

## 5. THE ORAL NARRATIVE STYLE AND TECHNIQUE

Arabian dialect studies are based on linguistic corpora drawn largely from the living oral traditions of nomadic and settled communities in Arabia. In these studies, the grammatical approach almost always prevails over the literary and aesthetic. But, even within the sphere of the grammatical analysis, phonology and morphology are usually emphasized at the expense of syntax (28). It is only logical to say that advanced research in the syntax of the Arabian dialects would enhance our understanding and appreciation of the Arabian oral narrative style to a large degree. In an oral language which is highly formulaic, style and syntax are so transfused that it is not easy to examine one apart from the other.

Heikki Palva points out that, thanks to modern techniques of tape recording, we are now able to capture the natural tempo and setting of the oral narrative performance; at least the verbal part of it (29). This, according to Palva, would make it possible to study the Arabian oral narrative style. The two articles by Palva (30), both dealing primarily with the descriptive imperative of narrative style in spoken Arabic, are the only published systematic studies on the subject of style. The pioneering contributions of Palva are most important and most welcome. However, style is a vast domain of linguistic and literary research which remains to this day generally shunned by students of Arabian dialects, or dealt with in a sketchy, almost dismissive, manner and merely as an appendage to a larger package of grammatical, not aesthetic, analysis.

Aside from drawing the attention of scholars to this avenue of research, no more can be done here except to point out some stylistic aspects exhibited by the narrative text at hand. Some, perhaps all, of these stylistic aspects seem to cut across dialect boundaries and apply to the oral style of the Arabian narrative in general. One of the most conspicuous features of the oral

narrative style is the frequent use of the descriptive imperative. The comprehensive and perceptive treatment of the descriptive imperative by Palva leaves no more to be said in this regard, except perhaps to reiterate some of the points made by Palva. According to him, "a feature typical of vivid narrative style is the use of the imperative instead of the perfect or imperfect in certain contexts" (31). In another article, Palva asserts that the descriptive use of the imperative is attested most frequently in Bedouin stories recorded in North Arabia and Greater Syria (32).

The descriptive imperative is used quite frequently in our narrative text, e.g. *w-gum*, . . . *w-inṣ haluh* <36>, *w-gum w-inzil Ṣala bin Inayyān* <52> <see also 16,19,24,37,51,61,101,167,215,220,250, 251,253,308,384,391,399,441,458,459,540,554>. In these examples, the descriptive imperative is used precisely in the same way that one would use the historical present to express a past action. None of our examples exhibit any of the dramatic qualities attested by Palva for other dialects; qualities such as depicting dramatic situations or actualizing descriptions of sudden, unexpected, hurried actions. Not even the idea of quick succession suggested by Abboud (33) is implied in the above examples. Perhaps it is of interest to note that in our text there is a noticeable absence of the descriptive imperative in passages where real dramatic and quick action takes place such as battle scenes.

In dealing with the descriptive imperative, Palva touched upon another stylistic feature of the Arabian oral narrative. This is the use of descriptive imperative with direct addressing of the subject (34). In this respect, the data presented by Palva and the way it is arranged may lead one to believe that direct addressing of the subject occurred only with descriptive imperatives. Examples of this feature in our narrative text are richer and more varied than those available to Palva, and they show that the feature is more complex than previously thought. In the examples given by Palva, direct addressing of the subject occurs only in connection with descriptive imperatives and the subject is always in the third person singular. Five examples from our narrative correspond to this description <24,51,61,250,308>. The subject can also be in the plural, e.g. *haṭiflu bah ya-l-gazuw* <80>.

The peculiarity of this construction is made even more apparent by inserting the second person pronoun before the third person addressed subject: *w-ašijluh, ant ya-l-šWāji, la yiṭilš al-midaćć <195>*, *w-arsil haka-l-šabīd, ant ya-bin Gdūr <37>*, *w-išiglah ġiddām bēt Hidlūl aš-šwēhri, ant ya-rāšyah <19>*, *ḥiṭṭu lihm rgiba mn al-xayyālat yirġbūn lihum, antum ya-gōm Hāyis <449>*.

