International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)
Volume 9, Issue 8, August 2021, PP 14-28
ISSN 2347-3126 (Print) & ISSN 2347-3134 (Online)
https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0908003
www.arcjournals.org

An Investigation into the Pragmatic Processes Conveyed in Arabic: A case study of the reported Qur'anic conversational patterns

Sami Al-Heeh*

Palestine

Corresponding Authors:** ***Sami Al-Heeh, *Palestine*

Abstract: *The study investigates the pragmatic processes manipulated in the Quranic conversation patterns. From a post-structural, non-essentialist theoretical framework, the study explores Quranic corpus linguistics. From a socio-pragmatic perspective, the paper benefits from discourse analysis to identify adjacent, converted, inserted, dis-preferred and solidarity routines as frequent speech patterns. From a pragmalinguistic view, the study identifies assigning reference and meaning and interpreting the illocutionary-force and the implicated meaning as strategies for processing meaning when people interact in language. The study furthers from a structural-functional perspective to reflect on the pragmatic processes identified. It finally acknowledges the Quranic text linguistics effort to remedy pair talks.*

Keywords: *Pragmatics, Arabic, Quranic Discourse, Conversational Patterns*

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent denotational theories, linguists make a clear difference between semantics and pragmatics. Semantics is defined as 'the study of meaning'. The main task of semantics is to describe linguistic meaning. It explains what a given utterance means by 'virtue of the words used and the way in which they are put together'. Pragmatics is, however, concerned with the study of meaning that linguistic expressions receive. So one task of pragmatics is to explain how participants in a dialogue move from decontextualized, i.e. out of context, meanings of the words and phrases to a grasp of their meaning in context.

To avoid any misunderstanding, interlocutors, i.e. speakers and their listeners, must be cooperative. They should sustain some maxims (also known as Grice's maxims) that help further cooperation. These maxims include quality, quantity, relevance, and style. Quantifying speech subsumes that the speaker should be informative enough. Qualifying words highlights telling only the truth. Being relevant subsumes that speakers should do their best to be relevant. Speech styles stress that communicators should make their contributions appropriately direct and short. Grice's maxims are supposed to accelerate good speeches.

1.1. Background to the Study

Pragmatics involves four processes. They include the assignment of both reference and meaning in context, and the interpretation of both illocutionary force and implicated meaning. A reference is a social act, in which the speaker assumes that the word or phrase chosen to identify an object or person will be interrupted as the speaker intended. A spam message "Congratulations! You became an Okhtubut", or example may sound weird because it does not convey something like an 'Okhtobut member'. There is a gap between the decontextualized sense of the utterance, i.e. what the word ‘Okhtubut’ means according to the dictionary and the thought expressed roughly by the message kept in the inbox.

There are some common kinds of references. The deictic expressions can be used to refer to person, place, and time. Person deictic pronouns can be first, such as 'I' and 'we', second, like 'you' and 'it', and third, as 'he', and 'she'. Cataphoric and anaphoric expressions are used to show the spread of the pronoun itself. A cataphoric reference always spreads forward in the text whereas an anaphoric pronoun always moves backward. Endophoric and exophoric phrases, such as 'that' and 'this' refer to certain linguistic element or or non-linguistic element. That is to say, the endophoric pronoun must

refer to a certain word (usually a noun phrase). The exophoric pronoun often refers to a full idea. Ideas are non-linguistic since they reside only in our heads. The purpose of both exophoric and endophoric expressions is to avoid repeating words twice.

Pragmatics also aims to check the sense assigned by the speaker and perceived by the addressee. Assigning meaning in context involves interpreting ambiguous and vague linguistic expressions to assign them in context. In general, most Palestinian teenagers tend to remark (muzzah!) when they see a gorgeous girl. More locally to the south, some teenagers would say the term (nathi:fah!) meaning 'so clean' to express their admiration of a very beautiful girl. The term sounds strange as it is used to evaluate concrete objects such as 'cars' and 'dishes'. Pragmatics plays a role in explaining how thought expressed by a given utterance on a given occasion is covered by the hearer.

Pragmatics can interpret the illocutionary force of utterances. Let us consider two Arab close friends met by chance in the market. One of them will actually start 'Guy, where are you going?'. Pragmatics would examine why such a friend ask the question, whetherhe was requesting factual information, whether he was hinting that he wanted to be invited and if he was criticizing the other friend for going out too much. When speaking, we intend or ‘do’ things like making requests, making statements and offering apologies or taking acts, for instance. However, people sometimes do not seek telling information. They aim only to socialize or express their feelings. If so, then the speech function looks phatic or expressive. The above question the Arab friend asked did not sound informative. It sounds phatic (also known as affective) as it means to socialize.

Pragmatics aims at working out the implicated meaning. The main import of an utterance easily lie not with the thought expressed by the utterance (with what is communicated directly), but rather with the thought the hearer assumes the speaker intends to suggest or hint at.Indeed, it lies with what is implicated or communicated indirectly. For a native speaker of English, a question, such as 'Where are you going tonight?' looks inappropriate as it sounds informative. This helps explain why such a question is usually interrupted by 'why are you asking?' before providing any information. The latter question aims at interpreting the implicated meaning loaded indirectly. So pragmatics needs to explain how implicitly communicated ideas are recovered.

Language use involves two perspectives: A pragmalinguistic and a socio-pragmatic perspective. Pragmalinguistic viewsfocus on the linguistic strategies that are used to convey a given pragmatic meaning. Socio-pragmatic perspectives focus on the social beliefs that underlie people’s choices of strategies. For example, you are giving someone a lift in a rainy day, you will receive certain formulas, such as 'Thank you!', 'Thank you so much!', 'Cheers', 'May Allah reward you!" and 'Live for long!". The socio-pragmatic perspective focuses on the social judgments associated the relationship between the participants whether it is close, distant, equal, or unequal and young or old. The pragmalinguistic perspective focuses on the linguistic strategies used to operationalize the formula used. Generally speaking, younger people tend to give direct thanking words whereas the old tend to supplicate instead.

Besides the general principle of cooperation, Leech proposes a set of ‘Politeness Maxims’. These include the modesty maxim and the agreement maxim which operate in conjunction with the cooperative maxims. Our social friendly relations subsume that our interlocutors are cooperative in the first place and should be polite. Generally speaking, human languages culturally encourage their native speakers to keep both the cooperative principle and that of politeness when they interact. For example, most natural languages stress politeness by maximizing agreement with others and dispraise of self as well as minimizing disagreement with others and self-praise. People, however, tend to place one general principle before the other. For example, Americans prefer to maintain interaction. This helps explain why some speeches may have many unintentional aphorism. In turn, Arabs, for instance, place polite interaction first. They would rather to block language interaction than use some offensive words.

The most influential model that tries to explain the impact of social factors on the use of people’s language is Brown and Levinson’s ‘face’ model of politeness. Brown and Levinson define ‘face’ as the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself. They draw a distinction between ‘positive’ face and ‘negative’ face. Positive face reflects every person’s need that his or herself- image is appreciated and approved of. Negative face reflects every person’s basic claim to territories and

personal preserves, rights to non-distraction that is freedom of action and freedom from imposition. For example, if an Arab does not greet someone else, he might be thought as an impolite person. When he does not greet back, he might be, however, interrupted by an identical greetings. This interruption is intended to remind this person that there is no breach of his personal preserves or a threat to his negative face.

