Vessels of Wisdom: HEART/MIND AS CONTAINER Metaphors in Nahj al-Balāgha

Lecturer Dr. Ayaad M. Abood
University of Basrah / Center for Basrah and Arabian Gulf Studies
E- mail : ayaad.m.abood@uobasrah.edu.iq

Abstract:

This article offers a protocol-documented, Conceptual Metaphor Theory account of how the compiled literary corpus of Nahj al-Balāgha, the orations, letters, and sayings attributed to Imam ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib (peace upon him) and assembled by al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, conceptualizes the heart/mind complex through the CONTAINER image schema. Twenty-seven analytical records, drawn from 19 independent loci, were assembled from the complete Arabic matn through diacritic-normalized co-occurrence retrieval and contextual screening, verified verbatim, and classified under an MIP-adapted identification gate. They can be subdivided into seven sub-models (vessel, store, dwelling, pressure-vessel, gated chamber, lamp-chamber, and capacity/placement) that together provide a moral anatomy in container physics. Two theoretical proposals are made: doctrinal load-bearing, where a doctrinal distinction is borne entirely by image-schematic structure, and figure-ground reversibility, proposed as a philological test of schema vitality. The study supplies cognitive stylistics with an audited classical Arabic case and a verified database designed to outlive its interpretations.

Keywords: Conceptual Metaphor Theory; CONTAINER image schema; cognitive stylistics; Nahj al-Balāgha; classical Arabic prose; heart and mind; religious discourse.

أوعية الحكمة: استعارات [القلب/العقل حاوية] في نهج البلاغة

المدرس الدكتور اياد محمد عبود
جامعة البصرة / مركز دراسات البصرة والخليج العربي
E- mail : ayaad.m.abood@uobasrah.edu.iq

تقدّم هذه الدراسة ، في إطار موثَّق بروتوكوليًا، تحليلًا قائمًا على نظرية الاستعارة المفهومية لكيفية تمثيل المدونة الأدبية المجمَّعة في نهج البلاغة—وهي الخطب والرسائل والحِكَم المنسوبة إلى الإمام علي بن أبي طالب (عليه السلام) والتي جمعها الشريف الرضي—لمركّب القلب/العقل من خلال مخطط الصورة [الحاوية]. وقد جُمعت سبعة وعشرون سجلًا تحليليًا، مستخرجة من تسعة عشر موضعًا مستقلًا، من المتن العربي الكامل، وذلك عبر استرجاع التلازم اللفظي بعد تطبيع العلامات التشكيلية، ثم الفحص السياقي، والتحقق الحرفي من النصوص، وتصنيفها وفق بوابة تعريف معدَّلة استنادًا إلى منهجية .MIP ويمكن تقسيم هذه السجلات إلى سبعة نماذج فرعية هي: الوعاء، والمخزن، والمسكن، ووعاء الضغط، والحجرة ذات البوابة، وحجرة المصباح، والسعة/التموضع، وهي مجتمعةً تقدّم نوعًا من التشريح الأخلاقي المصوغ بفيزياء الحاوية. وتقترح الدراسة مفهومين نظريين: الأول هو الارتكاز العقدي الحامل–(doctrinal load bearing)، حيث يُحمَل التمييز العقدي بكامله على البنية المخططية الصورية؛ والثاني هو قابلية انعكاس الشكل والخلفية(figure–ground reversibility) ، المقترحة بوصفها اختبارًا فيلولوجيًا لحيوية المخطط. وتزوّد الدراسةُ الأسلوبيةَ الإدراكيةَ بحالة مدققة من العربية الكلاسيكية، وبقاعدة بيانات موثَّقة صُمِّمت بحيث تبقى صالحة بعد تجاوز التأويلات الحالية لها.

الكلمات المفتاحية: نظرية الاستعارة المفهومية؛ مخطط الصورة [الحاوية]؛ الأسلوبية الإدراكية؛ نهج البلاغة؛ النثر العربي الكلاسيكي؛ القلب والعقل؛ الخطاب الديني

1. Introduction

Few textual bodies in the Arabic tradition speak about the interior of the person as insistently as Nahj al-Balāgha, the compilation of orations, letters, and aphorisms attributed to Imam ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib (peace upon him) and assembled by al-Sharīf al-Raḍī (d. 406/1015).

