cultural model of death as a vow.

7:2:8 Miscellaneous categories

Various additional phrasemes in the corpus are motivated by miscellaneous source domains within the category of habitus. Consider the following irreversible phraseme:

\begin{equation}
126) \quad \textit{al-’arabu wa-l-’ajamu} \quad \text{[Arabs and foreigners]} \quad \textsuperscript{728} = \text{all people/generalising.}
\end{equation}

\textsuperscript{727} Pre-Islamic Arabs adopted various explanations of life and death, but the image of death in Arabic phraseology is mainly grounded on the idea of the soul leaving the body: e.g., *māta ḥafā anfīhi* [(he) died his nose’s death] = to suddenly die, or *zahaqat rūḥuhū* [his soul has left] = to die. The concept of resurrection was not common in non-Abrahamic Arab religions. See ʿAli, *al-Mufassal*, vol. 11, p. 125.

\textsuperscript{728} Al-Maqiqānī, *Najfī at-Ṭīb*, vol. 3, p. 182.
Phraseme (128) is based on a cultural concept that Arabs are superior to other races. For that reason, the phraseme is coined from two irreversible words, the first describing Arabs, and the second being an abstract word for non-Arabs/foreigners. All the peoples of the world are classified as either Arabs, who are superior and hence mentioned first, or non-Arabs. Unconsciously, then, the community seems to have accepted the cultural model of Arab superiority that Arabic phraseology asserted, regardless of the complex realities of its socio-cultural situation.

The following phraseme has already been discussed in Chapter 2, above, as an example of a one-word phraseme. Here, however, I will discuss the cultural phenomenon it reflects.

127) marḥaban [(to be) wide] = welcome.

This phraseme is motivated by the conceptual metaphor WIDE IS COMFORT/NARROW IS DISTRESS. Such conceptual metaphors, as we have seen, are rooted in physical experience, which helped establish them firmly in Arabic’s conceptual system; and they are present in early Arabic texts including the Qurʾān. Here, the image is definitely motivated by a cross-cultural concept of wideness as related flexibility and freedom, but also it is likely to be influenced by nomadic Arab culture’s placing of a high value on the ability to move. This concept is especially seen in the rihla motif in Arabic poetry from the pre-Islamic period onward. Hence, the cultural phenomenon that is reflected by the one-word phraseme marḥaban is cultural modelling. But the cultural model does not contribute to the fixedness of the phraseme; rather, it is the structure of the phraseme that governs its fixedness.

---

729 We can see the influence of this concept in Islamic texts such as Muḥammad ibn Qutayba ad-Dīnawarī, Fadl al-Arab wa-l-Tabīb ‘alā ‘Ullūnihā, ed. Walid Maḥmūd Khālīṣ (Abu Dhabī: ADCH, 2010). See also ‘Alī, al-Mufaṣṣal, vol. 1, p. 264, and for further discussion of social differentiation in pre-Islamic Arabia, Hoyland, Arabia and the Arabs, pp. 117-21.

730 ‘Ajām literally means people who do not speak Arabic. This relates to an Arab belief that Arabic is the most eloquent language and that eloquence equals superiority. Ibn Manzūr, Lisān al-Arab, (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%B9%D8%AC%D9%85, accessed on 17 October 2018.


732 See Chapter 3.

733 For more details on the rihla motif see: Jacobi, Dirāsāt fī ash-Shī’r al-Jāhili, pp.67-70.

734 See Chapter 2.
The following phrasemes attained their shared binominal form in various ways, but all are collocations motivated by the modelling of cultural concepts:

128) \( kābiran \ 'an kābirin \) [older from older]\(^{735} \) = originally.
129) \( 'ushru mi 'shārin \) [one tenth of one tenth]\(^{736} \) = a very small amount.
130) \( abada l-ābidīna \) [the endlessness of people who live endlessly]\(^{737} \) = forever.

Phraseme (128) is formed of a ḥāl [circumstantial clause], and therefore is fixed syntactically. Semantically, although the phraseme is non-figurative, the circumstantial clause is used to emphasise originality rather than to explain circumstances. The reference in the phraseme is to the concept of connecting a person with his or her preceding generations, with [older from older] indicating the originality of a concept or the right assert a concept. This meaning is easier to discern from this phraseme’s context in the corpus: ‘akhdhū l-'ilma awwala-n ‘an ‘ākhirin wa-warithūhu kabiran ‘an kābirin’ [they gained knowledge, from the first of them until the last of them, and inherited it older from older].\(^ {738} \) It is also worth noting that phrasemes (128), (129) and (130) were all coined in an accusative grammatical form, and as elliptical sentences.

Phrasemes (129) and (130) are formed in iḍāfa lafziyya [formal annexation]: the form does not express the sense of possession, but instead emphasises the meaning of its elements. One-tenth is supposedly the smallest amount known, so one tenth of one tenth was conceptualised as the smallest amount that can be had or imagined.\(^ {739} \) However, the amount itself is not the target domain, insofar as the phraseme’s structure does not express possession. Phraseme (130) refers to a ultimate endlessness by refreing metaphorically to the eternity of those who live forever. The phraseme is coined using polyptoton to emphasise the

---

\(^{735}\) Ibn al-Khaṭīb, al-Iḥāṣa, vol. 1, p. 299.

\(^{736}\) Ibid., vol. 6, p. 345.

\(^{737}\) Al-Maqqari, Najḥ at-Ṭīb, vol. 7, p. 396.


phraseological meaning.

The following phraseme of the miscellaneous group, (131), includes safaka, a word that only occurs with dimāʾ [blood].

131)  

\[ \text{safaka d-dimāʾa} \]  

[to shed blood]\(^\text{740}\) = to kill/ to cause an issue leads to killing, i.e. war.

Though the phraseme itself means to spill blood, it functions more as a metaphor for an action arising from the target domain [to kill], or even for permitting one’s own death. It is an idiom that reflects both a gesture and a specific interpretation of that gesture as not only the act of killing, but also to cause great agony and possibly a war by that act. The cultural model here applies an additional meaning to the surface semantic level.

The following phraseme is a communicative collocation phraseme in which a cultural model

132)  

\[ \text{labbayka} \]  

[(dual) answering (you)]\(^\text{741}\) = emphasising that an answer is to a summons.

The etymology labbayka is well-investigated by Seidensticker, whose findings can be summarized in the following explanations:\(^\text{742}\)

a)  

Labbayka is associated with labba or alabba [to stay at a place] hence the meaning would be [I am staying here at your service], or with labbatun as in ummun labbatun [a loving mother] and the meaning would be [I answer with all love], or with lubābun [core/pureness] so the meaning would be [I sincerely answer you/ or with all love].\(^\text{743}\)

\(^{740}\) Al-Maqqarī, *Naṣḥ at-Tib*, vol. 5, p. 222.


\(^{743}\) This explanation is provided by Classical Arabic grammarian and linguists and can be found in Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al’Arab* (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%84%D8%A8%D9%89, accessed on 24 May 2018; and Ibn Fāris, *Maqāyīs al-Lughah*, (electronic resource): http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%84%D8%A8%D9%8A#2, accessed on 24 May 2018. Also see Seidensticker, ‘Sources for the History of Pre-Islamic Religion’, p. 295.
b) The suffix -ay in labbayka, same as saʿdayka and dawālayka are ‘mere apparent dual’ or an elliptical vocative in dual form.\textsuperscript{744}

c) It is borrowed from lappayk, a Syriac word means [towards thee (O God].

All of the previous analysis of labbayka’s etymology suggest that labbayka is formed of at least two elements, i.e. labba- (regardless the origin of it) and the second person accusative pronoun -ka. Hence fulfills the criteria of a phraseme labbayka.\textsuperscript{745}

The phraseme’s metaphorical meaning that requires a prior knowledge of that contextual meaning, regardless of the etymology, motivated by pre-Islamic cultural model.

The final phraseme has been one of the most common in Arabic grammar textbooks. The earliest known occurrence of it as a sequence is in Sibawayhi’s al-Kitāb:

133) Zaydun wa-ʿAmrun [Zayd and ’Amr]\textsuperscript{746} = two names are used to give examples, especially in grammar.

This phraseme is a sequence collocation in which ’Amrun never comes before Zaydun. Daraba Zaydun ʿAmran [Zayd hit ’Amr] is the complete version, in which – because it is sequential – Zayd always hits ’Amr.\textsuperscript{747} The origin of the phraseme is not certain, but the earliest known occurrence of it as a sequence is in Sibawayhi’s al-Kitāb.\textsuperscript{748} The reason its two names were chosen is also unknown. However, different hypotheses have been proposed. One holds that the two names provide perfect grammatical examples for all the cases. They both are applied to iʿrāb, not binā\textsuperscript{749}, and are formed from the shortest possible combination of letters, i.e.,

\textsuperscript{744} These suggestions are given by Wellhausen and Fleischer respectively. Seidensticker, ‘Sources for the History of Pre-Islamic Religion’, pp. 296-7.
\textsuperscript{745} Nöldeke suggested this etymology. Ibid., p. 297.
\textsuperscript{747} Daraba Zaydun ʿAmran is a referential phraseme that is not of interest to us here, because the version of it in our corpus is so different as to render it a separate phraseme.
\textsuperscript{748} As-Sirāfī, Sharḥ Kitāb Sibawayhi, vol. 1, p. 189.
\textsuperscript{749} Iʿrāb is the ability of the grammatical element to be applied to all the possible grammatical endings, while binā is the opposite concept. See Kinga Dévényi, “Iʿrāb”, in Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics (electronic resource): http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_SIM_vol2_0029>, accessed on 24 May 2018; and Ramzi Baalbaki, “Binā”, in ibid.: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_COM_0044, accessed on 24 May 2018.
three letters and the simplest short vowels. It is also worth mentioning that Sībawayhi is a nickname for men named 'Amr. Since the earliest known occurrence of this phraseme is in Sībawayhi’s work, it could have been chosen as a joke, especially given that its verb is *darab* [to hit]. The only potential flaw in this hypothesis is that we do not know who 'Amr is.

The metaphorical meaning of phraseme, as used in our corpus, expresses a general example of anonymous individuals. In theory, the phraseme should be fully fixed because it is a sequential collocation, has a high fixedness factor, and is a quotation. However, in one of the contexts in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s writings, the phraseme occurs as *laysa min 'Amrin wa-lā Zaydin.*

The first factor that weakened the fixedness of the phraseme is that it is common, which also explains why we can find it in an opposite sequence. (One would not find it in an opposite sequence if the verb were applied, unless the writer’s aim had been to create an alternative metaphorical meaning, i.e., he/she intended for the phraseme to be broken.) And secondly, the context of the phraseme includes negation. To apply negation to a sequential Arabic phrase, one has to apply a negation element to each part of the sequence; hence, *laysa* [is not] is applied to the first part and *wa-lā* [nor] to 'Amr.

**7:3 Conclusion**

Referential phrasemes are the dominant phraseological type in both of the broad cultural categories covered by this chapter. In other words – contrary to expectations, and even in the case of material culture – culture-specific artefacts appear, but are not the dominating phenomenon. We can also see cultural models motivating communicative phrasemes in the domain [praising]. A cultural model initiates the process of conceptualising an artefact, but artefacts themselves are universal objects and thus do not imply any cultural specificity, except in a cultural-modelling context. Thus, the dominating phenomenon across all domains was

---

found to be cultural modelling, followed by cultural symbolism – though it should be noted that material-culture phrasemes were associated with a greater variety of cultural phenomena than their counterparts that were rooted in cultural habitus.

Cultural models and culture-specific artefacts are the two phenomena best represented in the material-culture phrasemes, which by definition are driven by conceptual images of the areas in which they exist. For example, the source domain [home] is conceptualised as one’s honour and value, since in tribal Arab culture the home is the nucleus of the family, which in turn is the main measure of one’s honour. An example of the conceptualised image of the source domain [home] in Arabic is ʿāmiru d-dāri [(one’s) well-built home] = a man from an honourable family. In such phrasemes, decoding the metaphorical meaning requires us to understand the role of the model of [home] in the target culture as well as its symbolic role. Among culture-specific artefacts, which can also be identified in a number of phrasemes within the [material culture] source domain, many are common to multiple cultures; but cultural context applies new meanings to them. This can be noted in phrasemes motivated by household objects, such as ṭuwiya l-bisāṭu [the carpet has been folded] = the end of the event.

The relative rarity of culture-specific artefacts in the phrasemes analysed in this study could be related to the nature of the corpus. Another possibility is that the Arabian environment itself did not provide many artefacts that were conceptualised into specific symbolic imagery. And quotation, as noted above, was the least influential cultural phenomenon in the corpus’s classical-Arabic phrasemes with the source domains [material culture] and [habitus].

Although the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb provide us with only two phrasemes that reflect a gender-specific phenomenon, i.e., (77) and (78), both illustrate how such a phenomenon functions in the motivation of a phraseme. As such, their importance should not be underrated.

It can also be noted that the phrasemes in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works that are motivated by material culture and habitus exhibit specific contextual behaviour. First, most are referential
phrasemes, but all that are referential are given very limited modifications, e.g., phrasemes motivated by the [weapons] source domain. The fact that the referential elements were well-established in the language appears to have helped preserve a number of phrasemes in use despite major changes in the target cultural context, notably in the source domain [clothes].

Syntactically, the phrasemes in this chapter are mostly formed in annexation. The next two most common combinations are 1) noun + adjective, and 2) verbal phrases of all varieties. Judging from Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s prose works, some phrasemes persisted in use in classical Arabic writings in Granada despite their source domains having dwindled into minor importance in fourteenth-century Arab Muslim Andalusi culture, as compared to the importance they had held in their original pre-Islamic, eastern contexts. For instance, atlāl [marks of campsites’ ruination] were a significant cultural element in early pre-Islamic and Islamic Arab culture, forming a major motif in pre-Islamic and Islamic Arab poetry, connected with leaving home, lost love, and nostalgia for one’s youth. These functions remained in late fourteenth century Arabic phraseology, despite the fact that Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s Granada was a highly developed, urbanised society in which campsites’ practical significance was minimal. Hence, the use of such phrasemes should not be conceived merely as marks of poetic style, but as well-embedded in the secondary semantic level of the language, i.e., the motivating cultural phenomena of the phraseological system.
Chapter 8: Phrasemes with Islamic Source Domains and Non-religious Target Domains in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s Prose Works

The formation of the phrasemes in discussed in this chapter was motivated by source domains linked to Islamic ideas or texts, but they nevertheless function phraseologically in non-religious ways. Islamic holy texts are the main source domain for this group of phrasemes. Dealing with such a source domain raises some issues that need to be discussed. The Qurʾān will be dealt with according to the established understanding of the text shared by the commentators; in this sense, the Qurʾān itself is a single gigantic phraseme. Most religiously motivated phrasemes can be linked to the early commentators’ understandings of Qurʾānic texts. Even where there are multiple possible interpretations in the earlier commentaries, such phrasemes tend to cohere with the most common ones that became conventionalised by time.\textsuperscript{751}

Ḥadīth, sayings and deeds of the Prophet Muḥammad, are another important source of religiously motivated Islamic phrasemes. Evidence that a text was considered as a Ḥadīth of the Prophet in Ḥadīth collections, will be considered a source domain for that phraseme, because of the influence of such works on the Islamic culture and on classical Arabic. In some cases, however, a phraseme that appears to fit into such a category could have been established as a collocation, created to support a religious claim in the Ḥadīth. Nevertheless, the Ḥadīth is still considered its source domain, because it lends the phraseme a linguistic authority and renders its phraseological meaning more conventionalised. In some instances, a phraseme that existed as a collocation in the pre-Islamic era will be considered an Islam-motivated one if it gained an additional semantic level in the Islamic source domain, and if this added semantic level is represented in its phraseological meaning in the corpus.

The phrasemes in this category fall into eight groups. These are: 1) honorific titles, 2) 

\textsuperscript{751} For instance, see the analysis of phrasemes (143) and (159).
Qu’ranic and Ḥadīth-motivated allusive phrasemes, 3) Qu’ranic and Ḥadīth-motivated non-allusive phrasemes 4) taboos, and 5) communicative phrasemes, 6) sequential phrasemes, 7) naḥṭ, and 8) slogans.

8:1 Honorific Titles

The titles included here are religiously motivated, in the sense that either their elements, or their historical contexts, include religious references. Some of them are nicknames that were coined for specific people, which explains both their fixedness and their cultural phenomenon. Others became conventionalised as official titles in Islamic cultural contexts, as will be discussed further below. The titles-and-nicknames group comprises three phrasemes:

134) \textit{dhu n-nūraynī} [he who owns the two lights]\footnote{Ibid., vol. 6, p. 360.} = the third caliph, ʿUthmān Ibn ʿAffān.

135) \textit{sayfuka l-maslālu} [your (God) drawn sword]\footnote{Ibid., p. 131.} = Khālid ibn al-Walīd.


Phrases (134) through (135) refer either to a specific individual or, in the case of phrase (136), a small, clearly defined group, and are motivated either by a reference to a holy text, or a description of a religious concept.

Phrases (134) and (135) are idiomatic nicknames of two of the main followers of the Prophet Muḥammad. \textit{Nūrayn} [two lights] in phrase (134), according to Islamic tradition, are the two daughters of Muḥammad to whom ʿUthmān was married: Ruqayya, and after she died, Um Kalthūm. The coining of phrase (134) is not attributed to the prophet himself in the source, but used as an already-fixed phrase. The phrase appears in collections of

\footnote{Al-Maqṣarī, \textit{Naṣṣ at-Tīb}, vol. 6, p. 360.}
traditions and Ḥadīth from as early as the tenth century. Both phrasemes were coined in the collections of Ḥadīth. The writings of Khaythama ibn Sulayman (d. 343/955) and ad-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385/995), though al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066), in his Sunan, claimed that the referent of the nickname dhu nūrayn was Ḥusayn al-Ju’fī (d. 208/824), one of the famous names in the Ḥadīth chain in the third Muslim generation.757

Phraseme (135) refers to Khalid Ibn al-Walid. The phraseme can be traced to the Prophet Muḥammad in collections of Ḥadīth such as those compiled by Abū Ya’lā (d. 307/919), Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965), al-Ḥākim (d. 378/998) and al-Bayhaqī, but it is also found in even earlier works, including those of al-Wāqīdī (d. 207/823), Ibn al-Kalbī (d. 204/819), Gharīb al-Ḥadīth of Ibn Sallām (d. 224/838) and at-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), albeit with no attribution to the Prophet.759 The phraseme is also found in early Andalusi works like the al-ʿIqd al-Farīd of Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, and the Jamharat Ansāb al-ʿArab of Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064).760

In most of these references, the phraseme occurs without a final element, maslūl, that it featured in two early classical Arabic works: the Futūḥ ash-Shām of al-Wāqīdī, in which it is attributed to ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭalib,761 and the Maʿrifat as-Ṣaḥāba of Abū Nuʿaym al-Asbahānī (d. 430/1038).762 The combination of maslūl with sayf could have been adopted from a famous poem by Kaʾb ibn Zuhayr (d. c. 26/645) that praises the prophet Muḥammad:

---

The messenger, indeed, is a light by which (we are) illuminated, (he is) a drawn (Indian) sword of God’s swords.

Because the combination occurred in such a prestigious poem, the adjective maslūl was applied to the nickname, and only later became part of the phraseme. This phraseme is fully fixed. Hence, both phrasemes (134) and (135) reflect the cultural phenomenon of cultural modelling, but also, in the context of our fourteenth-century Arabic corpus, (135) reflects a quotation.

Phraseme (136), unlike the previous two, is a collocation nickname for a group of people, namely, the first four caliphs – Abū Bakr (d. 13/634), ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (d. 23/644), ‘Uthmān ibn ’Affān (d. 35/656), and ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib – commonly applied by Sunni Muslim scholars. The nickname itself can be traced to a text ascribed to the Prophet:

‘alaykum bi-sunnati wa-sunnati l-khulafāʾi r-rāshidīna l-mahdiyyīna min baʿdī

[stick to my deeds and the deeds of the rightful and well-guided successors].

By its existence, this text could easily be seen as implying that phraseme (136) reflects the cultural phenomenon of quotation; yet, it is very difficult to discern whether the phraseme influenced the Ḩadīth, or vice versa. If the Ḩadīth influenced the phraseme, then the phraseme is a quotation, but if the phraseme was coined first, then its cultural phenomenon would be cultural modelling. This uncertainty is caused by the ambiguity of the word khulafāʾ, which literally means the inheritors, but the singular form khalīfa became restricted to a title for the greatest ruler in the Islamic world. Quotation would normally explain the full fixedness of a

---

phraseme, yet in this case, being part of a Ḥadīth text attributed to the Prophet tended to fix the phraseme’s form – even if it predated the Ḥadīth.

Al-Andalus was always dominated by the Sunni branch of Islam, to which Ibn al-Khaṭīb belonged, in spite of the rise to power of the Shīʿa Fāṭimids on its borders beginning in 296/909. Phraseme (136) reflects a Sunni interpretation of the historical recognition of the caliphs that is contradicted and rejected by the Shīʿa.765 Its use reflects the writer’s own status as Sunni, as well as his position as vizier to the Sunni ruler of a predominately Sunni territory. Thus, we are able to say that the phraseme reflects Ibn al-Khaṭīb Andalusi religious culture and the mainstream of Islam at that time.

The following five honorific-title collocation phrasemes from our corpus were also well-established in Arabic at the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb:

137) *khalīfatu llāhi* [the inheritor of God]766 = the caliph.

138) *amīru l-mu’minīna* [the commander of the believers]767 = a title given to the caliph.

139) *amīru l-muslimīna* [the commander of the Muslims]768 = a title given to the ruler in al-Andalus but not to the caliph.

140) *waliyyu l-amri* [the holder of (the right to) order]769 = a title given to the caliph.

141) *qādi l-jamāʿati* [people’s judge]770 = the grand judge.

Phraseme (137) was established in the Umayyad period, and specifically in the time of ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Marwān, while previously, the title had taken the form *khalīfatu rasūli llāhi* [the

---

767 Ibid., p. 172.
768 Ibid., p. 361.
The origin of *amīru l-muʾminīna* [the commander of the believers] is attributed to the second caliph, ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, who used it as a replacement of *khalīfatu khalīfati rasūli lāhi*. The title (*khalīfa*) was used specifically to address the caliph, though in al-Andalus it was not used by the Umayyad rulers prior to 316/929, when an-Nāṣir declared himself to be the legitimate caliph. The ruler before an-Nāṣir was called merely *al-amīr* [the commander]. After the fall of the Umayyad Caliphate in al-Andalus in 422/1031, the new ruler of the territory, Yūsuf ibn Tāshafīn, chose the title *amīru l-muslimīna* [the commander of the Muslims], i.e., phraseme (139), to distinguish himself from the Abbasid caliph to whom he and his dynasty had pledged their loyalty. The title was resurrected by the Almohad Caliphate from 514/1121 to 668/1269, but at the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, the title was used to address the Abbasid caliph, while *amīru l-muslimīna* was used to address the Naṣrid ruler in al-Grenada and the Marini one in Morocco.

