

**The Cognitive Semantics of Prepositions in The Holy  
Qur'an and Their Implicatures**

Assist Prof. Ali Salman Hummadi

Department of English, College of Arts, University of  
Anbar, Iraq.

[alialanish1977@gmail.com](mailto:alialanish1977@gmail.com)

**Abstract**

First, this paper investigates the crucial role of metaphor and metonymy in the polysemy of the Arabic prepositions in The Holy Qur'an. Metaphor and metonymy, as cognitive mechanisms motivating polysemy, are powerful tools triggering meaning extension of the preposition in the Qur'anic Verse from its central meaning to its new extended meaning. Second, the study explores the contribution of these two cognitive tools in deriving the explicature of the extended meaning of the preposition through applying processes of pragmatic enrichment which, in turn, play a major role in the recovery of the explicated meanings and assumptions of the Qur'anic Verse as a whole. The study focuses on the issue that the extended meaning of the preposition accounts for the explicated content of the Qur'anic Verse from which an independent assumption, implicature, is inferred in terms of the central meaning of the preposition used.

**Keywords:** polysemy, metaphor and metonymy, explicature, implicature, pragmatic enrichment.

## المستخلص

تبحث هذه الدراسة الدور الاساسي للاستعارة والكناية في تعدد معاني حروف الجر العربية في القران الكريم, حيث تعد الاستعارة والكناية من الاليات المعرفية والادوات المؤثرة في توسع معنى حرف الجر في الايات القرانية من المعنى الاساسي لحرف الجر الى المعنى الجديد. كما وتبحث هذه الدراسة دور هذه الادوات المعرفية في الوصول الى المعنى الجلي لمعنى حرف الجر الجديد من خلال تطبيق عمليات التطوير والاشباع البراغماتي والتي بدورها تلعب دورا رئيسيا في استعادة المعنى الظاهر للاية القرانية ككل.

الكلمات الرئيسية: تجانس المعاني, الاستعارة, الكناية, المعنى الجلي, المعنى الضمني, الاشباع البراغماتي.

## 1. Introduction

Generally, a preposition indicates a connection between two entities, one of them is covered by the complement of the preposition (Quirk et al, 1989:143). In Arabic, Ibn Jini points out that a preposition is defined as an entity referring to meaning obtained in relation to the context that precedes and follows it (Cited in Al-Attiya, 2008: 242). Similarly, Hassan (Cited in Abdel Nasser, 2013:67) argues, however, that "a preposition is semantically empty as long as it appears alone but when it comes in a sentence, it denotes a meaning in its neighboring element". This idea of preposition in Arabic is completely identical with that of English. From the semantic viewpoint, English preposition doesn't have sufficient lexical content where its lexical

content is referred to "through various significances", determined by its existence in different co-texts and contexts, "mainly by the terms of syntagm to which" it belongs (Marin, n.d: 1). Prepositions in English are semantically connected to the lexical content of the words preceding and following them on the one hand, and with syntactic functions they perform in the sentence from the other hand. Zughoul defines prepositions as function words used to join words, phrases, or clauses to other words in the sentence, and prepositions are used to indicate ideas of "location, destination, direction of motion, time, manner, and so on"(Cited in Hamadallah and Tushyehh, n.d.:183).

Ibn Ilsiraj (1985: 408) says that Arabic prepositions have fundamental functions in the structure of the Arabic language. Basically, prepositions are important to build the semantic structure of the sentence in Arabic where prepositions link the words of the sentence to each other to show their meanings. Prepositions are a means to link the meanings of the verbs that precede them and the nouns (objects) that follow them. In other meaning, preposition in Arabic works as a bridge by which the verb passes to its object especially when verbs are intransitive. In this way, as it is argued by Abed Nasser (2003:68) that "the genitive noun that follows the preposition is construed as an object of the verb literally, virtually but not actually". And this is one of the ways in which the intransitive verb becomes transitive and the mono-transitive becomes ditransitive". So, like English, Arabic verbs are of two types: transitive and intransitive. A Transitive verb is one that requires to be followed by a noun which is object, while an intransitive

verb is one that doesn't require to be followed by an object. Transitivity, in the Arabic language, means that some verbs are linked to their objects through prepositions, even if these verbs are intransitive. The preposition, in Arabic, is the means by which the verb passes to its object.

The meaning of Arabic prepositions in many Qur'anic Verses is considered a complex issue due to their characteristic of being polysemic in nature. Meaning of prepositions in Qur'anic Verses is extended via several cognitive procedures to exhibit, besides the central meaning, another distinct but related meaning. Thus, semantic or meaning extension of the preposition in Qur'anic Verses is based on mechanisms that motivate this type of polysemy.

Metaphor and metonymy, in cognitive semantics, are considered ways of reasoning and making inferences (Ibáñez, 1999: 2). They are used as cognitive procedures for explicature production. In this paper, metaphor and metonymy are applied to the explicature of the extended use of the preposition in Qur'anic Verse.

In response to the research problem addressed, this study is oriented by the following research questions:

1. What mechanisms are there that motivate meaning extension (polysemy) of prepositions in The Qur'anic Verses?
2. What type of connection is there between the central meaning of a preposition and its new extended meaning?

3. How do metaphor and metonymy as cognitive mechanisms account for cases of explicated meaning of the utterance (explicature)?
4. How do the notion of pragmatic enrichment and other processes of propositional development recognized in the relevance theory play a role in recovering and emphasizing the explicated meaning of the extended meaning of the preposition obtained through the metaphoric and metonymic use of prepositions in The Holy Qur'an?

### **1.1. Aims of the Study**

This study aims at:

1. Investigating the role of metaphor and metonymy in motivating meaning extension (polysemy) of the preposition used from the central meaning to the extended one.
2. Exploring the type of connection between the central meaning of the preposition used and its new extended meaning.
3. Investigating the role of metaphor and metonymy in accounting to the explicated meaning of the preposition in The Qur'anic Verses.
4. Indicating the role of the central meaning of the preposition used in accounting to, in addition to the explicated meaning, implicated meaning of the utterance (implicature).

5. Investigating the role of the pragmatic processes of free enrichment in deriving the explicitly stated content of The Qur'anic Verse as a whole.

## **Literature Review**

### **2. Meanings of Prepositions in Arabic**

Basically, each preposition in Arabic has a central meaning attached to it, and other secondary meanings, when used in special co-texts and contexts, delivering different aspects of meaning. In this section, the central meanings of some prepositions in Arabic will be surveyed. These prepositions are mostly used in The Qur'anic citations and Verses of the data of analysis.