Conversational patterns start within the frame of conversation analysis (CA) or discourse analysis (DA). They start from the common sense observation that people take turns in conversation. Conversational pattern relies on descriptions of naturally occurring data to discover the rules that govern such conversations. Conversation proceeds through ordered pairs of utterances called adjacency pairs. The utterance in a pair is ordered, in that the first member of a pair requires an answer. Sometimes one adjacency pair is interrupted by another pair thus forming an 'insertion sequence'. In a few cases, the pair is either converted where the second pair comes before the first or not preferred where the second pair sounds indirect.

1.2. Research objectives

This small-scale study explores the extent to which meaning is conveyed in Arabic adjacent pairs. From a conversational perspective, the paper classifies the types into adjacent, inserted or interrupted, dis-preferred-sequence, converging and solidary-routine pairs. Then, it examines the pragmatic processes employed in each pair. From a pragmalinguistic perspective, the study quantifies as well as qualifies the assignment of reference and sense and the interpretation of the illocutionary force and the implicated meaning perspective, the paper quantifies the processes. Then, it advances to evaluate each pair from a socio-pragmatic view. Here, the participants in the conversational pattern, their age, gender, status and relation will be checked. For its conciseness, the paper quotes exclusively from The Noble Quran.

1.3. Research questions

The study addresses the following questions:

1. What are the main conversational patterns that can be perceived in Arabic, in general and the Qur'anic discourse, in particular?
2. What are the pragmatic processes that Arabic employs to convey meaning in the various conversations and arguments?
3. How is meaning satisfied in the various conversational patterns carried out in Arabic?

2. METHODS AND MATERIALS

Methodologically, the study benefits from both corpus linguistics (CL) and discourse analysis (DA). Corpora (plural of corpus) are 'large bodies of texts'. At first, the paper concordances the holy Script of Islam for 'key words in context' (KWIK). These will include certain quotes collected as data for more analyses (Schmitt: 92-111). Then, the paper makes use of DA to unearth the linguistic features of the texts under investigation. As the paper underlies pure linguistics as an approach, 'systemic functional language' (SFL) as well as 'critical discourse analysis (CDA) is supposed to leak a lot about the grammatical functions of the structures under study (Schmitt: 55-73). As the paper applies an integrative approach to lexical meaning, kinds, 'truth values, meaning relations and the syntactic properties' are supposed to be calculated and acknowledged (Hurford: 187-20).

.The paper highlights to a great extent pure linguistics as an approach to study language phenomena, though it stresses the importance of 'the social factors' in language choice (Holmes: Holmes 194-220). From a sociolinguistic as well as a 'pragmalinguistic' perspective, language has to be examined within a social context. The participants, i.e. the speaker and listener or listeners, their age, their roles, status, and relation will certainly affect people's use of language. They also affect the style used. Language styles vary a lot; they can be casual, formal, intimate or even frozen. The 'message content', that is how beneficial the message to both the speaker and the hearer, has a big impact on language selection. The 'communicative activity', a job interview or a complaint, for instance, has a considerable impact on the language choice, as it develops certain norms, such as the right to talk and ask questions, to structure discourse, and to determine the mood of the talk (Schmitt:74-91).

3. Discussion And Analysis

3.1. Conversational Patterns

Conversation analysis (CA) is concerned with the detailed organization of everyday conversation.CA focuses on large-scale categories of class, gender, and age groups. It focuses mainly on dialogic, spoken discourse of a fairly informal character. CA focuses on conversation because it offers an appropriate and accessible resource for sociological enquiry.CA favors fine-grain analyses, often of quite short stretches of conversation. Conversation analysts are interested in checking how people take turns in conversation, open and close conversations, launch new topics, close old ones and shift topics, and progress satisfactorily from one utterance to the next.

A turn is each occasion that an interlocutor speaks. Itusually ends when another speaker takes a turn. In any informal, ordinary conversation, there is hardly any overlap or interruption, and only minimal silences lasting one second between turns. Speakers are permitted to take turns when they are chosen or 'nominated' by the current speaker, or if no one is selected, they may speak of their own choice. If neither of the above conditions applies, the speaker can simply continue.

3.1.1. Adjacent Pairs (APs)

The most frequent pattern in CA is the adjacency pattern'. The adjacency pattern is a pair of turns that mutually affect one another. Adjacency pairs are often connected with politeness, small talks, openings and closings. Quote 1A exemplifies for adjacent patterns. It reveals the greetings between God's messengers and Abraham. The functions of the word used for greeting from both parties vary differently. Whereas the messengers' greeting is adverbial and sounds a directive one, Abraham's is expressive and affective. In this sense, Abraham's expression looks more polite (see pp1 and pp2 in quote 1A). This small talk also occurs at the beginning of a long speech that carries good tidings to Abraham and some bad news for Lot's peoples.

Quote[1A] [wa-laqad ja:'at rusuluna: ibra:hi:ma bil-bushra: qa:lu: $_{PP1}$salaman qa:la $_{PP2}$sala:mun ..] Hud 11:70

[And surely, Our messengers came to Abraham with glad tidings. They said, 'We bid you peace.' He answered, 'Peace be on you,'…]

Quote 1B also models on adjacent pairs where Muses starts a debate with the Pharaoh. The pattern includes two questions and two direct answers for each (see PP1 to PP4 in quote 1B). The pattern sounds regular as each pair interrogates as well as elicits some answers. The function of the language in this adjacent pattern is informative (see PP2 and PP4). Moses also tends to quantify as well as qualify his words. He attempts to provide enough as well as relevant information (see quote 1B).

Quote[1B] [qa:la $_{PP1}$fa-man Rabbukuma ya: mu:sa❋ qa:la $_{PP2}$Rubbuna 'alathi: 'ata: kulla shaiy'in khalqahu thumma: hada:❋ qa:la $_{PP3}$fa-ma: ba:lu al-qu:ru:ni 'al'u:la:❋ qa:la $_{PP4}$'ilmuha: 'inda Rabbi: fi: kita:bin la: yadillu Rabbi: wa-la: yansa:❋] Ta-Ha 50-53

[Pharaoh said, 'Who then is the Lord of you two, O Moses?'He said, 'Our Lord is He Who gave unto everything its proper form and then guided it to its proper function.'Pharaoh said, 'What then will be the fate of the former generations?'He said, 'The knowledge thereof is with my Lord recorded in a Book. My Lord neither errs nor forgets.'

The adjacent patterns are so frequent in the holy Script of Islam. Quotes 1C and 1D also exemplify for neighboring pairs where the second pair clearly attempts to answer the first. In quote 3D, dwellers of the Hell will cry for Malik, the Hell guard to ask Allah to finish with them (see PP1). Malik replies that they have to remain (see PP2). In quote 1D, Almighty God asks Beelzebub who is one of the angels about the reason that prevented him from submitting to Adam (see PP1). Beelzebub boasts that God has already created him of fire not from clay (see PP2).

Quote[1C] [wa-nadaw ya: maliku $_{PP1}$li-yaqdi: 'alayna: Rabbuka qa:la $_{PP2}$'innakum ma:kithu:na] Az-Zukhruf 43:48

[And they will cry: 'O master! let thy Lord finish with us.' He will say, 'You must remain.']

Quote[1D] [qa:la: $_{PP1}$ma: man'aka 'alla: tasjuda 'ith 'amartuka qa:la $_{PP2}$'ana: khaiyyrun minnhu khalqtani: min na:rin wwa-khalqtahu min ti:nin] Al-'Araf 7:13

[God said, 'What prevented thee from submitting when I commanded thee?' He said, 'I am better than he. Thou hast created me of fire while him hast Thou created of clay.'

