

Microstructural Translation of Al-Baqara (Q.2): A Novel Glimpse at Its Linguistic and Ideological Structure

Ebrahim Khodadady *

Department of English Language and Literature, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

Abstract

This study aimed to find out what statistically significant words and sentences constituted the verses of the second surah of the Holy Quran (HQ), i.e., Al-Baqara (AB). To this end, the microstructural approach of schema theory (MICAST) was employed and the whole AB was translated into English by consulting a number of English translations of the HQ. The surah was then parsed into its single and phrasal words on the basis of the concepts they represented, i.e., schemata. Based on their linguistic functions, the schemata were classified into three domains, i.e., semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic. The constituting genera and species of domains were also specified through codification to run statistical analyses. The results showed that the AB consists of 11489 and 1549 schema tokens and types, respectively. The four schema types “and”, “the”, “you” and “Allah” had the highest tokens because they appeared 734, 713, 444, and 282 times in the AB, respectively. In their unique combination with each other schema tokens have produced 697 sentences and 286 verses. Statistical analyses showed that not only the linguistic domains but also their constituting genera and species differed significantly from each other, indicating that the schemata were deliberately chosen to express concepts at word and verse levels. The results are discussed from both linguistic and ideological perspectives to address “Allah” as a unique Islamic name having specific attributes brought up in AB.

Keywords: Quran, schemata, species, genera, domains

INTRODUCTION

The Holy Quran (HQ) is “the scripture for Muslims brought to the Prophet Muhammad from God through the mediation of the archangel Jibril [i.e., Gabriel] (Newby, 2002, p. 178). “It is a fairly compact text of 114 sections” (McAuliffe, 2001, p. i). A review of literature dealing with the HQ translated into English shows that it has been described mainly through its sections or “chapters” (Al-Maliki & Sheikh-Ibrahim, 1997, p. 21) and their constituting parts commonly known as verses (e.g., Tabatabai, n.d.). Few studies, if any, have, however, focused on its fundamental units, i.e., words. The present study has, therefore, been developed to explain the reasons behind the traditional approaches and offer the microstructural approach of schema theory (MICAST) as a powerful rationale

through which the HQ can be translated, understood, and explained objectively. To fulfill the objective, the statistical analyses were conducted on the second and longest surah of the HQ called Al-Baqara (AB), i.e., the Cow.

Theories of Translation

Translation has been employed "to perform different functions, academic or religious, cultural or political, commercial or municipal" (Venuti, 2000, p. 477). No theory has, however, been put forward to define translation in an operationalized, empirical or objective manner. Following scholars such as Newmark (1988a, 1988b), House (2001), for example, demarcated translation as a "recontextualization of a text in L₁ [i.e., language one] by semantically and parametrically equivalent text in L₂" (p. 247). Others such as Baker (1992) and Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997) added some pragmatic and sociolinguistic considerations to the process.

Although traditional translations have achieved their intended function by conveying largely subjective messages to their readers, they have, as Bassnett (2002) asserted, fallen short of providing them with any objective measure to evaluate their translations. This is because what a text stands for or what "rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text" (Newmark, 1988a, p. 5) means is interpreted in two methodologically different rationales, i.e., macrostructural approach of schema theory (MACAST) and MICAST.

Khodadady (2001) believed that traditional translators have employed the MACAST unconsciously because they adopt "texts" (e.g., Venuti, 2000; Newmark, 1988a) or "messages" (e.g., Newmark, 1988b) as their basic units of translation. Translation from the MACAST perspective is thus very similar to, if not the same as, reading comprehension ability requiring, according to Stanovich (1980), the ability to employ mental processes that integrate information from various sentences and *the text as a whole*, i.e., schema. This approach led scholars such as Clapham (1996), Moy (1975) and Shoham, Peretz and Vorhaus (1987) to assume that the scores of students in a specific field such as the engineering on a language test developed on a literary text, i.e., schema, will be significantly lower than their score on the same test developed on an engineering text, i.e., another schema.

Khodadady and Herriman (2000) argued that adopting the MACAST as a reading comprehension theory is subjective because there is *no single* schema expressed in a given text dealing with literature and another schema dealing exclusively with engineering. Their argument was supported by Clapham's (1996) empirically designed study. She administered an English language proficiency test developed on texts dealing with humanities to several groups including university engineering and humanities students, hypothesizing that students of humanities will outperform those of engineering on tests designed on literary texts. Contrary to her expectations, the scores obtained by engineering test takers were significantly higher than those of humanities, indicating that there is no schema called humanities.

Khodadady and Herriman (2000) further argued that a *schema* is **not** a *text* or *message* **but** any *concept* represented by a single or phrasal *word*, i.e., MICAST. It combines with other *schemata* represented by other *words* within a hierarchical system to produce concepts at broader and more complex levels called cognitive species, genera and domains by Khodadady and Dastgahian (2013). Khodadady and Herriman maintained that the alleged single schema representing a text, i.e., MACAST, is the result of abstraction at various levels and cannot, therefore, explain how reading comprehension takes place. In contrast, by resorting to schemata represented by words, the MICAST not only shows what the readers already know but also explains how they combine them with each other to develop their cognitive species, genera and domains represented by the sentences, paragraphs and chapters of a text such as the HQ, respectively.

MACAST-Vs-MICAST-Based Translation

The outcome of translating any text into another language depends directly on how the translator defines language. Asad (2011), for example, believed that for translating the HQ, the translator “must be able to feel and hear this language as the Arabs felt and heard it at the time when the Qur'an was being revealed” (p. 6). He, therefore, spent years not only in familiarizing himself “with the bedouin speech of Central and Eastern Arabia” but also on acquiring the “academic knowledge of classical Arabic” (p. 7). He also claimed that since “none of the scholars who have previously translated the Qur'an into European languages has ever fulfilled this prerequisite, their translations have remained but *distant*, and *faulty* [italics added], echoes of its meaning and spirit” (p. 7).

Asad's (2011) approach towards translating the HQ is MACAST-based because he employs subjective terms such as feeling and hearing the spirit of Arabic language. What these terms meant to him nobody knows because he does not provide any examples to show how he has employed them in his translation to overcome the misunderstandings produced by so called “distinct and faulty translations” (p. 7). The application of MICAST to Asad's translation, however, shows that some of his translations are questionable if not faulty themselves and thus challenges MACAST-based translations as Khodadady and Herriman (2000) did with MACAST-based tests designed on reading comprehension passages.

Asad (2011), for example, translated the MUTTAQIN as “God-conscious” in the second verse of AB, i.e., “HIS DIVINE WRIT - let there be no doubt about it is [meant to be] a guidance for all the God-conscious”, and provided the footnote below for his English readers.