The article's thesis is that the corpus does not merely decorate inner life with container imagery; it builds a coherent moral, epistemic, and theological architecture through containment. On this reading, the container expressions scattered across sermons, letters, and sayings are surface tokens of one image schema in Johnson's sense (Johnson, 1987), and their coherence is demonstrable rather than impressionistic: the same schema parameters recur across genres and generate negative and inverse cases. From this thesis follow three questions . First, what are the container expressions in the corpus when retrieval, identification and verification are pre-determined? Second, are these expressions dispersed figures or an organized system, and how is that system organized? 3. Is the schema inherited with the lexicon, or actively operated through the corpus? The answers are, respectively, a twenty-seven-record verified database, assembled under its stated retrieval and screening procedure; Seven sub-models that collectively translate container physics into a moral framework; and manipulative evidence, resulting in figure-ground inversion, that a petrified lexicon would fail to provide. One scoping rule governs everything that follows: because the compilation postdates its attributed speaker by three and a half centuries and the authenticity of individual pieces has long been debated (al-Ḥusaynī al-Khaṭīb, 1975; Djebli, 1993), all claims concern the compiled literary corpus, not seventh-century speech events. A second rule follows: the study decouples wording claims (every Arabic quotation verified verbatim against a complete digitized matn) from location claims (flagged wherever collation with the printed Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ edition is pending), and only wording bears theoretical weight.

The research gap can be stated briefly. Cognitive-linguistic studies of Islamic texts have concentrated on the Qurʾan and the Prophetic tradition (on the Qurʾan, e.g., Charteris-Black, 2004); the commentarial tradition on Nahj al-Balāgha glosses imagery expression by expression (e.g., Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, 1959–1964); and literary appreciation, from the commentators onward, praises the corpus's eloquence in generic terms (e.g., Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, 1959–1964; al-Sharīf al-Raḍī,

n.d.). To the best of the present study's knowledge, the available scholarship has not yet provided a protocol-documented account of the corpus's container system, one in which retrieval, identification, verification, and classification are stated explicitly at every step. Sections 2–7 supply, in order, framework, protocol, analysis, synthesis, limits, and conclusion.

2. Theoretical Framework: CMT, Image Schemas, and Cognitive Stylistics

Conceptual Metaphor Theory holds that metaphor is a matter of thought before it is a matter of language: abstract domains are structured by systematic mappings from concrete source domains grounded in bodily experience, and linguistic metaphors are surface tokens of those mappings (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, 1999). Image schemas, which are repetitive pre-conceptual frameworks derived from bodily experiences like CONTAINER (encompassing an interior, boundary, and exterior), PATH, and FORCE, constitute the foundational structures that abstract reasoning recruits wholesale (Johnson, 1987). Emotion, knowledge, belief, and secrecy are frequent targets of container structuring, though parameter selection varies with culture (Kövecses, 2005, 2010).

Four further strands equip the study. First, cognitive stylistics, which reads literary texts with the categories of cognitive science, licenses the object choice: classical religious prose is a natural laboratory for schema analysis, its persuasive work done in public language processable by live audiences (Semino & Culpeper, 2002; Stockwell, 2002), and religious language in particular has been shown to be irreducibly metaphorical without being cognitively empty (Soskice, 1985). Corpus-based practice within this program, from Charteris-Black's critical metaphor analysis of scriptural corpora (Charteris-Black, 2004) to Semino's discourse-oriented synthesis (Semino, 2008), establishes the evidential standards adopted here: recurrence across independent texts, productivity in novel and inverse extensions, and conventionalization visible in grammar. Second, identification discipline. The Pragglejaz Group's MIP replaced analyst intuition with a repeatable protocol: establish each lexical unit's basic meaning, compare it with the contextual meaning, and count the unit metaphorical where the contextual meaning contrasts with and is understood through the basic one (Pragglejaz Group, 2007); and MIPVU extended the protocol's reach and reliability apparatus (Steen et al., 2010); Section 3 states the adaptation both require for a classical language, where basic senses must be reconstructed historically. Third, structure above the single mapping. Discourse traditions

organize mappings into larger units, whether narrative scenarios of the kind Musolff has documented in public discourse (Musolff, 2006) or, as argued here, parameter-complete exploitations of a single image schema; the present study's claim is of the latter kind, and its companion claim, that one sentence of the corpus performs doctrine through topology alone, is formulated against this background. Fourth, conceptual blending. One locus analyzed below, the locks of encrustation of Sermon 191, compounds two distinct Qurʾanic images into a novel figure, and its analysis requires the blending framework rather than simple mapping (Fauconnier & Turner, 2002); blending is invoked only there, since the remainder of the system is adequately described by schema and mapping. One evidential caution completes the framework: in a corpus attributed to a single speaker, recurrence alone could reflect personal style rather than conceptual entrenchment, so this study treats spread across the compilation's three genres (oration, letter, and aphorism), each with a different rhetorical economy, as the operative test of entrenchment, and reports genre distribution alongside every sub-model (Table 4).