1. The Arabic preposition (على – on, over, above):

Al-Samra'ai (2003: 41) agree that the central meaning of (على – on, over, above) in Arabic is that of (الاستعلاء – elevation) as in the following Qur'anic citation

لِتَسْتَوُوا عَلَى ظُهُورِهِ (الشورى: 12)

In order that ye may sit firm and square on their backs

Under 'elevation', there are two subcategories. Real elevation as in the Qur'anic Verse

وَعَلَيْهَا وَعَلَى الْفُلْكِ تُحْمَلُونَ (المؤمنون: 21)

And on them, as well as in ships, ye ride.

and the figurative elevation as in

لِلرِّجَالِ عَلَيْهِنَّ دَرَجَةٌ (البقرة 227)

men have a degree (of advantage) over them

2. The Arabic preposition (عن – out of, away from):

Al-Samra'ai (2003: 46) regards the central meaning of the Arabic preposition (عن – out of, away from) as that of "passing away from" and "being out of" as in the following Qur'anic Verse

وَيَضَعُ عَنْهُمْ إِصْرَهُمْ وَالْأَغْلَالَ الَّتِي كَانَتْ عَلَيْهِمُ (الاعراف 156)

He releases them from their heavy burdens and from the yokes that are upon them

where it means that the heavy burdens and yokes become away from them and they didn't and never carry them. In this example, the preposition (عن – "from" as it is in the translated version of the Verse) stands for the meaning of "passing away from" or "being out of".

3. The Arabic preposition (من – from, of):

Al-Mubrad (n.d.: 45) states that the central meaning of the preposition (من – from) in Arabic is the starting point of the end as in the following Verse

سُبْحَانَ الَّذِي أَسْرَى بِعَبْدِهِ لَيْلًا مِنَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ (الاسراء: 1)

Glory to (Allah) Who did take His servant for a Journey by  
night from the Sacred Mosque

where the journey started from the Sacred Mosque.  
Another central meaning of the Arabic preposition (من –  
from) is to show 'partition' as in

لَنْ تَنَالُوا الْبِرَّ حَتَّى تُنْفِقُوا مِمَّا تُحِبُّونَ وَمَا تُنْفِقُوا مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ بِهِ عَلِيمٌ (آل

عمران)

By no means shall ye attain righteousness unless ye give  
(freely) of that which ye love; and whatever ye give, of a  
truth Allah knoweth it well.

4. The Arabic preposition (إلى – to, into):

Sebaway (Cited in Al-Attiya, 2008: 235) says that the  
central meaning of the preposition (إلى – to, into) in Arabic  
is to declare 'the terminating point of the spatial end' as in  
the example below

سُبْحَانَ الَّذِي أَسْرَى بِعَبْدِهِ لَيْلًا مِنَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ إِلَى الْمَسْجِدِ الْأَقْصَى

(الاسراء: 1)

Glory to (Allah) Who did take His servant for a Journey by  
night from the Sacred Mosque to the farthest Mosque

and also to indicate 'the terminating point of the temporal  
end' as in the example below

اتِمُّوا الصِّيَامَ إِلَى اللَّيْلِ (البقرة: 187)



then complete your fast Till the night appears

5. The Arabic preposition (في – in, within):

Al-Maliqi (Cited in Al-Attiya, 2008:238) explains that the central meaning of the Arabic preposition (في – in, within) is as an adverb of place and time as in the following citations

عُلِبَتِ الرُّومُ فِي أَدْنَى الْأَرْضِ وَهُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ غَلَبِهِمْ سَيَغْلِبُونَ (العنكبوت: 2-3)

The Roman Empire has been defeated- In a land close by; but they, (even) after (this) defeat of theirs, will soon be victorious-

فِي بَضْعِ سِنِينَ لِلَّهِ الْأَمْرُ مِنْ قَبْلُ وَمِنْ بَعْدُ وَيَوْمَئِذٍ يَفْرَحُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ (الروم: 3)

Within a few years. With Allah is the Decision, in the past and in the Future: on that Day shall the Believers rejoice-

6. The Arabic preposition (بِالْبَاءِ – by, with, at):

Al-Samra'ai (Cited in Hussein, 2013: 204) states that the central meaning of the preposition (بِالْبَاءِ – by, with) in Arabic is that of 'attachment' or 'affix' as in the following Qur'anic Verse.

وَأَمْسَحُوا بِرُءُوسِكُمْ وَأَرْجُلَكُمْ إِلَى الْكَعْبَيْنِ (المائدة: 6)

Rub your heads (with water); and (wash) your feet to the ankles

### **3. Aspects of Utterance Meaning**

Grice has done a lot of work for his theory of conversational implicature essentially to distinguish between what is said and what is implicated. Actually, according to Grice, implicatures are either to be conventional (i.e. implicated in terms of word or sentence meaning) or non-conventional (i.e. a meaning beyond the normal one that the words convey). The distinction between the explicit content and the implicit content of an utterance is widely accepted. Actually, there is much controversy about the nature of the distinction between the levels of meaning embodied in utterance interpretation, that is, the distinction between the two notions of explicature and implicature (Cited in Carston, 2008: 35-36). For the purpose of approaching this important issue, consider the following conversation as an example (Carston, *ibid*).

**1.**

**Max: How was the party? Did it go well?**

**Amy: There wasn't enough drink and everyone left early.**

Focusing on Amy's utterance as a response to Max's question, it is clear that she delivers the communicative message that the party was not successful. Actually, what she communicated is not explicitly stated; rather, it is an indirect answer to the question – a conversational implicature, "as such implicitly communicated propositions are known". The listener depends on inference to derive this implicated meaning from the proposition which is

directly, explicitly stated and communicated by Amy along with his ready available beliefs regarding what makes parties successful versus unsuccessful. "The question now is: what is the explicit content of Amy's utterance?" One answer is "the linguistically encoded meaning of the sentence" that she said, which is a mixture of the two parts of the sentence presented: (a) "there wasn't enough drink", and (b) "everyone left early". These two simple sentence parts represent meaning free of context. Basically, this meaning is explicitly communicated as any meaning can be. Contextually and according to the conversational exchange above, it is obvious that Amy intends to explicitly communicate that "everyone who came to the particular party that Max asked her about left that party early". Thus, although the linguistic words and expressions that are actually uttered and employed by Amy convey a meaning and the meaning is the most explicit meaning that she stated or asserted by her utterance, it sounds to be clearly far from "the proposition Max is likely to take her to have directly communicated" (to have said, stated, or asserted). That meaning seems to be more like the content in (2) (the italicized elements in bold line "go beyond the encoded meaning of the linguistic expressions uttered") (Carston, 2008: 35-36).

**2.**

**There wasn't enough alcoholic drink to satisfy the people at [the party] and so everyone who came to [the party] left [it] early.**

What is noticeable in the example above is that the decoded linguistic form of Amy's utterance has been considered as "a template for the development of a propositional form" of (2), (Carston, 2004:5) while (2) has the crucial role in running the reasoning process which leads to the implicated meaning/communication that "the party didn't go well".

What is concluded from the above example is that there are "two candidates for the explicit content of Amy's utterance: (a) the encoded linguistic meaning, which is fully explicit but which doesn't seem (on its own) to constitute a communicated proposition (part of the speaker's meaning), and (b) the richer content given in (2), which is communicated, part of the speaker intended meaning", (Carston, 2008:36), and the independent implicature developed and inferred from the propositional form (the richer version = explicature) of (2).