The conventional translation of muttaqi as "Godfearing" does not adequately render the positive content of this expression - namely, the awareness of His all-presence and the desire to mould one's existence in the light of this awareness; while the interpretation adopted by some translators, "one who guards himself against evil" or "one who is careful of his duty", does not give more than one particular aspect of the concept of God-consciousness. (p. 11)

Asad's (2011) attempt to apply the subjective spirit of Arabic to the translation of the noun schema MUTTAQIN has been of little help, if any, because his equivalent, i.e., "God-conscious", seems to be as inadequate as "God fearing" offered by translators such as non-Arab Arberry (1955). Similar to Asad, Arberry adopted the MACAST as his translation theory because he believed "that in no previous rendering has a serious attempt been made to imitate, however imperfectly, those rhetorical and rhythmical patterns which are the glory and the sublimity of the Koran" (p. 16). Whatever the effect of acknowledged patterns in Arberry's translation, it has not helped him choose an appropriate equivalent for MUTTAQIN.

Had translators such as Arberry and Asad focused on the schemata comprising 2:2 and those following it, i.e., 2:3, 2:4 and 2:5, they would not have offered the inappropriate equivalents of "God fearing" and "God conscious", respectively, for the Quranic schema MUTTAQIN because they "believe in the unseen", "perform the salat", "spend in Allah's cause", "believe in the Quran and other divine scriptures" and "are certain of hereafter", to name a few of their distinct characteristics mentioned in the AB. Al-Hilali and Khan (1996), however, noticed the inadequacy of equivalents offered by translators and rightfully opted for the transliterated noun schema MUTTAQIN as the best equivalent. Although Al-Hilali and Khan do not tell their readers what theory they have followed in translating the HQ, the present study offers the MICAST to explain such attempts in terms of a sound theory.

In contrast to MACAST which adopts "text", "spirit", "rhetorical and rhythmical patterns" as its unit of translation, the MICAST approaches each single or phrasal word used by an author or translator as the main unit of writing or translation. It represents a *schema* whose application in isolation and in combination with other words expresses specific concepts at various levels of syntactic, semantic and discoursal complexity. The selection of each schema and employing it along with other schemata thus brings about not only the language of a specific text but also the hierarchically different concepts the text conveys to its readers. In other words, each schema has basically two distinct functions to play within texts: linguistic and cognitive.

A schema constituting a text falls into one of the three linguistic domains called semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic (Khodadady, 2013). The semantic domain consisting of adjective, adverb, noun and verb genera contains schemata which are open in type in that new schemata are either created in a specific language such as English itself or borrowed from other languages to meet ever-evolving communicative needs. *Longman Dictionary of American English* (2009), for example, had no entry for the noun schema "salat". *Dictionary.com Unabridged* accessed in 2016, however, does offer the entry of salat (n.d.) as an English word representing "prayers, said five times a day: the second of the Pillars of Islam". It also offers "salah" as its alternative spelling.

In contrast to semantic domain, the linguistically established syntactic domain consists of conjunction, determiner, preposition, pronoun, and syntactic verb genera which are closed in type because there is no need to create, say, new subject pronouns in the English language. Lagzian (2013), for example, analyzed 70 pages of the university

textbook "Radiology: Principles and interpretation" (White & Pharoah, 2004) and found that out of 4213 schema types comprising the pages only *four* were pronouns, i.e., "he", "it", "they", and "we". In spite of being few in type, they are frequently employed to fulfill their largely linguistic function. The schema "it", for example, had the highest token because it was used 102 times in the textbook.

The third linguistic domain, i.e., parasyntactic, has the characteristics of both semantic and syntactic domains. Since its abbreviation, name, numeral, and symbol genera can be many in type, they behave like semantic schemata. However, similar, to syntactic genera, the interjection, para-adverb, and particle genera of parasyntactic domain are few in type as syntactic schemata are. Whether the parasyntactic genera are many or few in type or not, they mainly play a syntactic role because their meaning depends on the semantic schemata they represent or attach to. The name "Allah" is, for example, largely unknown to irreligious individuals who have not read the HQ or been in contact with Muslims.

In order to study the texts more objectively and unravel their underlying structure and content in terms of MICAST, Khodadady (2013) broke the linguistic genera constituting the semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domains into their constituting genera and species. He also assigned specific codes to all linguistic domains, genera and species so that statistical analyses could be conducted on texts. (They will be described, albeit briefly, in the methodology section). His codes were, therefore, employed in this study to explore the structure of the AB in general and determine whether the domains, genera and species constituting the surah have psychological reality in particular. A number of key schemata has also been discussed to uncover the ideology pursued in the AB.

METHODOLOGY

Arabic Text of AB

The MICAST is based on the assumption that the written words, i.e., "those sets of things marked in black with the bigger spaces separating them" (Yule, 2010, p. 66), are linguistic symbols which represent specific concepts, mental images or *schemata* in readers' mind not only by themselves but also in combination with other words when they comprise the sentences, paragraphs, and chapters of a text. Based on this assumption, the Word file of the Arabic text written by calligrapher Uthman ibn Abduh ibn Husayn ibn Taha (Darul Tahqiq, 2015) was parsed into its constituting words in a Word file. However, when Khodadady (2001) was followed and an attempt was made to subsume them into semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domains, it was realized that some Arabic words separated by spaces needed to be joined together to represent a single schema. There were also many single Quranic words which represented more than one schema.

The two words appearing at the beginning of verse 2:21 are separated by a space in between "يَا أَيُّهَا" (YA AYYOHA), for example, represent a single parasyntactic interjection

schema translated as “O” by Al-Hilali and Khan (1996), e.g., “O mankind ...” (p.16). Or the two Quranic words “مِنْ بَعْدُ” (MIN BADE) separated by a space represent the single syntactic schema “after” in 2:56, i.e., “Then we raised you up *after* your death, so that you might be graceful” (Al-Hilali & Khan, 1996, p. 23). These linguistic and cognitive considerations led the present researcher to join these two words as a single schema.

There were also a number of parsed Quranic words which needed to be joined in order to show that they represented a single concept as a phrasal schema. The phrasal schema “الدَّارُ الْآخِرَةُ” (AD-DAR-OL-AKHERAH) in 2:177, for example, consists of the semantic noun “الدَّارُ” and adjective “الْآخِرَةُ” meaning “the home” and “the last”, respectively. The semantic words “home” and “last” were, therefore, combined according to English syntax to create the single phrasal schema “last home” specified by the single word schema “the” to represent the schema “hereafter”. Similarly the two words “الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ” (AL-MASJID-OL-HARAM) which are separated by a space in 2:192 were treated as a single phrasal schema translated as “Sacred Mosque” preceded by the determiner “the”. It is a phrasal schema which shows how KABAHA is treated in Islam.

While two separate Quranic words representing a single schema could be joined mechanically, a different procedure had to be taken to tackle single words which represented a number of different schemata. The single word Arabic schema “رَزَقْنَاهُمْ” (RAZAQNAHUM) in 2:3, for example, consists of the root RAZAQ and the bound morphs NA and HUM. Following Yusuf Ali (2011), it was translated as “We have provided for them”. Thus, from the MICAST perspective, the schema RAZAQNAHUM consists of four single syntactic schemata, i.e., “we”, “have”, “for” and “them”, and one single semantic schema “provided” which had to be parsed for linguistic, cognitive and statistical analyses.