The framework yields the article's evaluative question. A corpus may contain container expressions for two quite different reasons: because its lexicon fossilizes them, qalb and ṣadr arriving pre-packaged with containment, or because a live schema is being operated. The discriminating evidence, developed in Sections 4.7 and 5.3, is manipulation: gradation of capacity, moralization of parameters, novel blends on scriptural seeds, and above all reversal of figure and ground, operations that dead metaphors do not survive.

3. Corpus, Editions, and Methodology

The corpus is the complete Arabic matn of Nahj al-Balāgha in the recension accompanying Muḥammad ʿAbduh's commentary (al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, n.d.), in a digitized text (OpenITI, n.d.) from which the commentary, footnotes, and page apparatus were programmatically excluded, so that only the compilation's own wording entered analysis. Citation numbering follows the Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ edition (al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, 1967).

The matn was normalized (vocalization removed; hamza forms, tāʾ marbūṭa, and final yāʾ unified) and searched by a co-occurrence design: every occurrence of a heart/mind lexeme (Field A of Table 1: qalb/qulūb, ṣadr/ṣudūr, fuʾād/afʾida, lubb/albāb, ʿaql/ʿuqūl, nafs, jawf/ajwāf) within an eighty-character window of a

container-field lexeme (Field B: wiʿāʾ/awʿiya, waʿā/wiʿāya, malaʾa, shaḥana, khalā, saʿa/wasiʿa, ḍāqa, istaqarra/mustaqirr, mustawdaʿ, ʿawārī, sakana/iskān, ikhrāj, ʿimāra, bāḍa wa-farrakha, ṣundūq, maknūn, maktūm, kamana, aqfāl, istaghlaqa, nafadha, nafatha, walaja, alqā/qabila, qadaḥa, aṭfaʾa, miṣbāḥ, nawwara, hamada). The eighty-character window is a design parameter intended to capture co-occurrence within roughly a clause of context on either side, and its cost in recall is acknowledged as the third limitation in Section 6; every hit was read in complete context, and co-occurrences without construal (ḍāqa qualifying an escape route rather than a breast) were discarded at reading. Identification: each surviving candidate passed an MIP gate adapted to classical Arabic (Pragglejaz Group, 2007; Steen et al., 2010), set out step by step after Table 1.

Table 1. Retrieval lexicon and corpus procedure (normalized forms; Field A × Field B co-occurrence within an 80-character window defined a candidate hit; all hits read in full context).

Field	Sub-domain	Lexemes
A — Heart/mind terms	—	qalb/qulūb; ṣadr/ṣudūr; fuʾād/afʾida; lubb/albāb; ʿaql/ʿuqūl; nafs; jawf/ajwāf
B — Container field	Vessel & retention	wiʿāʾ/awʿiya; waʿā/wiʿāya
B — Container field	Filling, pressure & capacity	malaʾa; shaḥana; khalā; saʿa/wasiʿa; ḍāqa
B — Container field	Tenancy & dwelling	istaqarra/mustaqirr; ʿawārī; sakana/iskān; ikhrāj; ʿimāra; bāḍa wa-farrakha
B — Container field	Store & deposit	ṣundūq; maknūn; maktūm; kamana; mustawdaʿ
B — Container field	Access & breach	aqfāl; istaghlaqa; nafadha; nafatha; walaja; alqā/qabila
B — Container field	Fire & light within	qadaḥa; aṭfaʾa; miṣbāḥ; nawwara; hamada

The MIP gate adapts the procedure of the Pragglejaz Group (2007) as five steps applied to each candidate. (1) The candidate is read in its complete context.

