ETHNOSEMANTIC, PRAGMATIC, AND TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF KINSHIP TERMS IN ARABIC AND ENGLISH DISCOURSE

HASHIM ALIWY MOHAMMED NAKHILAWI

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2016

ETHNOSEMANTIC, PRAGMATIC, AND TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF KINSHIP TERMS IN ARABIC AND ENGLISH DISCOURSE

By

HASHIM ALIWY MOHAMMED NAKHILAWI

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

July 2016

DEDICATION

TO THE MARTYRS WHO SACRIFICED THEIR LIVES FOR

THE SAKE OF THE LOFTY PRINCIPLES OF ISLAM AND

HUMANITY

TO MY FAMILY

AND ALL THOSE WHO HELPED ME

WITH LOVE & GRATITUDE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, all praise and thanks be to Almighty Allah for granting me the strength and patience to accomplish this work and for blessing me with many great people who have been my greatest support in both my personal and professional life.

My deep respect and gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Ambigapathy Pandian for his kind guidance and the generous continual support he has offered me to fulfill this work. I would also like to seize this opportunity to express my deepest regards and gratitude to my co-supervisor Dr. Ghayth K. Shaker al-Shaibani for his invaluable advice and sincere effort throughout the whole stages of bringing this project into light. Needless to say that the mistakes are mine not theirs.

I am greatly indebted to a number of people who have helped me get to where I am and without them I could not have made it this far. It is with great pleasure that I am able to thank them here. In this context, I am indebted to Dr. Alexey Lyavdansky from Russian State University for the Humanities, Dr. Lawrence J. Mykytiuk from Purdue University, Dr. Raffaele Esposito from Università degli Studi di Napoli L'Orientale, and Dr. Diane E. King from University of Kentucky for their valuable comments on the analysis of the biblical texts. I would also like to express my deep thanks and gratitude to Dr. Qassim Abass Dhayf from University of Babylon, Dr. Mohamed Ali Bardi from Macquarie University, and Dr. Ahmed Qadoury Abed from Al-Mustansiryah University for their kind evaluation and comments on the Quranic texts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDAITONS — 321

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BTs   Biblical Text(s)

Circ.   Circumstance

KTs   Kinship terms

Lit.   Literally

LTs   Legislative Text(s)

Matr.   Material process

NH   New Hampshire

Partic.   Participants

pbuh   Peace be upon him

QCA   Qualitative content analysis

QTs   Quranic Text(s)

QVs   Quranic verse(s)

SAs   Speech act(s)

SAT   Speech act theory

SFL   Systemic Functional Linguistics

Translit.   Transliteration

Trans.   Translation

LIST OF SYMBOLS

Arabic Alphabets

No.	Arabic Alphabets	Phonetic Transcription
1	أ	ā
2	ب	b
3	ت	t
4	ث	th
5	ج	j
6	ح	ḥ
7	خ	kh
8	د	d
9	ذ	dh
10	ر	r
11	ز	z
12	س	s
13	ش	sh
14	ص	ṣ
15	ض	ḍ
16	ط	ṭ
17	ظ	ẓ
18	ع	'
19	غ	gh
20	ف	f
21	ق	q
22	ك	k
23	ل	l
24	م	m
25	ن	n
26	ه	h
27	و	w
28	ي	y
29	ء	?

ANALISIS ETNOSEMANTIK, PRAGMATIK, DAN TEKSTUAL DARIPADA ISTILAH PERTALIAN KEKELUARGAAN DALAM WACANA BAHASA ARAB DAN BAHASA INGGERIS

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini bermatlamat mengkaji serta membandingkan aspek etnosemantik, pragmatik dan tekstual daripada istilah pertalian kekeluargaan dalam bahasa Arab dan bahasa Inggeris. Hal ini kerana kebanyakan kajian terdahulu hanya menerangkan asas sosiologi atau etnologi daripada struktur pertalian kekeluargaan dan pengelasan. Selain itu, terlalu sedikit perhatian yang diberikan terhadap aspek linguistik terutamanya pragmatik dan keagamaan daripada istilah pertalian kekeluargaan. Kajian ini adalah suatu analisis kandungan kualitatif yang bertujuan menjalankan pemeriksaan yang menyeluruh dan sistematik tentang istilah pertalian kekeluargaan dalam dua puluh buah teks keagamaan dan perundangan yang dipilih; untuk mengenal pasti kewujudan konsep pertalian persaudaraan dan juga untuk menunjukkan persamaan dan perbezaan di antara kedua-dua bahasa dan budaya, Oleh itu, untuk memahami sifat istilah pertalian kekeluargaan dalam kedua-dua budaya sosiolinguistik, penyelidik memberi tumpuan terhadap dua tahap analisis: analisis perbandingan dan analisis teks.   Justeru, penyelidik menyesuaikan beberapa teori sosiobudaya yang disarankan oleh Descent, Alliance, Sponsorship dan Murdock's (1965) *classification of kinship terms*, dan teori linguistik yang diutarakan oleh Halliday's (1978; 1985; 2009) *Systemic Functional Linguistic Teory (SFL)*. Penyelidik memilih dua puluh buah teks yang diekstrak: enam teks diekstrak daripada Kitab Suci al-Quran, enam teks daripada dari Kitab Suci Bible, empat ayat daripada *Iraqi Personal Status Law*, dan empat teks lagi daripada *American family law*. Dapatan kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa kajian ini sepatutnya dilakukan bukan sahaja dari sudut pandangan biologi, tetapi juga dari aspek etnolinguistik dan sosial, disebabkan kepentingan serta kerelevanannya dalam kehidupan manusia. Didapati bahawa KT dalam bahasa Inggeris dan budaya Barat mempunyai tiga