Just as it happens in connection with the descriptive imperative, addressing the subject could also happen in connection with the perfect and imperfect: *fāṭaw, antum ya-gōm Ṭwērib <282>*, *yōm innuh rijaš, ant ya-šAwađ <177>*, *w-yaṭirduh, ant ya-Sāyir <539>*. This suggests a revision of Palva's conclusion that addressing the subject "draws the listener's attention to the turning point or culmination of the narrative, and actualizes and visualizes the situation" (35), a conclusion based on the assumption that direct address of the subject happens only in connection with the imperative.

According to Palva, direct addressing of the subject "is necessary for introducing the subject which otherwise would remain uncertain . . . . The primary function of direct addressing is undoubtedly to avoid ambiguity about the subject" (36). Although this might have been the case originally, the use of direct address has been extended to cases where ambiguity is out of the question, as in the case of first person subject: *indbu li, ana ya-šGāb, ajikum <134>*, *bwārdiyyina, ya-l-Griši <83>*, *kill ixīđin yūxađ minna, ya-l-Jašāfrih <336>*, *ḥinna, ya-ha-s-sirbih, nabi nišir šind al-bill <447>*, *timām al-arbišīn bina, ya-ha-s-sabšat hađōla <143>*.

Aside from direct addressing of the subject, there are other ways to clear up ambiguities and equivocations in oral narrative which have not yet been discussed by authorities. One of these ways which is not so very different from direct address is the insertion of an explanatory clause introduced by the relative pronoun *alli* followed by an independent personal pronoun which is in agreement with its antecedent. This pointing clause serves exactly the same purpose as the English *i.e.*, or, *that is*: *wu-hu yanzil wi-yšašši bah, alli hu Hāyis <406>*, *an-nās al-bāġi rijil, alli*

*hum šarab Silīm* <106>, *hādōlāk*, *alli hum ġazuw Hidlūl* <130>, <see also 81>.

Appositive construction is another stylistic device of disambiguation and intensification of meaning: *wi-ydalli lak al-šWāji, šGāb, yjaddš an-nđūr šalēh* <66>, *gāl ibin Dāhi, Rḥayyil, alli ma stšata* <200>.

Appending the name of the person to whom a previous pronoun in the clause refers serves to disambiguate the pronominal reference: *wu-hu yifūš šalēh, šala Hidlūl* <192>, *miġiblin šalēh bašad, šala Hidlūl* <194>, *arsil šalēh ibin Gdūr, šala s-Swēdi* <16>, *in allah jābuh, tāh bēn idēni, Hidlūl aš-Šwēhri* <67>, *hađāk mišuh rimḥin ṭiwīl, al-šNizi* <187>, *yōm xduwah, ya-hu, aš-Šwēhri, haka-l-wagt šaġīd* <38>.

There are times when instead of appending the name, an independent pronoun which refers to and agrees with an antecedent is tagged on to the end of a clause: *ma hu minhum hum* <129>, *akṭar min ġimathum hum* <90>, *mišuh ridīf hu* <300>, *tarūh tēr mōtin hu* <478>, *ilāuh ḥīfitin hu* <200>, *ma wallah fišalt buh ana* <330>.

Overuse and overextension of such techniques of disambiguation, disequivocation, and intensification of meaning lead to the proliferation of redundancies. Redundancy is one of the most intrinsic and prevalent features of the oral narrative style and it is manifested in various ways. One of these is the doubling of the demonstrative pronoun: *ha-r-rajjāl hāda* <13>, *ha-t-talšat hādi* <132>, *haka-z-zimān al-awwal hađāk* <10>, *ya-ha-r-rabiš hādōla* <136> <see also 5,53,143,283,324,362>. An analogical construction is the framing of a clause by two identical independent pronouns referring to the same subject: *hu ḥālfīn ma yġīm hu* <407>, *hi b-lah talšatin hi* <137>.

A somewhat different manifestation of redundancy is the noticeably frequent addition of the independent subject pronoun to the verb even in cases where conjugation and context make it perfectly clear who the subject is: *wu-hu yardišuh, wu-hu yāxiđ rimḥuh, wu-hu yinṭih ḥada as-Swēd yihūš buh* <191>. Every instance of *hu* in this sentence refers to *Hidlūl* and it can be simply

deleted without changing the meaning in the least. Instances of this construction in our narrative are more numerous than can be cited here.