#### **4. The Relevance Theoretic Approach to Explicature/Implicature**

A well-based pragmatic consideration of utterance interpretation which adopts the contextualist-pragmatist view on the explicit/implicit distinction is the one argued and developed within the cognitive framework of Relevance Theory (Wilson & Sperber, 2002, 2004). Carston (2004: 4) surveys Sperber & Wilson's definitions of 'explicature' and 'implicature' as follows:

- "An assumption communicated by an utterance U is explicit [hence an 'explicature'] if and only if it is a development of a logical form encoded by U".

*[Note: "in cases of ambiguity, a surface form encodes more than one logical form, hence the use of the indefinite here", 'a logical form encoded by U'.]*

- "An assumption communicated by U which is not explicit is implicit" [hence an 'implicature'].

Let's consider a simple example:

**3.**

**X: How is Mary feeling after her first year at university?**

**Y: She didn't get enough units and can't continue.**

In this particular example and context, X takes Y to communicate the following propositions (Carston, 2004: 4):

**4.**

**a. *Maryx* did not pass enough university course units to qualify for admission to second year study and, as a result, *Maryx* cannot continue with university study.**

**b. *Maryx* is not feeling very happy.**

*[Note: small caps are used to differentiate between propositions/ assumptions/thoughts and natural language*

*sentences; the subscripted x shows that a particular referent has been given to the name 'Mary'.]*

According to the definitions explicature and implicature stated above, it seems obvious to a certain extent that (4a) is an explicature of Y's utterance and (4b) is an implicature. "The decoded logical form of Y's utterance, still more or less visible in (4a), has been taken as a template for the development of a propositional form, while (4b) is an independent assumption, inferred as a whole from (4a) and a further premise concerning the relation between Mary's recent failure at university and her current state of mind" (Carston, 2004: 5).

The proposition in (4a) is more specific and elaborated than the encoded linguistic form of the sentence 'She didn't get enough units and can't continue', which, based on context, could be developed in any different ways. The pronoun (she) has been assigned more specific meaning (particular person assigned here as MARY<sub>x</sub>), 'get' and 'units' have been made clear through assigning more specific and elaborated meanings than what they encode, extra constituents have been provided as arguments of 'enough' and 'continue', and a cause-effect relation has been considered to connect the conjuncts. "These are all the result of pragmatic processes, context-dependent and relevance-governed" (Carston, *ibid*: 5).

Sperber and Wilson (Cited in Haugh, 2002:120) attempt to argue that "pragmatic inferences" have not only a role to contribute in what is implied, but also in what is explicitly stated or asserted. They introduced the concept of

explicature, to complement the Gricean concept of implicature. Carston (Cited in Haugh, *ibid*) who did much work in relevance theory on explicit and implicit meaning has adopted this definition of explicature and expanded it in the following way:

...a propositional form communicated by an utterance which is pragmatically constructed on the basis of the propositional schema or template (logical form) that the utterance encodes; its content is an amalgam of linguistically decoded material and pragmatically inferred material... (Carston, 2000: 10).

Haugh (2002:120) and Ibáñez (1999: 3) agree that pragmatic processes involved in deriving explicatures from the decoded linguistic expressions comprise disambiguation, saturation (including reference assignment), and free enrichment. Relevance theorists have presented a group of various pragmatic processes that contribute in developing "what is encoded by an utterance into the propositions that are actually communicated". An implicature, as defined by Carston, is "any other propositional form communicated by an utterance; its content consists of wholly pragmatically inferred matter" (Cited in Haugh, 2002:120). Haugh (*ibid*) points out that this definition of implicature agrees with and follows from Sperber and Wilson's (1995) original argument that "any assumption communicated which is not explicit must be implicit, and thus must be an implicature". Thus, according to relevance theorists, an implicature is defined as an essential assumption or proposition that is not explicitly

communicated, that is, it is implicature. Sperber and Wilson illustrate that the conceptual meaning or content of implicatures should be wholly inferred, and to be wholly inferred they should be intentionally meant and intended by the speaker, and be truly understood by the hearer as the meaning intended. If an utterance is developed by any one of these processes, it is called 'explicature' in Sperber & Wilson's terms, (i.e. an explicitly communicated assumption) (Haugh, *ibid*).

Sperber & Wilson and Carston have paid special attention to enrichment. Consider Sperber & Wilson's discussion of *It will take some time to repair your watch*. The authors here observe that watch-repairing is an activity that takes time and that if we benefit of decoding and reference assignment, the interpretation of this utterance will be a truism and as a result it is irrelevant. People generally understand a sentence like this to mean that watch-repairing will take longer time than expected. Sperber & Wilson argue that this issue is tackled in relevance theory: "the logical form of an utterance is an assumption schema which may be in need of completion; when completion is required, this is indicated by the presence of semantically incomplete or manifestly vague terms" (Cited in Ibáñez, *ibid*: 3-4). (*Some time*) as a part of the logical form in the sentence above is such a case; where it might be considered one second, one hour, one week, and so on. Each of these interpretations given is an enrichment of the expression (some time) in question since it contains the same information and more. Ibáñez (*ibid*) argues that the principle of enrichment, "as one way of accommodating



the utterance to meet contextual requirements" is an interesting issue. So, enrichment is arguably regarded as "a procedure by which an interpretation is made to contain the same information than a previous one and more", and that it is "constrained by consistency with the Principle of Relevance".

It is clear from what has been presented above that pragmatic inferences play a crucial role in supplying the conceptual constituent or content of an implicature where the conceptual content of an explicature is a mixture of a meaning that is linguistically decoded and a meaning that is pragmatically inferred (Carston, 2004: 5).

## **5. Pragmatic Aspects of Explicature**

### **5.1. Saturation and Free Enrichment**

Carston (2008: 49) reveals that relevance-theorists adopt two pragmatic processes that are involved in the production of explicatures of an utterance. The first one, known as 'saturation', emphasizes the process of finding the intended content (or value) for a slot or variable that is linguistically indicated. As an example, the existence of the pronoun 'she' in a particular syntactic place in an utterance obviously shows that a specific female individual is to be clear and identified in the place in question in the developing propositional interpretation. Saturation is generally supposed to be involved in the pragmatic development of the logical form of the utterance than

simply "finding values for overt indexicals". Check logical forms of the utterances below that provide answers to the questions between brackets: (adopted from Carston, 2004b: 7).

5.

- |                                  |                     |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>a. Paracetamol is better.</b> | <b>[than what?]</b> |
| <b>b. It's the same.</b>         | <b>[as what?]</b>   |
| <b>c. He is too young.</b>       | <b>[for what?]</b>  |
| <b>d. It's hot enough.</b>       | <b>[for what?]</b>  |

In these utterances, there is no linguistic element indicating the need for a suitable contextual value to be found. What motivates saturation is the idea of the presence of a covert indexical, or implicit proposition, in the logical forms of the utterances above. The lexical words 'better', 'same', 'too', 'enough' require the "imperceptible elements with them as part of their syntax". Thus, saturation (or linguistically motivated completion) is regarded as a necessary pragmatic process in developing the logical form of the utterance to derive its explicit proposition Carston, 2004: 7).