Phrasemes (138) and (139) are both culturally specific to Muslim Arabs. However, an Andalusi influence can be detected in the process of coining phraseme (139). Both phrasemes became fully fixed because they function like proper names, and both indicate a specific Arab Muslim cultural model.

The other phraseme in this group, *waliyyu l-amri*, has two meanings, both of which express guardianship. In its wider sense, it refers to any person who has guardianship over

---

771 One of the earliest texts in which the phraseme is mentioned is al-Farazdaq’s verse in praise of ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Marwān, *khalīfatu lāhi yustasqā bihi l-maṭārū* [the inheritor of God because of whom we have rain]. See at-Ṭabarī, *Ṭārīkh al-Umam wa-l-Mulūk*, vol. 4, p. 73; for more on the development of the term *khalīfa*, see: D. Sourdel, A.K.S. Lambton, F. de Jong, and P.M. Holt, “Khalīfa”, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (electronic resource): [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912.islam_COM_0486](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912.islam_COM_0486), accessed on 3 June 2018.
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775 Ibid., p. 229, and vol. 4, p. 572.

776 Ibid., vol. 4, p. 52.
another, e.g., a minor child. More narrowly, it expresses sovereignty. In the pre-Islamic era, the
two meanings could operate in combination, but the metaphorical meaning later became limited
to sovereignty via interpretation of the Qur’ānic verse,

*aṭī’ūllāha wa-aṭī’ur-rasūla wa-‘ūli l-amri minkum*

[Obey God and obey the messenger and those in authority among you].

The commentators, especially the later ones, interpreted `ūli l-amri [those in authority] as
temporal rulers, though a commentary attributed to the second century Muslim Mujāhid ibn
Jabr (d. 104/722) interprets the phraseme as referring to the clergy. By the tenth century, in
any case, aṭ-Ṭabarî held that the reference was to the sovereign, and this became its
conventionalised semantic level in latter commentaries.

Although phraseme (140) is considered a quotation, and even though its second
metaphorical meaning is motivated by a Qur’ānic verse (or at least by the commentaries on
that verse), it exhibits a level of flexibility insofar as its form can change from plural to singular.

Two points explain this. First, though the phraseme was likely established in the pre-Islamic
era as a general signifier of those who hold guardianship, the Qur’ān lent it a new meaning,
sovereign, that was related to the earlier meaning and did not totally supplant it. In other words,
before the advent of the Qur’ān, the phraseme was semi-fixed, and it accepted the modification
applied to it by the Qur’ān. This leads us to the second point: that the phraseme, at the time of

---

777 Qur’ān (an-Nisā’) 4:59.
778 Muḥammad ibn Jaʿār at-Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-Bayān fi Tafsīr al-Qurʾān (electronic resource):
http://www.altafsir.com/Tafsir.asp?MadhNo=1&tTafsirNo=1&tSoraNo=4&tAyahNo=59&tDisplay=yes&Page=
2&Size=1&LanguageId=1, accessed on 4 June 2018.
779 Ibid.
780 For examples, see al-Fakhr ar-Rāzī, at-Tafsīr al-Kabīr (electronic resource):
http://www.altafsir.com/Tafsir.asp?MadhNo=1&tTafsirNo=4&tSoraNo=4&tAyahNo=59&tDisplay=yes&UserProfile=0&LanguageId=1, accessed on 4 June 2018.; Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad 1-Qurtubī, al-Jāmiʿ li-
Aḥkām al-Qurʾān (electronic resource):
http://www.altafsir.com/Tafsir.asp?MadhNo=1&tTafsirNo=5&tSoraNo=4&tAyahNo=59&tDisplay=yes&Page=
2&Size=1&LanguageId=1, accessed on 4 June October 2018.; and Ismāʿīl ibn Kathīr, Anwār at-Tanzīl wa-Asrār
at-Tāwil (electronic resource):
http://www.altafsir.com/Tafsir.asp?MadhNo=1&tTafsirNo=6&tSoraNo=4&tAyahNo=59&tDisplay=yes&UserProfile=0&LanguageId=1, accessed on 4 June October 2018.
its coining, was semi-fixed because of its metaphorical meaning, which is reflected partially in one of the elements, amr [order]. The combination of ulū [the owner of] with amr [controlling/ordering] partially reflects its pre-Qur’ānic phraseological meaning. As a result, although the Qur’ānic verse used it in the plural, the speech community used it according to its original level of fixedness.

Phraseme (141) refers to the judge of the Muslim group, and latterly became the title of the grand judge of al-Andalus, who was based in Cordoba, the capital of the Umayyad Caliphate in al-Andalus until its collapse. The eastern equivalent title was qādi l-quḍātī [the Judge of Judges], and there were some differences between the powers of these two positions: perhaps most importantly, that while the holder of the title qādi l-quḍātī held authority over the other judges in the caliphate’s provinces, the holder of the title qādi l-Jamā’ati was the judge of Cordoba alone.781 Al-jamā’a [the people] in the phraseme refers to the Muslim group over which the judge had authority. For this reason, the term did appear in the east in some circumstances: e.g., the battle of Yarmūk in 15/636.782 ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān ad-Dākhil rejected the title of caliph, and chose instead to be called Amīr to represent the legal authority in al-Andalus – indicating, implicitly, the religious authority of the Caliphate of Baghdad and the superior position of the qādi l-quḍātī. However, the title qādi l-Jama’ati, as in the phraseme, was retained in al-Andalus even after ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān III proclaimed himself caliph in 316/929.783 It thereafter became even more phraseologically conventional, being used in the Emirate of Granada until it was conquered by the Christians in 897/1492.784

Phraseme (141) is a non-figurative, referential phraseme. However, it is still possible

782 Ibid.
783 Ibid.
to track cultural phenomena in its image: specifically, a cultural model. The concept of jamāʿa cannot be understood in the context of the phraseme without recalling the model of the jamāʿa in, firstly, the Islamic Arabic use of that term; and secondly, Andalusi culture in particular. The phraseme is non-figurative, and hence is coined from two lexemes on its literal semantic level: a condition of high fixedness; and the phraseme is coined by no more than two elements, also leading to high fixedness.

8:2 Qurʾānic and Ḥadīth-motivated Allusive Phrasemes

Holy texts motivate a great number of phrasemes because of the major influence of religion and, hence, on the Arabic language. Our corpus provides two main groupings of such phrasemes, i.e., those whose source domains are the Qurʾān vs. the Ḥadīth. However, it is more instructive to divide these phrasemes into allusive and non-allusive types, each of which will be dealt with in turn in this section and the next.

This is one of the most readily comprehensible groups of phrasemes in terms of its referents, phraseological meanings and cultural phenomena. The majority of the phrasemes in it refer to a Qurʾānic narrative, and only rarely to a Ḥadīth. Their phraseological meanings are easy to detect, for – as we shall see – they are highly influenced by Qurʾānic stories as interpreted by the commentators. Dbrobol’skij and Piirainen have argued that allusion is a phraseme’s cultural phenomenon if its core elements refer to a story, either partially or in its entirety; and that standard is met by all the phrasemes in this section. Nevertheless, they also exhibit other cultural phenomena, notably quotation.

Phraseme (142) alludes to the story of Abel and Cain as related in the Qurʾān:

---

785 It is not necessary to delve into how the stories were known or came to be known among Arabs before the Qurʾān. The phrasemes, as we will see, are derived from the Qurʾānic text both on the phraseological semantic level and in phraseological form.

786 Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen, *Figurative Language*, p. 234.
142)  *kashafat* (...) *saw’atan lā tuwārā* ([...) uncovered their deficiencies that cannot be covered]*787* = to show a weak point.

When Cain killed his brother Abel, a crow was sent to show him how to bury him:

*fa-ba’atha llāhu ghurāban yabḥathu fi l-ardī li-yuriyahū kayfa yuwārī*

*saw’ata akhīhi*

[So God sent a crow searching in the ground to show him how to hide his brother's disgrace].*788*

The phraseme is an idiom coined via the retention of the roots of the elements, *tuwārā* [to be hid] and *saw’a* [graceful/deficiency], which both preserves the allusion to the story, and motivates the phraseme’s metaphorical meaning. It is an allusive phraseme. The second element, *saw’a*, can be interpreted as [disgrace] or [deficiency] on the primary semantic level, but in the context of the Qur’ān, the latter meaning does not apply.*789*

Phraseme (142)’s elements can be interrupted by a whole sentence. The two words nevertheless form a phraseme because they maintain their joint metaphorical meaning and function as one semantic unit in spite of the distance between them.

The following idioms allude to the Qur’ān’s story of Noah:

143)  *safīnatu Nūḥin* [Noah’s Ark]*790* = surviving.

144)  *fāda t-tannūru* [the oven has overflowed]*791* = a sign of an event that has just happened, or that it is too late to prevent.

---


*788* Qur’ān (*Luqmān*) 31:5.

*789* The word *saw’a* occurs in a secondary semantic meaning as [genitals], in the story of Adam and Eve when ‘their genitals became apparent to them’ after eating from ‘the tree’: Qur’ān (Ṭāhā), 20:121. For interpretations of *saw’a*, see al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi’ al-Bayān* (electronic resource): [http://www.altafsir.com/Tafasir.asp?tMadhNo=1&tTafsirNo=1&tSoraNo=20&tAyahNo=121&tDisplay=yes&UserProfile=0&LanguageId=1](http://www.altafsir.com/Tafasir.asp?tMadhNo=1&tTafsirNo=1&tSoraNo=20&tAyahNo=121&tDisplay=yes&UserProfile=0&LanguageId=1), accessed on 6 June 2018.


145)  ṭagh a t-Ṭūfānū [the flood overflowed] = an event that overwhelmed the pre-existing situation.

Phraseme (143), while alluding to and motivated by the story of Noah, does not refer to the Qur’ān directly on its lexical level. The word safīna does not occur in the Qur’ān in combination with Nūḥ as Noah’s Ark, the word fulk being used instead, as in:

\[\text{fa-anjāynāhu wa-man ma’āhū fī l-fulkī l-mashhūnī} \]

[We rescue him (Noah) and with those who were with him in the loaded Ark].

In other words, phraseme (143) was conventionalised in the Arabic language in the Islamic era via the influence of the Qur’ān, even though the Qur’ānic words are different. The phraseme was coined to refer to the whole story, with no direct quotation. Phraseme (144), in contrast, was coined as a modified quotation from this Qur’ānic verse:

\[\text{ḥātā īdhā jā’a amrunā wa-fāra t-tannūru qunlāna ḫmil fīhā min kulli zawjāynī thnaynī} \]

[And when (the time) of our order came and the oven has overflowed, We said: ‘Load upon the ship of each (creature) two mates’]

Clearly, the metaphorical meaning of the phraseme was preserved in the context of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s writings, despite his change of the verb fāra to fāda in his letter to a leader in what is now Morocco asking for help:

\[\text{u’arrīfika anna jabalaka al-yawma wa-qad ‘ażuma r-rajamānu wa-fāda t-}\]
\textit{tannūru wa-ṭagha t-ṭuṣānu tu’ammi lu-n-ufīṣu l-gharqā Jūdiyya jūdīhī}

[I inform you that – since the convulsing has become great,\textsuperscript{797} the oven has overflowed and the flood over flowed – the drowning souls are hoping for your mountain’s generosity of (being) Jūdī].\textsuperscript{798}

Muslim commentators have not agreed on one meaning of \textit{tannūr}, with their interpretations varying from the direct (i.e., [oven]), to the distantly etymological, as from \textit{tanwīr} [enlightenment].\textsuperscript{799} The uncertain meaning of \textit{tannūr} has resulted in it becoming a cranberry lexeme, which one the one hand implies a direct link between the phraseme and the Qur’anic verse, and on the other, applies a level of flexibility to it: i.e., that its first element can be replaced by a synonym. Thus, the phraseme could be a modified quotation, but it is certainly an allusion.

Phraseme (145) alludes the story of Noah in the Qur’ān, and specifically to the verse \textit{lammā ṭagha l-mā’u} [when the water became excessive].\textsuperscript{800} It is flexible on its lexical level, in that \textit{ṭuṣānu} can occur in place of \textit{mā’}. This flexibility can be ascribed not only to the phraseme’s frequent occurrence, but also to the fact that \textit{mā’} is an abstract word, which can be replaced by a word that narrows the target domain [\textit{ṭuṣānu}] to a more precise meaning, i.e., the secondary meaning of the original word in the phraseme. Also, the combination of \textit{mā’} with the verb \textit{ṭaghā} is figurative. As a result, preserving the verb in the phraseme maintains its metaphorical meaning, so long as the second element refers to the original word.

The next phraseme refers to one of the most important figures in the Abrahamic...
religions, Abraham or Ibrāhīm:

146) *bardan wa-salāman* [coolness and safety]⁸⁰¹ = most pleasant situation.

In the Qurʾān, when Ibrāhīm destroyed his people’s idols, they threw him into a fire, but he was unharmed because God ordered the fire to be ‘cool and safe’:

\[
wa-qulnā yā nāru kūnī bardan wa-salāman ‘alā Ibrāhīma
\]

[and We ordered: O fire! be coolness and safety upon Ibrāhīm]⁸⁰²

This idiom occurs in full fixedness due to two factors: its phenomenon is quotation, and it is sequential. The image requires knowledge of the background story of Abraham if one is to map the additional naming of coolness and safety not only as a pleasant, but also as part of a miraculous situation.

In the Qurʾān, Moses is the most frequently mentioned of the patriarchs (as they are called in the Judaeo-Christian tradition) or prophets (as they are known in Islam). Within this category in our corpus, Moses also has the lion’s share, with six idioms.

147) *alqāhu l-yammu ila s-sāhili* [the sea cast him on the shore to him]⁸⁰³ = to be safe.

148) *khā ifatun tataraqqabu* [fearful and anticipating]⁸⁰⁴ = the ultimate worry.

149) ‘*ala stihyā’ in māshiyatun* [(she) shyly walks]⁸⁰⁵ = the ultimate level of being shy.

150) *yudriku Fir’ awna l-gharaqu* [drowning reached Pharaoh]⁸⁰⁶ = desperation.

151) *tajāwaza Mūsā majma’ a l-bahrayni* [Moses passed the junction of the two seas]⁸⁰⁷ = overshooting one’s goal.

---

⁸⁰² Qurʾān (al-Anbiyā’) 21:69.
⁸⁰⁴ Ibid., vol. 5, p. 59.
⁸⁰⁵ Ibid.
⁸⁰⁶ Ibid., vol. 6, p. 177.
⁸⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 388.
These six phrasemes have been listed in the order of their basis-stories’ appearance in the Qurʾān. Generally speaking, they show a level of flexibility on the morphological and syntactic levels, but not on the lexical one, and this preserves their metaphorical meanings. This can be attributed to the fact that all are both allusions and quotations, or more specifically, modified quotations.

Phraseme (147) alludes to the beginning of the story of Moses, when his mother was inspired by God to cast him into the Nile. According to Islamic tradition, Moses was then rescued by the servants of Pharaoh’s wife. The phraseme is extracted from the following verse:

\[
\text{ani qdhifī hi fī t-tābūtī fā-qdhīhi fī l-yammi fā-l-yulqīhi l-yammu bi-s-sāhīli}
\]  
[Cast him into the chest and cast it into the river and then the river will throw him onto the bank]

Phraseme (147) expresses the concept of being miraculously saved by God’s care, in the manner of Moses – a concept that can be directly decoded via the Qurʾānic reference, especially if we know that the phraseme is highly, but not fully, fixed. The fixedness is manifested on the lexicological level by the retention of the core words like \( yulqī \) and \( sāhīl \), which preserve the unity of the phraseme, especially given that there is an alien element (\( ilayh \)) between them. However, the phraseme exhibits a level of flexibility on the syntactic level, in that the verb can be re-conjugated from past to present. Again, we can see that through frequent use, a phraseme’s fixedness is weakened by the ease of decoding it, even though it is a quotation.

Phraseme (148) refers Moses’s escape from Egypt after killing an Egyptian while defending a Jew:

\[
\text{fa-kharaja minhā khāʾifan yataraquadu}
\]
[so he left it fearful and anticipating]\(^{810}\)

This phraseme occurs in our corpus in the context of describing a poem sent to a friend, and how this poem is humble: as if it is َيَضَع فِيِ التَّأَرَّقَابَةَ َمَا َتُنَبََثْ بِهِ [she is] fearful and anticipating, and unveiled that is soon will be yield] because of shyness.\(^{811}\)

This formulation of the phraseme preserves it lexically, in tense, its morphological pattern, and in terms of order; but it features a minor modification, in the conjugation from the second person masculine to the second person feminine, to cohere with the antecedent. As we will also see with most of the other phrasemes in this group, high rates of occurrence reduce full fixedness to high fixedness.

Phraseme (149) alludes to Moses’s future wife shyly walking towards him to invite him to meet her father:

\(\text{وَيَتَحَمَّلُ فَرَاحَةٌ تَغْلِبَةٌ أَنَّهُ يُدْعِى وَالِدَّ الَّذِي يُذْهَبُ يَحْذَرُكُمْ أَنَّهُ يُدْعِى وَالِدَّ الَّذِي يُذْهَبُ يَحْذَرُكُمْ أَنَّهُ يُدْعِى وَالِدَّ الَّذِي يُذْهَبُ يَحْذَرُكُمْ أَنَّهُ يُدْعِى وَالِدَّ الَّذِي يُذْهَبُ يَحْذَرُكُمْ أَنَّهُ يُدْعِى وَالِدَّ الَّذِي يُذْهَبُ يَحْذَرُكُمْ أَنَّهُ يُدْعِى وَالِدَّ الَّذِي يُذْهَبُ ي*

[Then one of the two women came to him walking with shyness. She said, ‘Indeed, my father invites you that he may reward you for having watered for us’]\(^{812}\)

The phraseme refers to any type of action undertaken shyly. In our corpus, it appears in the same context as phraseme (148): the poem shyly moves toward the recipient.

Phraseme (149) was preserved by Ibn al-Khatib except in terms of order, which he modified to cohere with the rhyme. Once more, as a quotation with a high occurrence in Islamic Arabic discourse, such a modification is phraseologically predictable, and would have not negatively affected the audience’s ability to understand it.

The climactic event in the story of Moses is the drowning of Pharaoh in the sea while pursuing Moses and the children of Israel. Phraseme (150) was coined as an allusion to this

\(^{810}\) Ibid., (al-Qaṣaṣ) 28:21.
\(^{812}\) Qur’an (al-Qaṣaṣ) 28:25.
part of the story, with a lexical reference to the following verse:

\[
\text{wa-}jāwznā\; \text{bi-bani}\; \text{Isrāʿīla}\; l-bahra\; fa-atbaʾahum\; Firʿawnu\; wa-junūduhu\; baghyan
\]

\[
\text{wa-}ʾudwānan\; ḥattā\; idhā\; ad rakahu\; l-g haraqu\; qāla\; ʾāmantu
\]

[and We took the Children of Israel across the sea, but Pharaoh and his soldiers pursued them in injustice and enmity until, when drowning overtook him, he said, ‘I believe’]813

The allusion in the phraseme is clear, but the quotation is slightly transformed. The phraseme retains the core elements *adrak* and *gharaq*, but reclaims the word of the pronoun’s antecedent. The preserved lemma allude to the verse on the lexical level because the verb *adrak* expresses the meaning [to reach] on that level. Phraseme (150) gained an additional meaning as a collocation when it was added to *gharaq* [drowning] in the verse, in the context of the story of Moses. Thereafter, the collocation indicated a phraseological secondary meaning that still refers to the act of drowning, but specifically in relation to its consequences, e.g., Pharaoh’s statement that he now believes in the God of Moses. This consequence is not included on the phraseme’s lexical level, but in the collocation from which it is coined. Nevertheless, the phraseme is also a quotation, in the broad sense. It should also be borne in mind that, as discussed in Chapter 2, above, Arabic phrasemes show a high level of flexibility in regard to gaps between their elements.

For phraseme (151), although in the Qurʾān *jāwzāʾ* and *majmaʾu l-bahrayni* are not seen in sequence, we see them in the same context, and both work as single semantic unit. *Majmaʾu l-bahrayni* is clearly mentioned at the beginning of the Qurʾānic passage. And then, in the verb *jāwzāʾ*, which became *tajāwaz* in the phraseme, a pronoun referring to ‘the junction of the two seas’ is substituted for the second noun in the annexation *majmʿu l-bahrayni*.

The Qurʾān provides a further story in which Moses meets ʿabd an ṣāliḥan [a good man] and goes with him on a trip. Moses and his servant expected to meet ‘the good man’ at *majmaʾu*

---

813 Ibid., (Yūnus), 10:90.
\textit{l-ahrayni} [the junction of the two seas]:

[And (mention) when Moses said to his servant: ‘I will not cease (travelling) until I reach the junction of the two seas \textit{[majma’\textbackslash{}a l-bahraini]} or continue for a long period.’ So when they had passed beyond it \textit{[j\textbackslash{}awaz\textbackslash{}ahu]}, (Moses) said to his boy: ‘Bring us our morning meal. We have certainly suffered in this, our journey, (much) tiredness.’ He said: ‘Did you see when we retired to the rock? Indeed, I forgot the fish (there). And none made me forget it except Satan – that I should mention it. And it took its course into the sea amazingly. (Moses) said: ‘That is what we were seeking.’ So they returned, following their footprints.]\textsuperscript{814}

So, having missed the junction of the two seas, Moses and his servant returned to it and duly met ‘the good man’; and phraseme (151) alludes to their initial error as a metaphor for overshooting one’s goal. The only re-formation in the phraseme is in the conjugation of the verb, due to the pronoun in its form. \textit{Majma’\textbackslash{}u l-bahraini} [the junction of the two seas] also became a fully fixed phraseme in its own right, referring to an important goal. Because phraseme (151) consists of two elements, is drawn from Qur’\textbackslash{n}ic verses (and hence is a quotation), and is non-figurative, it is fully fixed apart from the verb-change noted above.

The second most mentioned figure in Qur’\textbackslash{n}ic phrasemes is Joseph. In our corpus, the Joseph-citing phrasemes are:

152) \textit{wa-jī’\textbackslash{}a ‘alā qamīśīhī bi-damin kadhibin} [and they brought false blood on his shirt]\textsuperscript{815} = false evidence.