Use of synonyms is yet another manifestation of redundancy: *garrinōhum, kattifōhum* <167>, *ṭiggūhin, ṭabbtūhin* <167>, *as-sibab innihum miḍmīn. Ṣaṣṣa* <140>, *fayyiḍaw Ṣammar, inḥdaraw, rāhaw. hum ahal ibāṣir, miṣālīḥ* <246>. Instead of using synonyms to express the same idea twice, one may do the same by using different syntactic constructions, saying the same thing in different ways: *yāxd arbiṣīn dōd, arbiṣīn dōd alli axadaw* <49>, *hum ṣabbaḥōh, ṣabbaḥaw al-mārad, jōh maṣ aṣ-ṣibḥ* <262>, *imīr as-Swēd Fālḥ ibin Gdūr; hu imīr al-Ṣarab, imīr gibīlt as-Swēd* <10>.

Redundancies and repetitions function primarily as disambiguators and means of contrast, emphasis and intensification of meaning. But, with overuse and overextension in oral narratives they begin to lose their rhetorical force and power of signification and assume new functions in the narrative process. They become verbal crutches – a part of the formulaic back-up system. Not every *wallah* is a true oath nor every *ṭāl ṣumrak* is a courtesy. When the *sālfih* is transformed from an oral performance to a written text, such verbal crutches are put out of context and out of action. They are not so much part of the narrative content, they are part of the narrative process, the elusive dimension, which defies transcription and translation.

In a fixed, written text, redundancies are just that, redundancies. But in a fleeting oral performance, they offer brief respites for the narrator and his audience to relax their concentration without losing hold of the narrative thread. They serve to facilitate the extempore creative effort of the narrator and, at the same time, to ease the strain on the audience's attention. The narrator saturates his communicative message with redundant symbols to give himself some relief and to give his audience leeway, a latitude to follow clearly through a fast-moving narrative.

Oral delivery in the presence and full view of an audience allows for much pointing and gesturing on part of the performer. We see

only faint traces of this in a transcribed, even recorded, text. Aside from the prevalence of demonstratives (*hāda* "this", *hāna* "here", *hnāk* "over there" and the like) we find gesture words like *hāc* "like this, so," *hal-l-lōn* "in this fashion," etc. Without ever being present at a performance, we expect appropriate gestures to accompany the utterance of such phrases as *min hān* "from this side," *ha-ṭ-ṭūl* "this long," *hāda kibruh* "so big," *min hna li-hnāk* "from here to there," etc. All this is part of the narrator's effort to incorporate the presence of his audience in the verbal and kinetic structure of his narrative. The narrator is concretely aware of, and completely in touch with his audience. This is exhibited by such interjections as *wallah ya-r-rabiʿ* "by God, comrades", *wallah ya-jimāsih* "by God, honored assembly." The incorporation of the audience, as well as the formulaic diction of the *sālfih*, are no more evident than in such terms of address and expressions of courtesies as *ya-bu flān*, *ṭāl šumrak*, *sallamk allah*, *bārik allah b-ayyāmik*, etc. When passing over passages of good or bad fortune, the narrator makes the appropriate supplication to God, extending the benefits of such supplications to himself and to his entire audience <e.g.148,182,351>.

Regardless of how large the audience is, the narrator delivers his *sālfih* using expressions of courtesy and forms of address as if he were talking to one and only one second person, one principal listener <71,299,313,423,432,460,474>. This principal listener might have been the tribal chief in olden days, or the fieldworker in modern times. When the Šammari messenger arrived at the tent of Hāyis to deliver the news of Hiḍlūl's death, Hāyis' tent was full of men. But one would suppose that the messenger addressed his words to one main person, to Hāyis. Perhaps it is not far fetched to think of the principal listener to whom the narrator addresses his words, for whom he performs, so to speak, not so much as a real person but as a postulated idealized abstract listener, a poetic motif like the deputy (*an-nidīb*), the confidant (*an-nidīm*), the blamer (*al-ṣaḍūl*), and the rest of the stock characters. In other words, this addressed person is a cognitive paradigm, an image stilled into a frozen verbal fresco. He is an abstract listener

existing in the underlying deep structure of the performance event. This abstract listener is a component of the minimal dyad of speaker and listener, the necessary number of persons to effect an oral narrative performance. As will be amply demonstrated below, through the use of what I call the *-k* of courtesy, the oral narrative language formally projects this minimal dyad which in turn projects the oral nature of the narrative performance.