This 'completion' process is something obligatory to achieve the required communication of these sentences, since its absence results in no full propositional form that might be understood as the explicit content, explicature, of the utterance. The second process which is commonly controversial is identified as free enrichment, "free because it involves pragmatic enrichment of the decoded linguistic meaning in the absence of any indication (overt or covert)

within the linguistic form that this is necessary" (Carston, *ibid*).

Recanati (Cited in Ibáñez, 1999: 3) has also presented a useful distinction between the types of pragmatic enrichment, namely "saturation" and "strengthening". He views these two processes of pragmatic enrichment in a similar way. For him "Saturation occurs when the meaning of an incomplete sentence (what Sperber & Wilson would call an "assumption schema") sets up a slot that must be filled with the help of the context". For example, an expression like He's not good enough requires saturation to be He's not good enough for Mary to marry him. Strengthening, equals to Carston's (2008) concept of 'free enrichment' can be explained in cases like the expression (some time) in the sentence It will take some time to repair your watch, where a rather vague linguistic concept requires to be modified or turned into a more specific one in such a way that the modified one -which is "richer"-entails the former, in this case, (some time) might be one minute, one hour, one day, one week, and so on.

Recanati (Cited in Ibáñez, 1999: 5) considers expanded or developed versions of utterances from their logical forms as examples of saturation and what is said in each case differs from what is really communicated. The same differentiation is applicable to cases of strengthening, However, the process of saturation is not exactly the same as strengthening: in cases of saturation, what will fill the intended slot is clear from the context (whether this is the previous sentence, the present situation or the knowledge

shared by speaker and listener); in cases of strengthening or, in Carston's (2008) term, free enrichment, what makes the available information specific enough to perform the communicative needs (i.e. making it 'relevant' in Sperber & Wilson's meaning) is not a case of recovering the complementary information from the context, yet it is a matter of adding what is prompted by the linguistic expression itself.

## **5.2. Semantically vs. Grammatically-Motivated Free Enrichment**

On the contrary to the phenomenon of strengthening, saturation is not semantically motivated, it is grammatically motivated one (Ibáñez, 1999: 5). Ibáñez puts this idea in another way when stating that "strengthening is a phenomenon which does not exclusively belong to the domain of pragmatics and that it has a conceptual rather than a grammatical motivation". Factually, the context might require the use of enrichment even if there is not any (conceptually) conventional item or clue as to the way it usually happens. As such, the contribution of the context in strengthening is not -unlike what happens with cases of saturation- to fill with information a number of propositional slots. In contrast, what the context does is to present a linguistic expression vague enough that strengthening is to be required (ibid).

This discussion tends to emphasize the idea that strengthening is a process that is conceptually or

semantically motivated and that the process is obtained "either as a result of semantic convention or of a contextual requirement which has to be met for the utterance to be relevant" (ibid: 7).

It is the enriched propositions, the development of the logical form of the decoded linguistic utterance, that are communicated as explicatures and which work as prerequisite in the derivation of the implicit content of the utterance, implicatures. Actually, there are two kinds of free enrichment (Carston, 2008: 50):

- (a) cases, such as those just discussed, where constituents of the explicit content, explicature, that are pragmatically supplied have no existence or presence in the linguistic form of the utterance used, so are identified as ‘unarticulated constituents’, and
- (b) cases (recently become a major issue of investigation) where the pragmatic process of enrichment does not provide a whole new item or constituent of content but 'adjusts or modulates' an occurring constituent of linguistic meaning.

Consider utterances of the following sentences, focusing on the meaning communicated by the italicized word:

6.

**a. Boris is a *man*.**

**b. Buying a house is easy if *you've got money*.**

**c. Let's get rid of the *empty bottles*.**

**d. This policy will *bankrupt the farmers*.**

To reach the intended interpretation of (6a) and (6b) involves a pragmatic process of 'concept narrowing'. In many contexts, the proposition that "Boris is an adult male human will be trivially true and uninformative", so the linguistic expression *man* that is lexically encoded is be pragmatically strengthened to '*Ideal Man*' or '*Typical Man*', the similar comment is to be applied to (6b), since it is overtly false that just any amount of money by which any individual is able to buy a house. In contrast, (6c) and (6d) would require a modulation or adjustment, that is, a broadening of the encoded linguistically concept. Thus, although 'bankrupt' could be interpreted literally, where in a certain context it would be interpreted as a hyperbole, proposing that, because of the policy that the government follows, the farmers will be to a higher extent poorer than what expected or desired. In these cases, the denoted meaning of the concept that is communicated is broader than (and so comprise) the denotation of the linguistically encoded concept. Relevance theorists and other contextualists-pragmatists (Carston, 2008: 51) follow the stance that some degree of adjust or modulation of word meaning in context "occurs across virtually all utterances and is essential in deriving the intended truth-conditional content" (i.e. the explicit content of an utterance).

## **6. Free Enrichment and Implicatures**

Ibáñez (1999: 5) points out that pragmatics play a great role in deriving the explicitly communicated propositions

of an utterance regardless of the absence of a linguistic element which shows that a contextual instantiation is required. As such, there is no overt indexical, or any compelling reason motivating us to think that there is a covert element in the logical form of the utterance. Yet, a constituent that is contextually supplied takes place in the explicature. The interpretation of the following utterances, in different contexts, would involve the elements between brackets which are provided on pragmatic bases alone (adopted from Carston, 2004: 9).

7.

**a. The baby has a temperature.**

**[A high temperature]**

**b. It's going to take time for these wounds to heal.**

**[Considerable time]**

**c. I've had a shower.**

**[Today]**

**d. It's snowing.**

**[In location x]**

**e. Mary gave John a pen and he wrote down her address. [And then] [With the pen Mary gave them]**

**f. Sam left Jane and she became very depressed.**

**[And as a result]**

Each of the above utterances, arguably, expresses a truth-valuable proposition without supplying the bracketed constituent, but in many different contexts that specific proposition is not communicated (speaker meant). The above cases that are represented here by (7a) and (7b), would express an ordinary truth (every person has some

temperature or other, any process last for some time period or other), others, represented in (7c) and (7d), are very ambiguous and general that speakers rarely intend to communicate (they would not yield sufficient cognitive effects). In the contexts in which these utterances might exist, obvious implicatures of the utterance would be derived from the pragmatically enriched proposition; for instance, in (7a), the implicitly communicated proposition (implicature) is that a doctor should be called; in (7c), the implicature is that the speaker needs not to take a shower at that specific time (Carston, 2004: 9).

## **7. Polysemy**

Yule (2010: 120) defines polysemy as a single linguistic form (written or spoken) having multiple meanings or meanings related by extension. Evans and Green (2006:36) picture the same thought as Yule, when they state that polysemy is "the phenomenon where a single linguistic unit exhibits multiple distinct yet related meanings". For instance, consider the preposition *over* in (8) below (adopted from Evans and Green, *ibid*).