3.1.2. Interrupted Pairs (IPs)

Interrupted pairs (also known as dis-preferred-sequence pairs) refer to the pairs that people insert within the adjacent ones. Insertion takes place whenpeople sometimes insert a pair before providing the other speaker with some information. Interruption takes place for some pure pragmatic reasons. The listener thinks that he is losing his face as the other interlocutor is probably going beyond the space allotted for him. In quote 2A, Abraham asks Almighty God to show him how He gives life to the dead (see PP1). Abraham's query is centered on faith. This helps why the direct answer is postponed (see PP4). This accelerates the insertion of another interrogative pair to check why Abraham is asking (see PP2). This inserted interrogative has stimulated an answer from Abraham related to heart rest (see PP3).

Quote[2A] [wa-'ith qa:la Ibrahi:mu: $_{PP1}$Rabbi:, a:rini: kaiyfa tuhiyi al-mawta: qa:la: $_{PP2}$'awalam tu'min? qa:la: $_{PP3}$bala: walakin liyatma'inna qalbi: qa:la: ^{PP1}khuth 'arba'atan mina at-tayiri…] Al-Baqarah 2:261

[And remember when Abraham said, 'My Lord, show me how Thou givest life to the dead.' He said, 'Hast thou not believed?' He said, 'Yes, but I ask this that my heart may be at rest.' He answered, 'Take four birds..]

Quote 2B also exemplifies for inserted pairs. In the quote, the Disciples ask Jesus, the Christ if the Lord can send them a table from heaven (see PP1). The request sounds strange -if not polite at all- because the Lord definitely can. The Lord's willingness is also possible. The impolite, superficial request has led Jesus not to ask his Lord directly to send them the table. Instead, he warns them to fear the Lord (see PP3). Jesus' comment has driven his Companions to express why they desire the table of food (see PP4). To make their hearts rest, only then does the Christ ask his Lord to send them table from heaven (see PP2). Both PP3 and PP4 are inserted medially to clarify the opening which sounds weird. PP1 is finally conveyed once the trust is illustrated and sustained.

Quote[2B] ['ith qa:la al-hawa:riyyu:na $_{PP1}$ya: 'i:sa: ibna maryama hal yastati:'u Rabbuka 'an yunazzila 'alayinna ma'I'datan mina as-sam:'I❋ qa:la$_{PP2}$'ittaqu: Allaha 'in kuntum mu'mini:na❋ qa:lu: $_{PP3}$nuri:du 'an na'kula min-ha: wa-tatma'inu qu:lubuna:..❋ qa:la 'i:sa: inbnu maryama $_{PP2}$Allahuma Rabbana 'anzil 'alyina: ma:'idatan mina as-sama:'i taku:nu lana: 'i:dan…❋] Al-Ma'idah 113-115

[When the disciples said, 'O Jesus, son of Mary, is thy Lord able to send down to us a table spread with food from heaven?' he said, 'Fear Allah, if you are believers. 'They said, 'We desire that we may eat of it, and that our hearts be at rest… Said Jesus, son of Mary, 'O Allah, our Lord, send down to us a table from heaven spread with food that it may be to us a festival,..]

Quote 2C reveals when both adjacent and inserted patterns overlap. The quote presents the dispute between Moses and his brother or rather assistant Aaron. Moses angrily asks Aaron about the causes that hindered him from telling Moses that Sons of Israel got astray and whether he also shoes some disobedience (see PP1A and PP1B). In response to Moses' anger, Aaron distances himself a bit away by telling Moses not to seize him from his beard and hair of head. Indeed, Aaron is addressing Moses not as a brother but as an off-spring of his mother (see PP2A). By inserting such a semi-pair, Aaron probably tries not to lose his face. Moses is still a sibling, but he does not want Moses to catch him from his head. Then, he continues to answer Moses' questions raised initially (see PP2B).

Quote[3C] [qa:la $_{PP1A}$ya: haru:na ma: man'aka ith ra'aiytahum dallu:❋ 'al: tatabi'ni: $_{PP1B}$a-fa-asaiyta 'amri:❋$_{PP2A}$ya: 'ibna'umma la: ta'khuth bi-ra'si: wa-la: lihiyati: $_{PP2B}$'inni: khashiytu 'an taqu:la farraqqta baiyna bani: israeila..❋] Ta-Ha 20: 93-95

[Moses said, "O Aaron, what hindered thee, when thou didst see them gone astray, 'From following me? Hast thou then disobeyed my command?'He answered, "O son of my mother seize me not by my beard, nor by the hair of my head. I feared lest thou shouldst say, 'Thou hast caused a division among the children of Israel,..]

3.1.3. Solidary Routine Pairs (SRPs)

This pattern aims at showing solidarity between the speaker and the listener or listeners. Solidarity always reveals harmony. It also fixes agreement and maintains physical and emotional support among the interlocutors. In England, a passerby usually asks "Are you alright?" if he thinks that someone else is not feeling well. The question keeps solidarity as it aims to offer some aid for a pedestrian. Some Arabs also may greet each other in Arabic, though they are living in the United States. Language switching and shift is intended to show solidarity among minorities as it is geared towards showing harmony and agreement.

In quote 3A, Moses expresses solidarity with two women in a community of male shepherds. He asks them why they are not watering their flocks (see PP1). The women's answer reveals that the community of the shepherd is too violent to let a woman water the flocks first, and that their father is too old to give a hand (see PP2). Their reply encourages Moses to water the flocks for them. The women's father also suggests that Moses should work with him for eight or ten years so that he can get married from one of the girls. Moses agrees.

Quote [3A] [..qa:la $_{PP1}$ma: khatbukuma qa:lata $_{PP2}$la: nasqi: hatta: yusdira ar-ri:'a' wa-abu:na shaiykhun kabi:run] Al-Qasas 28:24

[..He said, 'What is the matter with you?' They replied, 'We cannot water our flocks until the shepherds take away their flocks, and our father is a very old man.']

Quote 3B continues to narrate what happens with Moses after serving the old man for eight or ten years. In his journey back home to Egypt, he watches a fire somewhere in Sinai. He leaves his family to check the light he sees in the distance. Here, the Almighty God asks him what hastened you away from your people (see PP1 in quote 3C). Moses replies that they are not far away following his footsteps. But he adds that he did so that his Lord might get pleased. This addition meets the general principle of politeness. It sustains the agreement maxim which highlights rushing away to meet or rather to see his God as the latter verses show (see PP2).

Quote[3C] [$_{PP1}$wa-ma: 'ajalaka 'an qawmika ya: mu:sa:❋ qa:la $_{PP2}$hum 'uwla:'i: 'la:: 'athari: wa-'ajiltu 'ilaiyka Rabbi: li-tarda:❋] Ta-Ha 20-84-85

['And what has hastened thee away from thy people, O Moses?'He said, 'They are closely following in my footsteps and I have hastened to Thee, my Lord, that Thou mightest be pleased.']

Similarly, quote 3D exemplifies for solidarity routines. Moses' Lords asks about the thing that he carries in his right hand (see PP1 in quote 3D). Moses replies that it is a rod. Up to here, the answer sounds sufficient. He, however, adds that he leans on, beats down therewith leaves for his sheep and has other purposes (see PP2). This addition violates the general principle of langauge interaction. It breaks both maxims of quantity and relevance as it looks too informative and irrelevant. It, however, sustains the truthfulness maxim as it maintains telling the truth. It also maintains the general principle of politeness which suggests that Moses should prolong the speech with his Lord.