Expressions of courtesy such as *ṭāl ṣumrak* and *sallamk allah* are used only with the masculine singular second person pronominal suffix *-k*, or what the Arab grammarians call *kāf al-muxāṭabah* (the *-k* pronoun of addressing). One of the most striking features of the style exhibited by the Arabian oral narratives is the attachment of this pronominal suffix *-k* to the various conjugations of the verb *ja* "to come" (37):

- \*1. *w-yijūnik wara rcāb al-ṣNūz* <204>
- \*2. *wu-hu yijik ybaššr al-ṣWāji* <166>
- \*3. *w-yijūnik yhadōn w-yagdōn* <165>
- \*4. *jāk yarkiḍ yaby aḍ-dilūl* <306>

In these four examples, the verb *ja* retains its true verbal status and its original meaning "to come," and it is clear that the last two examples are *ḥāl* constructions. However, there are many more examples in which the verbal status of *ja* is doubtful and its meaning is not clear (\*5-\*15 below). In these examples *ja* is followed either by a participle (\*5-\*13) or by another verb (\*14-\*15):

- \*5. *w-yijik lāḥiḡhum* <106>
- \*6. *w-yijik minćfin bihin* <255>
- \*7. *w-yāxiḍhum w-yijik minćif* <58>
- \*8. *yōm xaḍāhum w-yijik minćif* <42>
- \*9. *wu-hu yarćibah w-yijik miṭlibhum* <105>
- \*10. *wi-hi tijik fāzṣatin maṣ al-liḡf* <257>
- \*11. *w-yijūnak b-ha-l-gēḍ al-ḥamar msīmīnin ṣalēhin* <391>
- \*12. *w-ītak msannid* <56>
- \*13. *ircab al-faras w-ītak lāḥiḡhum* <101>
- \*14. *w-yijik Siṣdūn w-yazṣaj luh haka-ṣ-ṣlibi* <557>
- \*15. *yijik Hidlūl wu-hu yaḥarf aḍ-dilūl b-wajhahum* <300>

In these examples, the pronominal suffix *-k* is neither a deictic particle nor a true object marker (38) in the sense that *yijik* would mean "he comes to you." The narrative context clearly shows that the *-k* refers to the addressed person, but in the sense that *yijik* means "he comes for you, for your sake." Actually, the meaning is simply "he came," but expressed with courtesy to the listener, or with what we might call the *-k* of courtesy. This is supported by the fact that this *-k* can be omitted without the slightest change in meaning. As a matter of fact, even the word *ja* in these examples does not really mean "to come." The full meaning of a phrase like *yijik lāhiġhum* can be expressed by reducing the phrase to *yalħagħum* "he chased after them," that is by omitting *yijik* altogether and changing the participle *lāhiġ* to the imperfect *yalħag*. This demonstrates that although this peculiar syntactic structure has the form of a *ħāl*, it is semantically not a *ħāl*. This is made even more apparent by instances whereby instead of the participle being asyndetically joined to *ja*, a verb is joined syndetically to *ja* with its pronominal suffix *-k*, as in \*14-\*15 above.

Although in the above examples (\*5-\*15), *ja* has lost its original meaning "to come," it is hard to think of it as an auxiliary or a modal since it is either followed by a participle or joined syndetically to a following verb. At this stage in our research, it is difficult to determine the exact function, syntactic or semantic, of *ja* in these constructions.

The verb *ja* is the only verb to which the *-k* of courtesy can be suffixed directly. With other verbs *lak* is used instead. That is to say, with other verbs the *-k* of courtesy is attached to the preposition *l-* instead of to the verb. This *lak* may come right after the verb (\*16-\*20) or it may be posed between the free subject pronoun and the verb (\*21-\*33). In clauses with auxiliary verbs, *lak* is posed between the auxiliary and the main verb (\*34-\*41). Only in one example (\*42) does *lak* come after the main verb instead of between it and the auxiliary. There are two examples (\*43-\*44) where *lak*, instead of the pronominal suffix *-k*, is used with the verb *ja*. In all the examples given below, *lak* has the same meaning and the same function as the *-k* of courtesy.