Due to the procedural problems described in this section as well as the difficulty of parsing Arabic words in a Word file which is specifically designed for English alphabet, the present researcher decided that instead of parsing the Quranic words comprising the Arabic AB, one of its currently available English translations should be employed to study its linguistic structure. Implementing this decision, however, brought up another unpredicted problem: which English translation should be chosen for analysis? To solve this problem Khodadady’s (2001) MICAST-based translation was followed because it stipulates providing the most appropriate English equivalent for each single or phrasal Arabic word as it combined with other words to produce the sentences and verses of AB as described below.

MICAST-Based Translation of AB

Almost all well-known English translations of AB were consulted for the purpose of this study. However, it was realized that due to their adherence to the MACAST, they had a number of shortcomings which necessitated translating the AB by the present researcher himself. Its second verse, “ذَٰلِكَ الْكِتَابُ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهِ هُدًى لِّلْمُتَّقِينَ”, is, for example, translated by Pickthall (1930) as “This is the Scripture whereof there is no doubt, a guidance to those who are pious” (p. 16). As can be seen, he has translated the noun

schema MUTTAQIN as a dependent clause consisting of four schemata, i.e., “those”, “who”, “are” and “pious”. The main concept in Pickthall’s dependent clause is conveyed by the schema “pious” which is linguistically inappropriate because it is an *adjective*. The MICAST is based on the principle that every schema in the AB must be understood *linguistically* and *cognitively* as it is in the source text. MUTTAQIN is a *noun* and translating it as a dependent clause with an *adjective* as its core or head does not represent the schema it must invoke in its readers’ mind as the Arabic schema does.

It must, however, be emphasized that Pickthall (1930) did contribute to understanding the AB because he provided his readers with a translation rendered by a British Muslim 86 years ago when human communication and international interaction had not reached the current level. In order to make his English readers understand the AB, Pickthall, for example, translated the verb and noun schema “يُؤَيِّمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ” in 2:3 as “... establish worship”. The two noun and verb schemata “establish” and “worship” are far more appropriate than the clause “observe the appointed times of prayer” offered by non-Muslim Sale (Wherry, 1860, vol I, p. 293) in which the schema “salat” is equated with “the appointed times of prayer”!

Among the English translations of the AB, the one rendered by Al-Hilali and Khan (1996) seemed to be the closest to the MICAST because instead of translating “لِّلْمُتَّقِينَ” in 2:2 as a dependent clause as Yusuf Ali (2011) did, i.e., those who fear Allah (p. 3), they employed the transliterated schema “Al-Muttaqun” (p. 14). Surprisingly, however, they added the schemata “those who are” to the translation, i.e., “This is the Book ..., whereof there is no doubt, a guidance to *those who are* [italics added] Al-Muttaqun [sic] ... (p. 14). There is no schema in the 2:2 with which “*those who are*” can be equated with! A MICAST-based translation of the AB will be valid if and only if a translator provides the most appropriate equivalent for each and all of the schemata comprising the AB without deleting any schema from the AB or adding extraneous schemata unless acknowledged in brackets or explained as footnotes or endnotes.

Translation Units Broader than Schemata

From a MICAST perspective, while each word represents a schema in isolation it joins other schemata within structures traditionally called sentences to bring up broader concepts called *cognitive species* by Khodadady and Bagheri (2014). The sentences are linguistically analyzed in terms of two constituents: “the subject and the predicate” (Greenbaum & Nelson, 2002, p. 21). The subject of a sentence is usually a noun phrase while a verb phrase forms the predicate. Unfortunately, the majority of scholars who have translated the AB into English have not paid adequate attention to the structure of sentences they have composed and thus provided interested researchers with no data as regards the number of sentences each verse of the AB contains.

Asad (2011), for example, translated 2:2 as a single sentence, i.e., “HIS DIVINE WRIT - let there be no doubt about it is [meant to be] a guidance for all the God-conscious” (p. 3). This sentence is complex in structure because the imperative sentence “let there be no doubt about it” is employed as an appositive to “His divine writ” in order to render

“is ... a guidance for all the God-conscious” a predicate. Yusuf Ali (2010) translated 2:2 as a complex sentence too. He also managed to relate “without doubt” to “guidance” rather than “the book”, i.e., “This is the Book; in it is guidance sure, without doubt, to those who fear Allah” (p. 3).

In contrast to translators such as Asad (2011), Pickthall (1930) and Yusuf Ali (2010) who translated 2:2 as a complex sentence, the present researcher translated it in two simple sentences expressing two cognitive *species* as divine *facts*, i.e., “This is the book about which there is no doubt. It is a guidance to the muttaqin”. As can be seen, in addition to being simple in structure, the sentences are free from extraneous additions such as Asad’s “His divine” and “all” and Yusuf Ali’s “sure”. The two MICAST based translations of verse 2:2 also provide readers with English equivalents which can be matched with each of the Quranic schemata and thus help readers improve their Quranic competence, i.e., ذَلِكَ (this is) الْكِتَابُ (the book) لَا رَيْبَ (there is no doubt) فِيهِ (about which). هُدًى (It is a guidance) لِلْمُتَّقِينَ (to the muttaqin).

The syntactic juxtapositioning of words in specific sentences within verses provides a largely unnoticed broader concept of cognitive species which reveals itself only through the MICAST. Thus the sentence, “This is the book about which there is no doubt”, in 2:2 render the HQ different from all other scriptures such as the *Bible*. There is no doubt about the HQ because it was revealed directly to Muhammad by Archangel Gabriel and was memorized by many Muslims in his own life time. However, the New Testament is, according to Bucaille (n.d.), based on the Greek Septuagint dating from the third century B.C. and “written by Jews in Alexandria” (p. 11).

The second sentence of 2:2 brings up the second cognitive species through seven English schemata, i.e., “It is a guidance to the muttaqin”. Thus 2:2 conveys two Quranic species via two sentences consisting of ten and seven schemata, respectively. While the first species, for example, distinguishes the HQ as a purely divine book, the second reveals its nature, i.e., it is Allah’s guidance to the muttaqin. The HQ leaves it neither to its readers nor to its translators such as Asad (2011), Pickthall (1930) and Yusuf Ali (2010) to decide who the muttaqin are. Instead it refers its readers to verses 2:3, 2:4 and 2:5 as concepts-broader-than-species called genera to characterize the muttaqin as straightforwardly as possible. In other words, while the MICAST fails to reveal various levels of meaning revealed by the HQ, the MICAST indicates what schemata, species and genera are represented by the words, sentences and verses of AB, respectively.

Procedures

Each Arabic word comprising the 286 verses of AB was analyzed linguistically and assigned to its relevant domain, i.e., semantic, syntactic or parasyntactic, on the basis of the mental concept or schema it represented in isolation, and in combination not only with other words in a sentence, i.e., cognitive species, but also with other words in a verse, i.e., cognitive genus. Upon determining what schema each word represented linguistically and cognitively, it was translated into the English language and placed within an acceptable English sentence which kept the Arabic structure of each verse as

much as possible. This was done so that the bilingual presentation of each verse in both Arabic and English would help English readers determine easily what each Arabic word meant in English. (Interested readers can contact the present researcher for the PDF file of his translation).