Quote[3D] [$_{PP1}$wa-ma: tilka bi-yami:nika ya: mu:sa: qa:la $_{PP2}$hiya 'asa:ya 'atawakku'u 'alaiyha wa-ahushu bi-ha: 'ala: ghanami wa-li:ya fi:-ha: ma'a:ribu 'ukhra:] Ta-Ha 20:18-19

['And what is that in thy right hand, O Moses?' He replied, 'This is my rod, I lean on it, and beat down therewith leaves for my sheep, and I have also other uses for it.

Quote 3D also gives a good example of routine pairs. Jesus, the Christ feels that his native people do not believe him. So he looks for some solidarity, i.e. help, from some close friends (see PP1 in quote 3D). The Disciples are supposed to help as they are in full harmony with Jesus. Indeed, they are expected to be the supporters of their Lord (See PP2).

Quote[3D] [fa-lamma: 'ahassa 'i:sa: minhumu al-kufra qa:la: $_{PP1}$man 'ansariyya 'ila: Allahi Qa:la al-hawariyyu:na:$_{PP2}$nahnu ansaru Allahi…] Al-Imran 3:53

[And when Jesus perceived their disbelief, he said, 'Who will be my helpers in the cause of Allah?' The disciples answered, 'We are the helpers of Allah…]

Quote 3E clearly reveals when some pairs are inserted to achieve solidarity between the interlocutors. In the quote, the visiting angles greet Abraham (see PP1), but Abraham responds that he feels afraid

of them (see PP2). The angels ask Abraham not to feel panic, and that they are carrying him some good news of a knowledgeable son (see PP3). This pair aims at supporting Abraham who has grown old, but still does not have any sons. The quote continues with some adjacent pairs aiming to convince Abraham not to be helpless or hopeless regarding having a kid at this old age.

Quote[3E] ['ith dakhalu: 'alayyhi fa-qa:lu: $_{PP1}$salaman qa:la $_{PP2}$'inna: minkum wajilu:na❋ qa:lu: $_{PP3}$la: tawjal 'inna: nubashiruka bi-ghula:min 'ali:min❋ ga:la $_{PP4}$'abashshartumu:ni 'illa: 'an massaniya al-kibaru fa-bi-ma tubashshiru:na❋ qa:lu: $_{PP5}$bashshrnaka bi-al-haqi fa-la: takun mina al-qa:niti:na❋ qa"la $_{PP6}$wa-man yaqnat min rahmati Rabbihi illa: ad-dalu:na…] Al-Hijr 15:57

[When they entered in unto him and said, 'Peace,' he answered, 'Verily, we feel afraid of you. They said, 'Fear not, we give thee glad tidings of a son who shall be endowed with knowledge.' He said, 'Do you give me the glad tidings in spite of the fact that old age has overtaken me? Of what then do you give me the glad tidings?'They said, 'We have, indeed, given thee glad tidings in truth; be not therefore of those who despair.' He said, 'And who can despair of the mercy of his Lord save those who go astray?']

3.1.4. Converted Pairs (CPs)

In natural language, conversion takes place for a rhetoric reason. For example, someone may express his feeling by saying, "I don't like using cell-phones in public". Another may agree by remarking, "Neither do I". Language ellipsis seeks fluency. It also fears redundancy. This helps explain why linguistic recursion is always characterized by brevity. Indeed, the context in the live, i.e. the spoken, form of language helps build such a conversion to avoid tautologies, i.e. repeated words as well as to further streaming of pairs. In certain genres, such as the play or the Novel, actions and events require the characters to interact in a clear way. In some cases, they have to shadow back. They have to show to refer to some events that took place sometime earlier.

Quote 4A can be assigned as a climax. It is taken from a full Quranic chapter that narrates the story of Joseph and his brothers. In the quote, Joseph is revealing what his brothers did to him thirty years ago or so. It begins with Sons of Israel who already came in front of Joseph telling him they were rather poor as well as begging to give them a full measure of wheat (see PP1). Their speech encourages Joseph to remind them of what they did to him when he was very young. Here, they realize that they are addressing their own brother. Joseph agrees that he is their brother. They confess that Allah preferred him above them, so Joseph forgives them all. The quote tops down some pairs that shadow some events back for a dramatic reason. Pairs 2 to 4 can be bottomed up (see PP2 - PP4). Chronologically, PP2 aligns with PP1 as both take place at the same time, i.e. today.

Quote[3E][fa-lamma: dakhalu: 'alaiyhi qa:lau: $_{PP1}$ya: 'ayyuha: al-'azi:zu massana: wa-'ahlana: ad-durra wa-ji'na: bi-bida'atin muzja:tin fa-'awfi: lana: al-kayyla wa-tasadaq a'aliyna: …∗ qa:la$_{PP4}$hal a'limtum ma: fa'altum bi-yu:suf wa-'akhihi ith 'antum jahilu:na∗ qa:lu: $_{PP3}$'innaka la-'anta yu:sufu qa:la $_{PP1}$'ana: yu:sufu wa-ha:tha: akhi:…∗ qa:lu:$_{PP2}$ta-Allahi laqad a:tharaka Allahu 'aliyyna: wa-'in kunna: la-kha:ti'i:na∗ qa:la $_{PP2}$la: tathri:ba 'aliyykum al-yawma…∗] Yusuf 12:89-93

[And, when they came before him (Joseph), they said, 'O exalted one, poverty has smitten us and our family, and we have brought a paltry sum of money, so give us the full measure, and be charitable to us… He said, 'Do you know what you did to Joseph and his brother, when you were ignorant?' hey replied, 'Art thou Joseph?' He said, 'Yes, I am Joseph and this is my brother…They replied, 'By Allah! Surely has Allah preferred thee above us and we have indeed been sinners'.He said, 'No blame shall lie on you this day;..]

3.2. Assigning Reference in Conversational Patterns (ARCP)

Assigning reference in conversational patterns is important. Words out of context are rather dead. Once contextualized words, however, tend to be full of life. For example, the Arabic but feminine phrase [al-'arabiyyah] meaning (the Arabic) can be used to describe anything or anyone that has the semantic features of Arabs. It can refer to a 'woman', 'writing' or 'TV channel'. Interlocutors need to assign a reference once they use the phrase. One speaker may say "I watched the news on Al-

Arabiyyah". The listener will assume that the term must refer to a media channel. The same speaker will be misunderstood when he starts saying "Al-Arabiyyah is bias", for instance. His utterance has already failed to mean what it is intended to mean because he simply does not assign any reference for the thing he is evaluating.

References vary a lot. Generally speaking, a reference can be deictic. Deictic references are classified into personal, time and place. A reference can also spread backward or forward. Once it is referred to an NP that mentioned before, the reference is called anaphoric. However, when it refers to an NP to be mentioned later in the text, the reference is called cataphoric. Some references usually refer to certain linguistic elements. Those are referred to as endophoric pronouns. If they do not refer to certain elements, but to the whole idea, these words are best referred to as exophoric.