(2) The lexical units relevant to the decision are identified: the container marker, which is the candidate for metaphorical use (a container-field lexeme or a preposition of containment such as fī, which the procedure examines as a lexical unit in its own right, as MIPVU does for prepositions; Steen et al., 2010), and the heart/mind lexeme to which it applies. (3) The contextual meaning of the container marker is established. (4) Its basic meaning is established; because the corpus is classical, basic senses are reconstructed historically from the lexicographical tradition, preferring senses attested in early poetry and Qurʾanic usage (Section 6, fourth limitation), rather than taken from a contemporary dictionary as in the original procedure. (5) Where the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning and can be understood by comparison with it, the marker is counted as metaphorically used and the expression becomes a record; where there is no such contrast, or where the container marker does not apply to the heart/mind term, the candidate is discarded. Where the marker is a preposition, the adapted gate takes its spatial sense, inclusion within a bounded space, as an operational basic meaning against which the contextual meaning is compared; in ḥuznuhu fī qalbihi (Record 23c) the relation of grief to the heart contrasts with that sense and is understood through it, so fī is counted as the metaphor-related word, while the CONTAINER construal is realized by the expression as a whole. Explicit comparisons, such as ka-l-arḍi l-khāliya in Letter 31 (Record 4), are admitted as direct metaphor in the sense of MIPVU, with the comparison particle as the signal (Steen et al., 2010). The heart/mind lexemes themselves are not counted as metaphor-related: qalb and ṣadr stand for the inner self by bodily contiguity, a metonymic relation that supplies the target of the container mapping. Table 2 summarizes the decisions.

Three worked cases illustrate the gate. In Saying 147, awʿiya is predicated of the hearts; its contextual meaning is a capacity to retain knowledge and its basic meaning a vessel in which things are kept; the contrast is clear and the comparison transparent, so awʿiya is metaphorically used, and the elative awʿāhā extends the same mapping to a graded scale (Record 1). In Saying 6, ṣadru l-ʿāqili ṣundūqu sirrihi, ṣadr denotes the inner self by contiguity with the chest and is treated as a metonymic target term, whereas ṣundūq, whose basic meaning is a chest in which things are stored and whose contextual meaning is the mind's capacity to keep a secret, is the metaphorically used word, so the record rests on ṣundūq (Record 9). In the discarded case, ḍāqa co-occurs with a heart/mind lexeme within the window but qualifies an escape route rather than a breast: its

contextual meaning, the narrowness of a way, coincides with its basic meaning, and the heart/mind lexeme takes no part in the construal, so the candidate fails at the first decision in Table 2.

Table 2. Decision criteria of the MIP gate adapted to classical Arabic.

Decision	Criterion	Outcome
No construal	The container-field lexeme co-occurs with a heart/mind lexeme but does not apply to it (e.g., ḍāqa qualifying an escape route)	Discarded at reading
No contrast	Contextual meaning coincides with the reconstructed basic meaning	Not metaphorically used; discarded
Indirect metaphor	Contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning and is understood by comparison with it (e.g., awʿiya, ṣundūq; fī in ḥuznuhu fī qalbihi)	Metaphorically used; record created
Direct metaphor	Explicit comparison signalled by a comparison particle (e.g., ka-l-arḍi l-khāliya)	Direct metaphor; record created
Context-dependent locative	A deictic with no container meaning of its own is anchored to a heart/mind term by its co-text (hāhunā in Record 2)	Record created and marked context-dependent
Metonymic target	Heart/mind lexeme stands for the inner self by bodily contiguity (e.g., ṣadr)	Not counted as metaphor-related; supplies the target
Boundary	Construal belongs to an adjacent schema (codex, mirror, field, vegetation, adhesion figures)	Routed to the boundary category (Section 6)
Qurʾanic intertext	Wording is quoted from the Qurʾan	Routed to the quarantined register

Qurʾanic intertexts encountered at any stage (Q 47:24; 69:12; 83:14; 94:1; 6:98; 40:19) were routed to a quarantined register and are never attributed to the compilation; blended cases are tabled as Nahj loci with both scriptural sources flagged.