bentuk pertalian kekeluargaan yang utama: *keturunan* (descent), *persemendaan* (affinal) dan *fiktif;* Sebaliknya dalam bahasa Arab dan budaya Islam, terdapat empat bentuk asas pertalian kekeluargaan: *keturunan* (descent), *persemendaan* (affinal), *susuan* (milk) dan *fiktif.* Dalam budaya Inggeris, mereka mengabaikan peranan *susuan* (milk) dalam menjana ikatan kekeluargaan. Ditemui juga bahawa pertalian kekeluargaan bukan sahaja satu perkara sosiologi atau menamakan istilah-istilah tertentu, tetapi ia adalah jambatan yang boleh menghubungkan pelbagai bahasa, sosial, ekonomi, agama, politik, dan aspek-aspek budaya sesuatu masyarakat. Oleh itu, kajian ini telah menghubungjalinkan istilah pertalian kekeluargaan dengan banyak perkara penting seperti perkahwinan, hubungan pantang larang warisan, homoseksual, poligami dan perceraian. Akhir sekali, kajian ini berakhir dengan beberapa persamaan dan perbezaan di antara bahasa Arab dan bahasa Inggeris yang berkaitan dengan aspek sosial yang berbeza dari segi istilah pertalian kekeluargaan.

ETHNOSEMANTIC, PRAGMATIC, AND TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF KINSHIP TERMS IN ARABIC AND ENGLISH DISCOURSE

ABSTRACT

This study aims at investigating, comparatively, the ethnosemantic, pragmatic, and textual aspects of kinship terms in Arabic and English languages. This is because most of the previous kinship studies have focused on explaining the sociological or ethnological basis of kinship structures and classifications. Moreover, little attention has been given to the linguistic aspects specifically pragmatics as well as the religious aspect of kinship terms. The current study is a qualitative content analysis that aims to provide a thorough and systematic examination of kinship terms in twenty selected religious and legislative texts to identify the co-occurrences of kinship concepts and to reveal the similarities and differences between the two languages and cultures in this respect. Consequently, in order to understand the nature of kinship terms in both sociolinguistic cultures, the researcher focuses on two levels of analysis: textual analysis and comparative analysis. Because the study is of twofold (comparative analysis and textual analysis), the researcher adopts some socio-cultural theories represented by Descent, Alliance, Sponsorship as well as Murdock's (1965) classification of kinship terms, and a linguistic theory represented by Halliday's (1978; 1985; 2009) Systemic Functional Linguistic theory (SFL). The researcher has selected twenty extracted representative texts: six texts from the Glorious Quran, six texts from the Holy Bible, four texts from the Iraqi Personal Status Law, and four texts from American family law. The findings of this study at the comparative and textual levels revealed that one must study kinship terms not only from the biological point of view, but also from the ethnolinguistic and social aspects due to their importance and relevance in people's life. It was found that KTs in English and Western culture have three main forms of kinship: *descent, affinal* and *fictive*; whereas in Arabic and Islamic culture, there are four basic forms of kinship relations: *descent, affinal, milk,* and *fictive* because English culture has ignored the

xvii

role of milk in creating kinship relations. It was also found that kinship is not only a matter of sociology or designating certain terms, but it is a bridge that can link various linguistic, social, economic, religious, political, and cultural aspects of societies. Thus, this study has linked kinship terms with many important matters such as marriage, incestuous taboo relations, inheritance, homosexuality, polygamy and divorce. Finally, the study ends with some key points of similarity and difference between Arabic and English in relation to different social aspects of kinship terms.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Language is a familiar word that subsumes and denotes a broad area of study in social sciences and many other disciplines. This term is usually defined as a uniquae human attribute and is the first and invariably a means of communication among human beings. Thus, language is the main source generally used to maintain social relationship among people (Slonneger & Kurtz, 1995; Kukulska-Hulme, 1999; Norris, 2004; Mairal & Gil, 2006).

Language cannot be studied apart from other disciplines such as linguistics, anthropology, and sociolinguistics. As such, this field of study has been examined by scholars within the context of situation instead of the linguistic forms. The current study is mainly focused on utterance meaning and contextual features than on sentence meaning and syntactic features. Hence, the study of language not only refers to the analysis of grammatical rules but is also one of the major aspects of social contexts (Halliday, 2003). In addition, studying the language of any society requires knowledge about the respective culture of such community given that each culture is associated with respective lexicons (Whorf, 1956; Hymes, 1974a; Robins, 1976, Rapport & Overing, 2000; Ember & Ember, 2000; Jourdan & Tuite, 2006).

The fact cited in the preceding paragraph indicates that language and culture are interrelated, and they significantly influence each other. Research on any social or linguistic facet requires knowledge about the relationship between culture and people's association with their world or environment. In this regard, Kramsch (1998, p. 10) defined culture as "a membership in a discourse community that shares a common social space and history, and common imaginings". Culture may be affected by different aspects of life shared by people, including language, religion, gender, race, age, sexuality, class, geography, dress code,

norms, laws, and values though it is extremely liable to change according to the conditions or circumstances a community may face (Kramsch, 1993; Skelton & Allen, 1999; Kottak, 2002; Delaney, 2004; Levy, 2007).

Some scholars, such as Malinowski (1922), Sapir (1949), Hymes (1974b), Srivastava (2005), Jourdan and Tuite (2006), Wardhaugh (2006) and Wodak, Johnstone and Kerswill (2011), who studied the relationship between language and culture introduced ethno-science or ethnosemantics, a concept that combines linguistic and anthropological disciplines. Ethnosemantics mainly explores how social agents recognise, produce, and reproduce social behaviours and structures (Sturtevant, 1964; Geertz, 2003). Crystal (2008) added that ethnosemantics studies "the way meaning is structured in different cultural settings (e.g. in relation to the expression of kinship, colour, or the discourse structure of speech events) and the principles governing culturally conditioned semantic variation" (p. 174). Therefore, Geertz (2003, p. 313) stated that the main purpose of ethnoscience "is to develop a cultural grammar based on formal, taxonomic and paradigmatic principles"; and further it seeks explanation rather than interpretation of facts. This study also determines the regular semantic features of a cultural group. Thus, the study of KTs, which are used in a specific culture to regulate the structure of a society, is one of the most important fields of semantics (Spiro, 1977; Srivastava, 2005).