## **8.**

- |   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>a. The picture is <i>over</i> the sofa.</b>      | <b>Above</b>                |
| <b>b. The picture is <i>over</i> the hole.</b>      | <b>covering</b>             |
| <b>c. The ball is <i>over</i> the wall.</b>         | <b>On-the-other-side-of</b> |
| <b>d. The helicopter flew <i>over</i> the city.</b> | <b>Path</b>                 |
| <b>e. She has a strange power <i>over</i> me.</b>   | <b>Control</b>              |



Evans and Green (ibid) reveal that all these meanings of *over* are all related to each other and that they originate from the basic meaning "above".

Taylor (2002:98) argues that polysemy is considered a common phenomenon since individuals frequently encounter frequent words which exhibit different multiple meanings that can be seen as connected to each other. An example (adopted from Yule, 2010: 120) is the linguistic form *head*, which is used to denote the object on top of the body, froth on the top of a glass of beer, an individual at the top of a firm or department, and so other different things. Yule (ibid) differentiates between polysemy and homonymy through checking the dictionary. If the word has a group of meanings, then it is polysemy. It will have a single entry in a dictionary with a list of different meanings of the word. If two words or linguistic forms have been regarded as homonyms. There will be two separate entries for each word.

Taylor (2002:47) considers polysemy as an essential feature of our everyday language that is embodied and represented in basic frequent words and linguistic forms as prepositions. In contrast to the traditional account of polysemy, cognitivists view polysemy as arising by chaining which is the phenomenon of semantically extending certain existing meanings into new meanings that leads to meaning chain in which some meanings of words are more prototypical than others. They state that the semantic extension of words and linguistic forms from central prototypical meaning into new meaning arises as a

result of two productive phenomena which are metaphor and metonymy (Evans and Green, 2006: 332-333).

## **8. Metaphor and Metonymy as Mechanisms for Meaning Extensions**

An important issue concerning metaphors and metonymies is that they are powerful cognitive tools available to conceptualize our abstract categories. They are not just figures of speech in literature (Ungerer and H, 1996). Ibáñez (1999: 2) also asserts that metaphor and metonymy are considered as "ways of reasoning and making inference". Saeed (2009: 365) emphasizes that, for cognitive semanticists, metaphor and metonymy reveal many of the same characteristics. He lists these characteristics as "they are conceptual processes; both may be conventionalized; both are used to create new lexical resources in language and both show the same dependence on real-world knowledge or cognitive frames".

### **8.1. Metaphor in Cognitive Semantics**

Saeed (2009:360) states that cognitive semantics assigns to metaphor an important role in thought and language. Cognitivists think that metaphor is "ubiquitous in ordinary language" in the meaning that metaphor has existence in speakers' minds, as a result, it exerts influence on a wide group of linguistic behavior. Evans and Green (2006: 38) illustrates that metaphor, in view of cognitivists, is "the phenomenon where one conceptual domain is systematically structured in terms of another". They assert

that metaphor is an essential mechanism of meaning extension (polysemy). For example (adopted from Saeed, 2009:364) is the English verb (see) as having two meanings. One that relates to the physical meaning of "perceiving" with eyes, and the second metaphorically extended one is of "understanding "as in (I see what he has said).

Saeed (ibid: 365) agrees with Evans and Green (2016: 38) as to consider metaphor as providing a key to understand the process of polysemy where he exactly states that "metaphor, as one type of cognitive structuring, is seen to derive lexical change in a motivated way, and provides a key to understanding the creation of polysemy and the phenomenon of semantic shift. Evans and Green (ibid) announce that metaphor works as a mechanism for the creation of polysemy. Their study focused on the preposition "over" as a way of exhibiting polysemy or what is so called "meaning extension". Consider the following examples (adopted from Evans and Green, 2006: 38).

**9.**

**a. I am on top of the situation.**

**b. She's at the height of her power.**

**c. His power rose.**

In these examples, the conceptual metaphor "control is up" has been represented in terms of the meaning of the spatial elevation (up) in (8a) that motivated extension to the new metaphorical meaning "control" in (8e). Other examples

adopted from Seto et al (Cited in Tsujimoto, 2013:55) are the following

**10.**

**a. They danced through the night.**

**b. I went through various tests and interviews.**

**c. They met through the internet.**

where the meaning of "in one side and out of the other side of a period of time", the meaning of "in one side and out of the other side of an event" and the meaning of "in one side and out of the other side of an instrument" in each of the following sentences may be metaphorically extended from the basic meaning of "in one side and out of the other side of a physical space" represented by the expression *through* in the following.

**11.**

**His dog ran *through* the room.**

The meaning extensions of *through* in (11) to the new meanings in (10a), (10b), and (10c) are based on metaphor, "similarity of property".

## **8.2. Metonymy in Cognitive Semantics**

Lakoff & Turner (Cited in Ibáñez, 1999: 23) have referred that metonymy is primarily used for reference where "the frequent referential use of metonymies is connected to the fact that they constitute domain-internal mappings". Referring to a whole domain through exploiting

part-whole relation is economical, and the opposite is also applicable when referring to an identifiable part of domain by adopting the whole domain name. Thus, Yule (2010: 121) goes in line with this idea when he defines metonymy as "using one of the words to refer to the other".

Radden & Koveces (Cited in Hamann, 2011: 3) argue that, in cognitive semantics, metonymy is considered a conceptual mechanism of meaning extension, which is defined as "a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same idealized cognitive model". Consider the following example (adopted from Yule, 2010:121)

**12.**

**He drank the whole bottle.**

Although this sentence seems odd, we accept it without being confused (i.e. the subject drank the liquid in the bottle, not the glass object). Other examples, adopted from Seto et al, (Cited in Tsujimoto, 2013:55) represented by the preposition *through* in the following

**13.**

**a. Only halfway *through* the afternoon and it's like night.**

**b. Eventually I got *through* high school.**

where the meaning of "At the far end" of *through* in each one of the above examples may be metonymically extended

from the basic meaning of "at the far end of the physical space" of *through* represented in the following example

**14.**

**The kitchen is *through* the door.**

**(At the far end of the door).**

to the meaning of "at the far end of a period of time in (13a), and the meaning of "at the far end of an event" in (13b). Sentences of (13a) and (13b) represent metonymic extension (polysemy). (13a) is extended by "whole-part" relation, while (13b) is extended by "part-whole" relation, (Seto et al, Cited in Tsujimoto, 2013:55). Thus, the relatedness of meanings of *through* is essentially based on similarity, and these meanings are motivated through the process of metonymic meaning extension that results in polysemy.

## **9. Analysis and Findings**

Comrie states that because language of The Holy Qur'an is the Arabic language and Arabic is "the language of a major culture and of a major religion" (Cited in Abed Nasser, 2013:67), this linguistic study is concerned with the phenomenon of polysemy of Arabic prepositions in The Holy Qur'an motivated by the cognitive tools of metaphor and metonymy which contribute with other cognitive pragmatic processes of enrichment for the explanation of the explicated content of the utterance that is , in turn, considered a schema or template in the reasoning process

leading to the implicature of the utterance in specific. To achieve the aims addressed, this study adopts Evans and Green's (2006: 36) definition of polysemy as "the phenomenon where a single linguistic unit exhibit multiple distinct yet related meanings". As polysemy is triggered by meaning extension pattern, the study adopts Seto's et al (Cited in Tsujimoto, 2013:51) comprehensive pattern of meaning extension which, partially quoted, is listed below.