153) \textit{wa-īnī la-ajidu rīḥa} (...) [and I indeed (can) smell the air of (...)\textsuperscript{816} = to sense the existence of a pleasing thing via indirect signs.

\textsuperscript{814} Qur’\textbackslash{n} (\textit{al-Kahf}) 18:60-64.
\textsuperscript{815} Al-Maqqari, \textit{Naf\textbackslash{}ḥ at-Tib}, vol. 6, p. 179.
\textsuperscript{816} Ibid., vol. 2, p. 92.
154) *adghāthu aḥlāmin* [mixture of false dreams] = illusions/impossible dreams.

155) *wa-mā ubarriʿu nafsī* [and I do not acquit myself] = to admit a mistake.

156) *inna n-nafsā la-ammāratun bi-s-sūʿī* [the soul is a persistent enjoiner of evil] = to regret a mistake.

157) *asarrahā fī nafsihī* [(he) saved it in his chest] = to not show any reaction to an insult (generally, when planning to avenge it at a later time).

158) *al-karīmu bnu l-karīmi bni l-karīmi* [the noble son of the noble son of the noble] = Joseph, or a very respectable person.

Phraseme (152) is an idiom that alludes to the story of Joseph’s brothers attempting to kill him, but instead throwing him into a well and bringing his shirt – marked with false blood – to their father as proof that a wolf had eaten him. The phraseme is a quotation, which explains its full fixedness. Although it contains a pronoun, the other core elements *qamīṣ* [shirt] and *damīn kadhibin* [false blood], from which the figurative meaning is created, tend to keep it fully fixed.

Phraseme (153) is another idiom that recalls the same episode in the story of Joseph by quoting verse 12:94, in which Jacob smells the shirt, and says, ‘I indeed find/feel the air/smell of Joseph’. The allusion to the story is direct, especially given that the phraseme has a fully fixed form, which it retains because of its elements that are common words. However, it is sometimes used with a word replacing *Ŷūṣuf* [Joseph] as the target to which the phraseological meaning is applied.

Phraseme (154) refers to the part of the Joseph story in which the king of Egypt asks for an explanation of his dream, to which he receives the following reply:

*adghāthu aḥlāmin wa-mā nāḥnu bi-taʾwili l-aḥlāmi bi-ʾālimīna*

---

818 Ibid., vol. 6, p. 282; Qurʾān (*Ŷūṣuf*), 12:53.
820 Al-Maqqarī, *Nafḥ at-Tīb*, vol. 3, p. 34.
822 Qurʾān (*Ŷūṣuf*) 12:15-18.
[It is) a mixture of false dreams, and we are not learned in the interpretation of dreams]^{823}

This phraseme is fully fixed in spite of being used very often in Islamic Arabic contexts,^{824} because the cranberry lexeme *adghāth* became strongly collocated with the word *ahlām* [dreams] to imply the meaning [false dreams/nightmares]. As such, it simultaneously embodies the phenomena of quotation and allusion. Ibn Fāris interprets the word literally as ‘uncertain dreams’, as does Ibn Manẓūr, who gives the collective meaning of the root as ‘uncertainty’.^{825} Az-Zamakhsharī, however, connects the meaning with a literal practice of testing camel’s humps, and thus interprets the phraseme as an idiom that delivers the meaning ‘false dreams’ metaphorically. This difference in the interpretation of *adghāth* determines whether the phraseme is categorised as an idiom or as a lexical collocation.^{826}

When the king’s wife admits her fault, the Qur’ān has her say:

\[
wa-mā  ubarri ’u  nafsī  inna  n-nafsā  la-ammāratun  bi-s-sū ’i
\]

[And I do not acquit myself. Indeed, the soul is a persistent enjoiner of evil]^{827}

This verse motivates the collocation phrasemes (155) and (156), which also sometimes occur as a single phraseme. Both of them, and the combined version, express the meaning of regretting and admitting one’s bad deed. The allusion to the story motivates the phraseological meaning by shifting from a purely negative indication to a noble act of admitting, due to which the audience is expected to forgive the original misdeed. The phrasemes are non-figurative, and a quotation, and their lexical level reflects a major part of the phraseological meaning;

\^{823} Ibid., 12:44.
\^{824} For examples, see the results in: http://islamport.com/cgi-bin/w/adb/search.cgi?zoom_query=%C3%D6%DB%C7%CB+%C3%CD%E1%C7%E3&zoom_per_page=100 &zoom_and=1&zoom_sort=0, accessed on 10 June 2018
\^{826} Az-Zamakhsharī, *Asās al-Balāgha*, vol. 1, p. 583.
\^{827} Qur’ān (*Yūsuf*) 12:53.
therefore, it is fully fixed.

We cannot classify phrasemes as figurative, even though referring to *nafs* [soul] as the object of the verb is a dead Arabic metaphor, and a dead metaphor in the context of Arabic phraseology functions as a marker of non-figurativeness. Two additional factors contribute to the phraseme’s full fixedness: allusion, and lack of pronouns.

Phraseme (157) alludes to Joseph being accused of stealing by his brothers, without realising they are talking to him. So Joseph ‘kept it to himself’ [did not reveal it]. The phraseme is coined of two elements, and this would tend to apply high level of fixedness to it. However, it is only highly fixed, as there can be changes in the pronoun.\(^{828}\) The phraseme without the allusion could refer either to keeping secrets or to not revealing negative emotions towards something; but via allusion to the story of Joseph, it carries the latter phraseological meaning only. The words the verb conjugation and the order of the original text source are preserved, and hence it is a quotation too.

Lastly, the reference in phraseme (158) is to a Ḥadīth rather than to a Qur’ānic verse, though it is linked with the story of Joseph whose main Islamic source is the Qur’ān. The Ḥadīth’s text is:

\[
'\text{an }'\text{Abdillāhi bni }'\text{Umar }'\text{ani n-nabbiyyi qāla: l-karīmu bni l-karīmi bni l-karīmi Yūsufu bnu Ya'qūba bni Ishāqa}
\]

[narrated ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar the Prophet said: ‘The honourable son of the honourable son of honourable is Joseph son of Jacob son of Isaac’]\(^{829}\)

By making such a reference, the collocation gained a primary metaphorical meaning, i.e., Joseph. The secondary meaning was motivated by the whole concept of the Ḥadīth. Thus, the phraseme became a representation of the ultimate honour. It is fully fixed because it is a

---

\(^{828}\) The corpus does not provide any example of this phraseme in which it refers to a first person or third person feminine. However, according to the role of the pronoun, such examples are theoretically possible.

\(^{829}\) Al-Bukhārī, *al-Jāmi‘ al-Musnad*, vol. 6, p. 76.
Muḥammad himself is the topic of a share of allusive Qurʾānic phrasemes. According to the commentators, Muḥammad liked his adopted son Zayd ibn Ḥāritha’s wife, Zaynab bint Jaḥsh. When Muḥammad found out that Zayd wished to divorce Zaynab, he asked Zayd not to proceed. Accordingly, the revelation from which the phraseme is quoted justified Muḥammad’s marriage as an example of a law for the Muslims:

[And (remember, O Muḥammad), when you said to the one on whom God bestowed favour and you bestowed favour, ‘Keep your wife and fear God,’ while you concealed within yourself that which Allāh is to disclose. And you feared the people, while God has more right that you fear Him. So when Zayd had no longer any need for her (fa-lammā qadā Zaydun minhā watran), We married her to you in order that there not be upon the believers any discomfort concerning the wives of their adopted sons when they no longer have need of them. And ever is the command of God accomplished.]⁸³⁰

Accordingly, the phraseme became:

159) qadā waṭrahū [(he) has compiled his desire]⁸³¹ = to fulfil a wish.

Phraseme (159) refers to a general usage of the collocation qadā with waṭr to refer to any desire that is pleasantly fulfilled. The collocation could have been coined in the pre-Islamic era, but certainly, the Qurʾānic verse – especially in such important context – applies an additional level of conventionalisation. The phraseme’s form is fully fixed. It is a quotation, is non-figurative, and is coined from two elements. Additionally, waṭr is a cranberry that co-occurs only with the verb qadā. Classical Arabic dictionaries does not show verbs that are derived from the root w-ṭ-r, and this bonds waṭra even more closely to the collocation.⁸³²

---

⁸³⁰ Qurʾān (al-Ahzāb) 33:37.
⁸³² Ibn Manẓūr, in Lisān al-ʿArab, says ‘lām asmaʾ laḥā fiʿlan’[I did not hear a verb from it], whereas . See: Ibn
Ibn al-Khaṭīb used phraseme (159) not only as an allusion, but also as a representation of a concept: sexual desire. The collocation on its lexical level refers to a desire that is fulfilled. Adding this to the context of the story in the Qurʾān, the phraseme refers not only to a general desire or goal, but also to a specific (i.e., sexual) desire.

The following two idioms phrasemes also allude to stories related to Muḥammad:

160)  

\[\text{wa-mā ramayta idh ramayta} \] [it was not you who threw when you threw] 

= to achieve one’s goal by coincidence.

161)  

\[\text{lamma ltaqa l-jamʿāni} \] [when the two groups/armies met] = a great event involving the meeting of two groups or individuals.

Phraseme (160) alludes indirectly to the story of the Battle of Badr, in which (as related by the commentators) Muḥammad threw a handful of dust at the infidels, blinding them and thus leading to their defeat. The phraseme is used in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works in a secondary metaphorical meaning, [achieving a goal without real effort], but its quoted form is retained. One would not expect its pronoun to be re-conjugated, because the phraseme conveys a tone of censure, and reminds the audience of the favour they have received. One would nevertheless expect to see the phraseme conjugated with a third-person pronoun; but the corpus does not provide any example of such a variety.

The elements of (161) render it a fully fixed, non-figurative, quotation phraseme. It refers to three verses in the Qurʾan, two relating to the Battle of Uḥud in sūrat ‘Āl ʿImrān

---

Manzūr, Lisān al-ʿArab (electronic resource):  
http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%88%D8%B7%D8%B1#1, accessed on 11 June 2018; Ibn Fāris in Maqāyīs al-Lughā says ‘lā yubnā minhā fi `lum’ [no verb is conjugated of it (i.e. the root w-t-r)]. See: Ibn Fāris, Maqāyīs al-Lughā, (electronic resource):  
http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%88%D8%B7%D8%B1, accessed on 11 June 2018.

835 Aḥ-Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-Bayān (electronic resource):  
http://www.altafsir.com/Tafasir.asp?tMadhNo=0&tTafsirNo=1&tSoraNo=8&tAyahNo=17&tDisplay=yes&UserProfile=0&LanguageId=1, accessed on 11 June 2018.
836 Ibid.
(3:155 and 3:166) and the other to the Battle of Badr in sūrat al-Anfāl (8:41). Both battles are among the greatest in early Islamic history, and this provided the phraseme with its secondary semantic level.

The following phrasemes allude to two different stories, each relating to a religiously significant historical event:

162) \textit{shûhu l-wujāhi} [ugly be the faces]\footnote{Al-Maqqaq, Naḥī at-Ṭīb., vol. 7, p. 396.} = a curse.

163) \textit{wallā wajhahū shaṭrahū} [turn his face towards it]\footnote{Ibid., vol. 5, p. 212.} = to pleasingly change one’s emotions/loyalty towards someone/something.

The first phraseme in this group is motivated by an allusion to a Ḥadīth text that narrates the story of the Prophet Muḥammad in the Battle of Ḥunayn. The story that the phraseme alludes to, ‘narrated on the authority of Salama’, was as follows:

We fought by the side of the Messenger of Allāh […] at [Ḥunayn].[…] When we encountered the enemy, I advanced and ascended a hillock. A man from the enemy side turned towards me and I shot him with an arrow. He (ducked and) hid himself from me. I could not understand what he did, but (all of a sudden) I saw that a group of people appeared from the other hillock. They and the Companions of the Prophet met in combat, but the Companions of the Prophet turned back and I too turned back defeated. […] (In this downcast condition) I passed by the Messenger of Allāh who was riding on his white mule. He said: The son of Akwa’ finds himself to be utterly perplexed. […] The Companions gathered round him from all sides. The Messenger of Allāh got down from his mule, picked up a handful of
dust from the ground, threw it into their (enemy) faces and said: [ṣḥāḥati l-wujūhu] May these faces be deformed. There was no one among the enemy whose eyes were not filled with the dust from this handful. So they turned back fleeing. And Allāh the Exalted and Glorious defeated them, and the Messenger of Allāh distributed their booty among the Muslims.[840]

In the Ḥadīth, the phraseme is used as a curse for a specific, literal purpose; but its subsequent semantic development lent it a more general metaphorical meaning as an insult. Once more, regardless of whether the phraseme was coined as a collocation before its occurrence in the Ḥadīth text, or the Ḥadīth originated it, the fact that it appeared in the Ḥadīth rendered it more conventionalised, especially in terms of its phraseological meaning. The context of the phraseme’s source added an additional meaning to the insult, i.e., religiously motivated cursing.

Phraseme (163) is also an idiom motivated by a Qurʿānic verse whose context refers to the Prophet in a narrative style. Phraseme (163) shows a high level of fixedness because it contains the word šaṭr which, when combined with the root w-l-y, refers directly to the Qurʿānic verse fa-walli wajhaka šaṭra l-Masjidi l-Ḥarāmi[841] [so turn your face towards the holy mosque].

The context of this phraseme alludes to the part of the Qurʿān in which God points to al-Masjidi al-Ḥarām in Mecca as the qibla towards which Muslims must face while praying. Hence, the expression gained an additional semantic level, of turning one’s face in a direction that is pleasing; and this later concept came to dominate the phraseme’s metaphorical meaning. Its cultural phenomenon is allusion, in addition to being a quotation, rather than a gesture, but to explain why this is the case, we need to know Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s context for it:

\[\text{istiqbālihi l-wijnhata l-latī man wallā wajhahā šaṭrahā āthara athirān}\]

---


841 Qurʾān (al-Baqara) 2:144.
[(his) facing the direction which he whoever faces its direction, (he) favours a favourable (direction)]

Hence, the allusion of the of the story is embedded in the positivity of the target direction, which coheres with the Qur’ānic context. A gesture is indeed reflected in the phraseme, but one that can have both a positive meaning, as in the Qur’ān, or a negative one, moving the face away from something—though the latter is never indicated. Also, the use of shaṭr rather than any other in this phraseme hints at the story being alluded to.

The following phrasemes are Qur’ānic-motivated idioms that include proper names:

164) nawμu ahli l-kahfī [the sleeping of the Cave People] = an exaggeratedly long period of sleep.
165) saylū l-ʿarīmi [the revealing flood] = a great amount of a given thing.
166) wasīyyatu Luqmāna [Luqmān’s advice] = wisdom.

The story of ahlu l-kahfī [the people of the cave], known in the Christian tradition as the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, motivates phraseme (164). As recounted in the Qur’ān, this group of young men escaped from their infidel people to a cave in which they slept for 309 years, but thought only one day had passed. It is clear-cut that the cultural phenomenon of this phraseme is allusion rather than quotation, given that the term for Seven Sleepers of Ephesus used in the Qur’ān is aṣḥābu l-kahfī, not ahlu l-kahfī. The two elements aṣḥāb and ahl are used as synonyms in the annexation, or idāfa ma’nawiyya, and both are used in a dead-metaphorical meaning, [those who of...]. Ahlu l-kahfī is not a variety of aṣḥābu l-kahfī, but a separate, independent phrase; and the high number of occurrences of the former supports

---

842 Al-Maqqarī, Naḥḥ at-Ṭib, vol. 5, p. 212
843 Ibid., vol. 1, p. 184.
this claim.

Phraseme (165) alludes to a very old Arab folk story of the dam of Maʾrib. The name of the city of Maʾrib is not explicitly mentioned in the Qurʾān, but the commentators linked an anecdote in the Qurʾān with its dam. In the folkloric version, some Arabs were living a life of great luxury in Sabaʾ in Yemen, and did not follow God’s orders. So God sent a mouse to chew through the foundations of the dam so that it fell and destroyed Sabaʾ:  

[There was for Sabaʾ in their dwelling place a sign; two gardens on the right and the left. (They were told): ‘eat from the provisions of your God and be thank Him. (You have) a good land, and a forgiving God,’ but they turned away, so We sent upon them the flood of the dam [sayla l-ʿarim], and We replaced their two gardens with gardens of bitter fruit, tamarisks and a little of sparse lote trees.]  

The word ʿarim is interpreted in a number of ways by the commentators, but mostly as referring to the semantic field [great]. Its component ʿarim is derived from a southern Arabian word meaning [a dam], with no specific linkage either to Maʾrib or to the semantic field [great]. The uncertainty about the exact meaning of ʿarim in Qurʾānic commentaries affects the


849 Qurʾān (Sabaʾ) 34:15-16.


fixedness level of the phraseme. Because it is a quote, coined of two elements and including a cranberry word whose meaning was uncertain even to its early audience, we can link its full fixedness to the fixedness factor [foreign word].

Phraseme (166) refers the Qurʾānic story of Luqmān the Wise. Luqmān’s advice is explicitly mentioned in the Qurʾān (31:13), but it is not entirely clear whether the person to whom it is addressed is Luqmān’s son or a more general audience.852 The phraseme exhibits full fixedness even though it is not a quotation. Two factors affect this fixedness level. The first is the inclusion of a proper name, Luqmān, which is motivated by the allusion to the story in the Qurʾān; and the second is that it is coined of two elements. Moreover, as well as alluding to the story of Luqmān in the Qurʾān, the phraseme led the name Luqmān to become a cultural symbol of wisdom, just as ݀ātim became a symbol of generosity.853 There are two additional minor factors: the phraseme’s elements do not include pronouns, which if present could have conferred morphological variety on its form; and its first element, waṣiyya, indicates an indirect reference to the Qurʾānic verse,

\[
\text{wa-idh qāla Luqmānu li-bnihī wa-huwa yaʾizzuhū yā bunayya lā tushrik bi-
llāhi inna sh-shirk la-żlmun ʿazīmun, wa-waṣṣayna l-insāna bi-wālidayhi
iḥsānū}
\]

[And when Luqmān said to his son while he was advising him, ‘O! my son, do not associate (anything) with God, indeed, association (anything with Him) is great injustice.’ And we have advised man (to take care) of his parents]854

The first element of the phraseme is derived from the root w-ṣ-y, which agrees with the word

853 For more details, see Chapter 5, above.
854 Qurʾān (Luqmān) 31:12-14.
waṣṣaynā in the verse. Although it is unclear if the pronoun refers to God or to Luqmān, the phraseme was coined with a noun derived from the root w-ṣ-y rather than the root w-ʿ-z. The verb yaʿiz [to advise] in the verse includes a pronoun whose antecedent is clearly Luqmān. However, the phraseme was not coined with the word mawʿīza [an exhortation], which is derived from the same root. This phraseme functions in a fully fixed manner.

The following group of three phrasemes refers to narratives that will happen in the future, i.e., in the sequence of the events foretold of Judgment Day, or that occurred proverbially in the Qurʾān:

167) **ad-dābbatu tukallimunā** [the animal is talking to us]\(^{855}\) = to be examined.

168) **fa-aṣbaḥa hashīman tadhrīhu r-riyāhu** [it becomes dry remnants, scattered by the winds]\(^{856}\) = to lose something.

Phraseme (167) refers to the Qurʾān’s verse 27:82:

*wa-idhā waqaʿa l-qawlu ʿalayhim akhrajnā lahun dāabbatan mina l-arḍī tukallimuḥum*

[And when the word befalls them, We will take out for them a creature from the earth speaking to them]\(^{857}\)

According to the commentaries, this creature appears to people only at the end of time as one of a long sequence of events marking judgment day, and assigns each of them to one of two categories: Muslims and infidels.\(^{858}\) The phraseme gained its meaning from commentaries on the distinctions between good and bad, but refers not only to a tool for distinguishing between them, but also to the last judgment. Interestingly, Ibn al-Khaṭīb uses this phraseme in a context

---

\(^{855}\) Al-Maqṣūrī, *Nafḥ at-Ṭib*, vol. 6, p. 221.

\(^{856}\) Ibid., p. 165; Qurʾān (al-Anfāl) 8:45.

\(^{857}\) Qurʾān (an-Naml) 27:82.

that mixes satire with praise. Specifically, he describes a wālī [governor] who was tough with people, which explained why they hated him, even though he was just. It is telling that, instead of using phrasemes with more positive indications, Ibn al-Khaṭīb chose one that included the word dābba [creature/animal] to describe this man. Phraseme (167) is a highly fixed idiom; it is a near-quotation, but contains a pronoun that needs to be conjugated according to the context and the antecedent.

Hashīman in phraseme (168) is not a rare word in Arabic, or what is called gharīb. Nevertheless, it became associated with the Qurʾān’s verse 18:45. The collocation hashīman tadhrūhu r-riyāḥu is non-figurative on its lexical level, but in its Qurʾānic context, the sentence is used as the second part of a simile:

\[
\text{wa-ḍrib lahum mathalni l-ḥayāta d-dunyā ka-mā in anzalnāhu mina s-samāʾ i fa-khtalaṭa bihī nabāṭu l-arḍī fa-ašbaḥa hashīman tadhrūhu r-riyāḥu}
\]

[And give them the example of the life of in this world, (as if it is) like rain which We send down from the sky, and the plants of the earth mingles with it and it becomes dry remnants, scattered by the winds]

Being a part of a figurative combination, i.e., a proverbial story, applies a level of fixedness to the usage of phraseme (168), which is needed to keep the reference in the audience’s mind. The phraseme is an allusion to a larger text, even though its phraseological meaning can be decoded without recalling or even knowing a previous narrative, which is why it is a phraseme. However, the non-figurativeness of the phraseme is little more than an allusion to a larger text, coupled with a quotation thereof that serves to make the allusion clearer. Thus, Dobrovolskij and Piirainen’s definition of the cultural phenomenon of allusion – ‘the reference to an entire text or a large passage of a text’ – applies here. Yet, the phraseme is clearly also a quotation,

---

860 Qurʾān (al-Kahf) 18:45.
861 Dobrovolskij and Piirainen, Figurative Language, p. 234.
meaning that it is motivated by two cultural phenomena.

8:3 Qu’ranic and Ḥadīth motivated Non-allusive Phrasemes

The Qurʾān and Ḥadīth are the sources of large numbers of classical Arabic referential and communicative phrasemes with various target domains. Such phrasemes are fully fixed for multiple reasons, the main factor being quotation. However, some were coined with a cranberry lexeme or an element that functions as a proper name, and as we have seen, this also affects their fixedness level.