Quote 4A assigns some a reference in each pair. The pair looks adjacent as the second part clearly evaluates the first. In PP1 Joseph's brothers think that Benjamin might have stolen because his brother Joseph had stolen before. Here, the reference [llahu] meaning (his) is assigned to the word ['akhukhun] meaning (brother). The reference is personal deictic, and it moves anaphorically, i.e. backward. (see R1). In PP2, Joseph comments that they are the worst ever. The first plural personal deictic pronoun ['antum] meaning (you) is assigned. The pronoun spreads cataphorically to refer to what comes later (see R2).

Quote[4A] [qa:lu: $_{PP1}$'in yasriq fa-qad saraqa akhuhkun lla^{R1}hu min qablu.. qa:la $_{PP2}$ ^{R2}'antum sharrun maka:nan wa-Allahu 'alamu bi-ma: tasifu:na] Yusuf 12:78

[They said, 'If he has stolen, a brother of his had also committed theft before… He simply said, 'You seem to be in the worst condition; and Allah knows best what you allege.']

Quote 4B also exemplifies for adjacent pairs where some references are assigned to convey meaning. In PP1, Almighty God calls both the sky and the earth to come willingly or unwillingly (see PP1). In this part, the bound morpheme [-ha] meaning (it) is assigned to refer to 'the sky' (see R1). The bound morpheme [-ya] meaning (both of you) is inflected to refer to both 'the skyand the earth' (see R2). Both pronouns are deictic, personal and anaphoric. In PP2, the sky and the earth respond that they choose to come willingly. Here, the bound morpheme [-na] meaning (both of us) is inflected twice (see R3 and R4). They refer backward to the directive expressed before. As they refer to the whole idea, this recursive pronoun sounds endophoric.

Quote[4B] [thumma 'istwa: ila: as-sama:'i wa-hiya dukha:nun fa-qa:la la^{R1}ha: wa-lil-ardi $_{PP1}$'i'ti ^{R2}ya tawa'an 'aw karhana qa:lata $_{PP2}$'atay ^{R3}na: ta'i'i: ^{R4}na] As-Sajdah 41:12

[Then He turned to the heaven while it was something like smoke, and said to it and to the earth: 'Come ye both of you, willingly or unwillingly.' They said, 'We come willingly.']

3.3. Assigning Meaning in Conversational Patterns (AMCP)

To proceed, assigning reference as well as assigning meaning should be integrated in any linguistic analysis. Though assigning reference sounds locutionary, i.e. linguistic, assigning meaning looks rather illocutionary, i.e. nonlinguistic. Both processes are usually carried out by the speaker. Meaning only resides in our heads. The term 'meaning' also clashes with the term 'sense', i.e. the way we feel words. If you ask a group of international kids to draw the sun, you may have an 'orange' painting from a Chinese kid, a fairly yellow drawing from an English kid, and a dark yellow image from an Arab. This childish outlook shows that words usually connote. From a psychological perspective, words have either positive or negative connotations.

Kinds of meaning also vary. In recent denotational theories, meaning can be denotational and sense, lexical and structural, and categorematic and syncategorematic. Denotational meaning can be achieved by paraphrasing or defining. Sense is usually conveyed by ostensive, i.e. visual, definition. Lexical meaning is carried out by synonyms, antonyms, meronyms, hyponyms and polysemous expressions. Structural meaning is negotiated by composition and addition. Categorematic meaning is conveyed by providing words that carry full meaning. Syncategorematic meaning is achieved by providing words that help modify meaning.

In quote 4C (which has also been discussed in the previous section), the word [dukhanun] glossed in English as (smoke) is assigned as a predicator for the argument [hiya] meaning (it) which refers

backward to [as-sama:'i] meaning the sky. The one-place predicate [wa-hiya dukhanun] meaning (and it was like smoke) attempts to define, i.e. provide some information about, the 'sky' (see the bracketed OPP). As this meaning is achieved at the syntactic, i.e. structural level, it is best referred to as an additional meaning. This addition is pivotal to meaning as it tells a lot about the nature of the sky.

Quote[4C] [thumma 'istwa: ila: as-sama:'i (wa-hiya dukha:nun)^{OPP} fa-qa:la laha: wa-lil-ardi $_{PP1}$'i'tiya tawa'an 'aw karhana qa:lata $_{PP2}$'atayna: ta'i'i:na] As-Sajdah 41:12

[Then He turned to the heaven while it was something like smoke, and said to it and to the earth: 'Come ye both of you, willingly or unwillingly.' They said, 'We come willingly.']

Quote 4D gives a good example of structural as well as denotational meaning carried out by composition and ostensive definition. The quote models on adjacent pairs in which Moses attempts to provide a couple of answers for the Pharaoh's questions (see PP1 to PP4). In PP2, the whole bracketed relative clause is assigned to define the argument [rabbuna] meaning 'our Lord'. Though it functions as a predicate for the phrase (our Lord), the relative clause itself entails a predicate Therelative clause has two predicates and some arguments. They are drawn as follows: GIVE (He, x, proper form) & GUIDE (He, x). The phrase ['ATA:] meaning (He gave) is a three-place predicate whereas [HADA:] meaning (He guided) is a two-place predicate (see TTP and OPP in PP2). The arguments assigned for the predicates, namely (x) and proper form denote a lot about Moses' God. He is felt as a great creator. The meaning such arguments help convey is best referred to as ostensive definition.

In relevance, the dual inflected pronoun [-na:] meaning (our) is assigned to refer to both Moses and Aaron (see R1) in quote 4D). The pronoun is deictic, personal and anaphoric. The inflected pronoun [-hu] meaning (its) stands for [kulla shaiy'in] meaning (everything). The pronounalso sounds personal, and it spreads backward. The phrase [kulla shaiy'in] is a logical quantifier. It quantifies anything that does not necessarily exist. It can be a 'human', 'tree', 'cat', 'star'..etc. Simply, it can be an 'X'. Therefore, this logical pronoun is known as a universal or non-existential logical quantifier.

In quote 4D, the Pharaoh asks Moses about the former generations (see PP3). The Noble Quran uses the term [al-quru:nu] which sounds polysemous, i.e. carries different meanings. In Arabic the singular form [qarnun] means a (horn) or (one generation). The definite form [al-qarnu] means (century), and the adverbial form [muqarani:na] can be glossed as (both tied together or their legs tied to their hands which are all tied to the neck). It sounds that the whole form benefits from the various meaning values of the animal's horn. According to www.dictionary.com, a horn is 'one of the bony, permanent, hollow paired growths, often curved and pointed that project from the upper part of the head of certain mammals, as cattle, sheep, goats, or antelopes'. In the quote, the word [al-quru:na 'al'u:la] meaning (the former generations) has the connotation of positive growth, but of negative hollow curvedness.

Moses replies the knowledge of the former generations is with his Lord. He adds that the knowledge is recorded in a Book. He also concludes that his Lord neither errs nor forgets (see PP4). The inflected pronoun [-ha] is assigned to refer to the (former generations).The bound morpheme [-i:] is assigned only for (Moses). Both pronouns are personal, and they behave anaphorically (see R3 and R4). Up to this point, Moses' answer does not look sufficient from a pragmatic perspective. Interlocutors should provide enough information. Otherwise, they violate the quantity maxim. This helps explain why Moses adds the prepositional phrase (Prep-P) 'in a Book' to quantify as well as qualify the 'Lord's knowledge' (see the bracketed Prep-P). The concluding sentence (CS) also aims to qualify Moses' Lord who never gets astray or forgets (see the bracketed CS). The phrase as well as the clause is assigned as meanings in PP4.