Verse 2 of AB is, for example, a single sentence which consists of 10 Arabic schemata, i.e., الَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِالْغَيْبِ وَيُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنَاهُمْ يُنْفِقُونَ. Their English equivalents chosen by the present researcher were: those who (الَّذِينَ) believe (يُؤْمِنُونَ) in the unseen (بِالْغَيْبِ), and (و) perform (يُقِيمُونَ) the salat (الصَّلَاةَ) and (و) of what (مِمَّا) we have provided for them (رَزَقْنَاهُمْ) they spend (يُنْفِقُونَ). The MICAST-based translation of the verse along with others helped him analyze the structure of AB linguistically by parsing its verses into their constituting schemata and species. Following Khodadady's (2013) system of codification, all the parsed English schemata were then copied and pasted in the fourth column of an Excel worksheet as a variable, i.e., token, whose linguistic species, genera and domains had to be specified as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Codification of Schemata Comprising 2:3

No	Verse	Sentence	Token	Species	Genus	Domain
21	3	1	Those	2410	24	2
22	3	1	Who	2460	24	2
23	3	1	Believe	1441	14	1
24	3	1	In	2340	23	2
25	3	1	The Unseen	1332	13	1
26	3	1	And	2120	21	2
27	3	1	Perform	1441	14	1
28	3	1	The	2270	22	2
29	3	1	Salat	1380	13	1
30	3	1	And	2120	21	2
31	3	1	Of	2340	23	2
32	3	1	What	2460	24	2
33	3	1	We	2470	24	2
34	3	1	Have	2521	25	2
35	3	1	Provided	1443	14	1
36	3	1	For	2340	23	2
37	3	1	Them	2440	24	2
38	3	1	They	2470	24	2
39	3	1	Spend	1441	14	1

The tabulation of schema tokens comprising the verses of AB allowed running a number of analyses whose results and discussions will be presented shortly. As can be seen in Table 1 above, the first left hand digit in the fifth column, for example, indicates what domain the schema was assigned to, i.e., 1 (semantic), 2 (syntactic) and 3 (parasynthetic) while the first and second digits together reveal its genus, e.g., 13 (noun) and 14 (verb). The last two digits specify the species of schemata, e.g., 32 (conversion noun) and 41 (simple form of a verb or infinitive without to). Thus, "the unseen" is categorized as a conversion noun having the code of 1332 while "believe" is treated as a simple verb with the code of 1441.

Data Analysis

For running statistical analyses the data related to the schemata constituting the AB were copied from the Excel file and pasted in IBM SPSS 20 datasheet called schema tokens. The frequency analysis was run on schema tokens to specify how many schema types in what frequency or token constituted the AB. Then, another SPSS datasheet called schema types was developed which included their linguistic species, genera and domains. And finally, descriptive statistics and chi-square tests were run on both datasheets to test the research questions of the study. These tests reveal “whether the observed frequencies for the different categories within the variables are related or independent” (Brown, 1988, p. 184).

Q1. How many schema tokens and types constitute the semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domains of the AB?

Q2. Do the semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domains of AB differ significantly from each other in their tokens and types?

Q3. Do the genera of semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domains constituting the AB differ significantly from each other in their tokens and types?

Q4. Do the species of semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domains constituting the AB differ significantly from each other in their tokens and types?

Q5. How many cognitive species do schema tokens produce by combining with each other within the linguistic structure of sentences?

Q6. Do the cognitive genera represented by the linguistic verses of AB differ from each other in terms of their constituting cognitive species represented by sentences?

RESULTS

The descriptive statistics of linguistic domain tokens and types constituting the AB are given in Appendix A. They answer the *first* research question and show 11489 tokens, i.e., 6552 syntactic (57%), 3780 semantic (33%) and 1157 parasyntactic (10%), constitute the linguistic domains of surah. However, when types are taken into consideration, the AB proves to be mostly semantic (n=1275, 82%) in domain followed by syntactic (n=197, 13%) and parasyntactic ones (n=77, 5%). The Chi-Square test showed that *the semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic domains of the AB differ significantly from each other in their tokens* ($X^2= 3801.039$, $df=2$, $p< 001$) and *types* ($X^2= 1686.048$, $df=2$, $p< 001$), providing a positive answer to the *second* question.

The descriptive statistics of linguistic genus tokens and types presented in Appendix A showed 13 genera comprise the AB among which pronouns occupy the first position in terms of their tokens (n=2236, 20). However, in terms of types, verbs prove to be the most frequent genus (n=617, 40%) followed by nouns (n=521, 34%). In other words, the analysis of genera in terms of their tokens and types describe the linguistic structure of AB differently. The Chi-Square test of genera showed that *the genus schemata differed*

significantly from each other in tokens ($X^2=7650.862$, $df=12$, $p< .001$) and types ($X^2=4136.028$, $df=12$, $p< .001$), answering the *third* question positively.

The results presented in Appendix A highlight the necessity of specifying linguistic species as well because while linguistic genera assign the first rank to pronouns in token ($n=2236$, 20), the *first* frequently employed species prove to be simple preposition ($n=1309$, 11%) followed by subject pronouns ($n=1176$, 10%) and simple conjunctions ($n=1081$, 9%) constituting the preposition, pronoun and conjunction genera of syntactic domain, respectively. However, the *first* three most frequent types are simple nouns ($n=270$, 17%), simple base verbs ($n=189$, 12%), and simple derivational nouns ($n=157$, 10%) in species which constitute the noun and verb genera of semantic domain. The Chi-Square test of species constituting the AB showed that they differed significantly from each other in tokens ($X^2= 53415.332$, $df=94$, $p< .001$) and types ($X^2= 8341.978$, $df=94$, $p< .001$), providing a positive response to the fourth question.

The semantic, syntactic, and parasyntactic schema tokens constituting the sentences of 286 verses in the AB are given in Appendix B. The results show 3780 semantic, 6552 syntactic and 1157 parasyntactic schema tokens combine with each other to produce 697 linguistic sentences representing the same number of cognitive species combine with each other to generate 286 cognitive genera represented by the same number of verses. While the majority of verses consist of two sentences ($n= 87$, 30.4%), three sentences ($n= 68$, 23.8%) and one sentence ($n= 35$, 12.2%), verses 282, 259 and 233 consist of 18, 15 and 11 sentences each, respectively. The Chi-Square test run through cross tabulation showed that the verses constituting the AB did *not* differ significantly from each other in the number of sentences they contained ($X^2= 3432.000$, $df=3420$, $p=.439$) and thus answered the last research question negatively.