References to God represent another important fixedness factor in this category: tending to raise the level of fixedness from high to full, even if the phraseme occurs in a non-religious context. Consider the following:

169) ʿuṭī mukarāl man yashāʾu [he gives his sovereignty to whom he will][862] = to indicate a change in sovereignty, ownership or power.

170) fariḥīnā bimā ʿātāhum llāhu [rejoicing in what God has bestowed upon (you)][863] = pleasure, especially with good grace.

171) sa-yūḥdīthu llāhu baʿda ʿusrīn yusran [God will make after hardship, ease][864] = to hope for a positive change.

All three of the above phrasemes refer to actions linked to God. Although their phraseological semantic levels are motivated by the action in the phraseme rather than this divine connection, their references to God render them fully fixed – and would do so even if they were not also Qurʾānic quotations.

Phraseme (169) is a commonplace expression that contains a slight modification of the original Qurʾānic verse, in that the verb has been conjugated to suit the second-person pronoun,

---

864 Al-Maqṣūrī, Ṣafṣafat-Ṭibīb, vol. 6, p. 178.
which changes the prefix from *tu* to *yu*. Despite this modification, the reference to God is kept as it is, with no change on any level of the phraseme.

The phraseological meaning of phraseme (170) is suggested by its surface semantic level. Happiness for God’s gift is the ultimate happiness, so any grace one gains that makes one happy is from God. The phraseme is quoted from the verse in *sūrat ʿĀl ʿImrān* 3:26, in which it is explained that those who have been killed in God’s cause are happy with what they received from Him as a reward.

Phraseme (171) is another platitudinous commonplace expression that indicates the concept of fate, and its link to God as the one who controls fate – or, perhaps, is fate itself. In the Qurʾān, it is part of an explanation of why a man should spend as much as possible on his family, and an exhortation of he whose sources are limited to spend from what he has until God eases his hardship. In the original verse, the phraseme is preceded by *sayajʿalu* [(He) will make], while in our corpus, the verb is replaced by a synonym verb: *sayuḥdithu*. However, because the core elements *yusr* and *ʿusr* in their sequence maintain the phraseological usage of the phraseme, substituting a synonym for its verb does not affect the decoding of its metaphorical meaning.

The secondary meaning of phraseme (171), like that of phraseme (169), is predicted, yet not directly reflected, by the context of the non-figurative level. Additionally, (171)’s phraseological meaning is created by generalising its original meaning, which is motivated by its Qurʾānic religious purpose.

The main fixedness factors for the following three phrasemes are their non-figurativeness and use of frequently used words.

---

866 Ibid., (*at-Ṭulāq*) 65:7.
868 Qurʾān (*Hūd*) 11:102.
Phraseme (172) is in ḥaṣr form, in which only the subject is included in the predicate. This form is also used for emphasis the expressed idea especially in comomplaces, and in this case enables the phraseme to express a meaning beyond its literal one. All three phrasemes were coined in a non-figurative form and both are quotations, which applies a level of fixedness to them.

Phraseme (173) is an idiom that is motivated by a conceptual metaphor and a pre-scientific fictive concept. THE CHEST IS A CONTAINER is a conceptual metaphor that frequently occurs in the context of another such metaphor, SECRETS ARE MATERIAL ENTITIES. The combination of these two metaphors and two cultural phenomena – the fictive conceptual domain and quotation – produces the idea that to reveal secrets is to take them out of one’s chest. The fictive concept in the phraseme is the idea that one’s heart is, literally, where secrets are kept; and because the chest is the container of the heart, the chest is where secrets reside. This combination of elements applies a level of fixedness to the phraseme over and above the level conferred by it being a quotation.

Mā is one of the core elements of the final phraseme of this group, (174), an idiom that referred originally to doomsday, and specifically to the earthquakes that would occur at that time. Due to vagueness in the meaning of the word mā that refers to an indefinite antecedent to which the action applies and can apply to any target domain, the phraseme shows a high leve
of fixedness here.

In our corpus, the phraseme does not directly connect to this original Qur’anic context. It does, however, express negative feelings in a way that can only be understood by reference to such context.

The final two phrasemes in this section are quoted from Ḥadīth:

175) \( \text{kullun muyassarun limā khuliqa lahū} \) [each one is led to what he/she was created for]\(^872\) = to accept fate.

176) \( \text{al-ḥikmatu ḍāllatu l-mu’mini} \) [wisdom is the lost (property) of the believer]\(^873\) = seeking the truth.

Phraseme (175)’s fixedness is attributable to its status as a quotation, to its non-figurativeness, and to its use of the passive voice, which is meant to refer to God. Also, \( \text{kullun} \) here is an indefinite word that is used not only for generalisation, which is a characteristic of a commonplace phrasemes like (175), but semantically to refer to an unspecified person. Thus, it signals the applicability of the phraseological meaning to all possible targets, and this ability lessens the need to change the phraseme’s form.

Phraseme (176) became a proverb, but can be identified as a quotation from some Ḥadīth texts, including *Sunan Ibn Māja*.\(^874\) The difference between its phraseological meaning and its primary meaning relates to generalisation. Its core elements occur with the definite article \( \text{al} \). However, the article here refers to the general concepts of ‘wisdom’ and ‘believer’, and this motivates the generalising of the phraseological meaning. Hence, ‘wisdom’ becomes a collective word for truth, success, and knowledge, and ‘believer’ a collective word for thinker, intelligence and reasonableness.

The final phraseme in this section is a well-known communicative one. However, the

---

\(^{872}\) Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *al-Ihāja*, vol. 1, p. 90.

\(^{873}\) Ibid., vol. 3, p. 93.

\(^{874}\) It is found in multiple Ḥadīth texts, the oldest source I could find being Ibn Māja, *Sunan Ibn Māja*, vol. 2, p. 1359.
in the context of the fourteenth-century classical Arabic writings of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, it has a
different phraseological meaning:

177) mā shā’a llāhu [what God wills (will happen)]\(^{875}\) = to indicate something’s great
quantity, length, or size.

Phraseme (177) seems to be quoted from and metaphorically motivated by the Qur’ānic verse

\[ wa-lawlā an dakhalta jannataka qulta mā shā’a llāhu \]

[And why did you, when you entered your garden, not say: ‘What God willed
(has occurred?”)\(^{876}\)

In spite of the high number of occurrences of this phraseme, it does not show flexibility in its
form. This has two causes. First, its only pronoun refers to God; and second, mā – as an
ambiguous lexical element – eliminates the need for any substitute lexeme to indicate the target
domain. Although in the collocation in the Qur’ān, this phraseme is used metaphorically to
mean praising something without affecting it with an evil eye, this is not the context of any of
its three appearances in the corpus. Rather, in all these occurrences, it is used to indicate
muchness.

In the first of these three contexts, Ibn al-Khaṭīb explains a historical event in which the
Berber soldiery were allowed to do whatever they wanted \( (\text{istibāḥa}) \) in Cordoba, mā shā’a llāhu [as much as they desire]:

\[ wa-ḥarrakā ʾalā ahli Qurṭubata […] mā shā’a llāhu mini stibāḥatin \]

[and they caused over the people of Cordoba what God willed of agony].\(^{877}\)

The second context is praise for an Andalusi writer named ʿAbd Allāh al-Azdī (d.
750/1350):

\(^{876}\) Qurʾān (al-Kahf) 18:39.
\(^{877}\) Ibn al-Khaṭīb, al-Iḥāṣa, vol. 1, p. 294. For similar context, see ibid., vol. 1, p. 126. The translation of \( \text{istibāḥa} \)
here as ‘agonies’ has been provided to fit the context of the phraseme, and not to repeat the explanation of the
word that has already been given above.
taqallaba fī afānīnī l-balāghati wa-lawwana, wa-aafsada mā shā’ā llāhu wa-kawwana

[he (changed) and shifted between the branches of eloquence, and he deformed, as much God desires, and recreated (pieces of literature)].

Finally, the third example of this phraseme’s context in the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb is a story about a man who sold green figs that still hung on a tree he owned. When the buyer came to collect the figs, he picked some leaves to sort the figs on; but the seller then refused to go through with the transaction, because the leaves had not been included in it. Ibn al-Khaṭīb explains:

fa-ta’iba dhālika l-mushtarī mā shā’ā llāhu wa-jalaba waraqan min ghayrihā

[so that buyer was exhausted as much as God desires and brought leaves from another (tree)].

The two usages of the phraseme, 1) to praise something without affecting it with an evil eye, and 2) muchness, can both be said to be motivated by the cultural model that God is omnipotent – or, in the specific case of the first phraseological meaning, ‘God can do whatever He desires, so no wonder He could create such beauty’. This interpretation coheres with the context of the verse in sūrat al-Kahf mentioned above. For the second meaning, Ibn al-Khaṭīb writes: ‘God is omnipotent, so to exaggerate the size of a thing, a long period, or an event is linked with God’s power’.

Hence, in the context of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s writings, mā shā’ā llāhu is not a communicative phraseme. Rather, it is a referential collocation phraseme whose

---

879 Ibid., p. 56.
880 Qurʾān (al-Kahf) 18:39. Although both meanings reflect a cultural model, this usage might be a quotation too. In any case, it does not occur in the corpus in its Qurʾānic context.
881 See section 8.5.
phraseological meaning is [a long period of time].

8:4 Taboos

Our corpus does not provide a large number of religiously motivated phrasemes with the target domain [taboos], which themselves constitute a cultural phenomenon. Nevertheless, the four it does provide are all very commonly seen in classical Arabic:

178) \textit{al-ajalu l-maktūbu} [the written (appointed) time]\textsuperscript{882} = the instant of death.

179) \textit{mašāri ’u s-sū’i} [the fatal accident]\textsuperscript{883} = violent death.

180) \textit{hādimu l-ladhdhāti} [the destroyer of pleasures]\textsuperscript{884} = death.

181) \textit{ila r-rafiqi l-a’lā} [(he was) transferred to the higher companion]\textsuperscript{885} = he died.

The first of these three phrasemes is a modified idiom from the verse \textit{li-kulli ajalin kitābun} [for every term is a written (decree)],\textsuperscript{886} and retains the core elements of the source text, which deliver its phraseological meaning. These \textit{ajal} and \textit{maktūb} became a nearly dead metaphor in later Islamic contexts. In Islamic tradition, God wrote/decided the fate of every creature before He created the world; and \textit{katab} [to write] is used only in this context of God’s decisions. The lexical level of the word \textit{ajal} expresses the meaning [time] or [term]. In the Qur’ān and Ḥadīth, this word gained the meaning of [death] as an additional semantic level.\textsuperscript{887}

The flexibility of phraseme (178) is a result of the frequent occurrence, in Islamic culture generally, of its two elements in the same sense as its phraseological meaning. As such, it is also a cultural model of death that had become conventionalised by the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb.

The sources of phrasemes (179) and (180) are Ḥadīth texts. The former’s is:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{882} Al-Maqqarī, \textit{Nafḥ at-Tīb}, vol. 4, p. 426.
  \item \textsuperscript{883} Ibid., vol. 5, p. 507.
  \item \textsuperscript{884} Ibid., vol. 6, p. 316.
  \item \textsuperscript{885} Ibid, p. 335.
  \item \textsuperscript{886} Qur’ān (\textit{ar-Ra’d}) 13:38.
  \item \textsuperscript{887} See, for example, Qur’ān (\textit{al-A’rāf}) 7:34 (Yūnus) 10:11, 10:49; (\textit{an-Nahāl}) 16:61; and (\textit{Fāṭir}) 35:45.
\end{itemize}
The fixedness factors of the collocation phraseme (179) broadly agree with those of the rest of the Qurʿān- and Ḥadīth-quoting phrasemes. Nevertheless, it occurs in a fully fixed form, which can be attributed to two factors. First, it refers to a concept that became a collective name for any fatal accident, so it does not occur in the singular form maṣraʿu s-sūʿī. Rather, to refer to a single such incident, one would use the phrase aḥadu maṣārīʿi s-sūʿī [one of the fatal accidents]. The second factor is the reference to the Ḥadīth. By the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, the Qurʿān had become a stable, fixed text, and more established in the collective memory of the speech community than Ḥadīth texts were. The idea that the Qurʿān is a divine text preserved by God himself in sūrat al-Ḥijr (e.g., 15:9) tends to fix Qurʿānic phrasemes, albeit with a margin of flexibility encouraged by the speaker’s perhaps unconscious feeling that the audience will know the source text. In contrast, Ḥadīth texts – although in some cases well-established in the speech community – are not explicitly held to have been preserved by God.

Phraseme (180) likewise is an idiom that refers to death as per the Ḥadīth:

It is narrated by Abū Hurayra that he said: the messenger of God, peace been upon him, said: frequently you should mention the destroyer of pleasures [hādimi l-ladhdhātī]. They asked: but what is the destroyer of pleasures O messenger of God?, he said: death[.]

Here, in addition to the basic full-fixedness factors of such Ḥadīth-motivated phrasemes, the collocation was established in the Ḥadīth itself. In other words, it does not include any cultural phenomenon or linguistic implication that referred to death before the Ḥadīth was composed – as can be discerned from the question the Prophet’s followers ask about hādimu l-ladhdhātī.

---

In general, Islamic Arabic phrasemes whose target domains are non-religious are motivated by the two main Islamic sources: the Qurʾān and Ḥadīth. Although the Qurʾānic phrasemes are widely believed to be the more fixed of these two types, their divine status paradoxically confers a slightly greater flexibility upon them, whereas Ḥadīth-derived ones usually occur in full fixedness on all of their levels, as we can see from phrasemes (179) and (180). In these cases, the cultural phenomenon of quotation does not contribute to the fixedness of the phrasemes as much as the source domain does. We can also observe this in phrasemes reflecting the cultural phenomenon of quotation and motivated by the Qurʾān; however, such phrasemes still tend to exhibit higher flexibility than those motivated by, for instance, poetry.

The final phraseme refers to death via an image motivated by a cultural model. Unlike the previous phrasemes about death, phraseme (181) refers to it in a positive sense. Two concepts – UP IS GOOD, and God being above – are combined in the image of the phraseme. When one dies, and is expected by his/her beloved to be in the highest position, i.e., with God, it is the best possible situation.

8:5 Communicative Phrasemes

Religion in any Islamic community has a profound impact on the organisation of interpersonal communication, both oral and written. This is especially apparent in the sphere of phraseology. Many communicative and textual phrasemes are motivated by Islam, but their target domains have lost their direct connection to this source domain. In some cases, a single phraseme is used for both religious and non-religious target domains. For example, bi-smi llāhi r-raḥmāni r-raḥīmi [in the name of God the most gracious, the most merciful] is used for both religious purposes – e.g., reciting the Qurʾān – and non-religious ones such as commencing a project. The same applies to a ṣūdhu bi-llāhi mina sh-shayṭāni r-rajīmi [I seek refuge with God from the accursed Satan].
Although Islamic communicative phrasemes maintain their religious references on the lexical and primary semantic levels, both of which are understandable by their hearers, the metaphorical pragmatic meanings of such phrasemes dominate the process of their usage within the speech community. In other words, a phraseme like (189) *as-salāmu ‘alaykum wa-raḥmatu llāhi wa-barakātuhū* [peace, God’s mercy and blessings be upon you]\(^{890}\) is used as a greeting rather than being linked with its origin.

Our corpus provides a number of Islamic phrasemes that speech-act formulae. Not only are religiously motivated phrasemes connected with their original cultural source; they also take a long time to become so conventionalised that the connection between the source domain and the target domain is lost. In other words, to transfer the metaphorical meaning of a phraseme from a religious source domain to a non-religious one, the religious phraseological meaning in the target domain must have been established long enough ago that the speaker can move it to a new semantic level. This new semantic level is therefore a complex metaphorical image that has moved *twice* from its basic literal primary semantic level. Consider the following nine phrasemes:

182) *innā li-llāhi wa-innā ilayhi rājiʿūna* [indeed we (belong) to God, and indeed to Him we will return]\(^{891}\) = said to react to a problem.

183) *ḥasbuna llāhu wa-niʿma l-wakīlu* [sufficient for us is God, and (He is) the best disposer (of affairs)]\(^{892}\) = said to react to a problem.

184) *in shāʾa llāhu* [God wills]\(^{893}\) = to hope something.

185) *lā ḥawla wa-lā quwwata illā bi-llāhi* [there is no power nor strength but in God]\(^{894}\) = to express an inability to do something, or condolences.

892 Ibid., vol. 7, p. 389; Qurʾān (ʾĀl ʾImrān) 3:173.
894 Ibid., vol. 6, p. 298.
186) *bi-ḥawli llāhi wa-quwwatiḥi* [by the power and strength of God] = to express an ability to do something.

187) *raḥimahu llāhu* [may God have mercy on him] = to express condolences.

188) *bāraka llāhu fīka* [may God bless you] = to respond to a good deed.

189) *as-salāmu 'alaykum wa-raḥmatu llāhi wa-barakātuhū* [peace, God’s mercy, and blessings be upon you] = greeting.

190) *naddara allāhu wajhahū* [may God beautify his face] = a prayer for happiness in the afterlife.

191) *al-hamdu li-llāhi* [(all) praise be to God] = an expression of gratitude.

Phraseme (184) is derived from the following Qur'ānic verse:

\[ al-ladhīna idhā aṣābalāthum muṣībatun qālū innā li-llāhi wa-innā ilayhi rāji'ūna \]

[Who, when disaster strikes them, say, ‘Indeed we belong to God, and indeed to Him we will return’]  

The context of the phraseme in the verse coined its pragmatic usage as a response to a disaster. Indeed, the phraseme is motivated by a religious concept. The target domain, however, can be either religious (i.e., as an act of Islamic religious obedience) or non-religious, according to the intention of the speaker. Phraseme (182) occurs in full fixedness even though it contains a pronoun; but we can, in this case, note one additional fixedness factor: its original status as a prayer. A similar phenomenon can be noted in many other prayer phrasemes as in the

\_______________

895 Ibid., vol. 5, p. 138.
897 Ibid., vol. 3, p. 325.
898 Ibid., p. 375; this phraseme occurs in many places in the corpus, but I cite only one example because they all occur in the same phraseological meaning and the same context.
901 Qurʾān (*al-Baqara*) 2:156.
902 We mention the following examples of prayer phrasemes in this context as evidence of this fixedness factor, despite the target domain of the prayers being [religion].
following chapter.

Phraseme (183) is lexically and metaphorically derived from the Qurʾān, 3:173:

\begin{align*}
\text{al-ladhīna qāl lahumu n-nāsu inna n-nāsa qad jamaʿū lakum fa-khshawhum} \\
\text{fa-zādūhum imānan wa-qālū ḥasbuna llāhu wa-niʿma l-wakīlu}
\end{align*}

[Those to whom hypocrites said, ‘indeed, the people have gathered against you, so fear them,’ but it increased them in faith, and they said: ‘Sufficient for us is God, and (He is) the best Disposer (of affairs)’]^903

The phraseme expresses literally the idea that humans should rely on God in all aspects of life. On its secondary semantic level, it became a communicative expression used in the manner motivated by the context of the Qurʾānic verse: i.e., responding to a problem.

The analysis of phraseme (182), however, does not apply to phraseme (183) because the latter occurs in two forms in the source text. Each of these two forms shows modification in the pronoun, although they both express the same phraseological meaning. As mentioned above, the Qurʾānic verse sūrat ʿĀl ʿImrān 3:173 includes a version of the phraseme with the first-person plural pronoun. However, sūrat at-Tawba 9:129 gives it a first-person singular pronoun, as shown below:

\begin{align*}
\text{fa-in tawallaw fa-qul ḥasbiya llāhu}
\end{align*}

[and if they turn away, (O! Muḥammad), then say: ‘sufficient for me is God’]^904

Phraseme (183) is a quotation, its occurrence in two varieties in the Qurʾān allows it limited flexibility in terms of the pronouns used.

Phraseme (184) is one of the most common Islamic communicative phrasemes. Nevertheless, it exists in only one version, possibly because it lacks pronouns that do not refer

^903 Qurʾān (ʿĀl ʿImrān) 3:173.
^904 Ibid., (al-Tawba) 9:129.
to God. The phraseme is a quotation of multiple Qur’ānic verses, all of which motivate the same metaphorical meaning.\footnote{See ibid., (al-Baqara) 2:70, (Yūsf) 12:99, (al-Kahf) 18:69, (as-Ṣaffār) 37:101, and (al-Fath) 48:72.}

Phrasemes (185) and (186) are coined from the same core lexical elements; however, their syntactic form is different, and this difference affects the motivation of their secondary semantic levels. The former is found partially in the Qur’ān, sūrat al-Kahf 18:39 ‘lā quwwata illā bi-llāhi’\footnote{Ibid., (al-Kahf) 18:39.} – along with the latter, as we will see – and as a full quotation in some Ḥadīth, such as:

He who is overwhelmed with graces should often say thanks to God [fa-l-yukthir min ḥamdi llāhi], and he whose problems are too many, he should say I seek the mercy of God [fa-ʿalayhi bi-li-stighfāri], and he whose life is dominated by poverty, he often says there is no power nor strength but in God [fa-l-yukthir min lā ḥawla wa-lā quwwata illā bi-llāhi].\footnote{Abū al-Layth Muḥammad ibn Naṣr as-Samarqandi, Tanbīḥ al-Ghāfīlīn bi-ʾAḥādīth Saʿyīd al-Mursalīn, ed. Yūsf Budaywī (Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr, 2000), vol. 1, p. 446. For another example, see Ibn Ḥanbal, Murshad Ahmad, vol. 38, p. 534.}

As a communicative phraseme, (185) has a non-religious target domain and functions as an expression of annoyance, sadness, and sometimes condolence. A possible explanation of such a shift in the target domain is that the primary semantic level of the phraseme’s elements reflects man’s weakness as compared to God, and that this literal meaning served as the basis of the new secondary meanings that the phraseme established. Because it is a quotation, refers to God, and does not include a pronoun, phraseme (185) is fully fixed.

Phraseme (186) is not a quotation from an early Islamic text. I would argue, however, that it is derived from phraseme (185), to convey the opposite of its meaning. Specifically, the negation form in (185) that is preceded by an exception to express limitation is replaced in (186) by the article bi, which indicates the meaning of using a tool. Hence, by the power and
strength of God, things can happen, since there is no power or strength except in God.

Phraseme (187) is a prayer that dead people be treated with God’s mercy, which forgives all their sins. The phraseme is derived from, but not a quotation of, many different Qur’ānic verses including sūrat ʿĀl ʿImrān 3:107 and sūrat az-Zumar 39:53. As a frequently occurring phraseme that includes a pronoun, it has a degree of flexibility on the morphological level. Hence, we can say that the phraseme reflects a cultural model that is influenced by the Islamic concept of hoping that the deceased person is accepted into God’s mercy.