Quote[4D] [qa:la $_{PP1}$fa-man Rabbukuma ya: mu:sa❋ qa:la $_{PP2}$[Rubbu^{R1}na 'alathi: ^{TPP}'ata: kulla shaiy'in khalqa ^{R2}hu thumma:^{OPP}hada]:❋ qa:la $_{PP3}$fa-ma: ba:lu al-qu:ru:ni 'al'u:la:❋ qa:la $_{PP4}$'ilmu-^{R3}ha: 'inda Rabb-^{R4}i: [fi: kita:bin]$^{Prep-P}$ [la: yadillu Rabbi: wa-la: yansa:]^{CS}❋] Ta-Ha 50-53

[Pharaoh said, 'Who then is the Lord of you two, O Moses?'He said, 'Our Lord is He Who gave unto everything its proper form and then guided it to its proper function.' Pharaoh said, 'What then will be the fate of the former generations?'He said, 'The knowledge thereof is with my Lord recorded in a Book. My Lord neither errs nor forgets.'

3.4. Interpreting Illocutionary-force in Conversational Patterns (ILFCP)

Our linguistic competence enables us to interpret the illocutionary force of the utterances we hear. People can usually map some mental assumptions about the questions raised to them. Subconsciously, we ask ourselves about the purpose of the other interlocutors. We may conclude that they want us to socialize with them or to provide them with some knowledge. They may also need us to direct or to invite them. We may also conclude that they criticize us. The function of their speeches depends mainly on the senses of the words they use, the phonotactics they pick and the body language they employ. Our replies rely so heavily on the illocutionary force we interpreted.

Quote 4E directs Prophet Muhammad to ask polytheists to whom belongs the earth and whomsoever therein. (see PP1). Their answer entails that it belongs to Allah (see PP2). This natural as the polytheists interpret the question as an informative one. It only requires them to provide some information. As the question starts with [lli-man] meaning to (To whom), they assign the possessive preposition [li-] meaning (belonging to) as a reference to [man] meaning (who) which stands for Allah. The preposition is a categorematic expression (CE) that shows the properties, i.e. what belongs to someone (see CE in PP2). Their reply sustains the general principles of interaction and politeness. It also maintains maxims of quantity, quality, relevance and manner. So Almighty God redirects Muhammad to ask them keep in mind that they already agree upon God's ownership of the universe (see PP3).

Quote[4E] [qul $_{PP1}$lli-man al-'ardu wa-man fi:ha: 'in kuntum ta'lamu:na❋ sa-yaqu:lu:na $_{PP2}^{CE}$li-Allahi qul $_{PP3}$'afa-la: tathakkaru:na❋] Al-Mu'minun 23: 85-86

[Say, ‘To whom belongs the earth and whosoever is therein, if you know?’‘To Allah’, they will say. Say, ‘Will you not then be admonished?’]

Quote 4F also directs Prophet Muhammad to ask his native people who are still polytheists about Lordship. The first pair part clearly uses the question word [man] meaning (who) which entails providing a proper name (see PP1). For a polytheist, the question itself sounds critical as it gives a severe critique on polytheism. It also attempts to provide an answer that may totally contradict what a polytheist believes in. Therefore, those people will deliberately answer as [li-Allahi] meaning (God's). They assign the genitive morpheme as a reference to (man) mean (who). This reference is best referred to as a syncategorematic word (SE) that carries the sense of ownership (see the bracketed SE in PP2). It modifies the meaning from Lordship to ownership.

Quote[4F][qul $_{PP1}$man Rabbu as-sama:wa:ti as-sabi'i wa-Rabbu al-'arshi al-'athi:mi❋$_{PP2}$sa-yaqu:lu:na [li-Allahi]^{SE} qul $_{PP3}$'af-la: tataqu:na❋] Al-Mu'minun 23:87-88

[Say, ‘Who is the Lord of the seven heavens, and the Lord of the Great Throne?’They will say, ‘They are Allah’s.’ Say, ‘Will you not then take Him as your protector?]

Central to Islam is Lordship. A good monotheist, i.e. Muslim,has to believe that Allah is the only God in as well as of the universe. If so, then both Lordship, as in [Rabbu as-sama:wati] meaning (the Lord of the heavens) and ownership, as in (maliki yawmi ad-di:ni] meaning (the Owner of the Day of Doom) are inclusive. In turn, polytheism keeps both lordship and ownership but for many gods. For an Arab polytheist, ownership is much easier to deal with because they were used to sending their gifts to the owners of their own Temple. Prophet Muhammad actually paid a great effort as well as spent a great deal of his time to foster the concept of Lordship. His own people's notion of, i.e. way of understanding, God's lordship is completely different. This interpretation may help understand the devious answer they provided.

From a pragmalinguistic perspective, PP2 is both crafty and insincere (see quote 4F). It is scheming as it sustains to some extent the general principles of politeness and interaction. Maxims of agreement and modesty are barely met. That is to say, those interlocutors moderately fix the idea of Ownership but they notionally refute the idea of Lordship. Doing so, they look as if they agree and disagree with Muhammad (see also PP2 in quote 4E). Credibility also stems from sincerity, reliability, and truthfulness. Though they interact to some degree, those interlocutors violate the quantity maxim. Furthering 'God's' instead of 'God', they tend to provide more information than the answer requires. Shifting from God's leadership to God's ownership, they also break both maxims of relevance and style. The former stresses aptness of the answer to the question. The latter emphasizes directness of

speech. However, the interlocutors' potential answer partially sustains the truthfulness maxim which fixes God. Therefore, Muhammad inclines to ask them to fear Him as a Protector (see PP3 in quote 4F).

3.5. Interpreting the Implicated Meaning in Conversational Patterns (IIMCP)

When they say words, people often explicate meanings. Someone may point at another and says "This is my younger brother, John", and "This is my close friend, Jean". This person is simply introducing his friend to his brother. The selection of the terms 'younger brother' and 'close friend' clearly implicates that this person respects or like both of them. Let us assume that the same person picks the terms "my dad's offspring" instead of "my brother" and "a friend of mine" instead of "my close friend". The selection of these words would raise a question whether such a person likes at all both. He probably does so to balance telling the truth which clearly states that he respects both of them as a brother and a close friend, though he does not like them. So it is probably safer to say that words often explicate, but sometimes implicate meanings. In a perlocutionary process, hearers usually interpret the implicated meanings.

Quote 4G exemplifies for an adjacent pair where both reference and meaning are assigned. In PP1, the deictic personal pronoun [-i:] meaning (my) is assigned to refer to Almighty God. Meaning is also assigned in the word [shuraka'] meaning (partners). A partner is a person 'associated with another or others as a principal or a contributor of capital in a joint venture, usually sharing its risks and profits' (www.dictionary.com). Allah is asking people to show Him the gods they claim that they are partners to God. The question itself sounds very captious or very reprimanding. Interpreting the illocutionary force of such a heavy demanding questions, people would start their sincere apologies. In PP2, they beg Him their big pardon (BP) for taking other people as partners of God (see the bracketed BP). The BP has the connotations of negative feeling of remorse. PP2 begins with a word of regret to express, though it ends with a confession to give. Interpreting the implicated meaning depicted in the word 'partner',which necessarily implicates competitive equalitarianism (ICE), people declare that no one can bear witness (BW) among them (see the bracketed ICE and BE in quote 4G). .