Kinship is considered a major core in different fields, including anthropology, linguistics, sociology, ethnosemantics, and economics, especially for modern anthropology because it elucidates the social relations among people. Kinship has become a central topic in the writings of the Western anthropological and linguistic studies in the 19th century by many Western scholars such as Morgan (1871), Malinowski (1922), Rivers (1924), Murdock (1949), Radcliffe-Brown (1952), Goodenough (1956), Firth (1957), Levi-Strauss (1963), Fox (1966), Schneider (1980; 1984), Goody (1971), Scheffler (1978), Parkin (1997), Stone (2001; 2006), Read (1984; 2001a; 2001b; 2006; 2007; 2009; 2013a; 2013b), White (2010; 2011), and White & Houseman (2013). In 19th century, KTs were employed as a

comparative cultural analysis by numerous scholars, such as Morgan (1871) and Malinowski (1913). Since then, kinship theory has become invariable for anthropological analysis within the halcyon days of functionalists, structuralists, Marxists, and other paradigms (Radcliffe-Brown, 1941; Evans-Pritchard, 1951; Levi-Strauss, (1969); Pitt-Rivers, 1973; Jones, 2010).

Anthropologists generally claim that KTs consist of three different basic relations, namely, descent (vertical kin links between different generations), siblingship (kin links between brothers and sisters), and affinity (kin relation by and through marriage) (Parkin, 1997). Recent anthropological and linguistic studies have added another type of kinship, particularly in Islamic and Arab societies, that is, 'milk kinship' (Parkes, 2004a, 2004b, 2005; Clarke, 2007, 2009; El Guindi, 2012). Schusky (1965, p. 1-2) explained that the study of kinship is important for contemporary anthropologists in several ways. First, most theories on human behaviour can be studied through kinship systems. Second, such study is related to historical reconstructions in which language cannot be constructed without knowledge on any particular kinship practices. Third, the study of kinship allows anthropologists to understand the behaviour of people and how they can recognise their kinship system. Finally, one cannot understand how people view the world or part of it without analysing the meaning of KTs (Schusky, 1965). Agha (2007) stated that the idiom of KTs may serve as a descriptive and analytic background in discussing the regularities of meaningful social behaviours, including marriage patterns, inheritance, co-residence, affiliation, religious and economic aspects, and political activities. All these aspects of life may form a kinship system that can be considered a genealogical foundation that underlies the patterns of behaviour in various spheres of social life.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The study of kinship relations has greatly attracted the attention of many scholars, directly or indirectly, in various contexts and has been the focus of numerous linguistic, anthropological, and religious studies. Such interest can be attributed to the fact that kinship

relations are the most important factors in maintaining and reinforcing social relationships among people of all cultures (Gillies, 2003; Ofulue, 2004; Jelm, 2010; Smith & Tadmor, 2010). This premise can be observed in the sayings and writings of heavenly books such as the Glorious Quran of Islam and the Holy Bible of Christianity. The concept of KTs can be exemplified in the underlined words and phrases of the following verses from the Holy Quran and the Holy Bible respectively:

Example 1.1: (الفرقان:54) " وَهُوَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ مِنْ الْمَاءِ بَشَرًا فَجَعَلَهُ نَسَبًا وَصِهْرًا وَكَانَ رَبُّكَ قَدِيرًا"

(It is He Who has created man from water: then has He established <u>relationships of lineage and marriage</u>: for thy Lord has power (over all things). (Ali, Trans., 1937, 25:54)

Example 1.2: (But from the beginning of the creation God made them **male and female**. For this cause shall a man leave **his father and mother**, and cleave to **his wife**; And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.) (KJV, Mark 10:6-9).

  Although KTs have been examined from different perspectives, most of these studies have only explained the sociological or ethnological basis of kinship structures and classifications based on the theoretical models applied to different cultures. Scholars such as Buchler and Selby, I968; Schneider, 1972, 1984; Bock and Rao,2000; Carsten, 2004; Kronenfeld, 2006; Vleet, 2008; Clarke, 2009; Jones, 2010; Leaf, 2010; Shenk and Mattison, 2011; White, 2011; Mohyuddin, Chaudhry & Ambreen, 2012; and Denham, 2012 argued that these studies have given minimal attention to the linguistic aspects, particularly pragmatics, and religious aspects of kinship. Schneider (1984) urged anthropologists to stop looking for 'kinship' by asserting that it is a vacuous and confused domain when applied cross-culturally. Schneider posited that the underlying concept of kinship has remained stable, as "a purely biological relationship deriving from the facts of human sexual reproduction" (p.53). Thus, Carsten (2004), Clarke (2009), Jones (2010), and Read, Fischer, and Leaf (2012) called for revitalising and reformulating the concept of kinship to be 'a new

kinship' than 'an old kinship', which was concerned with only typologising and classifying the theoretical aspects of KTs. The new kinship should cope with the new sociological and cultural developments of the society because these aspects, according to Carsten (2004, p. 11), "could not be separated from kinship" as they represent an important source of cohesiveness of any society.

Lévi-Strauss (1963) considered linguistics as a social science and that it is the only concept that can be regarded as a science. Lévi-Strauss (1963) argued that from modern linguistics, other disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and anthropology can learn "the road which leads to the empirical knowledge of social phenomena" (p. 31). Therefore, linguistics and other social sciences should be joined together in the study of kinship. Lévi-Strauss asserted that KTs are similar to phonemes because both of them are elements of meaning but "they acquire meaning only if they are integrated into systems" (p. 34). Similarly, Bennardo (2009) and El Guindi (2010) pointed out that KTs are merely a linguistic phenomenon but they contain social, cultural, conceptual, cognitive, and algebraic dimensions. As such, the anthropologists who intend to study the development of KTs can utilise the diachronic or historical approach of linguistics. Another shortcoming in anthropological studies is that most of them have separated the kinship system from other social domains, including religion, politics, and economics (Parkin, 1997; Smith & Tadmor, 2010; White, 2011). This separation has been justified by Beattie (1964a) who stated that kinship is merely an idiom through which certain domains can be activated. For example, economics is closely related to KTs as in most human societies, and inheritance (the transmission of property) takes place within kin groups and should be organised by economic and legislative rules. Throughout such activities, kinship may become apparent. Rapport and Overing (2000), El Guindi (2006; 2009; 2010; 2011; 2012) and Bloch (2010) mentioned that human kinship should further be looked into because it is broad and multidimensional in anthropology and linguistics. Rapport and Overing (2000, p. 228)

suggested that in discussing KTs, one can wed pragmatics with metaphysics features, including the philosophies of religion, language and mind.