Phraseme (188) is motivated by a prayer to increase one’s own goodness, derived from Qur’ānic verses including sūrat al-Anbiyāʾ 21:71 and 21:81 and sūrat Sabaʾ 34:18. However, it derived the form quoted above from Ḥadīth texts, such as:

\[\text{thumma raʃaʾa yadayhū fa-maʃaḥa bihā ʿalā raʾsi Zubaybin wa-qāla: bāraka}
\]

\[llāhu bika yā ghulāmu\]

[then the Prophet raised his hand and rubbed Zubayb’s head with it, saying:

God bless you, O young boy!]\(^{908}\)

This phraseme gained additional pragmatic/communicative value as an expression of praise for the audience. It exhibits a level of flexibility because of the pronoun in its form.

Phraseme (189) was the most common communicative phraseme in classical Arabic language from the advent of Islam onwards. Used as a greeting, it is derived from Ḥadīth texts such as

\[\text{idhā laqiya r-rajulu akhāhu l-muslima fa-l-yaquli s-salāmu ʿalaykum wa-raḥmatu llāhi wa-barakātuhū.}\]

[if one meets his Muslim brother he should say: Peace, God’s mercy, and blessings be upon you.]\(^{909}\)

---


\(^{909}\) Aṭ-Ṭabarānī, al-Muʾjam al-Kabīr, vol. 6, p. 256.
It exhibits a high level of flexibility, both in the number of elements and the space between them. With regard to the former, the phraseme always retains two core elements that preserve its lexical reference and its metaphorical meaning.

In its shortest form, phraseme (189) is found as *salāmun ʿalaykum*, e.g., in *sūrat az-Zumar* 39:73, as well as in the Ḥadīth.\(^{910}\) In the corpus, phraseme (189) occurs with a large amount of space between the first two elements, on the one hand, and the rest of the phraseme, on the other:

\[
\text{wa-s-salāmu ʿalā sayyidī mā kānati l-fikāhatu min shaʿwi l-wafā wa-l-mudā ʿabatu min shiyami z-zurafā wa-raḥmatu llāhi wa-barakātuhū.}
\]

[and peace be upon my lord, as long as humour is a sign of faithfulness and joking is a characteristic of elegant (men) and blessings of God almighty.\(^{911}\)]

Or like:

\[
\text{salāmu l-ladīhī yataʿannaqu ʿabaqan wa-nashran ʿalā ḥaḍratikumu l-ʿaliyyati wa-raḥmatu llāhi taʿālā wa-barakātuhū [the most attractively infused (with aroma and fragrance) may be with your great excellency, along with mercy and blessings of God almighty].}\(^{912}\)

Additional to the long verions of the phrasemes, itt also occurs in shorter forms like ʿ*alayka minnī salāmu*,\(^{913}\) as-*salāmu ʿalayka* [may the peace be upon you],\(^{914}\) *salāmu llāhi ʿalayka wa-raḥmatuhū wa-barakātuhū*.\(^{915}\) As discussed in detail in Chapter 2, above, as long as the metaphorical target domain of a classical Arabic phraseme is detectable, the space between its elements has no effect. In this particular case, such flexibility is explained by the fact that the

---

\(^{910}\) Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad ʿĀmid ibn Ḥanbal*, vol. 4, p. 482.
\(^{912}\) Al-Maqqari, *Naft fi-Tib*, vol. 1, p. 175.
\(^{913}\) Ibid., vol. 4, p. 166.
\(^{914}\) Ibid., vol. 7, p. 425.
\(^{915}\) Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *al-ʿIlāma*, vol. 4, p. 23.
target/audience of the phraseme is referred to by the pronoun that comes after the preposition ʿalā [upon]. A proper name with all of the syntactically possible elements, or a pronoun, can follow this preposition, and this pattern (along with its frequency of occurrence) lends phraseme (189) a high level of flexibility on its morphological level, despite the fixedness mandated by it being a quotation.

The Qurʾānic verse to which phraseme (190) refers is wujūhun yawm ʿidhin nādīratun [faces are beautified, on that day]. On its primary semantic level, this phraseme is non-figurative. Dictionaries define nādira as ‘beautiful’, and in the context of the Qurʾān it describes the happiness of believers in Heaven, within the conceptual metaphor A BEAUTIFUL FACE IS HAPPINESS. This metaphor is also reflected in another (inter-cultural) Arabic one, WHITE IS GOOD – for instance, in:

wa-amma l-ladhīna byaadḍat wujūhuhum fa-fi raḥmatin mina lāhi

[And those whose faces are white, they are (included) in the mercy of God]

BEAUTY IS GOOD, meanwhile, is clearly identifiable in Islamic religious texts, including the Ḥadīth:

inna llāha jamīlun yuḥibbu l-jamāla

[Indeed God is beautiful and loves beauty]

A BEAUTIFUL FACE IS HAPPINESS and WHITE IS GOOD both motivate the image of phraseme (190), which, because it is a non-figurative expression that predates the Qurʾān, has a high level of fixedness. The phraseme does not merely refer to facial beauty as happiness, nor it is a general cultural model. Rather, it refers to a specific situation in which the beautification of a face – with a special use of the verb naḍdar – is performed as a prayer to have a beautiful face on judgment day, as explained by the Qurʾān in sūrat al-Qiyāma, 75:22-

---

916 Qurʾān (al-Qiyāma) 75:22.
918 Qurʾān (A ʿl Imrān) 3:107.
25. As people who are accepted by God will happily look at God (with beautified faces), while others are in agony (with contorted faces) as they anticipate being tortured. That scene is established on the semantic level, not only for the verb *naḍḍara*, but also by the reference to God in the phraseme’s formation. The words of the original text are retained, but with high levels of modification to their order, syntax and morphology, which makes it difficult to accept phraseme (190) as a quotation.

Finally, phraseme (191) is a speech-act formula that is fully fixed. It is, as mentioned earlier, a quotation that is found in the most recited Qur’anic *sūra*, i.e., *al-Fātiha*. Because it originally occurred at the beginning of the Qur’ān, it became indelibly associated with the commencement of events, letters and speeches. The phraseme is mostly used as a speech-act formula to express gratefulness. For example, in one letter in the corpus, Ibn al-Khaṭīb uses it in *thumma inna hādhihi l-ʿawāʿida* […] *lam tuḍāyiq l-ʿīmāna wa-lā rafaʿat wa-l-ḥamdu li-llāhi l-ʿamāna* [and those catastrophes did not disturb the faith, nor did they, thanks to God, take the peace away], and in another letter, *fa-ḥamdu li-llāhi ʿalā mā yassarahū* [and thanks to God, for what He eased], and, *wa-lam yuṣībnī wa-ḥamdu li-lāhi illā jirāḥṭun yasīrātun* [and nothing affected us, thanks to God, except for a few wounds]. Despite being a quotation, as with phraseme (189), it shows a flexibility – albeit one that is limited to its order – due to its high frequency of occurrence, as *wa-lillāhi l-ḥamdu*.

8:6 Sequential Phrasemes

Sequential or irreversible phrasemes are, by definition, fully fixed in terms of the order of their elements. The sequential phrasemes in our corpus are all also quotations, and are thus

---

919 See Chapter 3 of this dissertation.
923 Ibid.
924 Ibid.
highly fixed. In most cases, there is no logical reason for the order of these phrasemes, quotation aside. However, it is occasionally possible to detect an explanation for the order of a phraseme’s elements in its original source text, even though it does not contribute to the phraseological meaning.

The following two examples are religiously motivated sequential phrasemes:

192)  
\[ mā\ zahara \ldots wa-mā\ baṭana \] [what is shown and what is hidden] \(^{925}\) = all the concepts of the world.

193)  
\[ al-jinnu\ wa-l-insu \] [Jinn and human] \(^{926}\) = all thinking creatures.

The first phraseme in this set is directly motivated by and quoted from Qur’ānic verse, i.e., *sūrat al-’An’ām* 6:151, which additionally refers to a specific definition of what is apparent or concealed: immoralities. The order of the elements is logical, starting with what is apparent, and contrasting it to what is concealed.

Phraseme (193) could have been derived from an early collocation, possibly pre-Islamic; but the order of its elements is based on the Qur’ānic verses from which it is quoted: *sūrat al- Naml* 27:17, *sūrat al- Fussilat* 41:29, and *sūrat adh-Dhāriyāt* 51:56. This order could be explained by a progression from the unseen part of the world to the visible part, to emphasise the concept of generalisation. It should also be noted that, while phrases conveying the same idea using the same elements are found in other sequences, their frequency is too low for them to rate as phrasemes.

8:7 Naḥt Phrasemes

Naḥt phrasemes, as discussed in Chapter 2, above, are compounds coined in one morphological form despite being originally derived from multi-word phrases, and function

\(^{925}\) Al-Maqrīzī, *Naḥḥ at-Tib*, vol. 5, p. 266.

phraseologically in their original phrases’ metaphorical meaning, or as a reference to them. Our corpus provides just one example:

194) ḥamdala [hamdala (a mix of letters that by themselves have no meaning and no status as a word)]\(^{927}\) = to say: al-ḥamdū li-llāḥī = [(all) praise be to God].

The phraseme is coined from two groups of letters, each of which refers to one of the referenced phrases. The first three consonants, ḥ, m, and d, refer to the word al-ḥamd [thank], while the l refers to the word li-llāḥī [for God]. Because the metaphorical meaning of the phraseme is understood as a reference to the original phrase, its target domain depends on whether the original phrase was used religiously, non-religiously, or as a reference to itself; hence, the target domain is linguistic/non-religious. In our corpus, the phraseme occurs in the following context:

\[\text{wa-qassamtuḥā ilā ḥamdalati dīwānin wa-tahniʾati ikhwānin}^{928}\]

[and I categorised it into hamdala (introduction) of the work, congratulating friends].

Phraseme (194) functions on three semantic levels. The first is its reference to the linguistic concept of the phraseme al-ḥamdū li-llāḥī, which itself is not meant in either its religious or non-religious metaphorical meaning – i.e., being thankful, or finishing a meal; this is the second semantic level. The third semantic level, the target domain of the naḥt phraseme, is a reference to the idea that introductions in Arabic always start with the phrase al-ḥamdū li-llāḥī. Hence, Ibn al-Khaṭīb used phraseme (194) as a coined term for the introduction to his book. The cultural phenomenon at work in this and other naḥt phrasemes is cultural modelling.

8:8 Slogans

As much as it is rare, it is interesting to see a slogan in classical Arabic. Phraseme (195)

\(^{927}\) Ibid., p. 20; we could call it an acronym.
\(^{928}\) Ibid.
is the of the Naṣrid dynasty. The borders between a slogan and a motto in the pre-modern period can be hard to draw. Nevertheless, both these types of phrases (if indeed they are two separate types in this historical context) have the same motivation: cultural modelling. Classical Arabic slogans are mostly related to political movements: for instance, the 'Abbasid revolution’s ar-ridā min ‘āli Muḥammadin [the accepted (person) of Muḥammad’s family], i.e., the sons of Muḥammad’s uncle 'Abbās.⁹²⁹ Such collocations gained their phraseological meaning from their historical context. Consider the following:

195) wa-lā ghāliba illa llāhu [no victorious but God]⁹³⁰ = The Naṣrid dynasty motto. Phraseme (195) is motivated by a the concept of God being the essence of victory, as explicitly mentioned in the Qur’ān: ‘in yanṣürkum illāhu fa-lā ghāliba lakum'⁹³¹ and ‘wa-llāhu ghālibun 'alā amrihim’.⁹³² Ibn al-Khaṭīb mentioned this slogan in the context of praise for the Naṣrids, saying, ‘wa-shi ‘āruhum wa-lā ghāliba illa llāhu wa-ni'ma sh-shi ‘āru’⁹³³ [their motto is there is no victorious but God]. This slogan became a sign of the Naṣrids’ sovereignty; their power is wherever the slogan exists.

8:9 Conclusion

Islamic source domains hold tremendous sway in the motivation of phrasemes, and not only those that function in a religious domain, as we will see in the following chapter. Investigating such phrasemes provides us with a number of interesting findings.

The main source domains of Islam-motivated phrasemes are holy texts, and this ipso facto imposes quotation as the main source of the phrasemes in this chapter. One main reason for this is the well-established belief that the Qur’ān is the most eloquent Arabic text. As we

⁹³¹ Qur’ān, (Āl Ḳurān) 3:160.
⁹³² Ibid., (Yūsuf) 12:21.
have seen, quotation is a full-fixedness factor, and poetic quotation exhibits a tendency to remain fixed even when its rate of occurrence is high. But for Qurʿānic and Ḥadīth phrasemes, the situation is somewhat different. Because these holy texts are well-known and well-established in the speech community, writers/speakers are afforded a level of freedom to reform the original source material, as seen in phrasemes like (145), (147) and (151). This phenomenon is especially marked in allusive phrasemes, despite allusion mostly occurring in combination with quotation. In some cases, like wasṣiyatu Luqmāna, the phraseme reflects an allusion and a cultural symbol that is a proper name, which should bring to mind the historically motivated phrasemes in Chapter 5. Stories about the prophets in the Qurʿān are the main source domain for the allusive phrasemes in our corpus, but some also allude to proverbial stories in the Qurʿān — i.e., (168) — or the narrative of the sequence of events that will happen on judgment day according to the Islamic tradition.

Regardless of whether the Qurʿān or Ḥadīth was their source, the meaning that motivated the phraseological semantic level of phrasemes in this section was mostly based on established, relatively late interpretations of the meanings of their elements. Because of the pre-Islamic stylistic characteristics of both the Qurʿān and Ḥadīth, some Islamic phrasemes are collocations whose form had been coined in pre-Islamic Arabic, but gained an extra semantic level in the Islamic context.

In the Qurʿānic phrasemes, we could distinguish five interchangeable semantic levels:

1) The primary lexical level.
2) Blessing, regardless of the primary lexical level.
3) Non-religious indication in the target domain.
4) The context, if indicating a reference to dramatis personae.
5) An allusion to an historical event.

Vagueness on the primary lexical level applies full fixedness to a phraseme; and when
one of a phraseme’s elements is a lexeme with a vague primary semantic level, it exhibits a
tendency to remain fully fixed. Vagueness is defined as either 1) the lexeme, on its primary
semantic level, having no single conventionalised meaning; or 2) the interpretation of the word
within the original context not being conventionalised, e.g., *tannūr*. Other vagueness factors
include inherently vague lexemes like *mā*, which do not refer to specific antecedents, and
cannot be definite. All of those factors are especially noted in phrasemes of the cultural
phenomenon quotation.

The non-allusive phrasemes in the corpus are mostly motivated by Islamic cultural
models. The dominant religious group in Granada, Sunni Islam, is well represented in the
Islamic-motivated phrasemes used by Ibn al-Khaṭīb: for example, in titles related to figures of
the early Islamic period, like phraseme (134)’s *dhu n-nūraynī*, which refers to the third caliph,
ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān. Moreover, Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s phrasemes include specifically Andalusi titles.
For instance, phraseme (141), *qāḍī l-Jamāʿati*, originally meant ‘phalanx’s judge’, but became
a title for the supreme judge in al-Andalus.

*Naḥt* phrasemes are fully fixed because of their blended nature and because, in some
cases, this blending yields more than two semantic levels. A *naḥt* phraseme’s combination of
letters does not indicate any meaning (apart from a reference to other phrasemes), and it occurs
only in a fully fixed form. The corpus includes one *naḥt* phraseme, which can imply more than
two phraseological semantic levels. Comprising fragments of a multi-word phraseme, as in the
case of *ḥamdala*, a *naḥt* phraseme can either refer to the phraseological meaning of the original
phraseme, or indicate an additional metaphorical meaning based on context. The cultural
phenomenon of the *naḥt* phraseme in the corpus is a cultural model.

Islamic communivative phrasemes are mostly quotations. Phraseme (189) in particular
shows a high level of flexibility in its order and regarding the gap between its elements –
illustrating a key characteristic of classical Arabic phrasemes, as discussed in Chapter 3.
Finally, the corpus includes one phraseme that is a slogan. It is not only motivated by an Islamic cultural model, but one that has specific regional connotations, as the slogan of the Naṣrid dynasty that ruled Granada until 897/1492.
Chapter 9: Islamic-Motivated Phrasemes with Religious Indications in the Target Domain in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s Prose Works

Within the broad category of Islamic phrasemes, those whose source domains are religious occur more frequently in our corpus than any other type. One of the reasons for such frequency is that some of the phrasemes can be used in both religious and non-religious target domains. A phrase like *lā hawla wa-lā quwwata illā bi-llāhi* [there is neither power nor strength but in God], in addition to the non-religious target domain that was already discussed, functions – with an Islamic target domain – as a prayer that should be made at a specific time.934

This group has been subdivided into five categories: 1) Qur’ānic prayers and Qur’ān-Quoting phrasemes 2) Sufi target domain, 3) the Qur’ān as a target domain, 4) God, 5) the prophet, 6) religious practices and concepts, and 7) names and terms that function in an Islamic religious target domain.

9:1 Qur’ānic Prayers and Qur’ān-Quoting phrasemes

All Qur’ānic prayers are collocation phrasemes. Each prayer phraseme in the Qur’ān functions on two, three, or even more semantic levels. Each one of their lexemes indicates a literal/primary meaning that developed within the context of classical Arabic; and, as a holy text, the Qur’ān is often recited for the purpose of blessing, regardless of the quoted passage’s primary semantic level. In many cases, moreover, Qur’anic prayer phrasemes have an additional meaning that was coined based on historical context, and which is considered to be an additional semantic level even if it has become a dead metaphor. As noted above, Qur’anic phrasemes can be non-religious or religious, but all Qur’ānic prayers are obviously religious in

934 For example, after the prayer call, when the caller says *hayya ʿala l-falāḥi* [come to good deeds]. See Muslim ibn al-Hajjāj (al-Qushayri), *Saḥīḥ Muslim*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Bāqī (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1991), vol. 2, p. 4.
nature, and can comprise the words of various *dramatis personae*. When a Muslim uses such a prayer, it functions in a religious target domain, motivated by a religious source domain. The prayer does not indicate its original context, except insofar as the primary semantic level (including what became dead metaphors) decodes the target domain. Consider the following example:

196) *wa-lā tuḥammilnā*... [and burden us not...] = a prayer asking God to prevent something.

The original quotation is in a context of this phraseme in the Qurʾān is a prayer made by the believers who ‘have believed in God, His angels, His books and His messengers’. Though the term ‘believers’ in an Islamic context applies to the Muslim faithful, irrespective of historical time periods, the context of the verses specifically refers to those who were contemporaries of Muḥammad. Thus, we can see that use of this text, even with the same target domain, by a different person in a different historical context applies a new semantic level to it. Also, the text itself exhibits, on its lexical level, an additional semantic layer in some of its lexemes. On the basic lexical semantic level, *ighfir* expresses the meaning of covering; but later, it gained a new semantic level motivated by a physical experience, and thus refers to the conceptual metaphor: A SIN IS A PHYSICAL DISORDER. For a sin to be forgiven, it must be covered; hence, to cover is to forgive. And, if we consider the blessing that the speaker hopes to obtain by reciting the Qurʾānic verse, we can add a third semantic level to the phraseme, even while remaining within the sphere of literal meaning.

The following example is another Qurʾān-quoting phraseme that has a religious target domain and features three of the four semantic levels that such phrasemes can have.

---

936 Ibid., 2:285-286.
937 For more examples of this conceptual metaphor, see al-Hamadhānī, *al-Alfāz*, p. 271.
As noted earlier, the first detected semantic level is to seek a particular result by reciting the verse. On the semantic level, *tujāhidūn* [(you) make an effort] gains an additional semantic level within the Islamic context, i.e., that the effort is specifically for the sake of God; and later, its root came exclusively to mean holy war, *jihād*. And the third semantic level of this phraseme is the context in which the verse originally appeared in the Qurʾān.

All the phrasemes in this group are fully fixed, regardless of the flexibility factors in their forms. This phenomenon is explained by two main full-fixedness factors: that each phraseme is a quotation from a holy text, and that each indicates more than one level of metaphor on its semantic level. Also, we should remember that Qurʾānic phrasemes often are associated with other full-fixedness factors, including references to God, cranberry lexemes, or vagueness on the primary semantic level.

9:2 Sufism as a Target Domain

As discussed in Chapter 4, Ibn al-Khaṭīb studied and wrote about Sufism, and some of the writings in question were preserved in al-Maqqārī’s *Nafl at-Ţīb*. Sufism influenced the usage of some Qurʾānic phrasemes, which gained additional Sufi religious meaning in the context of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s writing.

198) *khalaʾa n-naʾlayni* [he took off the sandals] = to be ready for a great event, spiritually.

---

938 Al-Maqqārī, *Nafl at-Ţīb*, vol. 6, p. 166; Qurʾān *(as-Saff)* 61:11.
939 Al-Maqqārī, *Nafl at-Ţīb*, vol. 6, p. 305.
Phraseme (198) is an allusion to the Qurʾānic account of Moses encountering a fire in Ṭūr Ṣimāʾ [the mountain of Sinai], where he met God, who asked him to take off his sandals:

\[
\text{innī ana rabbuka fa-khlaʾ naʿlay-ka innaka fi l-wādi l-muqaddasi Ṭuwā}
\]

[I am your God, so take off your sandals you are in Ṭuwā the holy valley].\(^{940}\)

Moses gained a special status in Sufi belief due to his image in the Qurʾān: specifically, his having spoken directly with God and encountered esoteric knowledge, which associated him with the figure known as al-Khiḍr (or al-Khaḍir), a teacher of secret knowledge.\(^{942}\) Phraseme (198)’s phraseological meaning is motivated by the Moses story’s linkage between taking off one’s sandals and the greatest event in one’s spiritual life; and in Sufism, this act became a representation of reaching the level of \(\text{wuṣūl} \) [reaching] God.

The analysis of the formation of this phraseme follows that of the previous ones in this group. It includes a secondary cultural phenomenon of gesture: as an act of respect, people remove their footwear in holy places. Whether this act was Islamic in origin or pre-Islamic, it became conventionalised in the context of Islamic culture, due especially to the influence of this verse.