DISCUSSION

As the HQ states in the second sentence of the second verse in the AB, it is revealed as a guidance to muttaqin. In order to specify the nature of guidance, traditionists have focused on the HQ as was common in their time. Ibn Kathir (n.d) has, for example, addressed each of its 114 surahs by first stating its place of revelation and then narrating what the Prophet Muhammad's companions have reported about reciting the surahs. In introducing the AB, Ibn Kathir, for example, tells his readers that it was revealed in Al-Madinah. Then he quotes many companions including Abdullah bin Masud who said, "Shaytan flees from the house where Surat Al-Baqarah is heard" (p. 65). However valuable the traditional approach towards understanding the HQ in general and AB in particular might be it does not address what constitutes the AB in terms of its words, sentences and verses on the one hand and what concepts they represent on the other.

Asad (2011) noticed the necessity of linguistic and cognitive approach to the HQ by stating that "the Qur'an itself has never yet been presented in any European language in a manner which would make it truly comprehensible" (p.6). He did, therefore, introduce

the AB in two paragraphs while translators such as Al-Hilali and Khan (1996) did not. However, Asad falls short of addressing what he himself acknowledges to be necessary, i.e., “the words and sentences of a language- any language- are but symbols for meanings conventionally” (p. 6). He does not, for example, tell his readers how many words the AB consist of and how their conventional meanings differ from the equivalents provided by most translators. Nor does he provide his readers with any statistics regarding its number of sentences due to his unfamiliarity with a sound theory such as the MICAST.

By applying the MICAST to the AB, the present study filled the gap in literature and addressed its revelation as a specific surah of the HQ whose 1549 single and phrasal schema types combine with each other in varying numbers to create 95 species, 13 genera and three domains. The schema, species, genus and domain types and tokens differ significantly indicating that their employment to create 286 verses was on purpose. The 697 sentences forming the verses do not, however, show any significant difference in number indicating that the cognitive genera represented by the verses are of the same signification. In other words, what each and all verses of the AB reveal as distinct cognitive genera is best understood through their constituting schemata than cognitive species represented by sentences.

The three most frequent schema types used in the AB are, for example, syntactic in domain, i.e., “and”, “the”, and “you” having the tokens of 734, 713, and 444, respectively. Due to the novelty of MICAST in text analysis, few scholars, if any, have applied it to divine scriptures or religious writings. In applied linguistics, Adelpour (2015), however, applied it to the nine reading comprehension passages used in “English Book 1” (Birjandi, Soheili, Noroozi & Mahmoodi, (2013) taught to grade one senior high school students throughout Iran. Her results showed that the first three most frequent schema types, i.e., “the”, “he” “a” with tokens of 145, 54, and 50, respectively, were also syntactic. Similarly, Defaee (2015) analyzed the seven passages of “English book 2” (Birjandi, Nouroozi, & Mahmoodi, 2014) and found the syntactic schema types “the”, “a”, and “and” had the first three highest tokens of 98, 68, and 46, respectively.

The application of the syntactic schemata is observed not only in the above mentioned locally written English textbooks but also in those designed in English speaking countries. Khodadady and Soltanian (2016), for example, analyzed ten reading passages of “English Result: Upper-intermediate Student's Book” (Hancock, & McDonald, 2010) [henceforth ERUI] taught in some Iranian language institutes and found that its most frequent schema types were also syntactic in domain, i.e., “the”, “and” and “a” with tokens of 339, 155, and 145, respectively. However, contrary to the AB whose fourth most frequent schema type was “Allah” with a token of 282, “to” was employed 137 times and occupied the same position in the ERUI, indicating that the two textbooks differed not only linguistically but also ideologically.

While Carter et al. (2001) followed the MACAST and believed “turning the texts around reveals the ideology lying behind them” (p. 239) as did van Dijk (2008) by defining ideology as “perspective, beliefs and opinions of speaker and/or audience design” (p.

173), the MICAST identifies ideology in the schemata employed in texts. The analysis of schema types constituting the AB, for example, sets “Allah” as a unique Islamic name with a token (t) of 282 for a “Lord” (t=49) “who” (t=6) is “one” (t=1) God (t=7) and has distinct characteristics such as all-knowing (t=13), cognizant (t=12), all-compassionate (t=8), all-forgiving (t=8), all-hearing (t=7), all-wise (t=7), and all-mighty (t=6), to name a few. In other words, the AB has been revealed to help humans understand “Allah” through 60 schema types represented by the linguistic genera of 28 adjectives, 12 nouns, 5 determiners, 13 pronouns and 2 names as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Linguistic Genera Representing Schema Types Specifying “Allah” in AB

Schema Type	Token	Linguistic Genus	Schema Type	Token	Linguistic Genus
Allah	282	Name	Severe	2	Adjective
He	72	Pronoun	Creator	2	Noun
We	59	Pronoun	Helpers	2	Noun
Lord	49	Name	Your	2	Determiner
His	24	Determiner	None but Me	2	Pronoun
Him	22	Pronoun	It	2	Pronoun
I	21	Pronoun	Self-Subsisting	1	Adjective
You	15	Pronoun	All-Clement	1	Adjective
All-Knowing	13	Adjective	All-Gentle	1	Adjective
Cognizant	12	Adjective	All-Grateful	1	Adjective
My	11	Determiner	All-Great	1	Adjective
Me	10	Pronoun	All-High	1	Adjective
All-Compassionate	8	Adjective	All-Laudable	1	Adjective
All-Forgiving	8	Adjective	(Not) Ungrateful	1	Adjective
All-Hearing	7	Adjective	Gentle	1	Adjective
All-Wise	7	Adjective	Nigh	1	Adjective
God	7	Noun	Strict	1	Adjective
All-Mighty	6	Adjective	Swift	1	Adjective
Powerful	6	Adjective	Encompasser	1	Noun
Who	6	Pronoun	Originator	1	Noun
Ever-Compassionate	5	Adjective	Possessor	1	Noun
(Not) Unmindful	5	Adjective	Seer	1	Noun
One	5	Pronoun	Turner	1	Noun
All-Embracing	4	Adjective	Discloser	1	Noun
Protector	4	Noun	Living	1	Noun
Oft-Returning	3	Adjective	Name	1	Noun
Our	3	Determiner	One	1	Determiner
All-Forbearing	2	Adjective	Himself	1	Pronoun
All-Sufficient	2	Adjective	Us	1	Pronoun
Aware	2	Adjective	Whom	1	Pronoun

CONCLUSION

Scholars such as Aebersold and Field (1997) followed the MACAST and characterized good readers as those who “use title(s) to infer what information might follow” (p. 16). The results of this study, however, show that the readers of AB should not infer what the longest surah of the HQ conveys to them by using its title *only*, i.e., the cow. They

should also know that the AB consists of 1549 different words representing surah's specific schema types among which "Allah" occupies a unique position as the core of its ideology. It is repeated 282 times along with other 59 schema types to convince believers to do certain deeds and avoid specific actions. To the best knowledge of the present researcher no other divine scripture exists in which God is specifically defined and the necessity of believing him is established to tell humans what to do and what to avoid as the AB does. While the present study tapped into the linguistic structure of the AB and addressed "Allah" as its main idea, its cognitive structure will be presented and discussed in a separate paper.