White and Houseman (2012) and Denham (2012) affirmed that kinship studies should not move away from the traditional 'closed' approaches of discussing KTs to place further emphasis on the open, multileveled aspects of such terms. Farghal and Shakir (1994), Jones (2010), Sommer and Lupapula (2012), Jones (2010), Leonetti and Chabot-Hanowell, (2011), and Shenk and Mattison (2011) suggested that researchers need to establish an inherent link between the cultural recognition of kinship relations and other disciplines, such as pragmatics, economics, politics, and sociology, because such a connection can lead to extensive research and improved understanding. In this regard, Rose (2008) urged researchers to pay further attention to the relationship of the linguistic aspects with social relationships, a research area that has been insufficiently explored. In addition, Rose (2008) asserted that analysing certain social discourses using the systemic functional linguistics (henceforth SFL) introduced by Halliday (1985) is the best approach to relate any language to its social contexts, particularly the kinship system.

Based on the researcher's literature review and many linguists' calls for further studies, this study assumes that studying the ethnosemantic, pragmatic, and textual aspects of KTs in Arabic and English may address such research gap. A systematic analytic and comparative study can explicate this important area that is crucial to society and culture in Arabic and English with a specific reference to some religious and legal discourses in both languages. Alvard (2011) articulated that the linguistic components of KTs should be understood urgently and that these terms should be examined comparatively.

1.3 Research Objectives

The study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To identify the ethnosemantic and pragmatic aspects of kinship terms in Arabic and English discourse.

2. To examine the textual and intertextual features of kinship terms in selected religious and legislative texts in both Arabic and English in order to identify relations of kin.

3. To compare between the two languages with respect to the ethnosemantic, pragmatic and textual features of kinship terms.

1.4 Research Questions

The following questions will be addressed:

1. What are the ethnosemantic and pragmatic aspects of kinship terms in Arabic and English discourse?
2. What are the textual and intertextual features of kinship terms in selected religious and legislative texts in both Arabic and English?
3. What are the similarities and differences between Arabic and English with respect to the ethnosemantic, pragmatic, and textual features of kinship terms?

1.5 Scope and Limitation of the Study

The current study is a qualitative content analysis (henceforth QCA) that aims to thoroughly and systematically examine KTs in selected religious (the Glorious Quran and the Holy Bible) and legislative texts (henceforth LTs) (Iraqi Personal Status Law and American family law) (see Chapter Three, section 3.3 on criteria and data selection). To understand the nature of KTs in both cultures, Arabic and English, two analysis approaches, namely comparative and textual analyses, have been adopted. These methods are important because the knowledge of the ethnolinguistic aspects, especially semantic and pragmatic, of any language is fundamental for cross-cultural communication. This circumstance is in line with the viewpoint of Berger (1991) who stated that every human community can be

regarded as a web of shared meanings that can be studied in a comparative cultural manner. Textual analysis needs to be considered in the study of KTs because as McKee (2003, p. 1) stated, "textual analysis is a way for researchers to gather information about how other human beings make sense of the world". Moreover, Fairclough (2003, p. 15) asserted that "textual analysis is a resource for social research which can enhance it provided that it is used in conjunction with other methods of analysis". In this regard, kinship studies have been regarded as one of the most important areas of linguistic socialisation and social research that should be investigated through different socio-linguistic views, approaches, and theories (Duranti, Ochs, Elinor & Schieffelin, 2012). To tackle this particular research area, comparative and textual analyses should both be used to capture the social structuring and cultural interpretations of the suitable forms, practices, and behaviours used by individuals.

This present comparative cultural and textual study attempts to further one's understanding of the KTs employed in both Arabic and English. This study also aims to establish an interrelationship between the linguistic and socio-cultural findings to comprehend the social processes involved in kinship. This endeavour can be achieved by discussing the theoretical and methodological postulates of KTs comparatively because Dezepetnek (2003) explained that the comparative perspective is an important element of such framework.

Given that this study is of twofold (comparative and textual), the study will discuss the ethnosemantic and pragmatic aspects of KTs in Arabic and English by adopting the socio-cultural theories presented by Descent, Alliance, and Sponsorship, the classification of KTs introduced by Murdock, and the linguistic theory (i.e. SFL) proposed by Halliday. Selected religious texts from the Glorious Quran of Islam and the Holy Bible of Christianity as well as LTs from personal status law of both languages will be analysed through the proposed model.

The study will be restricted to the use of English Standard variety and Modern Standard Arabic variety in discussing and analysing KTs. To conduct such analysis and

discussion, I will select 20 extracted representative religious and LTs as follows: six texts from the Glorious Quran, six texts from the Holy Bible, four texts from the Iraqi Personal Status Law, and four texts from American family law (see Chapter Three, section 3.3 on criteria and data selection).

1.6 Significance of the Study

Language is used as a basic means of communication. The individuals living in a speech community different from their cultural backgrounds should be acquainted with the suitable words, rules, and behaviours of that community to communicate with the locals politely and appropriately in different contexts (Saville-Troike, 2003). Kinship terms are one of the important forms employed by individuals to address and communicate with one another in most communities, particularly in Arabic and English. Thus, understanding the cultural and linguistic forms of addressing people of both communities will allow the members of the Arab and English societies to be familiar with the cross-cultural forms of communicating with one another. In addition, Kronenfeld (2001) mentioned that understanding kinship systems in any language is very vital "to an understanding of the broader social, political, economic and symbolic issues that concern today's anthropology''(p.148).