The following phraseme is a Qurʾānic quotation that functions in a specific Sufi spiritual context:

\[ \text{199) laysa laka min l-amri shayʾun [Not for you, (O Muhammad, but for God), is the decision]}^{943} = \text{things are created and decided by God.} \]

Although phraseme (199) does not exhibit figurativeness, its Qurʾānic context and the context of its use in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s work appear to have separate religious source domains. In the

---

\(^{940}\) \text{Qurʾān (Ṭāhā), 20:12.}  
\(^{942}\) This story of Moses has already been mentioned as an allusive motivation in chapter 8, but not in a specifically Sufi context. For more on the influence of the Qurʾānic Moses on Sufism, see ibid., pp. 62-3, and John Renard, \text{The A to Z of Sufism} (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2009), p. 137.  
\(^{943}\) Al-Maqṣarī, \text{Nafḥ at-Tib}, vol. 6, p. 299; Qurʾān (\(\text{Āl, Imrān}\) 3:128.
Qurʾān, it refers to the previous verse, which commentators have related to God’s reinforcement of the Muslims with three thousand angels at Badr.\textsuperscript{944} Specifically, the decision that is God’s and not Muḥammad’s is whether ‘a section of the disbelievers’ should be forgiven, killed, or punished in some other way.\textsuperscript{945} The context of story with which the commentators explain the verse is not important to one’s understanding idiomacity of the phraseme. Unlike with the allusive phrasemes discussed earlier, in this case, the knowledge that the phraseme is originally in the Qurʾān and that the Prophet is being spoken to is sufficient to enable its coinage, conveying the belief that it is God who controls fate. Allusion as a cultural phenomenon in phraseme (199) is hard to ignore, given that the Battle of Badr is clearly mentioned in that phraseme’s Qurʾānic context; that the Qurʾān is a frequently read and memorised text; and that the event itself was of enormous historical importance. Ibn al-Khaṭīb, however, does not deploy this phraseme as a reference to the Battle of Badr, but uses it to refer to the Sufi concept of \textit{tawakkul}: that a believer should rely on God in all decision-making.

\begin{align*}
\textit{aw man kāna min ahli llāhi l-ladhī ya‘lamu anna mā siwa llāhi ta‘ālā zillun} \\
\textit{wa-fay‘un wa-yataḥaqqaqu qawlu llāhi laysa laka mina l-amri shay‘un}
\end{align*}

[Or he who is of pious people who knows that nothing but God is a shadow and cover and (so) the verse (Not for you…) becomes reality].\textsuperscript{946}

More broadly, Ibn al-Khaṭīb used phraseme (199) in the introduction to his book on Sufi divine love, by way of apologising for the possibly quite stark divergence between what he aimed to accomplish in writing the book, and the actual outcome. The implicit reference to God is preserved in the source domain, but Ibn al-Khaṭīb makes no reference to the context of the verse in the Qurʾān, i.e., the Prophet in the Battle of Badr. The phraseme thus expresses three semantic layers: the context of an historical event; the reference, via the pronoun, to the

\textsuperscript{944} Qurʾān (ʾĀl, ʾImrān) 3:124.
\textsuperscript{945} Ibid., 3:127-128.
\textsuperscript{946} Al-Maqqarī, \textit{Nafḥ at-Ṯib}, vol. 6, p. 299.
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Prophet as a *dramatis persona*; and the general usage of Qur’ānic verses as blessings.

9:3 The Qur’ān as a Target Domain

The next set of phrasemes are all related to the semantic field of the Qur’ān, but are not quotations. Such a phraseme can be either 1) formed from a lexeme, or more often, from references to the Qur’ān, like *al-Qur’ān* or *kitābu llāhi* [the book of God], plus a lexeme that gained an additional meaning in *idāfa* [annexation] form; or 2) formed as a collocation that refers to the Qur’ān on its metaphorical level.

The following two collocation phrasemes are formed in the first of these two styles:

200)  *tajwīdu al-Qur’āni* [ameliorate the Qur’ān]*947* = to recite the Qur’ān in a specific chanting style.

201)  *tilāwatu l-Qur’ān* [succeeding (a verse after a verse of) the Qur’ān]*948* = to recite the Qur’ān.

Phrasemes (200) and (201) both express the concept of reciting the Qur’ān, and both their first elements lost their literal meanings to the phrasemes’ metaphorical meanings; hence, they are collocation phrasemes. In the case of the former, the metaphorical meaning of the phraseme is concentrated in the alteration of its first element, influenced by a cultural model. The root of *tajwīd* is *j-w-d*, the collective meaning of which is to be good or to produce goodness. In the context of Islam, it gained the meaning of reciting the Qur’ān according to certain rules – and especially, knowing the correct pronunciations, as well as where to stop.*949* Some sources record that ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib provided an early usage of the word in this context.*950* When he

---

947 Ibid., vol. 7, p. 400.
950 Ibid.
was asked the meaning of the verse *wa-rattili l-Qurʾāna tartīlan* [recite the Qurʾān with measured recitation].<sup>951</sup> He answered, “‘*tajwīd al-ḥurūf wa-maʿrifat al-wu[q]ūf*’ [excellent rendering of the consonant sounds and knowledge of the pauses].<sup>952</sup>

The core element in phraseme (200) is *ṭilāwā*, whose root is *t-l-w*, the primary semantic level of which is [to follow].<sup>953</sup> *Ṭilāwā* does not occur in the Qurʾān, but its verb does in the in *yatālnahū ḥaqqa ṭilāwatiḥī* [(they) follow/recite it its true way/recitation].<sup>954</sup> Various commentators interpreted *yatālūna* in the vers as both to follow, and to recite.<sup>955</sup> Ibn Fāris, however, saw a semantic mutuality between the two meanings, insofar as one verse ‘follows [...] after the other’.<sup>956</sup> Nevertheless, the phraseological meaning of the phraseme has been limited to the second meaning of the word, i.e., [to recite]. The verb *talā* gained a specific cultural model that coined its cultural meaning: not of reading merely, but of a specific type of reading connected with the Qurʾān. Is the phraseme therefore a quotation? It can be, if we associate it with the Qurʾānic verse previously mentioned. Its flexibility, however, is explained by having the metaphorical meaning of the verb *talā* as a dead metaphor for ‘to read’, which eases the receiver’s decoding process.

The following three collocation phrasemes refer to the Qurʾān or one of its components:

202) *kitābu llāhi* [the book of God]<sup>957</sup> = the Qurʾān.

---

954 Qurʾān (*al-Baqara*) 2:121.
955 See ʿAbd al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ al-Bayān* (electronic resource): http://www.altafsir.com/Tafasir.asp?tMadhNo=1&amp;tTafsirNo=1&amp;tSoraNo=2&amp;tAyahNo=121&amp;tDisplay=yes&amp;UserProfile=0&amp;LanguageId=1, accessed on 15 July 2018; and Al-Qurtubi, *al-Jāmiʿ li-Ahkām al-Qurʾān* (electronic resource): https://www.altafsir.com/Tafasir.asp?tMadhNo=1&amp;tTafsirNo=5&amp;tSoraNo=2&amp;tAyahNo=121&amp;tDisplay=yes&amp;UserProfile=0&amp;LanguageId=1, accessed on 15 July 2018.
al-qirāʾātu s-sabʿu [the Seven Readings]958 = the canonical versions of the Qurʾān.

as-sabʿu l-mathānī [the Seven Repeated (Sūras)].959

The phraseological meaning of phraseme (202) is decoded via its annexation form and the context of al-kitāb [the book] in the Qurʾān and Ḥadīth. In the latter, the phraseme functions mostly in its metaphorical meaning, whereas in the Qurʾān, the collocation comes in two meanings: kitāb, as a verbal noun of [to write], and as a book. The first meaning can be observed in verses like ‘but those who were given knowledge and faith will say: “You remained in God’s book [kitābi llāhi] until the Day of Resurrection, and this is the Day of Resurrection but you did not know before.”’960 Here, kitābi llāhi is the fate that God has written based on his omniscience, and that will definitely happen in one’s life.961 The other phraseological meaning of (202), i.e., the Qurʾān, is found in other Qurʾānic verses, such as:

And when a messenger from God came to them confirming that which was with them a party of those who had been given the book threw the book of God [kitāba llāhi] behind their backs as if they did not know (what it contained).962

In the above-quoted verse, the referent of kitāba llāhi is the Qurʾān, which was abandoned by the ‘people of the book’, those Christians and Jews who lost their faith in it.

One could readily question the notion that the collocation referred to the Qurʾān within the Qurʾān; but the combination of a possible such reference in the Qurʾānic verse with an obvious one in Ḥadīth texts represents clear evidence of the phraseological origin of the phraseme, and hence that it is a quotation. And in the context of cultural analysis of Arabic

959 Ibid., vol. 6, p. 57.
960 Qurʾān (ar-Rūm) 30:56.
961 KNOWLEDGE IS TO WRITE was discussed in the previous chapter.
962 Qurʾān (al-Baqara) 2:101.
phraseology within a corpus of fourteenth-century literature, such evidence is sufficient.

The next phraseme, (203), refers to the seven canonical versions of the Qurʾān, chosen according to criteria set by the fourth century Islamic cleric Ibn Mujāhid (d. 326/936). It is fully fixed because it was coined from two words and a reference to a specific number. The number seven, in addition to its long and deep cultural symbolism in Middle Eastern civilisations, is always connected to a report of the Prophet, who said nazala l-Qurʾānu `alā sabʿati ahrufatā [the Qurʾān was revealed in seven letters]. The word ahrufat has been interpreted as having a variety of meanings, one of which is [readings]. The concept of the ten canonical readings was established by Ibn al-Jazarī (d. 833/1429), a contemporary of Ibn al-Khaṭīb. Hence, the collocation al-qirāʾātu l-ʿāshru [the ten readings] had not yet been coined as a phraseme at the time of our corpus. In short, then, the cultural phenomenon in this phraseme is cultural modelling, established both by the concept of the seven readings of the Qurʾān introduced by Ibn Mujāhid, and by the Ḥadīth on the seven ahrufat [letters].

The lexical and phraseological meanings of phraseme (204) are highly controversial, with different commentators having seen it as meaning the seven long Sūras, the first Sūra, or the whole Qurʾān. The first interpretation is taken from a report that the Prophet said: ‘I have been given the long seven [verses]’. According to this interpretation, phraseme (204)’s second element is explained by the fact that, in those seven long verses, stories are yuthannā bihā = [to be repeated].

---


967 Ibid.
r-rahmānī r-rahīmī [in the name of God the most gracious the most merciful] as the first verse of *al-Fātiha*.

The meaning of the *mathānī* would then be [to be repeated], because Muslims repeat it each time they pray. Lastly, the third interpretation is based on another verse, *allāhu anzala ahsana l-ḥadīthi kitāban mutashābihan mathāniya* [God has sent down the best speech; a book that is *mutashābih*]. In this view, the number seven – even if it refers to the verses of the first Sūra – is a metonym for the whole Qurʿān. In other words, the seven *mathānī* are part of the bigger *mathānī*; that is, the Qurʿān. This explanation is supported by a rarely mentioned but important interpretation of the seven *mathānī*: that they are seven parts/genres of the Qurʿān, i.e., to order, to prohibit, to announce, to threaten, to point out a model, to tell the stories of former generations, and to count the graces.  

The context of phraseme (204) in our corpus does not exhibit an obvious preference for any one of these three rival interpretations. As part of a biography of a Granadan, Ibn al-Khaṭīb praised the man’s ability to recite the Qurʿān, saying:

*min ahli ḍṭilāʾ in bi-ḥamlī kitābi llāhi, bulbulu dawhi s-sab`i l-mathānī*  

[(One) of the people (who have) a knowledge of carrying/reciting the book of God, he is the Bulbul of the Seven Mathānī tree].

This reference appears most likely to refer either to the Qurʿān as a whole, or else to its first chapter as a metonym for the whole. Like the previous phrasemes in this section, this one is fully fixed because it has two elements, one with a vague meaning, and because it is a quotation.

The fixedness level of the Qurʿānic phrasemes in this group is sufficiently high that no

---

968 Ibid.; Qurʿān (al-Fātiha), 1:1. See the foot note in Chapter 3, p. 59.
alterations in the metre are discernible. The fact that their source domain and target domain share the same semantic umbrella, combined with having the Qur’ān as a sub-semantic domain, applies a high level of fixedness to each of them. Moreover, in the sphere of cultural phenomena, each phraseme’s source domain and semantic field are linked with the establishment of the primary semantic levels of its elements.

9:4 God

This section examines a few examples of each of two types of phrasemes with [God] as an Islamic domain. The first type comprises phrasemes that relate directly to the characteristics of the image of God in Islam. The phrasemes of the other type indicate concepts linked with God in a metaphorical, honorary sense, and were coined in annexation form.

Phraseme (205) *subḥāna llāhi* [exalted is God]⁹⁷² = to praise God.

Phraseme (205) is a well-known collocation.⁹⁷³ Its use as a communicative phraseme of exclamation is not our focus here. Rather, we would like to highlight that it always connotes a ‘negative assertion of what God is not’, especially if it is followed by the preposition ‘*ān*.⁹⁷⁴ Thus, the religious target domain of the phraseme is to praise God. Its core element, *subḥāna*, has the root *s-b-h*, words derived from which are used to praise God in Arabic, Aramaic and Hebrew; and the semantic umbrella in all three languages expresses the meaning [glory].⁹⁷⁵ Mir claimed that the primary meaning of the root in Arabic is [swift movement],⁹⁷⁶ as in *sabāh*

⁹⁷³ It can also be considered a speech-act formula, if used in the specific context of expressing surprise.
[to swim]; but Ibn Fāris differentiated between the meaning of *subḥān* and the meaning of other words derived from *s-b-h*. It is possible that the word *subḥān*, in this context, was influenced by Aramaic or Hebrew, especially since – as *tashbuṭh* – it also appears in the Lord’s Prayer.\(^977\)

On the syntactic level, the word is a noun, in the accusative case because it is an absolute object.\(^978\) Essentially, *subḥān* is a cranberry lexeme that is only found in the context of praising God, and it occurs in one morphological form when it is formed in annexation, added to *Allāh*. Hence, phraseme (205) is fully fixed. However, there is another phraseme in which *subḥān* is present, but with an annexation to the third person masculine pronoun *-hu*, followed by *taʿālā* [to be high above]. The cultural phenomenon of the phraseme is quotation: specifically, from various Qur’ānic verses including *al-Qaṣāṣ* 28:68, *aṣ-Ṣāffāt* 37:159, *al-Ṭūr* 52:43, and *al-Ḥāshr* 59:23.

The next phraseme relates to a Qur’ānic metaphor of God as modelling:

\[ \text{206) } \text{agradna llāha qardan [we lent God a goodly loan]}^{979} = \text{to do a good deed.} \]

Its source is the verse,

\[ \text{man dha l-ladhī yuqrīḍu llāha qardan ḥasanan fā-yuḍāʿīfhu lahū} \]

[Who is it that would loan God a goodly loan so He will multiply it for him]?\(^980\)

Despite the fact that the phraseme is a Qur’ānic quotation and includes a pronoun whose


\(^980\) Qur’ān (*al-Baqara*) 2:245 and (*al-Hadīd*) 57:11.
antecedent is God, the phraseme shows a level of flexibility – albeit a strictly limited one – in terms of its other pronouns and conjugation. The metaphorical meaning of [loan] is first motivated by applying the verb ‘to loan’ to [God]. This syntactic connection results in a metaphor on the semantic level of the phrase. The source domain suggests that the action ‘to give (in order to gain more in return)’ is understood by reference to the core element qaraḍ [to loan]. Giving a loan to the Omnipotent, who will multiply its value, is seen as an especially good deed.

The following communicative phrasemes are motivated by a personification of the Islamic God, via the cultural phenomenon of quotation:

207) ṭabûna ṭabûna [May God be pleased with him]981 = a prayer that follows a mention of a pious person.

208) ṭabûna ṭabûna ṭabûna [God has opened for him]982 = to be enlightened or successful in regard to a particular issue.

Phraseme (207) is a quotation that occurs at various points in the Qurʾān.983 In such contexts, the phraseme refers to pious people who followed the Prophet, especially at the dawn of Islam. The phraseme was coined as it is quoted, in the past tense, as is usual for Qurʾānic references to facts and prayers.

Phraseme (208) is also a speech-act formula that is derived from the Qurʾān’s sūrat al-Baqara, verse 2:76, which according to the commentators refers to ‘the People of the Book’, the Jews:

And when they meet those who believe, they say: ‘We have believed’; but when they become alone with each other, they say: ‘Do you talk to them about what God has opened for you [bimā fataḥa llāhu ʿailaykum] so they

982 Al-Maqqari, Ṣayyidat al-Tīb, vol. 1, p. 70.
983 Qurʾān (al-Māʾ āda) 5:119; (al-Tawba) 9:100; (al-Fath) 48:18; (al-Muṣāma) 58:22; and (al-Bayyina) 98:8.
can argue with you about it before your God’?  

The core element *fatah* [to open] is used metaphorically, as [to reveal], and is motivated by the conceptual metaphor **TO OPEN IS A PRIVILEGE**. This metaphor is in turn motivated by a physical experience of closed things being mysterious and unyielding. When God ‘opens’ to someone, it means that He reveals secrets to and confers special privileges upon that person. Phraseme (208) shows a level of flexibility in terms of the pronoun that refers to the target; and in some varieties, it is formed in the passive. However, the core-element, *fataḥ* and the preposition ‘alā, remain the same. This is because the verb *fatah*, if combined with the preposition *la*, expresses the meaning [to succeed/conquer], as in a Qur’ānic verse that (per the commentators) is connected with the Ḥudaybiya Agreement:  

*innā fataḥnā laka fathan mubīnān* [Indeed, we have (given) you a great success/conquest].  

It would be difficult to argue that the cultural phenomenon of this phraseme is an allusion, for two reasons. First, the story does not contribute to the metaphorical meaning of the phraseme; and secondly, the idea that the collocation in the Qur’ān indicates a narrative is merely the commentator’s interpretation, unlike the clearly allusive Qur’ānic phraseme previously discussed.

Exactly the same analysis regarding this issue applies to the next phraseme, although it is motivated by Ḥadīth rather than Qur’ānic text:

209)  

*anjaza llāhu (bihī min naṣri dīnihi l-ḥaqiqi) wa’dan* [with which God fulfilled His promise (to render victory to His belief)] = to win a battle of belief/argument.

The Ḥadīth source of phraseme (209) is a part of a prayer that the Prophet made on his pilgrimage to Mecca after he conquered it:

*anjaza wa’dahū, wa-ṣadaqa ‘abdahū wa-a’za jundahū wa-hazama l-

---

984 Ibid., (al-Baqara), 2:76.
986 Qur’ān (al-Fāṭḥ) 48:1.
ahzāba waḥdahu\textsuperscript{988}

[He fulfilled his promise, He approved His servant’s (wish), He supported
His soldiers and alone He defeated the companies].

According to the commentators, the source text refers to the defeat of Quraysh and their
companies using \textit{ahzāb}.\textsuperscript{989} The phraseme retains the core elements of the source text, \textit{anjaz}
and \textit{wa'}d. However, it shows flexibility in its order and in the antecedent of the pronoun. This
flexibility, despite the phraseme being a quotation, is explained by two factors: first, that the
same text is quoted very frequently; and second, that the antecedent of the pronoun refers to
the non-believer, and hence can be applied to any fighting non-Muslim who represented the
early \textit{ahzāb}.

The following two collocation phrasemes include aspects related to [God]. By
implication, therefore, they indicate honour, as indicated by the annexation form that they all
share. The next two examples connect God with two different material entities:

\begin{itemize}
\item 210) \textit{khaylu llāhi} [the horses of God]\textsuperscript{990} = the Muslim army in \textit{jihād}.
\item 211) \textit{baytu llāhi} [the house of God]\textsuperscript{991} = the mosque in Mecca, or any mosque.
\end{itemize}

Phraseme (210) refers to a Ḥadīth text in which the Prophet calls out to a group of riders
heading to battle against non-believers, saying, \textit{yā khayla llāhi rkaḇī} [O horses of God, ride!].\textsuperscript{992} The mapping of the metaphor can be decoded according to its general context, and
the verb \textit{irkabī} [ride!] specifically. The original subject/the doer of the action/verb is the
riders/knights, but as a metonym, the object became the subject/doer: i.e., horses.\textsuperscript{993} The

\textsuperscript{988} Ibn Ḥanbal, \textit{Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal}, 4, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{989} At-Ṭabarī, Jāmi` al-Bayān, 33:20-22 (electronic resource):
http://www.altafsir.com/Tafsir.asp?MadhNo=1&tTafsirNo=1&tSoraNo=33&tAyahNo=22&tDisplay=yes&LanguageId=1, accessed on 5 August 2018.
\textsuperscript{991} Ibid., vol. 1, p. 302.
\textsuperscript{993} In traditional Arabic rhetoric, this phenomenon is called \textit{majāz `aqli}. See Udo Simon, ‘\textit{Majāz},’ in \textit{Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics} (electronic resource):
http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-arabic-language-and-linguistics/majaz-
phraseme is possibly motivated by a quotation taken from the Ḥadīth, but it also involves a cultural model of nobility and blessedness that is connected with God, especially if the context is provided by the Prophet.

Phraseme (211) appears able to express two metaphorical levels. The first is a reference to the Kʿaba, the holy mosque in Mecca. This meaning was very frequently used in early Islamic texts, especially Ḥadīth ones. For instance:

\[nadharat ukhtī an tamshiya ilā bāyiṭ fā-īmaratī an astaftiya lāhā n-nabiyya...\]  
[She made a vow to walk to the house of God (the Kaʿba), so she ordered me to ask the Prophet for her...].

In the Qurʾān, the mosque of Mecca is referred to as al-bayt [the house], a detail that supports the motivation of the metaphorical link between bayt and Allāh, as established in phraseme (211). This phraseme is, additionally, used to refer to any mosque – possibly through a process of generalisation from the Kaʿba to lesser mosques, as all are used for the same purposes, at least partially.

Phrasemes (210) and (211) are fully fixed due to three factors: 1) they are each coined of two elements, 2) both are quotations, and 3) their second elements hold specific semantic ranks in their Islamic cultural context. Also, given that we can apply the meaning of phraseme (211) to all mosques, it has an additional metaphorical layer, and as we have seen, this is an additional full-fixedness factor.

Unlike the preceding pair of phrasemes, the following three examples link God to abstract concepts:

---

994 Ibn al-Ḥājjāj, Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol. 5, p. 79.
995 See for example Qurʾān (al-Baqara) 2:127; (al-Ḥajj) 22:26 and 22:333; and (Quraysh) 106:3.
996 See also ibid., (an-Nūr) 24:36.
212) *ḥudūdu lāhi* [the limits of God]\(^{997}\) = orders and rules of God.

213) *sabīlu lāhi* [the path of God]\(^{998}\) = belief/Islam.

214) *rawḥu lāhi* [the cool breeze of God]\(^{999}\) = the mercy of God.