Furthermore, all these examples and those examples given above constitute evidence for proposing the concept of a postulated, abstract listener existing at the deep structure of the narrative performance and projected into the surface grammar of the narrative language:

- \*16. *wu-hu yisill lak al-ġanāt* <302>
- \*17. *wu-hu ywarri lak hazīmih* <460>
- \*18. *wu-hu ʕād Hāyis ytisallam lak ʕGāb* <490>
- \*19. *ħiṭṭu lak ʕan ar-rcāb w-dallu lak yaħafrūn* <262>
- \*20. *ya fājġitin lak dēduh* <213>
- \*21. *wu-hu lak yatirk aš-Šarārāt* <62>
- \*22. *wu-hu lak yġazi* <68>
- \*23. *wu-hu lak yxaṭṭm al-faras lahum* <108>
- \*24. *wu-hu lak yanhaḍ ar-rimħ* <185>
- \*25. *wu-hu lak yalkdah wu-hu lak yiṣīħ* <483>
- \*26. *wu-hum lak yṣaddrūn* <76>
- \*27. *wu-hum lak ynawwxūn* <170>
- \*28. *wu-hum lak yirticūn ʕala l-mrisat* <203>
- \*29. *wu-hum lak yaʕagbūnuh* <296>
- \*30. *wu-hum lak yāṣfūn lihum* <442>
- \*31. *wu-hum lak yaṣilġūnihin maʕ al-Milħ* <481>
- \*32. *wu-hum lak yinćfūn* <543>
- \*33. *wu-hum lak killin yāxḍ slāħuh* <204>
- \*34. *wu-hu yigūm lak yihūš* <302>
- \*35. *w-yigūm lak Hidlūl yġazi w-yanhab* <65>
- \*36. *wi-ydalli lak al-ʕWāji, ʕGāb, yjaddʕ an-ndūr ʕalēh* <66>
- \*37. *w-yigūmūn lak al-Gʕaṭih yanxōn al-ʕBidāt* <523>
- \*38. *w-gum lak yʕalwij ġilyūnuh* <554>
- \*39. *w-dallu lak yaħafrūn* <262>
- \*40. *w-dallu lak yaġdiʕūn b-xēlihum* <479>
- \*41. *wi-ydalli lak maġāzīħ maʕ ha-l-liġf* <62>
- \*42. *wu-hu yabda yanxa lak Šammar* <355>
- \*43. *wi-hi lak tiji b-waṣṭ ad-dibaš* <452>
- \*44. *wu-hu yiji lak b-luh ħazmin ygāl luh al-Jišš* <270>

We see that in none of the above examples was *lak* a reflexive or an object marker, nor was the subject of the verb a second

person masculine singular. In other words, *lak* has no antecedent and it is not in agreement with anything in the sentence. The agreement of *lak* with an antecedent in the sentence changes the picture completely. In the phrase *tāxiḍ lak yaṣni ḥōl niṣf al-kilu w-ant tamši* <71>, *lak* agrees with the subject of the verb *tāxiḍ*. This is another intriguing feature of the oral narrative style (39). In this type of structure, the pronominal suffix appended to the preposition *l-* agrees with its most immediate precedent, which can be the subject of a verb (\*45-\*59), the subject of a participle (\*60-\*63), the object of a preposition (\*64-\*68), or the object of a verb (\*69-\*74). In some instances, the pseudo-dative *lak* is doubled (\*75-\*78). When *lak* occurs with a prepositional phrase, it snuggles itself between the preposition and its object (\*78-\*82). When the preposition introduces a genitive construct, *lak* can be posed either between the preposition and its object (\*82) or between the two terms of the genitive construct (\*83).

- \*45. *baḡa luh wāḥḍin min Swēdina* <249>
- \*46. *gimaš luh nāsin tamši ḥālahum* <247>
- \*47. *yōm innuh . . . ja luh ḡaltitin* <70>
- \*48. *ana jānan li magrūdin jāb luh nāḡitin* <26>
- \*49. *taṣallagt li ḡazwin min ṢAbdiḥ* <21>
- \*50. *xaḍaw lihm abāṣir* <12>
- \*51. *jo lihm abragḡn ygāl luh Abrug Rḡayyih* <481>
- \*52. *jidaṣna lina xayyālin ma naṣarfuh* <574>
- \*53. *liḡiḡna lina rjālin w-ittiṣalna bahum* <5>
- \*54. *yṣamal luh xallin ḡa-l-ḡin ygāl luh Xall aš-Šwēhri* <56>
- \*55. *w-yijik Siṣdūn w-yazṣaj luh ḡaka-ṣ-ṣlibi* <557>
- \*56. *w-yafigḍūn luhum wāḥḍin* <207>
- \*57. *ab-aḡriḡ li rḡimtēnin* <177>
- \*58. *ab-aḡīb li bētin* <538>
- \*59. *ab-aṣalli li rakṣatēn w-ab-aṣibb li ṣōtēn* <352>
- \*60. *ana rajjālin miṣṣallḡin li ḡazuw* <17>
- \*61. *al-ṢWāji ḡaṡṡin luh ṣiriṡitin* <430>
- \*62. *wāṡyin luh ḡayyih* <435>
- \*63. *mṣābin luh ṣuwābin saḡil* <538>
- \*64. *buh luh ḡiṣḡḍitin* <283>