The findings of this study are expected to benefit the legislators who formulate family laws to obtain benefit from the Divine laws to overcome the social problems faced by people. If this undertaking is achieved, then our understanding of kinship can be modified and some familial rules inapplicable to the religious and social practices of both societies can be amended.

Zhu and Bao (2010, p. 848) stated that "with the rapid development of globalization, cross-cultural communication has been a more and more important part in people's ordinary life". Thus, the rapid development of globalization leads to the emergence of many dramatic changes that may affect the lifestyle, thinking, speech, emotions, actions, and behaviours of people (Quisumbing, 2002). One of the these dramatic changes is related to family life and

kinship relations, and this, in turn, requires to develop new concepts, ideas, and rules to regulate the societies. Cicourel (1967) asserted that the legal statutes of kinship and family life should be examined comparatively to address some social problems. Thus, Cicourel (1967) affirmed that modifying legal statutes will "provide structural meanings of kinship terms and lead to the formal acceptance of various but not all existing practices in the community" (p. 123). This study intends to solve some of these problems by analysing certain legal texts to put forward some social and linguistic forms and solutions for kinship. It is hoped that the results of this study may serve as a useful source of information about the new concepts of KTs for the users of both the Arabic and English languages.

1.7 Definition of Key Terms

This section provides the definitions of the key terms and concepts that are frequently used in this study:

Affinity: It refers to those relatives who are connected by one or more marital links (Graburn, 1971).

Descent: A rule of descent is a vertical kin links between different generations and affiliates an individual at birth with a group of relatives; this intimate group provides extensive rights and obligations. Descent can be patrilineal, matrilineal, or bilateral (Parkin, 1997).

Ethnology: It is a field of study that is concerned with patterns of thought and human behaviour, such as marriage, kinship organisation, and religious, social, political, and economic systems; ethnologists concentrate on the human behaviours as seen and experienced (Ember & Ember, 2000).

Ethnosemantics: Crystal (2008) stated that ethnosemantics, or sometimes called ethnographic semantics, combines between the anthropological perspectives and cognitive

sciences, and "studying the way meaning is structured in different cultural settings (e.g. in relation to the expression of kinship, colour, or the discourse structure of speech events) and the principles governing culturally conditioned semantic variation." (p.174).

Kinship: It is a "relationship based on or modeled on the culturally recognised connection between parents and children (and extended to siblings and through parents to more distant relatives)" (Keesing, 1975, p. 150).

Kinship Terminology: "A system of linguistic categories for denoting kinds of relatives." (Keesing, 1975, p. 150).

Milk kinship: It is a kind of kinship in which milk suckling creates relations overlapping with or superseding relations of blood and prohibits kin ties (El Guindi, 2012).

Pragmatic analysis: It is a linguistic analysis that refers to what the users of a language mean by their verbal speech rather than what the words, phrases and sentences mean by themselves. Crystal (2008) affirmed that pragmatic analysis is mainly concerned with "the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction" (p. 379). Moreover, pragmatic analysis is mainly concerned with contextual meaning rather than sentence meaning; it also focuses on different pragmatic topics, such as aspects of deixis, speech acts (henceforth SAs), discourse structure, politeness, and performative utterance.

Siblingship: It is a kin relationship between brothers and sisters (Parkin, 1997).

Systemic Functional Linguistics theory (SFL): It is a socio-linguistic theory developed by Halliday which views language as a social semiotic system that is composed of different sub-systems, and such sub-systems are analysed with regard to four strata: phonology-graphology, lexicogrammar, semantics, and context (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Textual analysis: It is an analysis of a text and is used by researchers who are working in cultural, sociological, and philosophical studies, media studies, and in mass communication. Ruiz (2009) stated that the discourse can be considered as the main object of study in textual analysis. In this regard, Mckee (2003) defined textual analysis as "a way for researchers to gather information about how other human beings make sense of the world. It is a methodology - a data-gathering process - for those researchers who want to understand the ways in which members of various cultures and subcultures make sense of who they are, and of how they fit into the world in which they live" (p. 1).

1.8 Organization of the Study

The framework of the present study is organised to include five chapters. The first chapter introduces the introductory remarks of the study, which includes the background of the study, problem statement, research objectives, research questions, the significance of the study, the scope and limitation of the study, the plan of the study represented by the research layout, and the definitions of key terms. Chapter Two discusses the relevant literature review on KTs and their relationships with language, culture, religion, as well as some relevant theories and classification about KTs that are used to to achieve the objectives of the present study. Chapter Three organises the research methodology of this study in terms of its nature, methods of data collection, the nature of selected samples, the criteria used for data selection, the theoretical framework adopted, and issues of validity and reliability. Chapter Four addresses and analyses the selected 20 extracted texts. Chapter Five finalises the study with the outcome of the research throughout discussing the main findings resulted from the comparative and textual analysis study. Further, it also includes some concluding remarks and some recommendations to be suggested for further research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

"It is He Who has created man from water: then has He established relationships of lineage and marriage"
(Qur'an 25:54)

2.0 Introduction

The study of kinship has witnessed many cultural and linguistic modifications from the early anthropological and linguistic studies in the eighteenth century until the present time. Kinship studies have fascinated many scholars from different perspectives in various cultures. Thus, anthropologists, sociologists, linguists, and legislators have written about this topic in order to show its importance in most of the world's cultures as being the central topic which links between people, forms social relationships, arranges economic, political, religious, and linguistic structural behaviour, and lastly studies the correlation between language and society's culture. Moreover, it may provide some solutions to the problems of cultural differences among individuals in any society such as that related to the creation of new kinship systems of adoption, inheritance, new forms of marriage, and new reproductive kinship technologies of "In vitro fertilization" (IVF) (a process where fertilization done outside the womb of a woman) (Clarke, 2009). In this trend, this chapter gives historical, cultural, and linguistic background of kinship studies in relation to culture, society, language, and religion. Hence, the relationship between languaculture, society, and religion, from one hand, and kinship studies, on the other hand, is also discussed in this chapter. Then, relevant historical background information, concepts, and diagrams are also highlighted in this chapter.