All three of these collocation phrasemes indicate two cultural phenomena: a quotation from a holy text, and a cultural model linked with the concept of holiness that is associated with God as conceptualised in Islam. The primary meaning of the root *ḥ-d-d* is [to limit]. Phraseme (212) occurs frequently in the Qurʾān,\(^{1000}\) always in the context of making rules or addressing commandments to the believers. Such orders are followed, firstly, by the phrase *wa-tilka-ḥudūdu lāhi* [and those are the limits of God],\(^{1001}\) and secondly by a warning not to exceed those limits. The metaphor can be mapped as follows: God is the king, and his orders draw the limits/borders of his kingdom, so to transgress his orders is to leave the sphere of his kingly protection. The phraseme exhibits the same three full-fixedness factors mentioned above, and for that reason it occurs in plural form only.

Phraseme (213) is also a quotation from various points in the Qurʾān.\(^{1002}\) *Sabīl* in its primary meaning indicates a clear, well-known path. To do something *fī sabīli lāhi* is to do it for the sake of God, to reach God, to walk on the path [religion] of God. The ‘right belief’ is often conceptualised as a straight, clear path. Hence, annexation of the phraseme links the meaning of *sabīl* with God. The Qurʾān emphasises this image in various ways, for example:

\*wa-lā tattabiʿu s-subula fa-tafarraqa bikum ʿan sabīlihī*

[do not follow (other) paths that would separate you from His way],\(^{1003}\)

and:

---


\(^{998}\) Al-Maqqārī, *Naḥṭ at-Tīb*, vol. 4, p. 405.

\(^{999}\) Ibid., vol. 1, p. 189.

\(^{1000}\) See for example Qurʾān (*al-Baqara*) 2:229-230; (*an-Nisāʾ*) 4:13; (*al-Mujādila*) 58:4; and (*al-Talāq*) 65:1.

\(^{1001}\) Ibid., (*al-Baqara*) 2:229.

\(^{1002}\) See for example ibid., (*an-Nisāʾ*) 4:74; (*al-Tawba*) 9:20; and (*Ṣād*) 38:26.

\(^{1003}\) Ibid., (*al-ʿĀʾām*) 6:153.
wa-lā tattabiʿū khutuwāti sh-shayṭāni

[And do not follow the Devil’s steps].

Not unexpectedly, the phraseme is fully fixed, for reasons that include its plural’s linkage with the false paths that lead to the steps of the Devil, according to the Qurʿān.

The final phraseme in this section, (214), is another Qurʿānic quotation:

wa-lā tayʾasū min rawḥī ʿllāhi innahū lā yayʾasu min rawḥī ʿllāhi illa l-qawmu l-kafīrūna

[And do not despair of the mercy [rawḥi] of God; indeed, no one despairs of the mercy [rawḥi] of God except the unbelievers].

Here, the context is Jacob asking his sons to go to Egypt so they might return his son Benjamin to him and ask after Joseph there. He tells them that they should not despair of the mercy of God, which will help them to find his other two sons. The context of the phraseme here does not apply an additional naming to rawḥu ʿllāhi, and hence it is not an allusion. Although from this context – and in the opinion of the commentators – rawḥ appears to mean mercy, the collective meaning of the root connotes a breeze or wind.

We can map the metaphor as follows: a cool breeze in a desert environment is a relief from nature. When one is losing hope, it is like being in a desert where no help can be found. The cool breeze gives one hope of finding help/water = breeze from God, or in other words, mercy.

Rawḥ became a cranberry lexeme, limited to this phraseme.

---

1004 Ibid., (al-Baqara) 2:168, 2:208; and (al-ʿAʿām) 6:142.

1005 Qurʿān (Yūsuf) 12:87.

1006 Ibn Fāris, Maqāyīs al-Lugha (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%B1%D9%88%D8%A7%2, accessed on 8 August 2018.

1007 In Maqāyīs al-Lugha, Ibn Fāris links all the words derived from the root r-w-h to the collective meaning [widthness] and thence to [wind], because in broad, empty places the wind is more likely to be felt. Then, he connects rāḥa [comfort] to the conceptual metaphors TO MOVE IS FREEDOM and WIDENESS IS FREEDOM, and hence WIDE IS COMFORTABLE: see Chapter 3, above. Rūḥ [spirit], according to Ibn Fāris, is derived from rūḥ [wind]: ibid.
The image of the Prophet is a cornerstone of Islamic belief and therefore of Islamic phraseology. Consider the following collocation phrasemes:

215) \textit{rasūlu llāhi} [the messenger of God]\textsuperscript{1008} = a title of the Prophet.

216) \textit{khātamu r-rusuli} [the seal of the messengers]\textsuperscript{1009} = the last messenger/a title of the Prophet.

217) \textit{khātamu l-anbiyāʾi} [the seal of the prophets]\textsuperscript{1010} = the last prophet/a title of the Prophet.

\textit{Rasūlu llāhi} is a fully fixed phraseme motivated by and quoted from multiple verses in the Qur’ān, including \textit{Muḥammadun rasūlu llāhi}\textsuperscript{1011} [Muhammad is the messenger of God]. This explicit reference limits the target domain of the phraseme to the Prophet. Elsewhere, however, the phraseme is used to refer to other prophets, including Moses\textsuperscript{1012} and Salih.\textsuperscript{1013} However, when phraseme (215) is neither applied as an adjective to a mentioned prophet, nor within the context of explicitly mentioning the name of a prophet, its source domain is presumed to be Muhammad. Hence, the phraseme is not merely a quotation; rather, one’s understanding of which prophet it refers to is generated by previous knowledge motivated by a specific Islamic cultural model.

The next two phrasemes, (216) and (217), could also be considered varieties of a single, flexible phraseme. This flexibility is explained by the vague border between the two, which renders them synonymous.\textsuperscript{1014} In both cases, the first element is derived from the root \textit{kh-t-m},

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1008} Ibn al-Khaṭīb, \textit{Rayhānat al-Kuttāb}, vol. 1, p. 468.
\item \textsuperscript{1009} Ibid., p. 360.
\item \textsuperscript{1010} Al-Maqqari, \textit{Naḥḥ at-Ṭib}, vol. 7, p. 513.
\item \textsuperscript{1011} Qur’ān (al-Fath) 48:29.
\item \textsuperscript{1012} Ibid., (as-Ṣaff) 61:5.
\item \textsuperscript{1013} Qur’ān (ash-Shams) 91:13.
\end{itemize}
whose collective meaning is [to end].\textsuperscript{1015} Khātam connotes both a seal and a ring, because signet rings are used to create seals. [Seal] is derived from the root because a seal is used at the end of a process – typically, as in an exchange of correspondence, a process that will begin again once the seal is broken. The derivations of the words rusul and anbiyā’ have already been provided above.

218)   \textit{sunnatu rasāli llāhī} [the habitual practice of the messenger of God]\textsuperscript{1016} = the traditions and reports of the Prophet. 

The root \textit{s-n-n} generally connotes [to be usual].\textsuperscript{1017} Accordingly, \textit{sunna} is the usual tradition that is followed, either by a person or by God:

\textit{sunnatu llāhī l-latī qad khalat min qablu wa-lan tajida li-sunnati llāhī tabdīlan}

[(This is) God’s usual way that has occurred before and you will never find in the way of God any change]\textsuperscript{1018}

or:

\textit{la yu’minīna bihī wa-qad khalat sunnatu l-awwalīna}

[They do not believe in it, while there has already occurred the way \textit{[sunnatu]} of the former peoples]\textsuperscript{1019}

The term \textit{sunna} ‘came to stand for the generally approved standard or practice introduced by the Prophet as well as the pious Muslims of olden days’.\textsuperscript{1020} However, when it is added via

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1015} Ibn Fāris, \textit{Maqāyiṣ al-Lugha} (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%86%D8%A8%D9%8A, accessed on 8 August 2018.
\textsuperscript{1017} Ibn Fāris, \textit{Maqāyiṣ al-Lugha} (electronic resource):
\textsuperscript{1018} Qur’ān (al-\textit{Fath}) 48:23.
\textsuperscript{1019} Ibid., (al-Ḥijr) 15:13.
\end{flushright}
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annexation to the Prophet, it gains a metaphorical meaning of the traditions and sayings of the Prophet exclusively, which became a specific cultural model. Phraseme (218) is flexible collocation because its second element can be replaced with one of the Prophet’s titles/synonyms that were previously described.

The following collocation phraseme is quoted from the Qurʾān, where it gained its phraseological meaning:

219) \textit{ahlu l-bayti} [the people of the house] \textsuperscript{1022} = the family of the Prophet.

According to traditional Arabic lexical analysis, \textit{ahl} in annexation denotes the meaning of [people of] or [inhabitants of]. \textsuperscript{1023} Another word, \textit{ʾāl}, is used in the collocation as a synonym of \textit{ahl}. In classical Arabic lexicographies, \textit{ʾāl} is a variety of \textit{ahl}, although Ibn Manẓūr claimed that \textit{ʾāl} was used in annexation with certain other words to refer to noble entities. \textsuperscript{1024}

In the Qurʾān, both \textit{ahl} and \textit{ʾāl} are used to mean [the family] or [the followers]. The former denotes the meaning of [the people of] or [inhabitants of] in the following verses:

\textit{innā muhlikū ahli hādhihi l-qaryati} \textsuperscript{1025}

[Indeed we are destroying the people of that village]

and:

\textit{wa-lā tujādilū ahla l-kitābi} \textsuperscript{1026}

[and do not argue with the people of the book (the Jews and Christians)]

The [family/household] meaning of \textit{ʾāl}, meanwhile, occurs in the following verse:

\textit{inna llāha ṣṭafā ʾĀdama wa-ʾNūḥan wa-ʾāla Ibrahīma wa-ʾāla Ḳmrāna ʾala l-ʾālamīna}

\textsuperscript{1021} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1023} Ibn Manẓūr, \textit{Liṣān al-ʿArab} (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A3%D9%87%D9%84, accessed on 15 August 2018; and Ibn Fāris, \textit{Maqāyīs al-Lugha} (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A3%D9%87%D9%84#4, accessed on 15 August 2018.
\textsuperscript{1024} Ibn Manẓūr, \textit{Liṣān al-ʿArab} (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%A3%D9%87%D9%84, accessed on 15 August 2018.
\textsuperscript{1025} Qurʾān (al-ʾAnkabūt) 29:31.
\textsuperscript{1026} Ibid., (ash-Shuʿarāʾ) 26:46.
[Indeed God has (carefully) chosen Adam, Noah, the family of Abraham and the family of Amram over the worlds]  

and its meaning of [followers] in this one:

\[\text{adkhil} \ '\text{āla Fir'awna ashadda l-} \ '\text{adhābi} \]

[Make the people of Pharaoh endure the most painful punishment]  

As previously discussed, the family and the tribe are equated to the symbol of house/tent in the conceptual system of the Arabic language. The collocation referring to one’s family occurs in the Qur’ān, which suggests that it had been coined in the pre-Islamic era:

\[\text{hal adullukum 'alā ahli baytin yakfułuñahū} \]

[Shall I direct you to a household that will be responsible for him]  

However, the verse that motivates the phraseological meaning of the phraseme is:

\[\text{innamā yurīdu llāhu li-yudhhiba 'ankumur r-rijsa ahla l-bayti wa-yuṭahhirakum taṭhīran} \]

[God only wants to remove from you the impurity, O people of the household, and to purify you with (extensive) purification]  

As previously discussed, the dominant form of religious belief in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s era in al-Andalus was Sunni Islam; and according to Sunni interpretation, phraseme (219) applies to the Prophet’s family – Fāṭima and ‘Ālī, al-al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn – as in the Ḥadīth. In a different Sunni interpretation, however, it applies to the wives of the Prophet and all the Muslim members of his tribe.

\[\text{Ibid., ('Āl 'Imrān) 3:33.} \]
\[\text{Ibid., (Ghāfir) 40:46.} \]
\[\text{See Chapter 4, above.} \]
\[\text{Qur’ān (al-} \text{Qaṣṣaṣ) 28:12.} \]
\[\text{Ibid., (al-} \text{Aḥzāb) 33:33.} \]
\[\text{Ibn al-Ḥajjāj, Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol. 7, p. 130; At-Ṭabarī, Jāmi' al-} \text{Bayān (al-} \text{Aḥzāb) 33:20-22 (electronic resource): http://www.altafsir.com/Tafasir.asp?MadhNo=1&tTafsirNo=1&tSoraNo=33&tAyahNo=33&tDisplay=yes&Pag e=4&Size=1&LanguageId=1, accessed on 16 August 2018.} \]
The analysis of phraseme (219) is that it reflects blended cultural phenomena: quotation (in the fixed form motivated by holy texts); cultural symbolism (of the house as the family); and a specific Muslim cultural model related to ʾāl/ahl al-bayt that is decoded differently depending on the context and the religious background.

The final phraseme in this category, a speech-act formula, is one of the most frequently occurring Arabic phrasemes; yet, it shows a high level of fixedness on its lexical level.

220) ṣallā llāhu ʿalayhi wa-sallama [blessed be him by God and peace (God sent) to him]1034 = a phrase used after mentioning the Prophet.

Although the ṭasliya [eulogy] comes in many different varieties, it always retains the two core elements ʿalā and salām. Phraseme (220) is its most common and most fixed form. It is motivated by the Qurʾānic verse

\[
inna llāha wa-malāʾ ikatahū yuṣallūna ʿala n-nabiyyi yā ayyuha l-ladhiḥa
\]

\[‘āmanū ṣallū ʿalayhi wa-sallimū taslīman\]

[Indeed, God and his angels bless the Prophet, O those who believed, bless him and (extensively send) peace to him]

The above verse does not reflect the form we have in the example, but it does share its core elements as well as the order in which they occur. The primary meaning of the root ṣ-l-w is [to pray/to bless].1036 When combined with the preposition ʿlī, the preposition ʿalā [upon] gives this phrasal verb the meaning of [to bless] rather than [to pray for].1037 The commentators interpret the meaning of the word differently depending on subject of the action.1038 When God prays,
he blesses and shows mercy to the target, whereas when an ordinary Muslim prays, he/she prays to God to bless the Prophet. Or, in some interpretations, God’s ʂalā over the Prophet is to praise him in front of the angels.1039 Șalā also appears in another Qur‘ānic verse in which the Prophet’s ʂalā is described as a prayer that is ‘peacefulness for them’:

wa-ʂalli ʿalayhim inna šalātaka sakanun lahum1040

[and pray for them, indeed, your prayer is peacefulness for them]

The semantic level of the second element is also a controversial issue. The collective meaning of the root s-l-m is [to save/to purify], and from it, salām [peace] and the greeting as-slāmu ʿalaykum [peace be upon you] are both derived. Traditional linguists and Qur‘ān commentators accept the lexeme sallam as a semantic derivation from the greeting.1041

Phraseme (220) has two semantic levels, each motivated by a different cultural model. In the case of the first level, adding ʂalā and salām to God indicates an alteration in their primary meanings. The second level involves the context of the use of the tašliya: i.e., either after a mention of the Prophet, or as a prayer for general blessing, which indicates another secondary meaning motivated by an Islamic cultural model conceptualising the holiness of the Prophet.

9:6 Religious Practices And Concepts

In terms of cultural influence, the phrasemes in this group are no different to those in the previous one. They reflect Islamic religious practices and concepts like the folloquing phrasemes:

li and ʂallā ʿalā, see aṭ-Ţabarī, Jāmī’ al-Bayān, (electronic resource): http://www.altafsir.com/Tafsir.asp?tMadhNo=1&tTafsirNo=1&tSoraNo=9&tAyahNo=103&tDisplay=yes&Pag e=3&Size=1&LanguageId=1, accessed on 17 August 2018; for ʂallā ʿalā, see ibid., http://www.altafsir.com/Tafsir.asp?tMadhNo=1&tTafsirNo=1&tSoraNo=33&tAyahNo=56&tDisplay=yes&LanguageId=1, accessed on 17 August 2018.


1040 Qur‘ān (al-Tawba) 9:103.

1041 Goldziher discusses sallam in the collocation’s form, in ‘Ueber die Eulogien der Muhammedaner’, p. 106.
221)  *mu‘ayyadun bi-rūḥī l-qudusi* [he is supported by the Holy Spirit] \(^{1042}\) = to be successful, especially in religious-related matters.

222)  *lā taqrabu z-zinā* [do not approach adultery] \(^{1043}\) = do not commit adultery. \(^{1044}\)

223)  *qarraba badanatan* [(he) brought a body] \(^{1045}\) = to sacrifice an animal in a religious ritual.

Phrasemes (221) and (222) are both idioms that are motivated by the Qur’an on all of their linguistic levels, including phraseological meaning. However, because of their frequent occurrence in conventionalised Islamic Arabic language, in addition to other elements that will be noted below, these phrasemes exhibit a level of flexibility, especially on the morphological level and in their conjugations.

The source text for phraseme (221) comprises three verses, of which two are conjugated in the first person plural, and read exactly the same as in:

*wa-‘ayyadnāhu bi-rūḥī l-qudusi*

[And We supported him by the Holy Spirit] \(^{1046}\)

and the other, in the first person singular:

*wa-‘ayyadtuka bi-rūḥī l-qudusi*

[I supported you by the Holy Spirit] \(^{1047}\)

All three verses refer to the narrative of Jesus. The commentators interpret the meaning of *bi-rūḥī l-qudusi* as Jibrīl [Gabriel]. \(^{1048}\) On the primary semantic level of the words, *rūḥ* is [a spirit] and *qudus* is [holy]. The annexation does not apply an additional meaning, because the collocation is adopted from earlier Syriac Christian texts. The Arabic collocation corresponds


\(^{1043}\) Ibid., vol. 7, p. 402.

\(^{1044}\) Qur’an (*al-Isrā’*) 17:32.

\(^{1045}\) Al-Maqqarī, *Naḥf at-Ṭib*, vol. 6, p. 224.

\(^{1046}\) Qur’an (*al-Baqara*) 2:87 and 2:253.

\(^{1047}\) Ibid., (*al-Mā’ida*), 5:115.

philologically to the Syriac phrase *rūḥā l-qudshā*. The verb in the phraseme is the only flexible element of the three, because the pronoun – in both forms of the verse – refers to God in the first person. When a speaker uses the phraseme, the verb is conjugated to refer to God either in the third person or the second person, as in phraseme (221). A Ḥadīth text reports that the Prophet linked the pronoun in the verb *ayyad* [to support] to the Holy Spirit when speaking to Ḥassān ibn Thābit, encouraging him to lampoon the non-believers: *inna rūḥa l-qudusī lā-zāla yu’ayyiduκa* [indeed, the Holy Spirit is still supporting you]. In Arabic, the *bā’* in *bi-rūḥi* is *bā’* *al-isti’āna. Bā’* *al-isti’āna* is defined as a preposition used specifically in reference to a tool. The *bā’* is dropped in the Arabic metaphorical style *majāz ‘aqīl*.

One of the varieties of the Ḥadīth text explicitly uses the same conjugation as phraseme (221): *allāhummā ayyidhu bi-rūḥi l-qudusi* [O God, support him with the Holy Spirit]. In other words, this phraseme includes another phraseme within it, i.e., *bi-rūḥi l-qudusi*. This ‘inner’ phraseme occurs in a fully fixed form because it is vague on the semantic level, is formed of two elements, and is a quotation. The form of phraseme (221), on the other hand, has a level of flexibility because the verb *ayyad* includes a pronoun that, although it refers to God, must be conjugated in the third or second person whenever it is used.

Phrasemes (222) and (223) each include one element derived from the root *q-r-b*, but this has different semantic implications for each of them. In phraseme (222) as used in our corpus, *taqrābū* denotes the meaning [to commit], motivated by the conceptual metaphor TO

---


1053 Ibn al-Ḥājjāj, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol. 7, p. 162.
APPROACH IS TO COMMIT, which is represented extensively in the Qur’an: lā taqrabu l-fawāḥisha [do not come near immoralities], lā taqrabū māla l-yatīmi [do not approach the property of an orphan], lā taqrabu ṣ-ṣalāta wa-antum sukārā [do not approach prayer while you are intoxicated].

Various factors apply different levels of fixedness or flexibility to phraseme (222). Its second element, zinā, is used on its primary semantic level. Quotation, the phraseme’s cultural phenomenon, is a full-fixedness factor, and being coined of two elements and a common word implies high fixedness. Its flexibility factors are the pronoun, and the fact that its concept still existed in the target culture. Based on the relative numbers of these factors, the phraseme can be expected to tend to fixedness more than flexibility. However, there is one additional possible fixedness factor to consider: that the phraseme does not occur except in contexts where it indicates an imperative, to emphasise the connection of the commandment with God. This phenomenon is reflected in the usage of a verb, derived from the root z-n-y, which is used to express committing adultery, rather than the collocation in the phraseme. If we accept this analysis, we can add an emphasised conventional metaphor to the fixedness factors.

The verb in phraseme (223) is derived from the root q-r-b, whose collective meaning is [to come near]. The contextual usage of the verb, as a source domain, is influenced by a pre-Islamic conventionalised metaphor, possibly adopted from another Semitic language such as Syriac. The source of the collocation is a quotation form a Ḥadīth text describing one who practises the ghusl al-Jum’a [Friday bath] before prayer: fa-ka’annamā qarraba badanatan [as if he sacrificed an (animal) body]. The phraseme is semi-flexible, especially

---

1054 Qur’an (al-An’ām) 6:151.
1055 Ibid., (al-Isrā’) 17:34.
1056 Ibid., (an-Nisā’) 4:43.
1057 Ibn Fāris, Maqāyis al-Lughā (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%82%D8%B1%D8%A8%D8%A7%D9%86, accessed on 21 August 2018.
1058 Manna, Chaldean-Arabic Dictionary, p. 700.
in the conjugation of the verb. Unlike in phraseme (223), the meaning of the action here cannot be expressed other than by using the first verb colligated with the word badana [a body/animal] in addition to ḍamīr mustatir [the embedded/elliptic pronoun], which refers to a generalised concept of the Muslim in this context. This produces the flexibility in verb conjugation.

Finally, the following phraseme indicates a gesture that gained a religious connotation:

224) tumaddu l-aydī [hands are raised]¹⁰⁶⁰ = to invoke God.

It is conceivable that the act of raising one’s hands to invoke God was known in pre-Islamic Arab society; but be that as it may, the gesture became a conventionalised Islamic practice, to be understood in this phraseme as falling within the sphere of Islamic motivation. In our corpus, the phraseme only ever occurs as an idiomatic reference to the act of duʿāʾ, used to address an authority figure with praise.