REFERENCES

- Adelpour, Z. (2015). *Textual analysis of the "English Book 1" taught in Iranian high schools: Schema-based approach* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran.
- Aebbersold, J. A. & Field, M. A. (1997). *From reader to reading teacher: Issues and strategies for second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Al-Hilali, M. T., & Khan, M. M. (1996). *The Interpretation of the meanings of the Noble Quran in the English language: Summarized in one volume*. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Darussalam.
- Al-Maliki, A. A., & Sheikh-Ibrahim, A. (1997). *A dictionary of religious terms: English-Arabic*. Department of English and Translation: Islamic University of Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud, Southern Branch at Abila.
- Arberry, A. J. (1955). *The Koran Interpreted*. New York: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Asad, M. (2011). *The message of the Quran*. PDF Published by Mursil.com. Retrieved February 18, 2016 from <http://quranebook.blogspot.ca/2011/07/quran-pdfsebooks.html>.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A course book on translation*. London: Routledge.
- Bassnet, S. (2002). *Translation studies* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Birjandi, P., Nouroozi, M., & Mahmoodi, G. (2014). *English book 2*. Tehran: Textbook Publishing Company of Iran.
- Birjandi, P., Soheili, A., Noroozi, M., & Mahmoodi, G. (2013). *English Book 1*. Tehran: Textbook Publishing Company of Iran.
- Brown, J. D. (1988). *Understanding research in second language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucaille, M. (n.d.). *The Bible, the Qur'an and science* (A. D. Pannell, Trans.). Retrieved February 24, 2016 from http://www.islamicbulletin.org/free_downloads/quran/bible_quran_science.pdf
- Carter, R., Goddard, A., Reah, D., Sanger, K., & Bowring, M. (2001). *Working with Texts A core introduction to language analysis* (2nd ed.). Lodon: Routledge
- Clapham, C. (1996). *The development of IELTS: A study of the effect of background knowledge on reading comprehension*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Darul Tahqiq (2015). *The Holy Qur'an – [Fahd edition] scribed by Ustadh Uthman Taha*. Retrieved November 21, 2015 from <http://www.darultahqiq.com/the-holy-quran-fahd-edition-scribed-by-ustadh-uthman-taha/>
- Defaee, Z. (2015). *The effect of schema-vs-translation-based instruction on grade two senior high school students learning English in Mashhad* (Unpublished master's thesis). Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch.
- Greenbaum, S., & Nelson, G. (2002). *An introduction to English grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Pearson Education.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. London: Longman.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.
- House, J. (2001). Translation quality assessment: linguistic description versus social evaluation. *Translator's Journal*, 46(2), 243-257.
- Ibn Kathir, H. (n.d). *A compilation of the abridged Tafsir Ibn Kathir volumes 1 – 10 in the English language with Arabic verses*. Retrieved February 19, 2016 from <http://www.islamwb.com/books/Tafsir%20Ibn%20Kathir%2010%20Volumes.pdf>
- Khodadady, E. (2001). Schema: A theory of translation. In S. Cunico (ed.). *Training Translators and Interpreters in the New Millennium, Portsmouth 17th March 2001 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 107-123). Portsmouth, England: University of Portsmouth, School of Languages and Areas Studies.
- Khodadady, E. (2013). *Research principles and methods and statistics in applied linguistics*. Mashhad: Hamsayeh Aftab.
- Khodadady, E., & Bagheri, N. (2014). Development and validation of an Islamic religious orientation scale with pilgrims of Imam Reza Shrine. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 3(8), 37-50.
- Khodadady, E., & Dastgahian, B. D. (2013). Logical-mathematical intelligence and its relationship with English language proficiency. *American Journal of Scientific Research*, 90, 57-68.
- Khodadady, E., & Herriman, M. (2000). Schemata theory and selected response item tests: from theory to practice. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *Fairness and validation on language assessment* (pp. 201-222). Cambridge: CUP.
- Khodadady, E., Soltanian, N. (2016). *Upper intermediate English language proficiency: Macro and micro structural perspectives*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of English Language and Literature, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran.
- Lagzian, M. (2013). *Textual analysis of an English dentistry text and its translation in Persian: A schema-based approach* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran.
- Longman Dictionary of American English* (special edition). (2009). Essex, England: Pearson Education.
- McAuliffe, J. D. (Ed.) (2001). *Encyclopedia of the Quran* (Vol. 1). Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill.
- Moy, R. H. (1975). *The effect of vocabulary clues, content familiarity and English proficiency on cloze scores* (Unpublished master thesis), UCLA.

- Newby, G. D. (2002). *A concise encyclopedia of Islam*. Oxford, England: Oneworld Publications.
- Newmark, P. (1988a). *A textbook of translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Newmark, P. (1988b). *Approaches to translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Pickthall, M. (1930). *The meaning of the glorious Qur'an, text and explanatory translation*. Tehran: Salehi Publications.
- Salat. (n.d.). *Dictionary.com Unabridged*. Retrieved February 23, 2016 from Dictionary.com website
- Shoham, M., Peretz, A. S., & Vorhau, R. (1987). Reading comprehension tests: General or subject specific? *System*, 15, 81-8.
- Stanovich, K. (1980). Toward an interactive-compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly*, XVI(1), 32-72.
- Tabatabai, M. H. (n.d.). *Tafsir Al-Mizan* (Vol. 1). Retrieved January 8, 2016 from http://islamicmobility.com/pdf/Tafsir_Al_Mizan_Vol1.pdf
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Venuti, L. (2000). Translation, community, utopia. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 468-488). London and New York: Routledge.
- Wherry, E. M. (1896). *A comprehensive commentary on the Quran: Comprising Sale's translation and preliminary discourse with additional notes and emendations* (Vols. I- IV). London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, & Co.
- White, S. C., & Pharoah, M. J. (2004). *Oral radiology: Principles and interpretation* (5th ed.). St. Louis, Missouri: Mosby.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language* (4th ed.). Cambridge: CUP.
- Yusuf Ali, A. (2011). *The Quran: Translation & Commentary Notes*. PDF Published by Mursil.com. Retrieved February 18, 2016 from <http://quranebook.blogspot.ca/2011/07/quran-pdfsebooks.html>.