2.1 Language and Culture

Though many studies have been written about language, many people, whether linguists and/or nonlinguists, may find the subject of language interesting and liable to be given more attention for many different reasons. Duranti (1997), in this regard, mentioned that "To have a culture means to have communication and to have communication means to have access to a language" (p. 332). This means that one cannot have access to a language without being a member of a speech community and without sharing its traditions, views, behaviour, and history. Therefore, to understand language and its importance in the human life, new levels of behaviour and meanings, purposes, or mental functioning and theories should be created and developed. Thus, language can be used to investigate different aspects of human life, such as social, methodological, stylistic, scientific, anthropological and religious. Many of these aspects may overlap, and all of these trends can be confined and included within the modern approaches of linguistics. Today, linguistics is regarded as a science that deals with all these social, methodological, stylistic, scientific, anthropological and religious aspects of language. Hence, linguists have discussed modern approaches to linguistics such as descriptive linguistics, theoretical linguistics, sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, neurolinguistics, computational linguistics, ethnolinguistics and historical linguistics (Thomas & Wareing, 2000; Wildgen, 2004; Jourdan & Tuiti, 2006).

The process of learning another language requires from any researcher or scholar not only its form and structure, but also a clear understanding of the relationship between language and culture. Many views have been given to the relationship between language and culture. Thus, to many scholars, language is heavily influenced by culture as well as being a part of culture. Hence, the relationship between language and culture can be exemplified as if to be like two sides of a coin. To other scholars, however, the relationship is much more problematic because language could be regarded as a medium through which culture is communicated, expressed, and learned. As far as human culture develops, other means of

communication should also be developed to cope with such developments of culture (Rosman, Rubel & Weisgrau, 2009). Thus, through the way one uses his/her language, others can immediately grasp, or at least infer the person's gender, nationality or ethnicity, emotional attitude, physical state, age, class, education, and often their relationship to the hearer. All of this evaluated information is heavily influenced by that culture. In short, language (and culture) is what mediates between human being and the world or reality. Accordingly, learning any language means not only learning its structure, but also learning its social and cultural conventions. Having cognitive, expressive, and value aspects, language is eligible to be regarded as a cultural institution (Wierzbicka, 1992; Delaney, 2004).

Since the relationship between language and culture is inseparable from each other, Agar (1994) proposed the term "languaculture" that suitably combines between these two terms or specifically between "theory" and "action". Languaculture is a coined term which combines between the term language which studies elements such as grammar and vocabulary, and culture which can be seen as the sum of shared customs, beliefs, values, behaviour (linguistics and otherwise), institutions, objects and techniques that the members of a society use to regulate their lives and is transmitted from one generation to another through learning. In other words, Languaculture can be regarded as a suitable item to link between linguistic forms and meanings that can be understood and shared within social groups but not necessarily across them. Risager (2005) considered such a concept of languaculture as a very useful notion in understanding language as both deemed as a social and a cultural phenomenon.

In discussing the relationship between language and culture, Duranti (2003) and Crystal (2008) mentioned that many labels such as linguistic anthropology, anthropological linguistics, ethnolinguistics, and linguistic determinism and/or relativism may synonymously be used to refer to this relationship even though these terms may refer to different theoretical and methodological orientations toward their object of investigation. Whenever such terms

are mentioned, what comes to someone's mind is the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis (1956) which was a very influential hypothesis or theory of cultural difference working at the intersection of linguistics and anthropology. The Sapir–Whorf hypothesis focused on the combination of two controversial principles to the relation between language and culture. These include the idea of linguistic determinism and the concept of linguistic relativism. These two principles focus on the idea that language determines the way people perceive and organise their way of interpreting worlds and their modes of thought. Hence, language is an unavoidable shaper of ideas, the program and guide for the individual's mental activity. The Sapir–Whorf (1956) hypothesis also focused on the uniqueness of each language and the need to examine it in its own terms because each language may provide its speakers with a set of hard-to-question dispositions that may have an effect on their interpretation of reality and consequently on their behaviour (Jourdan & Tuiti, 2006; Rosman et al, 2009; Wiseman, 2009).

Linguistic anthropology, which studies human languages in relation to the broader biological, cultural, and historical contexts, is regarded as one subfield of the four major traditional branches of anthropology. The other subfields include: archaeological, biological or physical, and sociocultural anthropology. Generally, one can say that such fields of anthropology are relatively overlapping with each other because all of them are concerned with the study of all aspects of human beings (Lavenda & Schultz, 2010). One of the most important areas of anthropological studies can be viewed in the study of kinship systems which investigates how humans can use certain words to establish and identify social relations among each other. Thus, Kottak (2009) stated that both linguistic and cultural anthropologists work together to investigate lexical and cultural terms and concepts that link between language and other aspects of culture by which kinship can be perceived and reckoned among the people.

2.2 Language and Social Relations

Many linguistic views have stressed on the important function of language as being the main means of communication and a source of maintaining the social relationship between a speaker and a listener in any speech community. This maintenance on the importance of language can be attributed to the idea that any human society is made up of many related patterns and behaviours in which some of them are linguistic items such as sounds, words and grammatical structures, as mentioned by Hudson (1996). Fairclough (1989) and Cap and Kozanecka (2002) mentioned that in order for a language to be recognised as a homogenous entity, it should be studied in its social context. Thus, one can say that the study of language cannot be completed in isolation from the social context. This indicates that in acquiring terms of any language, people should learn not only their grammatical or lexical meanings, but also how to use them in appropriate situations with various audiences. Consequently, Agha (2007) declared that language is a social phenomenon that should be accompanied with other metalinguistic activities which include a vast range of meaningful behaviour.