<b>metaphor</b>	<b>Similarity of form</b>
	<b>Similarity of property</b>
	<b>Similarity of function</b>
<b>metonymy</b>	
	<b>Space</b>
	<b>Whole for part</b>
	<b>Part for whole</b>

(Seto et al)

Marin (n.d.: 7) writes that few studies (Cervoni, Cadiot, and Kurzon) of prepositions "have focused on the pragmatic value of prepositions", stating that "the appropriate structural frame for the study of the preposition is not the grammatical unit of the sentence, but the discourse unit".

As for the cognitive semantics of Arabic prepositions in The Holy Qur'an and their implicatures, this study draws from a well-based pragmatic consideration of utterance interpretation which adopts the contextualist-pragmatist view on the explicit/implicit distinction that is the one argued and developed within the cognitive framework of Relevance Theory (Wilson and Sperber, 2002, 2004; Carston, 2004, 2008). The Study adopts The Muslim Website (<http://quran.muslim-web.com/>) in the translation of The Qur'anic Verses into English.

Prepositions in The Holy Qur'an are of polysemous nature and they entail a set of different meanings and to the best of my knowledge, few studies have been devoted to investigate the cognitive semantic and pragmatic aspects and values of prepositions in The Holy Qur'an.

1. **وَأَصْلَبَنَّاكُمْ فِي جُدُوعِ النَّخْلِ وَلَتَعْلَمَنَّ أَيُّنَا أَشَدُّ عَذَابًا وَأَبْقَى (طه: 71)**

and I will have you crucified on trunks of palm-trees: so shall ye know for certain, which of us can give the more severe and the more lasting punishment!"

In this Qur'anic Verse, Allah is talking to pharaoh's magicians warning them of being punished and tortured crucified on the trunks of palm-tree. The basic meaning of the preposition (في – in) is that of "containment", and as a result, "trunks of palm- trees" mentioned in the Qur'anic Verse above is the "container". In this specific Qur'anic Verse, the basic meaning of (في – in) is extended to comprise the meaning of the prepositions (على – on).



وَأَصْلَبَكُمْ (على) جُدُوعِ النَّخْلِ

From the central meaning of (في – in), another meaning extends via metaphor. This extension of the preposition (في – in) from the basic meaning of "containment" to the metaphorical meaning of "elevation" represented by (على – on) is based on metaphor, "similarity of property", where although the preposition (في – in) is primarily used to express the meaning of "containment" and that "trunks of palm-tree" is the container of those who are crucified, it is also used in this Verse to convey the meaning of "elevation" and this doesn't necessarily mean that the container should be empty from all directions to contain the contained thing or entity. The contained thing or entity may lie on part of the container or on its surface as is shown with "trunks of palm-trees" (Al-Maliqi, Cited in Al-Attiya, 2008:238). So, because (في – in) is a linguistic unit exhibiting another distinct yet related meaning, (في – in) is polysemic in nature, and it is the metaphor, as a cognitive mechanism of meaning extension, that systematically structures the conceptual domain of "elevation" represented by (على – on) in terms of "containment" represented by (في – in). The polysemy exhibited by the preposition (في – in) in the above Qur'anic Verse also accounts for the explicature cognitive aspects of the preposition in use.

In terms of pragmatic enrichment, the pragmatic process of "strengthening" in Recanati's meaning, (Cited in Ibáñez, 1999: 5) and what is called the pragmatic process of modulation of word meaning (Carston, 2004:17), will provide criteria in deriving the explicit content of an utterance and will provide evidence for the existence of

explicature created by metaphor. Thus, we must assume that the preposition (في – in) in the above Verse, being vague and truistic, would also need to be turned into a more specific one in such a way that the latter which is pragmatically richer accounts for the explicit content of the preposition and the former (the encoded linguistic element) accounts for the implicated content of the utterance (implicature). So, the lexically encoded preposition (في – in) is likely to be modulated or pragmatically strengthened to (على – on) making it specific enough to, according to the principle of transitivity in Arabic, satisfy our communicative needs (i.e. making it relevant in Sperber and Wilson's meaning (Cited in Ibáñez, 1999: 5). In other words, the pragmatic development of the encoded linguistic meaning of the preposition (في – in) to (على – on) is semantically motivated and the assumption communicated by the richer form (على – on) is an explicature that is evidenced by the recovery of the explicit contents of the Qur'anic Verse through applying other processes of pragmatic enrichment.

Looking back again to The Qura'nic Verse above, other assumptions have been communicated through the application of the pragmatic development of the utterance as shown below:

- a. and I will have you [pharaoh's magicians] crucified on trunks of palm-trees: so shall ye [pharaoh's magicians] know for certain, which of us can give the more severe and the more lasting punishment!"

- b. the length of the period of pharaoh's magicians of being crucified and the severity of punishment pharaoh's magicians deserve.

Thus, the encoded logical form of the Qur'anic Verse has been pragmatically developed through enriching the preposition (في – in) to likely be (على – on), and through assigning a referent [pharaoh's magicians] to the pronouns (you – ye) which is also a form of pragmatic processes of enrichment. The development of the logical form of the above Qur'anic Verse (a) is taken as a template for the propositional form of (b) which is an independent assumption inferred as a whole from (a) and communicated implicitly in The Qur'anic Verse. The assumption (which is not explicit) communicated by the utterance as a whole and the preposition (في – in) in specific, which has the metaphorical meaning of "elevation" beside its central or basic meaning of "containment", is the implicature of the length of the period of crucifixion and the severity of the torture and punishment that magicians deserve as a result of disobeying Allah orders. What is also implicitly communicated through context when looking deeply at the preposition (في – in) as an adverb of place describing someone or something surrounded from all the directions, as this is the basic meaning of (في – in), is that the preposition (في – in) pictures the trunks of palm-tree as a prison for torturing in which pharaoh's magicians are put to experience the severe and the more lasting punishment (Al-Maliqi, Cited in Al-Attiyia, 2008:238). Thus, (على – on) as the metaphorical extension of the encoded linguistic element (في – in) accounts for explicature of the utterance,

while the encoded linguistic element (في – in) accounts for the implicature of the utterance.

2. وَأَتَى الْمَالَ عَلَىٰ حُبِّهِ ذَوِي الْقُرْبَىٰ (البقرة: 177)

to spend of your substance, out of love for Him, for your  
kin

One of the basic meanings of the preposition (على – on) is that of "elevation". In this Qur'anic Verse, the basic meaning of the preposition (على – on) is extended to involve the meaning of the preposition (مع – with) according to the notion of transitivity in Arabic. Basically, from the basic meaning of the preposition (على – on), another meaning extends via metaphor. The meaning extension from "elevation= على – on" in this specific Qur'anic Verse to the meaning of "accompaniment" represented by the preposition (مع – with) is based on the device of metaphor, "similarity of property". Thus, the shift or directionality of the meaning of the preposition (على – on) is motivated by meaning extension pattern of metaphor leading the preposition in question to be polysemous in character. The preposition (على – on) in the above Qur'anic Verse exhibits another distinct meaning, that of "accompaniment" represented by the preposition "with" as is shown below in the developed version of the Verse.