Quote[4G] [..wa-yawma yuna:di:him $_{PP1}$'ayna [shuraka:'i:]^{ICE} qa:lu: $_{PP2}$['a:thanna:ka]^{BP} ma: minna: min [shahi:din]^{BW}] As-Sajdah 41: 48

> [..And on the day when He will call unto them, saying, “Where are My ‘Partners’?” they will say, ‘We declare unto Thee, not one of us is a witness thereto‘.]

Quote 4H narrates the story of two disputants who transgressed one another. They entered in upon King David who was afraid of them. They asked him not to get scared and to judge fairly between them. In PP1, the demonstrative pronoun [ha:tha:] meaning (this) is assigned as a reference. The demonstrative pronoun (DP) refers to ['akhun] meaning (brother). This reference sounds endophoric and cataphoric (see DP) as it refers to a linguistic element placed latter (see DP). The first pronouns [-y] meaning (my) as well as [-ya] meaning (I) is deictic personal. These first pronouns (FPs) refer to one of the disputants, namely the speaker (see both FPs). The pronoun [-hu] meaning (he) is also deictic and personal. This third pronoun (TP) refers to the other disputant (see TP). The first personal pronoun [-ni:] is inflected for the accusative case. This first but accusative pronoun (FAP) is assigned to refer to the other disputant brother. The personal pronoun [-ha:] meaning (it) is also inflected for the accusative case See FAP1 and FAP3). The third FAP behaves anaphoric ally as it refers to the only 'ewe' the speaker owns (see FAP2).

The pronouns assigned in PP1 also attempts to assign meaning. For example the pronoun [-i:] shows that the other disputant is (my) brother. This pronoun clearly shows that the disputant is still aligning himself with his brother. The pronoun [-hu] reveals that the ninety-nine ewes belong to the other brother. The other pronouns, namely [-ni:] and [-ha:] also assign meaning to the whole dispute. They clearly show that the other brother who owns ninety-nine ewes wants his brother who only owns one ewe to give to him.

Quote[4H] ['inna ^{DP}ha:tha: $_{Pred.1}$'akh-^{FP}i: la-^{TP}hu tis'un wa-tis'una na'jatan wa-li^{FP}ya na'jatun wahidatun fa-qa:la $_{LS}$[$_{Pred.2}$'akfil-^{FAP1}ni:- ^{FAP2}ha:] wa-'azza-^{FAP3}ni: fi: al-khita:bi❋ ga:la la-qad thalamaka bi-su'ali na'jatika 'la: ni'ajihi..❋] Sad 28:23-25

> [$_{PP1}$"This is my brother; he has ninety-nine ewes, and I have one ewe. Yet he says, 'Give it to me,' and has been overbearing to me in his address."David said, $_{PP2}$"Surely, he has wronged thee in demanding thy ewe in addition to his own ewes…]

Quote 4H exemplifies for longer structures in Arabic. A longer structure (LS) incorporates the predicate and its arguments on both the structural and phonemic level (see the bracketed LS). In the directive butloner structure, the predicate 'AKFALA roughly glossed as (GIVE) argues for the unstated pronoun ['anta] meaning 'you', [-ni:] meaning [me] and [-ha:] meaning (it). A predicate is what is said about the subject. The predicate is a three-place one. This is natural as the Semitic ['a] is a tense-transitive marker. It shifts the intransitive verb phrase (VP) into a transitive VP. The predicate KAFALA sounds a technical term used officially in business. It differs from its counterpart ['ata] meaning (he gave). Therefore, it is probably much better interpreted as 'entrust' in modern English.

In quote 4H, the predicate ['akhi:] meaning (my brother) maintains the illocutionary force of potential good brotherhood. That is to say, the poor disputant seems to like the other one as a brother (see Pred. 1). The predicate in the longer structure, however, sustains the illocutionary force of overwhelming greed. It may also connote the negative inessential selfishness. The technical predicate KAFALA meaning (entrust) may also stand for 'making trust' or 'putting trust in someone. It is a misleading term as it entails either making or not making trust with, i.e. entrusting or untrusting, someone. It may also mean either putting or not putting trust in, i.e. entrusting or distrusting, someone. If the interpretation were true, then the predicate would maintain the connotations of insufficient or bad trust. The meanings implicated in both predicates is very similar to that depicted in the English common saying "Love is blind; greed insatiable". The disputant brother might implicate that he likes the other one as a brother, but does not respect or trust him as a businessman as he sounds demanding and greedy.

In quote 4H, the second pair includes David's judgment. He has actually wronged the rich brother in demanding the other brother's ewe in addition to his own ewes (see PP2 in quote 4H). From a a forensic linguistic perspective, legal cases should manipulated conceptually and notionally. As the concept is a full understanding, it may require arbitrators to grasp the meanings explicated, i.e. said directly, in the words they hear. They should also develop a way of understanding the meaning implicated, i.e. said indirectly, in the words used. It is probable that David had already grasped the connotations of negative avarice, i.e. longing for more, so he wronged the other brother for just asking his brother to have the only ovine property. The quest itself raises a big question about his notion of brotherhood. It sounds that this brother understands brotherhood in a different way.

4. Conclusions And Implications

To conclude as well to imply for pedagogy and research, conversational patterns in Standard Arabic can be classified into four main types: Adjacent, inserted, solidary and converted. Adjacent pairs are rather frequent in The Noble Quran. These patterns advance at least two pairs. In each pair, two parts are related. The function of each pair is registered mainly for greeting, socializing, expressing feelings, providing knowledge, directing or even criticizing other's behaviours. Arab teachers should draw their learners to such conversational patterns as they are very frequent in natural language and standardized one. Beneath any conversation, there is a full organization that clearly shows how ideas stream.

Inserted conversational patterns take place within adjacent pairs. In this type, people insert a pair when they feel threatened by the question being asked. So they tend to check the function of the question before providing any answers. Functions of speech vary a lot. They can be informative, directive, expressive, affective or per formative. The functions of speech may also overlap. For a native speaker of English, the clause "It is too hot here" sounds directive. It leads him to 'open the window' or turn off the central heating. For an Arab, it sounds more expressive. From a pragmatic perspective, people may lose their face when they interact. They mandate that the other interlocutor not go beyond. Arab researchers should conduct some studies that investigate speech functions in Standard Arabic.

Solidarity-routine conversational patterns are also very likely in Standard Arabic. Fairly frequently, the function of these pairs looks affective, i.e. social. From a socio-pragmatic view, native people may stop to check whether another person is 'alright' or not, for instance. Their act aims at offering some help. Doing so, they socialize and harmonize. In more polyglossic communities where minorities have

to use the language of the majority, people also switch to their own native language to socialize and symphonize. Language switching helps someone to align himself with another. There is also some evidence from The Noble Quran for a switching from adjacency to solidarity pairs. Arab research may investigate the formulas, i.e. the ready expressions, Arab people use to show solidarity when they interact. Less frequently, converted conversational patterns are used through-out the Holy Script of Islam for a rhetoric purpose. They are exceptionally used to advance some events in melodramas and novels.