- \*65. *buh luh wāḥdin min hal al-Ḥfēr* <428>
- \*66. *bah lah hidbitin min Šammar* <434>
- \*67. *ya šalyah lah šarab* <404>
- \*68. *min dūnuh luh ṭšēsātin ḥājzātuh* <86>
- \*69. *w-tištīn li grēbitin* <568>
- \*70. *iḥizmūhum luhum bi-mrisih* <166>
- \*71. *tašallaghūm lihum wāḥdin Swēdi* <12>
- \*72. *kill ma hāda ya mšāngathum lihum sirbih* <461>
- \*73. *kill sās šālgūh luh b-būrt ibāsir* <252>
- \*74. *ḥittu b-rūs al-mrisih lah awtād* <167>
- \*75. *ṭarah luh luh ḍabiy* <77>
- \*76. *lgiṭo lihum lihum fajjin* <443>
- \*77. *mušuh luh luh rakb* <273>
- \*78. *Abragn . . . b-luh luh šrēg* <266>
- \*79. *šala lihum mhārin tawwihin mxaššalāyh* <395>
- \*80. *gayybitan šajūzin b-lah bigīrih* <566>
- \*81. *mirtafšatin šan al-arḍ b-lah gāšat talših . . . b-lah šifāh, b-lah rīšin* <71>
- \*82. *b-lah wašt nifūd* <408>
- \*83. *b-wašt luh širg* <266>

In all of the above examples (\*45-83), the pseudo-dative has no apparent semantic function, no meaning, and its deletion would have no noticeable effect on the sentence. The examples \*78-82 show that the pseudo-dative is hooked to a preposition which is clear evidence that it is not a true dative. Further proof for this is the doubling of the pseudo-dative in examples \*75-78 above. The pseudo-dative, however, is used so profusely and is smoothly integrated into the narrative syntax. This speaks for its antiquity and the longevity of its usage. At this stage of our research, we cannot venture to speculate on the genesis and true function of the pseudo-dative. But one question might be raised in this respect. Could it be possible that there is any relation between the pseudo-dative and the *-k/lak* of courtesy? For example, the *-k/lak* of courtesy could have slipped at one point in the history of its usage into a pseudo-dative as in *tāxiḍ lak yašni ḥōl nišf al-kilu w-ant tamši* and by analogy this pseudo-dative usage was

extended gradually to other syntactic environments until it reached its present state. This, of course, would imply that the *-k/lak* of courtesy is older than the pseudo-dative.

There is a final point to be made in concluding this chapter concerning the formulaic nature of the language of the Arabian oral narrative. Since narration is a creative event and a living process, the diction employed is formulaic, not only in the sense that it is drawn from a stock of traditional and oft repeated idioms and motifs, but even in the sense of a reliance on frozen linguistic forms, even though these might violate the intention of the speaker or the context of the event somewhat. To illustrate this point, consider the instance when Hiḍlūl and his men are surrounded at Kiḥlih and he urges his men to run for their lives and abandon their mounts saying of the mounts *l-ḡillat wālīhin w-ahālīhin* <175> "may they and their owners have no one to look after them." This is a strong expression of dismissing the mounts from one's mind, writing them off, doing away with them. Hiḍlūl talks about the mounts in disparagement and despair, and wishes them evil. But surely by adding the rhyming word *w-ahālīhin* "and their owners", Hiḍlūl did not intend to extend the curse to the owners of the camels, his own men. This rhyming word is just a glued part of this frozen verbal form, a formula, albeit a graceful formula with rhyme and cadence.