وَأَتَى الْمَالَ (مع) حُبِّهِ ذَوِي الْقُرْبَىٰ

In this context, these two meanings of the preposition (على – on) are related to each other by means of polysemy. In

addition to the basic meaning of "elevation" that the preposition (على – on) expresses, it obtains another extended meaning which is related to the explicit content of the utterance, while the meaning of "elevation" represented by (على – on) in the Verse stands for what is implicitly communicated in the utterance itself. So, this Qura'nic Verse, seen in the light of the pragmatic development of its logical form in general and the pragmatic process of "strengthening" in specific will adjust and modulate the preposition to the richer form (مع – with) to suit the required context and to meet the needs of the intended communication.

The partial development of the encoded logical form (the preposition "على – on") expresses the explicit propositional form communicated by the utterance (the Qur'anic Verse in question). In another meaning, this pragmatic development of the encoded preposition (على – on) represents part of the explicit cognitive aspect of the utterance. Other processes of pragmatic enrichment will provide criteria to make evident the explicitly stated content that is communicated by polysemy of the preposition (على – on) in general and the metaphorical use of the same preposition in particular.

Other pragmatic processes of free enrichment involved in this Qur'anic Verse to derive the explicatures of the utterance include saturation. Because the notion of enrichment is a way of accommodating the utterance to go in match with the contextual requirement (Ibáñez, 1999: 5), and because saturation, grammatically motivated, appears when the meaning of an incomplete sentence provides

empty slots that need to be filled and completed with the assistance of the context, the following expanded version of the utterance is the result of the application of the pragmatic process of saturation and strengthening as an attempt to derive these explicatures of the utterance.

وَأَتَى (المسلم) الْمَالَ (مع) حُبِّهِ (المسلم للمال) دَوِي الْقُرْبَىٰ

(The Muslim) to spend substance, but out of (the Muslim's) love for substance, for the (the Muslim's) kin.

As we have already stated, the polysemy of the prepositions in The Holy Qur'an account for the explicature and implicature of the utterance. Here, in addition to the explicit content of The Verse communicated by the new extended meaning of (مع – with), the encoded linguistic element (على – on) in the utterance is used to reveal an assumption that is implicitly communicated by the use of (على – on) in the utterance, and what is wholly pragmatically inferred depending on the conceptual metaphor (control is up) (Evans and Green, 2006:38) represented by the basic meaning of (على – on) in general is 'elevation' of love of Allah in the hearts of the righteous upon the love of money. The use of (على – on) presented a picture in the praise of the pious righteous who associate the good work to the correct belief. As a result, the Qur'anic Verse began to describe the full surrender of their hearts and souls to Allah that is embodied by faith in Allah,

his messengers, and angels that heaven sent and ratification in the Judgment Day. After faith in these things, the Quranic Verse began to list the best deeds associated to the righteous. The first of these is to give wealth willingly where this is the strongest evidence for the higher truth of faith because money cannot be easily overcome in the hearts of those who cling to it and are trapped in fierce love of money but with the strongest and largest love which is that of Allah. Thus, the use of the preposition (على – on) expresses the righteous' ability to cope with and overcome, by means of love to Allah, their desires and to be away from stinginess (Al-Kudari, 1989: 73) and (Hussein, 2013 :208).

3. عَيْنًا يَشْرَبُ بِهَا الْمُقَرَّبُونَ (المطففين: 17)

A spring, from (the waters) whereof drink those Nearest to Allah (Al-Mutfifin: 17)

This Qur'anic Verse pictures the pleasure or bliss of the righteous. Based on the linguistic standard of transitivity in Arabic, and the pragmatic enrichment process of "strengthening" or the pragmatic development of the logical form of the utterance and the preposition used, the verb (يشرب – drink) should pass to its object (المقربون – the Nearest) with the preposition (من – from). The basic meaning of the preposition (ب – of, by, with, at) in Arabic in general and in The Qur'anic Verse in specific is to show the meaning of "attachment" or "affix" (Al-Samara'I, Cited

in Hussein, 2013:204). In this Qura'nic Verse, the basic meaning of the preposition (ب – of, by, with, at) is extended to involve the meaning of the preposition (من – from). Actually, it is metonymy that motivated meaning extension of the preposition (ب – of, by, with, at) to the preposition (من – from). Thus, the extension of the preposition (ب – of, by, with, at) from the meaning of "attachment" or "affix" to the meaning of "partition" represented by (من – from) occurs as a result of metonymy, "part for whole". The character of polysemousness that the preposition (ب – of, by, with, at) reveals is motivated and based on the cognitive mechanism of metonymy. In this Verse, in addition to the basic meaning of "attachment" that the preposition (ب – of, by, with, at) has, another distinct meaning (metonymical meaning) of "partition" is also related to the preposition (ب – of, by, with, at) by means of polysemy motivated through the metonymical relation. So, the preposition (ب – of, by, with, at) in The Qur'anic Verse is polysemous.

Based on the notion of the pragmatic development of the logical form of the utterance and the pragmatic process of strengthening in specific, this Verse will adjust and modulate the preposition (ب – of, by, with, at) to the pragmatically richer form (من – from) to suit the contextual requirement of the content of The Qur'anic Verse. Because metonymy is a meaning extension device, and "strengthening" as one of the pragmatic processes of developing the encoded logical form of the utterance account for the explicit preposition of the utterance, the meaning extension of the preposition (ب – of, by, with, at) to the likely richer form (من – from) reveals part of the



explicit cognitive aspect of the utterance, explicature, as is shown below.

عَيْنًا يَشْرَبُ (منها) الْمُقَرَّبُونَ

Applying other processes of pragmatic enrichment will help making clear other explicatures communicated through the utterance. Of these pragmatic processes of free enrichment involved in this Qur'anic Verse is "saturation". As "saturation (or linguistically mandated completion) is widely recognized across different frameworks as necessary in deriving the explicit content of the utterance" (Carston, 2004:7), the following expanded version of The Qur'anic Verse is the outcome of the pragmatic development of the encoded logical form that is motivated by "saturation" to account for the explicatures of the Verse.