APPENDIX A

Schema Domain, Genus and Species Tokens and Types Comprising Al-Baqara

Domain	Genus	No	Code	Species	Tokens		Types	
					f	%	f	%
Semantic	Adjective	1	1110	Agentive	4	.0	4	.3
		2	1111	Agentive Complex	4	.0	2	.1
		3	1120	Comparative	19	.2	6	.4
		4	1130	Complex	69	.6	17	1.1
		5	1140	Dative	5	.0	5	.3
		6	1141	Complex Dative	2	.0	2	.1
		7	1150	Derivational	59	.5	26	1.7
		8	1170	Simple	111	1.0	51	3.3
		9	1180	Superlative	4	.0	4	.3
	Adverb	10	1211	Complex	1	.0	1	.1
		11	1220	Derivational	27	.2	18	1.2
		12	1230	Simple	2	.0	1	.1
	Noun	13	1320	Complex	42	.4	12	.8

		14	1330	Compound	4	.0	3	.2
		15	1331	Compound Complex	2	.0	1	.1
		16	1332	Conversion	16	.1	13	.8
		17	1340	Derivational Simple	351	3.1	157	10.1
		18	1341	Derivational Complex	19	.2	4	.3
		19	1350	Gerund	48	.4	30	1.9
		20	1351	Gerund Complex	4	.0	2	.1
		21	1370	Nominal	14	.1	3	.2
		22	1380	Simple	939	8.2	270	17.4
		23	1390	Translated	59	.5	26	1.7
	Verb	24	1411	Complex Base	38	.3	16	1.0
		25	1412	Complex Third Person	5	.0	3	.2
		26	1413	Complex Past Participle	4	.0	3	.2
		27	1414	Complex Present Participle	4	.0	4	.3
		28	1415	Complex Simple Past	6	.1	4	.3
		29	1421	Derivational Base	53	.5	29	1.9
		30	1422	Derivational Third Person	7	.1	7	.5
Semantic (Continued)	Verb (Continued)	31	1423	Derivational Past Participle	36	.3	18	1.2
		32	1424	Derivational Present Participle	2	.0	2	.1
		33	1425	Derivational Simple Past	25	.2	20	1.3
		34	1431	Phrasal Base	118	1.0	73	4.7
		35	1432	Phrasal Third Person	26	.2	24	1.5
		36	1433	Phrasal Past Participle	27	.2	5	.3
		37	1434	Phrasal Present Participle	4	.0	4	.3
		38	1435	Phrasal Simple Past	23	.2	17	1.1
		39	1441	Simple Base	842	7.3	189	12.2
		40	1442	Simple Third Person	392	3.4	63	4.1
		41	1443	Simple Past Participle	119	1.0	51	3.3
		42	1444	Simple Present Participle	51	.4	25	1.6
		43	1445	Simple Past	190	1.7	58	3.7
		44	1446	Slang	3	.0	2	.1
Syntactic	Conjunction	45	2110	Phrasal	11	.1	6	.4
		46	2120	Simple	1081	9.4	19	1.2
	Determiner	47	2210	Demonstrative	10	.1	2	.1
		48	2230	Nominal	24	.2	9	.6
		49	2240	Possessive	298	2.6	7	.5
		50	2250	Quantifying	45	.4	6	.4
		51	2260	Ranking	1	.0	1	.1
		52	2270	Specifying	922	8.0	9	.6
	Preposition	53	2310	Complex	27	.2	6	.4
		54	2320	Compound	12	.1	4	.3
		55	2330	Phrasal	30	.3	8	.5
		56	2340	Simple	1309	11.4	26	1.7
	Pronoun	57	2410	Demonstrative	145	1.3	5	.3
		58	2420	Emphatic	18	.2	3	.2
		59	2430	Interrogative	11	.1	2	.1
		60	2440	Object	317	2.8	6	.4

Syntactic (Continued)	Pronoun (Continued)	61	2441	Possessive	3	.0	3	.2
		62	2450	Reflexive	15	.1	1	.1
		63	2460	Relative	412	3.6	10	.6
		64	2470	Subject	1176	10.2	8	.5
		65	2480	Unspecified	85	.7	13	.8
		66	2481	Specified	53	.5	8	.5
	Syntactic Verb	67	2511	Past Auxiliary	76	.7	5	.3
		68	2512	Past Perfect Auxiliary	2	.0	1	.1
		69	2514	Present Continuous Auxiliary	1	.0	1	.1
		70	2521	Present Auxiliary	246	2.1	7	.5
		71	2522	Present Perfect Auxiliary	12	.1	2	.1
		72	2531	Past Modal Auxiliary	6	.1	4	.3
		73	2541	Present Modal Auxiliary	2	.0	2	.1
		74	2544	Future	130	1.1	2	.1
		75	2545	Future Auxiliary	28	.2	2	.1
		76	2551	Past Phrasal Auxiliary	1	.0	1	.1
		77	2561	Present Phrasal Auxiliary	2	.0	1	.1
		78	2570	Modal Present	21	.2	4	.3
		79	2580	Modal Past	20	.2	3	.2
Parasyntactic	Interjection	80	3210	Simple	27	.2	2	.1
	Name	81	3310	Full	12	.1	5	.3
		82	3340	Single	423	3.7	34	2.2
	Para-adverb	83	3511	Additive	2	.0	2	.1
		84	3512	Contrasting	37	.3	4	.3
		85	3513	Emphatic	83	.7	4	.3
		86	3514	Frequency	7	.1	4	.3
		87	3515	Intensifying	11	.1	3	.2
		88	3516	Interrogative	11	.1	2	.1
		89	3517	Manner	5	.0	2	.1
		90	3518	Negation/Approval	227	2.0	4	.3
		91	3520	Referential	53	.5	2	.1
Parasyntactic (Continued)	Para-adverb (Continued)	92	3521	Time	189	1.6	5	.3
		93	3522	Exemplifying	2	.0	2	.1
		94	3523	Location	21	.2	1	.1
		95	3611	Simple	47	.4	1	.1
		96	Total	Total	11489	100.0	1549	100.0

APPENDIX B

Semantic (SEM), Syntactic (SYN), and Parasyntactic (PSYN) Schemata Constituting the Sentences (Ss) of the Verses (Vs) in Al-Baqara

Vs	Ss	SEM	SYN	PSYN	Token	Vs	Ss	SEM	SYN	PSYN	Token
1	1	3	0	0	3	144	6	21	39	6	66
2	2	7	9	1	17	145	4	18	43	5	66
3	1	6	13	0	19	146	3	8	16	1	25
4	2	6	18	0	24	147	2	4	5	3	12
5	2	5	9	1	15	148	1	10	20	4	34
6	1	6	15	2	23	149	3	8	16	5	29
7	2	8	15	1	24	150	5	15	38	6	59
8	1	7	13	2	22	151	2	10	24	2	36
9	1	4	12	3	19	152	2	4	10	2	16
10	1	9	15	1	25	153	2	6	8	2	16
11	1	7	11	2	20	154	2	7	13	4	24
12	1	5	8	1	14	155	2	9	20	0	29
13	1	13	21	1	35	156	1	5	11	1	17
14	1	9	18	2	29	157	2	7	11	1	19
15	1	4	6	1	11	158	3	14	17	7	38
16	2	7	10	3	20	159	2	11	26	1	38
17	3	13	18	1	32	160	3	9	16	1	26
18	1	4	2	2	8	161	1	9	18	2	29
19	4	16	21	1	38	162	3	4	7	2	13
20	5	15	23	4	42	163	2	7	8	1	16
21	2	5	11	3	19	164	1	29	49	3	81
22	2	14	25	3	42	165	6	18	33	8	59
23	2	11	21	2	34	166	2	8	18	0	26
24	2	11	16	2	29	167	4	12	31	4	47
25	5	22	41	2	65	168	3	11	16	3	30
26	5	19	41	6	66	169	2	5	15	2	22
27	3	11	18	3	32	170	4	11	23	3	37
28	4	7	18	5	30	171	2	12	20	3	35
29	3	11	21	1	33	172	2	8	14	2	24
30	4	16	30	5	51	173	4	14	24	7	45
31	2	9	17	3	29	174	3	15	32	3	50
32	2	9	15	1	25	175	2	11	17	2	30
33	3	14	29	3	46	176	2	11	14	1	26
34	2	8	14	2	24	177	6	42	70	4	116
35	2	12	20	4	36	178	4	26	41	4	71
36	4	12	29	2	43	179	1	5	8	1	14
37	2	6	9	4	19	180	2	13	21	0	34
38	1	9	20	2	31	181	2	8	14	2	24
39	2	8	11	1	20	182	3	11	14	4	29
40	3	9	14	2	25	183	2	7	16	2	25
41	4	11	22	2	35	184	6	22	31	2	55
42	2	6	10	1	17	185	9	29	50	11	90
43	1	6	7	0	13	186	5	16	26	2	44
44	3	7	11	1	19	187	11	40	64	12	116
45	2	6	7	0	13	188	3	11	18	3	32
46	2	3	9	1	13	189	6	21	31	5	57
47	2	6	11	2	19	190	3	6	12	4	22
48	4	10	21	4	35	191	5	15	32	4	51
49	2	12	21	2	35	192	1	4	4	2	10
50	2	6	14	1	21	193	3	10	13	4	27
51	3	6	11	2	19	194	5	14	24	4	42
52	2	2	6	2	10	195	4	10	14	3	27
53	2	4	8	2	14	196	10	47	67	12	126