Like most [gesture]-motivated phrasemes, this one is non-figurative, which applies a high fixedness to it. However, [gesture]-motivated non-figurative Arabic phrasemes display greater-than-expected flexibility. The fact that the gesture itself was still commonplace in the target audience’s speech community could have helped reduce its level of fixedness from highly fixed to free.

9:7 Names and Terms

Many names and terms have been motivated by Islamic concepts. Quotation is the main cultural phenomenon of the phrasemes in this category, except for phraseme (230) which shows an allusion as a secondary phenomenon.

225) dāru l-baqāʾī [the Home of Immortality]¹⁰⁶¹ = the afterlife.

226) al-hayātu d-dunyā [the near/lowlife]¹⁰⁶² = worldly life.

¹⁰⁶² Ibid., vol. 7, p. 396.
227) sakarātu l-mawti [the intoxications of death]\textsuperscript{1063} = signs of death.
228) yawmu l-ʿarḍi [the day of presenting]\textsuperscript{1064} = Judgment Day.

The source domain of phraseme (225), a collocation, is the concept of dār [home], as a signifier of both [house] and [the place to which one belongs]. And the root of baqāʾ [immortality] originally expressed the meaning [to stay]. We are dealing with [house] as a cultural symbol here, because it reflects the symbolic conception of [house] in the context of either nomadic or settled Arabic culture, as discussed in Chapter 7, above. As such, we can consider a blending of phenomena here: that of a cultural symbol, and a quotation from the Prophet as recorded by ar-Rāghib al-ʿAṣfahānī (d. 502/1108):

\textit{al-ʿaqilu man yāḥṭamīlu d-ṭurra fī dāri l-fānāʾi ʿīqānan bi-n-nafʾi fīdārī l-baqāʾi}

[The intelligent man is he who bears burdens in the Home of Mortality hoping for grace in the Home of Immortality].\textsuperscript{1065}

Az-Zamakhsharī attributed the following, similar passage to ʿAlī:

\textit{wa-ʿajibtu li-ʿāmirī dārī l-fānāʾi wa-tārīki dārī l-baqāʾi}

[And I wonder at the one who builds the Home of Mortality and he leaves the Home of Immortality (with no building)].\textsuperscript{1066}

The annexation of dār to another culturally specific concept motivated words like baqāʾ [immortality], in the Islamic sense of real immortality that is in Heaven, results phrasemes in fully fixed form. They are coined of two elements, one of which is motivated by a deeply established metaphor that cannot occur in plural form because of the concept it expresses: singularity and uniqueness. The second element is always an abstract word that functions as a description that refers to target domain. And if linked with the above mentioned Ḥadīth, they

\textsuperscript{1063} Ibid., vol. 6, p. 318.
\textsuperscript{1064} Ibn al-Khaṭīb, \textit{Rayḥānat al-Kuttāb}, vol. 1, p. 118.
can also considered a quotation.

Both elements of the next collocation phraseme, (226), are used to denote \[\text{life/world}\]. The collective meaning of the root \(h-y-w\) is \([\text{to live}]\), from which \(\text{hayā}\) is derived.\(^{1067}\) The collective meaning of the second element, \(d-n-y\), is \([\text{to come close}]\); and the element \(\text{dunyā}\) was known in pre-Islamic Arabic as a signifier of \(\text{hayā}\.\(^{1068}\) The phraseme thus corresponds to the Hebrew term \(hā-ʾōlām haz-ze\ \text{[this world]}\).\(^{1069}\) Unlike \(\text{dunyā}\), which in the context of the Qurʾān mostly appears as a comparative for \(ʾākhira\ [\text{the latter}] = \text{afterlife}\), phraseme (226) occurs as a synonym for \([\text{the world}]\) as signified by either the primary element \(\text{hayā}\) or the well-established metaphor \(\text{dunyā}\).\(^{1070}\) Thus, it reflects two cultural phenomena: quotation (from the Qurʾān ) and cultural modelling. The cultural model is in the second element, which implies a pre-Islamic Arabic concept and is hence a fixedness factor. Also, the combination of the two words applies a secondary metaphorical level: a specific meaning of \([\text{life}]\) that recalls the primary meaning of \(\text{dunyā} \ [\text{lowest/nearest}]\), although Arabic does not include an opposite concept or phraseme like \(al-\text{hayātu} \ l-ʾulyā\ \text{[the farthest life]}\). Hence, the phraseme occurs in fully fixed form.

Phraseme (227) is an idiom that is derived from a Qurʾānic verse, but unlike that verse takes a singular form:

\[
\text{wa-jāʿat sakratu l-mawti bi-l-ḥaqqi}
\]

\([\text{and the intoxication of death will bring the truth}]\).\(^{1071}\)

The plural form of the phraseme occurs in a Ḥadith text attributed to the Prophet:

\(^{1067}\) Ibn Fāris, \textit{Maqāyīṣ al-Lughā} (electronic resource): \url{http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%AD%D9%8A%D8%A7%D8%A9%3}, accessed on 25 August 2018.


\(^{1069}\) Ibid.

\(^{1070}\) For example, compare Qurʾān (\textit{al-Tawba}) 9:38, (\textit{ar-Raʿd}) 13:26 and 13:34; (\textit{ar-Rūm}) 30:7; and (\textit{al-Ḥadīd}) 57:20.

\(^{1071}\) Ibid., (\textit{Qād}) 50:19.
indeed, there are intoxications for death.

when approaching death, one experiences dizziness and blurred vision, much like an intoxicated person, and such symptoms are the source domain from which the metaphor in phraseme (227) is drawn. if one counted the two above-quoted varieties as two independent phrasemes, both could be deemed fully fixed; but the argument for doing so is not convincing. rather, both forms should be seen as a single, highly fixed phraseme, whose use in two different forms in holy texts applied this level of flexibility to it – even though, in theory, it should have been fully fixed due to factors including quotation, figurativeness, and having two elements.

the source domain of phraseme (228) is motivated by yawm [a concept of time/event] and ‘ard [presenting]. ‘Arḍ can denote [to review], [to show], [to present] or even [to expose]. the latter metaphorical meaning of the second element, ‘ard, is established in – but not quoted from – the Qurʾān, in verses like:

wa-‘aradnā jahannama yawma idhin li-l-kāfirīna ‘araḍan

[And We will present Hell that day to the disbelievers, on display].

and:

an-nūra yu’aradūna ‘alayhā ghuduwwan wa-‘ashiyyan wa-yawma taqūmu s-sā’atu

[The fire, they are exposed to it morning and evening and the day the Hour appears].

and:

ulā’ika yu’raḍūna ‘alā rabbihim

[Those will be presented before their God].

the phraseme is a collocation that alludes to an event that, according to the Qurʾān, will happen

---

1073 Ibn Fāris, Maqāyis al-Lugha (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D8%B9%D8%B6#1, accessed on 26 August 2018.
1074 Qurʾān (al-Kahf) 18:100.
1075 Ibid., (Ghāfır), 40:46.
1076 Ibid., (Hūd) 11:18.
in the future: the day of judgment, when Hell is exposed and displayed to unbelievers or they are exposed to it. Hence, the phraseme indicates negativity when used to refer to judgment day.

The coining of the following phrasemes was motivated by Islamic cultural models, and only prior knowledge of the relevant cultural conventions would enable one to decode their metaphorical meanings.

229) *uṣūlu l-fiqhī* [the foundation of knowledge] \(^{1077}\) = an academic discipline investigating the sources of Islamic law.

230) *‘ilmu l-kalāmi* [the science of speaking] \(^{1078}\) = theology.

Phraseme (229) is a collocation that is motivated by layers of cultural concepts. It was in use in the tenth century, but may be even older.\(^{1079}\) Certainly, by the time of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, it was established as a term for the knowledge of construing Islamic laws.\(^{1080}\) On the lexical level, the first element of the phraseme denotes the meaning [roots], and specifically, the roots of the second element of the phraseme: *fiqh*. The roots [*uṣūl*] of *fiqh* are parallel to the *furūʿ* [branches] of *fiqh*, which are those religious practices that are derived form, or come in a secondary importance after the main subjects, *uṣūl*. Lexically, *fiqh* is [knowledge], but later, it became a signifier of knowledge of religion in particular. It could have been derived from the Ḥadīth text in which the Prophet prays, regarding Ibn ʿAbbās (d. 68/687): *allāhumma faqqihhu fi d-dīni* [may God (make) him knowledgeable in religion].\(^{1081}\) Once the phraseme’s second element came to signify [knowledge of religion], its first element, by annexation, became [the foundation of religion]. Hence, the phraseme is fully fixed. It is coined from two other phrasemes, both of which are common words, and gained a metaphorical meaning motivated


\(^{1078}\) Ibid., vol. 2, p. 37.


\(^{1080}\) The phraseme can be found in eighth/fourteenth century works like al-Qalqashandi, *Subh al-Aʾshā*, vol. 1, p. 478; and even in earlier works in the seventh/thirteenth century like As-Sakkākī, *Miftāḥ al-ʿUlūm*, p. 442.

Phraseme (230) was established as a term for a branch of theology, or in some translations, for theology itself. The term ‘Ilm al-kalām has been defined as ‘the science which is concerned with firmly establishing religious beliefs by adducing proofs and with banishing doubts’. To understand the phraseme, we must break it down to the lexical meanings of its elements. ‘Ilm is the verbal noun derived from the root ‘-l-m [to know]. The second element, kalām [speech], is the core element requiring analysis. In the lexical sense, it is derived from the root k-l-m, which yields two sets of meanings, [to speak] and [to cut]. The semantic shifting-point at which kalām became dialexis is uncertain, and hence its specific meaning is theological dialexis. Tannous suggested that the kalām gained the meaning of theological dialexis via inter-religious debate between Muslim and Christian Arabs, in which the Syriac term mlāth alāhūthā [speech (regarding) divinity] was transferred into Arabic as kalām. Treiger, however, has argued that Tannous’s hypothesis is ‘in need of further testing and corroboration, given that the evidence presently supporting it is mostly circumstantial and from somewhat later’. Additionally, we can argue that Tannous’s hypothesis does not propose an explanation for the concept being derived from k-l-m rather than n-t-q, like manṭiq [logic], even though the Syriac term for logic is mlāth – derived from m-l-l, a root shared by mlāth alāhūthā.

Regardless of the uncertainties surrounding the semantic origin of the term, it is widely

---


1083 Some early lexicologists suggest that the meaning of kalām [speech] is a dead metaphor of the original meaning [to cut] because speaking, in most cases, harms the audience. See Ibn Fāris, Maqāyīs al-Lugha (electronic resource): http://baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%83%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%85, accessed on 30 August 2018.


1085 Ibid.; Treiger does not indicate a specific time.
accepted that it was coined at an early date in the eastern part of the Arabic-speaking world; and it maintained its phraseological meaning in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s works. Regarding its level of fixedness, such terms became well known within the community dealing with the concept, and this would tend to apply full fixedness to them, especially in light of the phraseme’s cultural phenomenon: cultural modelling. In other words, to understand the transferred meaning of *kalām* from [speech] to a specific type of theological argument, and the connection between *ʿilm* and *kalām*, one would require prior knowledge of Arab-specific cultural features.

9:8 Conclusion

In the Islamic Arab culture, the Qurʾān was the main source of phrasemes, followed by the Ḥadīth. Each text had become, in a sense, a single enormous phraseme by the period in which Ibn al-Khaṭīb lived. Muslims believe the Qurʾān to be a miraculous text, and that the sayings of the Prophet are formed in the most eloquent Arabic style: as he put it, ʿūṭītu jawāmiʿa l-kalimi [I have been given the most eloquent of words]. Any text extracted from the Qurʾān or Ḥadīth can thus be considered a phraseme, and will be of at least high fixedness. Nevertheless, we can identify a level of flexibility in the form of the phrasemes in this category that appear in our fourteenth-century corpus. Quotation and cultural models are the most influential cultural phenomena in this source domain. Its main full-fixedness factors are cranberry lexemes; vagueness on the primary lexical and/or primary semantic levels; having more than two semantic levels; and references to God. The various conceptual metaphors that motivate these phrasemes include A SIN IS A PHYSICAL DISORDER; TO APPROACH IS TO COMMIT; and TO OPEN IS A PRIVILEGE.

The primary source of quotations is the Qurʾān, followed by the Ḥadīth. Interestingly,

---

we can also observe blending of phenomena. In phraseme (225), quotation and cultural symbolism were also identified. Phraseme (219) reflects a blending of three cultural phenomena: a quotation, which provides its fixedness factor; a cultural symbol, reflected in the secondary semantic level of bayt; and a cultural model, by which the meaning of the phraseme would be interpreted according to one’s religious/sectarian background (i.e., Sunni/Sufi, in the case of Ibn al-Khaṭīb). And quotation and cultural modelling are blended in phraseme (226).

We also find Sufism as a religious/spiritual target domain represented in Qurʾān-motivated phrasemes. The cultural phenomena in such phrasemes as occur in the coprus is quotation, with one of them having an additional allusion to a well-known Sufi interpretation of the Qurʾānic figure of Moses.

Another interesting phenomenon exhibited by the phrasemes in this category is their tendency to fixedness when they include a pronoun referring to God. This occurs because such pronouns’ antecedent – God – cannot be conjugated with any other pronoun.

No matter how long prayers are, it is interesting that they function in fully fixed form as quotations. Phrasemes with the Qurʾān as a target domain are mostly quoted from holy texts. When the quotation is combined with vagueness, as in (204) – as-sabʿu l-mathānī – its form gains full fixedness. Gesture is rarely represented in this category; however, phraseme (224) reflects this cultural phenomenon, which motivates its phraseolgical meaning of a religious practice.
10: Conclusion

Phraseology is a relatively new field in linguistic studies, and a very young field in the context of Arabic studies in general. This dissertation has helped to fill a gap in Arabic phraseological studies by introducing classical Arabic phraseology as a core target of study, and analysing the cultural layers of the formation and functionality of classical Arabic phrasemes. As such, it represents a vital initial step towards the establishment of a systematic approach to the study of classical Arabic phraseology, and especially the language’s cultural reflections.

To achieve this study’s aims, it was necessary to select a corpus in which classical phraseology had gained a stable form; thus, a relatively late body of prose writing on a variety of topics – the works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb – was chosen as representative of an important classical Arabic style in both its chronological (fourteenth century) and geographical (Andalus) context. Having defined Arabic phrasemes within the context of classical Arabic, this study applied Granger and Paquot’s typological system to classical Arabic, and then utilised Dobrovol’skij and Piirainen’s culturally specific phenomena approach within the context of the selected classical Arabic corpus. The results of the present study are highly relevant for the future research on Arabic phraseology.

10:1 Questions

The central research question of this study can be formulated as follows: Based on an analysis of the fourteenth-century prose works of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, what are the culturally specific phenomena that classical Arabic phraseology conveys, and how do they affect the formation of phrasemes? This question can be broken down into more detailed ones: What are the source domains that motivate the corpus’ phrasemes of the selected corpus? How are cultural
phenomena reflected in these phrasemes? What type(s) of phrasemes reflect cultural phenomena most clearly? And to what extent do cultural phenomena contribute to the fixedness of classical Arabic phrasemes? In order to approach these questions, it was necessary to clarify what should be regarded as a phraseme in classical Arabic and how a phraseme should be defined in the specific linguistic context of classical Arabic.

10:2 Phrasemes in Classical Arabic

The first two chapters of this dissertation established that a phraseme in classical Arabic is a combination of two linguistic elements that frequently co-occur as a single semantic unit expressing, at least, a metaphorical secondary semantic level, and exhibiting a level of fixedness in its form. Moreover, the high level of flexibility in relation to the gaps that can occur between the elements of a phraseme has been discussed along with the phenomenon of a one-word phraseme in Arabic.

The results of the analysis of Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s prose writings using Granger and Paqout’s phraseological typology and Piirainen and Dobrovol’skiy’s approach to culturally specific phenomena suggest that cultural phenomena in classical Arabic phraseology are reflected primarily in referential phrasemes (idioms, collocations and irreversible binomials), and secondarily, in communicative ones (speech acts, proverbs and commonplaces).

10:3 Source Domains, Phraseological Types, and Cultural Phenomena

The present study has resulted in the identification of four main source domains for classical Arabic phrasemes: historical references, nature, material culture and habitus, and Islamic religious motivations (with either religious or non-religious target domains). Within the specific context of phrasemes reflecting cultural phenomena that were used by Ibn al-Khaṭīb, the lion’s share was taken by Islamic and religiously motivated phrasemes.
Whether alone or blended, cultural modelling dominated the culturally specific phenomena in classical Arabic phrasemes in all the source domains provided by the corpus. This was the case irrespective of whether the cultural model’s source was tribal Arab culture or a specifically Islamic context. This is especially clear in the case of the [nature] and [animal] source domains. Because cultural modelling is the phenomenon most dependent upon the reader or hearer’s prior knowledge of cultural conventions, it is the predominantly applied phenomenon to motivate cross-cultural experiences like [nature]. Also, where a culturally specific artefact is expected to be reflected in the [material culture] domain, cultural modelling is the dominant phenomenon. The cultural context is established by the model that motivates the phraseme rather than by the artefact itself. [Islam] as a source domain also motivates many of the phrasemes that reflect cultural models.

The second most important phenomenon is quotation – unsurprisingly, given that poetry and religious texts are well known to have been the most influential texts in classical Arabic writing. Although the cultural phenomenon of quotation is reflected by itself in poetry, in Qurʾānic and Hādīth phrasemes it rarely occurs independently of other cultural phenomena. In other words, holy texts, especially the Qurʾān, became so well established in the conceptual system of the language that they were taken to a second level of idiomacity, mainly exhibited as a source of phrasemes with an allusion. The sphere of allusion in the corpus’ phrasemes is dominated by holy-text quotations, but it is important to note that those phrasemes alluding to non-religious texts generally co-occur with another cultural phenomenon, i.e., cultural symbolism. Though rarely seen in Islamic religious phrasemes, cultural symbolism plays a vital role in the formation of phrasemes influenced by history or collective memory, especially those that include a proper name; and indeed, the pattern of phrasemes that incorporate both a Qurʾānic allusion and a proper name, e.g., waṣīyyatu Luqmāna, reveal that cultural symbolism in classical Arabic phrasemes is mainly governed by the presence of proper names. However,
the concept of [home] reflects two important cultural symbols that motivate a number of common phrasemes, *dār/manzil/bayt* [house/home] and *majlis* [meeting room]. Other phenomena in Piirainen and Dobrovol’skij’s system, e.g., gestures, gender-specific phenomena (which co-occur with cultural artefacts) and fictive cultural domains, make scant contribution to the formation of classical Arabic phrasemes; and some types of phrasemes, such as *naḥt* compounds, have been found to be motivated only by Islamic cultural models.

10:4 Cultural Phenomena and Fixedness

Cultural phenomena were also found to affect the fixedness level of classical Arabic phrasemes. Specifically, the phrasemes in the corpus tended to have a high level of fixedness if they included a quotation, especially if that quotation included a cranberry lexeme, a specific number, or a proper name (especially one that functions as a cultural symbol). Cultural symbolism is a main fixedness factor for phrasemes; and a phraseme that includes both a cultural symbol and an allusion will generally be fully fixed in its form, like *daʿwatu Ḥātimin*.

Interestingly, the present research has established that this rule is often broken by some Qurʿānic-quotation phrasemes, especially those with non-religious target domains. Due to both their frequent usage and their well known, well established source domain, such phrasemes can exhibit modified versions of the original source texts – unlike, for example, most of the poetry-quotation phrasemes in the corpus. Also, it should be noted that holy texts are an important source even for those phrasemes that have non-religious target domains: a phenomenon attributable to the fact that the Qurʿān and Ḥadīth are very frequently cited texts, memorised by a number of Muslims, and which therefore can operate as Islamic cultural models rather than quotations. Thus, modifying a phraseme from the source domain [Qurʿān] or [Ḥadīth] will not necessarily alter the phraseological meaning that was established in the context of its source text. And even when they incorporate an allusion, a Qurʿānic-quotation phraseme does
not show full fixedness. However, Prayer, Qur’ānic-quotation with religious target domain and (to an extent) communicative speech act phrasemes are the exception, wherein Qur’ān- and Ḥadīth-quoting phrasemes gain full fixedness. For the first, it is related to the Muslim belief that praying to God in the words of the divine revelation given in the Qur’ān cannot be improved by any linguistic modification. Additionally, holy texts, which are recited purely for blessing, loose their primary semantic level for the purpose of the recitation. Finally, communicative speech act phrasemes are mostly quotations that became well fixed and idiomatic at a high level, with the exception of those with more than two words, such as as-salāmu `alaykum wa-rahmatu llāhi wa-barakātuhū.

Naḥt compounds, and vagueness on the primary lexical level within a quotation, also influence the fixedness level of a phraseme. Although fictive cultural domains were rarely found in the corpus’s phrasemes, this cultural phenomenon – if coupled with a cultural symbol – renders a phraseme fully fixed, as in at-ṭā’iru l-maymūnu. Also, irreversible phrasemes, regardless of their motivating cultural phenomenon, exhibited full fixedness in their form.

Lastly, two rare phenomena occurred only once each in the corpus. These were: a cultural model-motivated phraseme that occurred in full fixedness (the only slogan in the corpus, wa-lā ghāliba illa-llāha); and ahlu al-bayti, a phraseme motivated by a blend of three cultural phenomena, i.e., a cultural model, a cultural symbol and a quotation.

10:5 Directions for Future Research

Further research on phraseology in classical Arabic, modern standard Arabic, and Arabic dialects is needed. This dissertation has profitably applied the techniques of cultural analysis to classical Arabic works written in a particular time and region by a particular author. However, further exploration of the colloquial Arabic used in the region in question is also long overdue. Applying the same cultural-analysis approach and fixedness framework provided in
the present research to colloquial phrasemes would undoubtedly yield very interesting results.

Each period in the history of the Arabic language exhibits distinctive stylistic characteristics. As such, further applications of the cultural-phenomena approach are likely to considerably enrich the study of culturally specific influences on the formation of Arabic phrasemes. Specifically, it is to be expected that more cultural symbols and models will be discovered via scholarship on a range of different periods and regions.

The study presented highlights the relevance of cultural aspects in the formation of classical Arabic phraseology and the domains in which classical Arabic phraseology functions. It also outlines important theoretical approaches for future research including establishing the most appropriate typology of phrasemes in classical Arabic and discussing some issues in defining classical Arabic phraseme. Most importantly, the present study provides a framework required to analyse how cultural phenomena are reflected and function in classical Arabic. This is aimed at stimulating further research on cultural influence on Arabic phraseology. Developing the field Arabic phraseology will help illuminating the internal layers of Arabic stylistics and semanatics.
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