عَيْنًا (من الماء) يَشْرَبُ (من العين) الْمُقَرَّبُونَ (الى الله)

A spring, from (the waters) whereof (the spring) drink those Nearest (to Allah)

Because "the conceptual content of an explicature is an amalgam of decoded linguistic meaning and pragmatically inferred meaning" and "the conceptual content of an explicature is supplied wholly by pragmatic inference" (ibid), the extended meaning (من – from) accounts for the explicature of the utterance, while the basic use of the preposition (ب – of, by, with, at), still retaining one of its basic meaning that of "attachment", accounts for the implicature of the utterance. So, according to Carston's (2004: 2) definition of an implicature as "an assumption communicated by U which is not explicit is implicit", the

implicitly communicated assumption by the utterance through the use of the meaning of "attachment" represented by (ب – of, by, with, at) in the Verse is that people who are righteous and nearest to Allah not only drink water from the blessed spring, but they delectate it and reach to the extent of saturation. Saturating water means to be completely satisfied in drinking water and having the sufficient amount of water. The proposition of 'just drinking' achieved by (من – from) doesn't necessarily mean having water to the extent of saturation and with the meaning of delectation and intoxication arrived to by the use of the preposition (الباء – with, at, of). Thus, this idea of saturating water is not possible to be construed if the verb (يشرب – drink) collocates with the preposition (من – from). So, the use of the Arabic preposition (الباء – with, at, of) communicated more than what is explicitly said in words when seen on the discorsal level of analysis (Al-Kudari, 1989:196).

## **10. Conclusion**

Prepositions in many Qur'anic Verses are polysemic in the meaning that they undergo meaning extension patterns to extend from their central meanings, which account for the implicated proposition of the utterance (The Qur'anic Verse), to their new extended meanings, which account for the explicated content of the utterance. Metaphor and metonymy are powerful cognitive tools that reveal the type of connection between the polysemic different meanings of the preposition used, that is, the shift or directionality from the central meaning of the preposition to the new extended

one. It is also concluded that metaphor and metonymy of the prepositions in The Qur'anic Verses play a major role in explicatures production, and thus not implicatures production. The study reached the prominent conclusion that the extended version of the preposition used accounts for the explicated proposition of the The Qur'anic Verse, while the main preposition used accounts for the implicit proposition of the Verse.

## **References**

- Abdel Nasser, Manal Mohamed. (2013) "The Polysemous Nature of Some Arabic Prepositions". Vol. 5, No. 2. *International Journal of Linguistics*.
- Al-Attiya Ahmed Mutar. (2008) "Prepositions between Alternation and Inclusion".[Huruf Al-Jarr Bayn Al-Niyabiti Wa ?at-tadmiin]. *Arabic Heritage Journal*, No.112. Pp: 233-261.Retrieved from [www.mohamedrabeea.com/books/book1\\_17349.pdf](http://www.mohamedrabeea.com/books/book1_17349.pdf).
- Al-Kudari, Mohammad Ameen. (1989) *Secrets of Prepositions in The Holy Qur'an*. [Asrar Huruf Ajarr Fi Al-Thiqr Al-Hakim]. Cairo: Al-Amana Press.

Al-Mubarad. (N.D.) *The Summary*. [Al-Muktadab].  
Verified by A'dima, Abd Ilqalik Mohammad.  
Volume 1. Beirut: World of Books. [Alam Al-  
Kutub].

Al-Samara'ai, Fadhil. (2003) *Meanings of Grammar*.  
[Ma'ani An-Nahw]. Volume 3. Beirut: Dar Al-  
Fikr.

Carston, Robyn. (2008) "The Explicit/Implicit Distinction  
In Pragmatics And The Limit Of Explicit  
Communication". *International Review of  
Pragmatics* 12/2008; 1(1):35-62. Retrieved from  
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.233.1202&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

..... (2004) "Relevance Theory and the  
Saying/Implicating Distinction", in L. Horn & G.  
Ward (eds) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, Oxford:  
Blackwell.

Evans, Vyvyan, Melanie Green. (2006) *Cognitive  
Linguistics. An Introduction*: Edinburgh  
University Press.

Hamadallah, Rami & Tushyeh, Hanna (n.d.) "A Contrastive  
Analysis Of Selected English And Arabic  
Prepositions with Pedagogical Implications".  
Retrieved from

[http://wa.amu.edu.pl/psicl/files/28/11Hamdallah  
&Tusyehh.pdf](http://wa.amu.edu.pl/psicl/files/28/11Hamdallah&Tusyehh.pdf)

Hamann, Agnieszka. (2011) "Metonymy And Metaphor As Mechanisms Motivating Polysemy". Retrieved from

[https://www.academia.edu/1613004/Metonymy\\_and\\_metaphor\\_as\\_mechanisms\\_motivating\\_polysemy](https://www.academia.edu/1613004/Metonymy_and_metaphor_as_mechanisms_motivating_polysemy).

Haugh, Michael. (2002) "The Intuitive Basis Of Implicature: Relevance Theoretic Implicitness Versus Gricean Implying". *Pragmatics* 12:2. 117-134. Retrieved from

[http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/25181/33407\\_1.pdf;jsessionid=1C0EB56E86B70A5658B687A01246CD26?sequence=1](http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/25181/33407_1.pdf;jsessionid=1C0EB56E86B70A5658B687A01246CD26?sequence=1).

Hussein, Mohammad Sabah. (2013) "Rhetorics of Prepositions Alternation in The Holy Qur'an". [Baghat Ta'wir Huruf Ajarr Fi Al-Qur'an]. *Journal of College of Arts, University of Diyala*. No. 103. Pp. 199-238. Retrieved from <http://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=83609>.

Ibáñez, Francisco. (1999) "From Semantic Underdetermination Via Metaphor And Metonymy To Conceptual Interaction". *LAUD Essen Series A: General & Theoretical Papers*. Retrieved from <http://www.linse.uni-due.de/linse/laud/index.html>

- Ibn Ilsiraj, Abu Bibr. (1985) *Origins In Grammar*. [Al-Asool Fi An-Nahw]. Verified by Al-Fatli Abd Illhussein. Beirut: Mua'sasat Al-Risala. Volume 1.
- Quirk, Randolph & Greenbaum, Sidney. (1998) *A University Grammar Of English*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Marin, Adina Matrozi. (N.D.) "A Semantic Description of the Preposition". Retrieved from [http://cis01.central.ucv.ro/revista\\_scol/site\\_ro/2008/adina\\_matrozi-marin.pdf](http://cis01.central.ucv.ro/revista_scol/site_ro/2008/adina_matrozi-marin.pdf).
- Saeed, John. (2009) *Semantics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Wilson. (1995) *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Taylor, John R. (2002) *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tsujimoto, Tomoko. (2013) "A Multi Meaning Network Approach To English Prepositions". *Memoirs of Osaka Institute of Technology*, Series B Vol. 58, No. 2 (2013) pp. 51-56. Retrieved from <https://www.oit.ac.jp/japanese/toshokan/tosho/kiyou/jinshahen/58-2/04j.pdf>

Ungerer, F and H.-J. Schmid. (1996). *Conceptual Metaphors and Metonymies: An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Yule, George. (2010) *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber. (2002) "Truthfulness and relevance", *Mind*, 111: 583-632.

Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber. (2004) "Relevance theory", in Laurence Horn and Gregory Ward (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics*, 607-632, Oxford: Blackwell.

.....  
- *The translated versions of The Qur'anic Verses in this study have been quoted from <http://quran.muslim-web.com/>*