54	5	15	30	3	48	197	6	21	29	4	54
55	2	7	14	4	25	198	3	10	23	7	40
56	2	3	7	2	12	199	3	8	7	3	18
57	5	10	23	2	35	200	3	15	25	5	45
58	3	15	19	0	34	201	2	10	17	1	28
59	2	9	22	2	33	202	2	7	12	1	20
60	3	18	22	6	46	203	5	14	25	4	43
61	7	38	66	10	114	204	3	12	20	3	35
62	2	12	26	4	42	205	2	9	14	5	28
63	2	9	17	3	29	206	3	10	16	3	29
64	2	7	16	3	26	207	2	9	11	3	23
65	2	7	13	1	21	208	2	9	13	3	25
66	1	7	16	0	23	209	1	8	11	2	21
67	3	12	18	6	36	210	1	10	17	2	29
68	3	14	21	3	38	211	2	11	15	5	31
69	2	14	17	2	33	212	3	13	25	1	39
70	3	8	19	3	30	213	6	27	49	8	84
71	6	16	22	5	43	214	3	19	38	6	63
72	2	6	11	2	19	215	3	14	27	1	42
73	3	9	11	4	24	216	4	19	28	3	50
74	6	21	42	4	67	217	8	37	61	9	107
75	3	9	23	4	36	218	2	9	14	3	26
76	3	10	30	5	45	219	5	19	28	3	50
77	1	4	9	2	15	220	7	20	30	4	54
78	2	7	11	2	20	221	8	30	44	4	78
79	3	11	24	7	42	222	6	18	31	6	55
80	3	12	19	6	37	223	5	14	16	3	33
81	2	10	9	2	21	224	2	11	11	3	25
82	2	8	8	1	17	225	3	9	14	3	26
83	3	20	31	4	55	226	2	8	11	1	20
84	2	8	14	2	24	227	1	5	6	1	12
85	5	35	58	7	100	228	7	25	44	7	76
86	3	8	15	1	24	229	8	30	59	11	100
87	3	16	31	6	53	230	4	17	34	5	56
88	3	9	9	3	21	231	7	26	52	10	88
89	2	14	30	4	48	232	5	18	36	5	59
90	4	16	30	2	48	233	11	44	71	10	125
91	4	18	34	5	57	234	3	15	31	3	49
92	3	6	12	2	20	235	7	29	43	7	79
93	6	21	32	1	54	236	3	18	31	3	52
94	1	9	9	2	20	237	6	20	40	5	65
95	2	6	11	3	20	238	2	7	7	1	15
96	4	13	34	2	49	239	2	8	14	3	25
97	1	13	20	2	35	240	3	16	29	2	47
98	1	7	13	4	24	241	1	7	9	0	16
99	2	5	11	0	16	242	2	3	5	3	11
100	2	6	12	3	21	243	4	16	24	6	46
101	1	12	22	3	37	244	2	6	5	3	14
102	10	34	78	16	128	245	4	11	19	2	32
103	2	6	13	1	20	246	7	28	64	10	102
104	1	10	11	2	23	247	6	25	47	7	79
105	3	13	23	4	40	248	4	18	38	4	60
106	2	10	17	2	29	249	9	28	74	15	117
107	2	9	20	3	32	250	1	11	18	2	31
108	2	11	16	2	29	251	3	16	30	8	54
109	4	16	27	2	45	252	3	6	15	1	22
110	3	10	18	2	30	253	9	27	68	9	104
111	3	13	15	1	29	254	2	13	21	2	36
112	2	9	18	4	31	255	9	31	57	5	93

Running Head 118

113	5	19	31	8	58	256	5	18	19	6	43
114	4	17	29	5	51	257	5	18	26	2	46
115	3	9	11	3	23	258	6	23	39	12	74
116	4	10	18	2	30	259	15	42	70	12	124
117	3	8	13	2	23	260	8	24	33	11	68
118	4	16	24	7	47	261	5	17	26	3	46
119	2	8	15	1	24	262	2	12	25	4	41
120	3	16	32	3	51	263	2	11	5	1	17
121	3	9	22	0	31	264	4	29	43	9	81
122	1	5	13	2	20	265	5	21	30	3	54
123	3	10	20	2	32	266	8	24	43	6	73
124	4	13	21	3	37	267	4	15	34	4	53
125	3	16	27	3	46	268	3	10	11	4	25
126	4	18	28	4	50	269	3	10	18	1	29
127	3	7	13	3	23	270	2	8	15	1	24
128	5	14	21	1	36	271	3	14	27	3	44
129	2	11	23	1	35	272	5	14	31	5	50
130	3	9	20	2	31	273	6	19	30	4	53
131	2	5	10	2	17	274	1	11	21	3	35
132	2	8	15	6	29	275	6	29	46	9	84
133	4	16	29	4	49	276	2	7	10	3	20
134	4	10	20	1	31	277	2	12	22	2	36
135	3	10	11	3	24	278	1	7	9	2	18
136	3	12	38	9	59	279	3	10	22	6	38
137	3	11	24	4	39	280	2	8	16	1	25
138	3	7	10	2	19	281	3	7	14	4	25
139	4	9	22	3	34	282	18	82	132	30	244
140	4	16	28	9	53	283	5	22	38	8	68
141	4	10	21	1	32	284	4	14	37	3	54
142	3	13	23	1	37	285	6	16	40	4	60
143	6	27	46	8	81	286	7	26	57	9	92
							697	3780	6552	1157	11489