According to this important relationship between language and society and in order to discover the correlations between social structure and linguistic structure and to scrutinise any changes that occur, a new scientific discipline has emerged which is known as sociolinguistics. According to Crystal (2008) and Radford, Atkinson, Britain, Clahsen & Spencer (2009), sociolinguistics studies all aspects of the relationship between language use and the structure of society by taking into consideration different factors such as the social backgrounds and family relationship of both the addresser and the addressee (such as their sex, social status, age, ethnic background, grandfather, son, sibling), the context and manner of the interaction, standard and non-standard forms of language, the patterns and needs of national language user, social varieties and levels of language, and the effects of language use on society. Mesthrie, Swann, Deumert & William (2009) confirmed that the term

'sociolinguistics' was firstly used in 1939 by T.C. Hodson in relation to language study in India; after that significant writings on sociolinguistics which appeared after this date contain Weinreich's *Languages in Contact (1966)*, and also many other American structuralists such as Labov (1966), Hymes (1974b), and Trudgill (2000). In contrast to linguists, such as De Saussure (1959) and Chomsky (1965), who consider language as an abstract entity and context-free, the area of sociolinguistics has emerged to prove that a language is not only an abstract object of study or a matter of linguistic structure, but it is also a matter of social structure that people use it in everyday communication (Wardhaugh, 2006). Gumperz and Gumperz (2008) maintained that sociolinguistics may extremely overlap with pragmatics because both of them focus on the study of how social and linguistic contexts affects language use, and it is closely related to linguistic anthropology and the distinction between the two fields has even been questioned recently.

Crystal (2008) mentioned that sociolinguistics may be discussed or interrelated with another subject which is the sociology of language although the latter is mainly concerned with the study of social aspects of language rather than the linguistic ones as the former. Hudson (1996) and Wardhaugh (2006) stated that the sociology of language which is sometimes called macro-linguistics can be differentiated from sociolinguistics or micro-linguistics. In sociology, the sociologists investigate language's effects on aspects of society; whereas in sociolinguisitics, the sociolinguists are concerned with the study of society's effects on the language.

In discussing the relationship between language and society, language can be used to link between individuals in different social activities including kinship. Thus, terms of kinship, according to the sociolinguistic point of view, are used as terms of address and reference which reflects the use of language to classify and identify individuals through the system of kinship (Thomas &Wareing, 2000). In addition, Hymes (1996) confirmed that the meanings of KTs (henceforth KTs) can be regarded as the bridge that links between social

18

life and formal linguistics. In this vein, such a bridge was designated as ethnolinguistics before forty years ago; however, today scholars have identified different terms and designations that can be used to describe the relationship between linguistics and society such as sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, conversational analysis, pragmatics, cross-cultural communication, sociology of language, and discourse.

2.3 Language and Religion

Although the relationship between the study of religion and the study of language is still in progress in most religious studies, sociologists have recently started to capture such an important relationship between the two. Thus, many scholars, such as Crystal (1966; 1990), Ferguson (1982), Fishman (1968), Spolsky (2003), Omoniyi and Fishman (2006), and Downes (2011), have stated that in many cultures the study of language cannot be separated from the study of religion because the relationship between them is intertwined and both together can be perceived as culture. Therefore, Carrasco and Riegelhaupt (2006) declared that religion and language cannot be isolated from culture by saying that if you "Take away language, you lose culture; take away religion, you lose culture; take away culture, you lose both language and religion" (p. 259). In fact, religion, in this sense, cannot be located away from other linguistic and cultural exercises because religion is implicitly positioned in the behaviour of human beings (Downes, 2011).

Bennett (2011) declared that, in religious studies, the relationship between religion and language has been in continuous progress, but in sociolinguistic studies, such a relation is still premature. Therefore, scholars such as Sapir (1949), Ferguson (1982), Wierzbicka (1997), Duranti (2003), Spolsky (2003), Delaney (2004), and Jourdan and Tuiti (2006) focused on the study of the relationship between culture, language and religion. Consequently, to study any aspect anthropologically is to look at it as a learned and shared human behaviour. This is usually done through language which is considered as the medium

that transfers our thoughts, ideas and concepts to be shared with other people. Therefore, Bennardo (2009) asserted that, from a theoretical and practical viewpoint, the study of language is one of the most important elements in ethnological studies because a thorough insight into ethnology cannot be gained without practical knowledge of language, on the one hand. On the other hand, the exchange of ideas, thoughts and concepts illustrated by human languages are not distinct in kind from ethnological phenomena. Furthermore, the peculiar characteristics of languages are clearly reflected in the views and customs of the peoples of the world.

Eller (2007) stated that most of the anthropological religious studies tend to investigate scientifically the diversity of human religions. Such studies must raise, discuss and answer different specific questions about the relationship between religion and some cultural and social aspects of a society. Hence, Meister (2009) mentioned that religion cannot be isolated from other aspects of society and culture because it covers all facets of human life.

As far as KTs are concerned, by modifying Eller's questions (2007), the researcher believes that some contentious matters should be addressed in this respect. One may argue whether one can consider KTs as one of the commonalities between religions, particularly Islam and Christianity. One may pose a question whether there is a relationship between various parts of any single religion, or between a religion and its social environment. Finally, the researcher may ask whether they can detect regular pattern kinship concepts or rules that maintain or regulate kinship relations across religions. In this regard, Cohen (2011) and Brubaker (2013) attempted to address such matters. Cohen (2011), for example, contented that religious descended texts and doctrines may form the way that cultures develop. That is, religious texts in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam can help explain different intercultural similarities and differences between one culture and another. Thus, such texts can theoretically and practically stimulate scholars to think about how cultural

differences among religions be related and solved. One can affirm that religions have a lot of commonalities and similarities than disagreements or differences. On the other hand, Brubaker (2013) presented different views that may link between langua-culture and ethno-religious aspects. Firstly, language and religion can be regarded as the basic sources and forms of social, cultural and political identification among social groups. In fact, language, religion or both are generally understood as central to most ethnic and national identifications that may serve as the key diacritical markers, emblems or symbols of such identifications. Second, he added that a family is a primary site of linguistic and religious socialisation than ethnicity and nationality. Third, language and religion are not fixed notions; they should be seen as changeable, progressing and flexible concepts because they are affected by the change of cultural, social, economic, and political processes. However, both are interrelated by time to cope with the new developments of the communities. Consequently, some scholars such as Rothschild (1981) and Brubaker (2013) argued that the relationship between language and religion should be treated - implicitly or explicitly - as functionally equivalent.