Assigning reference in Arabic conversational patterns is likely. References can be deictic personal, time and place, cataphoric or anaphoric, and exophoric or endophoric. Surprisingly, the Arabic structure can sometimes incorporate the VP as well as its arguments into one longer structure in a way similar to the language used by the Inuit, i.e. Eskimos. Arab linguists should go beyond the traditional studies that classify the references into personal noun phrase (NP), such as first, second or third, relative NPs and demonstrative NPs. Indeed, references can do much more than than the functions labeled to them. For example, the Arabic demonstrative NPs [ha:tha:] meaning 'this' and [tha:lika] meaning 'that' can go beyond demonstrating the near or distant proximity. They advance to express what belongs to the speaker or the others. They can refer to certain elements in a backward or a forward way. Sometimes they spread out of the text to refer the idea expressed. Arab linguists should isolate the demonstrative template morph [tha-], for example, so that they can quantify its frequencies as well as to qualify its functions in the words used for demonstration. Investigations may reveal some other possible allomorphs such as [ha-] and [ta] as in [ha'umu] and [ta-Allahi], for instance.

Assigning sense in conversational patterns is also very probable. In Arabic, meaning is loaded at the consonantal tier. It can be altered for an inflectional, i.e grammatical, or derivational purpose at both the melodic, i.e. vowelized and morphological levels. Once contextualized, words denote clear meanings. If not, then they have to be paraphrased or defined. If it is too abstract, then it can be perceived by our senses. On the structural level, meaning can universally be satisfied by addition and composition. More locally, it has been observed that meaning is also conveyed by [bal] roughly glossed as 'but' or 'rather' in modern English. If so, then meaning can be negotiated by correction at the syntactic level. On the phrasal level, meaning can also be fulfilled by categorematic and syncategorematic expressions which either carry full meaning or help modify meaning, respectively. Arabic language textbook publishers and educational policy-makers should include these types of meanings in the schooling syllabi.

Lexically, meaning can also be achieved by providing a synonym, antonym, meronym, i.e. part of whole, or hyponym, i.e. one kind. Meaning can also be satisfied by polysemy and family-resemblance expressions. Polysemous words, i.e. words that related in forms but carry different meanings, tend to make use of the meaning values of one template form. For example, the words [ba:tini] meaning 'abdominal', [Al-batin] glossed as 'Almighty God, the closest to hearts', [bitanatun] meaning 'the closest people to someone' and the vernacular [bata:niya] glossed as 'bed cover' carry different meanings. They all benefit from the different meaning values of template form [batnun] meaning the 'abdomen cavity'. Family-resemblance words may include certain words for 'Muslim', 'Christian' and 'Jew'. From a sociological point of view, the family can be functional or dysfunctional. From a pragmalinguistic as well as a sociopragmatic perspective, members coming from functional or dysfunctional families should behave differently in life and on the structural level. Arab researchers may examine how The Noble Quran treats such members on the structural level. They should also investigate how polysemy makes use of the various meaning values depicted in one basic form.

Interpreting the illocutionary force is also likely. It refers to the unstated linguistic competence that enables the hearer to build some assumptions about the real ultimate goal loaded in the question raised to them. Is the question geared to criticism, information, or just socialization? Grasping a full understand of the purpose would enable the hearer respond accordingly. The Noble Quran exemplifies for some conversational patterns where the interlocutors abstain to show a good awareness of the purpose of the question raised to them. It also gives some clear examples of some interlocutors who

manipulated the illocutionary force skillfully. In response to somebody asking his own brother to entrust him his only goat, the other brother implies that he likes him as a brother, but he will definitely mistrust or distrust him as a partner. Arab teachers should draw their learners' attention that words do not only denote but also connote. Most words show either positive or negative connotations.

Finally, interpreting the implicated meaning is also necessarily possible. When people interact, they usually explicate meaning. Sometimes people implicate, i.e. say indirectly, the meaning. For example, one guest remarked at dinner, "I'm starving to death! Will it take them long to get the stakes?" Smiling, the other guest replied, "That horrible terrier looks happy". The second guest definitely meant to say, "Yes, it will take them long as the pet dog has already eaten the stakes". Though it sounds irrelevant, the guest's reply had successfully addressed the question, so it provided enough information. As it maintained maxim of quality, the reply told the truth. However, it violated saying the truth directly. The latter guest's style was strange. He did so for some polite reasons. He probably meant to keep the host's positive face, the other guest's as well as his own. To interpret the implicated meaning, mainly hearers have to be either holistic or heuristic. The holistic way helps them develop a full understanding whereas a heuristic way teaches them to develop a way of understanding meaning. Arabic language learners should negotiate meaning notionally and conceptually.

REFERENCES

[1] *The Noble Quran*. Available at: www.alislam.org [Accessed in January 2016].

[2] At-Tabari, M. (2012). *Tafsir At-Tabari* (Vol. 2).Dar-ul-Kutb: Beirut. Available at: www.tafsir.com [Accessed in January 2016].

[3] Al-Alusi, Sh. (1997). Ruhul Ma'any fi Tafisiri Al-Qur'an Al-'athim wa-al Sabi' Al-Mathani'. Dar-ul-Kutb: Beirut. Available at: www.tafsir.com [Accessed in January 2016].

[4] Azar, Betty Schrampfer. (1999).*Understanding and Using English Grammar*(3rded.). Longman:London.

[5] Baker, C. L. (2004) *English Syntax*. London: The MIT Press.

[6] Dudley-Evans, T. & ST John, M.J. (1998) Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach. Cambridge: CUP.

[7] English Dictionary. Available at: www.dictionary.com [Accessed in January 2016].

[8] Hurford, J., Heasley, B. & Smith, M. (2007). *Semantics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: CUP.

[9] Holmes, J (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.

[10] Kail, R. & Cavanaugh J. (2010). *Human Development: A Lifespan View* (5th ed.). Cengage Learning.

[11] Katamba, F. (2006). *Morphology* (2nd ed.). Palgrave: Macmillan.

[12] Kearns, K. (2000). *Semantics* (1st ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.

[13] Matsumoto, D. & et al (2011). *Evaluating Truthfulness and Detecting Deception*. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin 80 (6): 1–8.

[14] Norbert Schmitt (editor: 2010). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (2nd ed.). London: Hodder Education.

[15] Onedera J. (2006). *Functional Family Therapy: An Interview with Dr. James Alexander*, The Family Journal, 14, 3, 306-311

[16] O'Moore, M., & Kirkham, C. (2001). *Self-esteem and its Relationship to Bullying Behaviour*. Aggressive Behaviour, 27, 269–283

[17] Palmer, F. (2013). *Semantics* (*2nd ed.). Cambridge: CUP.*

[18] Sexton, T. & Datchi, C. (2014). *The Development and Evolution of Family Therapy Research: Its Impact on Practice, Current Status, and Future Directions*, x, 1-19.ß

[19] Silwadi, H., An-Noori, M., Musalam, O. et al. (2012) Al-Mual'ah wa-An-Nusus: Grade 9 Part 1, (Edited copy). Ramallah: Palestine.

[20] Webster's-learners Dictionary. Available at: www.merriam-webester.com [Accessed in January 2016].

AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY

Dr. Sami Al-Heeh, obtained his Master's degree in TESOL from University of Brighton, UK in 2007, and his PhD degree in Applied Linguistics from Mansoura University, Egypt in 2020. He works as full-time, lecturer and assistant professor at the Department of Applied English, Faculty of Arts at Palestine Ahliya University (PAU). Dr. Sami has been teaching as well as researching linguistics, semantics, morphology,

applied linguistics, pragmatics, stylistics, discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics since 2008.

Citation: *Sami Al-Heeh. "An Investigation into the Pragmatic Processes Conveyed in Arabic: A case study of the reported Qur'anic conversational patterns" International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), vol 9, no. 8, 2021, pp. 14-28. doi: https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0908003.*