As a matter of fact, one can state that the relationship between language and religion is dynamic and fundamental, particularly in dynamic societies. This is because all religious texts such as the Holy Quran and the Holy Bible provide fundamental rules that organise various societal institutions such as kinship, marriage, inheritance, adoption, contracts, economic and political activities as well as ethical teachings. In addition, one can say that the analysis of such religious texts may provide solutions to many social, economic, and political problems as the world is currently increasingly facing. In this regard, Knitter (2002) argued that all religions are invited to regularly urge people to take time out to study the ethical teachings of the religious texts because such texts may determine how people feel about themselves and properly view their world.

2.4 Historical Views of Related Kinship Studies

Kinship studies have a long and varied history among anthropological scholars who have been embarked on such studies since the 1850s with significant transformations. Such studies flourished in anthropology by the early theorists such as Morgan (1871), Rivers (1924), Malinowski (1913; 1929), Murdock (1965), Evans-Pritchard, (1951), Radcliffe-Brown (1952), Goodenough (1956), Schusky (1965), Fox (1966), Schneider (1980; 1984), Needham (1971), Goody (1971), and Scheffler (1978) until the 1980s, when these studies lost their sparkle. However, the most important anthropologist among those scholars was Lewis Henry Morgan who was regarded as the father of kinship studies in anthropology in the nineteenth century. By gathering an enormous amount of data on kinship terminologies of different cultures, Morgan (1871) formulated a scientific theory that can explain and classify different kinds of kinship systems that can be regarded as the basic step for any future studies. Thus, many productive efforts about the classification of kinship by many anthropologists who followed Morgan continued to declare that the study of kinship could be considered as the main developing area of social anthropology (Buchler & Selby, 1968; Hemmings, 2004). After this date, studies of kinship fainted when Schneider (1984) rejected and criticised the old fashion concepts of kinship studies that based on genealogical and biological way of thinking. He called for a revolution in this area of kinship in order to revitalise and create a new approach to the study of kinship based on the use of modern quantitative methods and approaches. Such a criticism of kinship studies by Schneider (1984) led to a decline in this field of study which is based on the traditional concepts; however, this also motivated more recent scholars to renew and revitalise the concepts of kinship to cope with the new developments of societies.

Various new anthropological, sociological, linguistic, and religious studies have dealt with the terms of kinship from different perspectives. Most of these studies focused on the importance of kinship and its usable terms as being a major universal cultural aspect in

determining and organizing principles in human societies. In addition, research on kinship is one of the most important areas that links language with other aspects of culture and has aroused the interest of modern linguists and anthropologists in recent years. Therefore, modern scholars have so far stressed on new modern kinship studies such as gender, new reproductive technologies, new religious concepts about marriage and remarriage, mathematical approaches of kinship and new legal codes of family relations (Schneider, 1984; Parkin, 1997; Stone, 2001; Read, 1984, 2001a, 2001b, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2013a; Sousa, 2003; Hemmings, 2004; Shenk & Mattison, 2011).

Historically, the study of kinship was central to the development of anthropology and sociology. These two fields of study conceptualised family and kinship within different theories of descent and alliance, biological connectedness, and marriage. Kinship has been conventionally defined as a relationship between one person with another and this relationship is based on two traditional views: descent and/or marriage. For many decades, specifically from Morgan's works in 1871 and up to present, anthropologists and linguists have been researching and analysing aspects of kinship and family around the world for over a century. Such studies, first, have focused on studying the structure of kinship and family, but they have shifted the analysis of KTs from structure into cultural meanings. Thus, from the mid twentieth century up to the present time, there have been, among many other changes, three main shifts (Ebtehaj, Lindley & Richards, 2006; Stone, 2010). In the first view, many anthropologists have viewed kinship as an important phenomenon primarily because it was understood to constitute a social structure and play a fundamental role in the formation of many social groups with their political, economic, and religious organisations. By the mid-twentieth century, anthropological models of kinship systems in relation to social structure had become quite complex and shifted into giving more attention to the internal cultural meanings of kinship rather than structure (Stone, 2010).

The second view emerged in the works of nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. During this period, anthropologists confirmed that kinship and family ties were fundamentally based on biological (genetic) link, and ties between parents and children were assumed to emerge from the natural facts of procreation or acts of birth. This relationship is sometimes called blood ties which result from marriage and by which kin ties are acquired (Schneider, 1980, 1984; Stone, 2010; Logan, 2012).

The third view, according to Stone (2010), appeared in the 1980s by most contemporary anthropologists such as Schneider (1984), Carsten (2004), and Clarke (2009). These anthropologists stated that kin relations are not only necessarily established through normal acts of birth or biogenetic ties, but also through various actions of social kinship such as adoption, fostering, and acts of receiving and giving food. This new view of kinship has now seen kinship relations and terms as more processing and dynamic in order to cope with the new developments of life than previously assumed to be an inflexible concept.

2.5 What is Kinship?

Many modern and historical sociocultural scholars have written various books and articles on kinship in such a way that gives a significant understanding of social structure and demography, ethnicity, and the human attempts for organizing family relations, sex, marriage, inheritance, polite/impolite expressions, and religious matters. Since kinship knowledge is a universal complex human trait, it can be regarded as an appropriate means for the study of all modern societies and their cultural aspects (White, Batagelj & Mrvar, 1999; Read & El Guindi, 2013). Moreover, Trautmann and Whiteley (2012) regarded kinship studies as one of the most important disciplines that can investigate universal trait variations and to collect and study worldwide databases of the culture of any primitive or modern society. Thus, many anthropologists and linguists are trying to put and develop important standards for the sake of typologizing, historizing, quantifying, mapping, and