The unit of the database is the record, defined as one contiguous metaphorical expression at a single locus that realizes one CONTAINER construal; coordinated clauses that realize the same construal form one expression, and a locus contributes more than one record when it contains distinct construals (Saying 147, for instance, contributes three). A record is licensed either by an explicit container marker, that is, a lexical unit whose basic meaning belongs to the container field, whether listed in Table 1 or not (such as marājil, "cauldrons"), or a preposition of containment such as fī, that construes a heart/mind lexeme, in the quoted phrase or its immediate co-text, as container or content; or, exceptionally, by a context-dependent locative construal anchored by the co-text. Record 2 is the sole such exception: hāhunā ("here") carries no container meaning of its own, and its container reading rests on the co-text, in which the deixis is accompanied by the narrative note that he pointed with his hand to his breast. Phrases quoted from the co-text of a record that are licensed in neither way, such as the grave of Saying 6 or the ṣudūr amīna of Sermon 189, are cited as context and are not counted as records. The definition has been applied to every entry in Appendix A. Two entries that combined what it separates have been divided: the maintenance and illumination imperatives of Letter 31 (Records 5a and 5b) and the capacity formulae of Sayings 176 and 333 (Records 23a and 23b). Applied consistently, the definition also requires the placement expression of Saying 333, ḥuznuhu fī qalbihi, which Section 4.7 uses as evidence, to be entered as a record of its own (Record 23c). The database therefore comprises 27 records drawn from 19 independent loci. Each record is assigned to one primary sub-model, given by the first label in Appendix A and corresponding to the section in which it is analyzed; a second label records a secondary relation. Records labelled Capacity, Placement, or Reversal belong to the seventh sub-model, which operates on container geometry itself (Section 4.7). Candidates whose construal belongs to an adjacent schema (codex, mirror, field, vegetation, and adhesion figures) were routed to a boundary category rather than to the database (Section 6, fifth limitation).

Verification operates at two levels, which the protocol keeps apart (Section 1; Section 6, second limitation). Wording is verified at the level of the record: every Arabic expression was checked verbatim against the digitized matn. Location is verified at the level of the locus: a flag marks a Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ number still pending collation with the printed edition, and every record at a locus shares that locus's status. Twelve of the 19 loci are currently flagged

(63.2% at the locus level), corresponding to 16 of the 27 records (59.3% at the record level). Eleven of these loci await ordinary collation; the twelfth, the battle invocation, is unresolved in a stronger sense, since its placement in the compilation has not yet been established.

Appendix A quotes each metaphorical expression rather than the retrieval trigger that brought its passage to reading. Besides expressions that contain the retrieval pair, the database contains container expressions that construe a heart/mind lexeme as container or content and have passed the MIP gate, but whose container marker is a preposition of containment or a lexeme outside Table 1, whose heart/mind term lies outside the quoted phrase, or whose container reading depends on co-text (Record 2). Their presence is consistent with admission during the full-context reading of hits, but that route is inferred here from the structure of the database rather than documented as a separate step of the procedure. For ten records (2, 5b, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 22, and 23c) the quoted phrase does not itself contain both a Field A and a Field B lexeme of Table 1, and the published materials do not show whether the pair lies elsewhere in the eighty-character window or which hit brought the passage to reading, since the record-level retrieval log is not reproduced here. Table 1, moreover, lists lexemes in citation form, while the records include inflected and derived forms of them (e.g., yanqadiḥu for qadaḥa, khāliya for khalā, istawdaʿa for mustawdaʿ); the matching implementation that related surface forms to the listed lexemes is likewise not reproduced. Completeness is accordingly claimed only for the retrieval stage, in the sense that every co-occurrence hit was read in full context; it is not claimed for records that do not themselves contain the retrieval pair (Section 6, third limitation).

4. Analysis: The Seven Container Sub-Models

The twenty-seven verified records resolve into seven sub-models, summarized in Table 3 and analyzed below in order of weight. Throughout, Arabic evidence is given in transliteration with literal translation; flagged locations preserve their flags.

Table 3. Seven HEART/MIND AS CONTAINER sub-models in Nahj al-Balāgha (flagged locations preserve the database's verification flags).

Sub-model	Source domain	Flagship locus	Core entailment	Representative evidence
Vessel of knowledge	Graded storage vessels; porterage	Saying 147	Understanding is retention, not reception	al-qulūb awʿiya fa-khayruhā awʿāhā
Secure store of secrets	Strongbox, well, grave, deposit	Saying 6; Sermon 5	Discretion is enclosure integrity	ṣadr al-ʿāqil ṣundūq sirrih
Dwelling of faith/vice	Tenancy: residence, loan, upkeep, eviction	Sermon 189	Belief has tenure, not just intensity	mustaqirr fī l-qulūb / ʿawārī
Pressure-vessel of emotion	Filled vessels, cauldrons, banked fire	Sermon 27	Self-command is pressure management	malaʾtum qalbī qayḥan
Gated chamber	Locks, corrosion, inlets, breach	Sermon 191	Moral failure can be access failure	aqfāl al-rayn
Lamp-chamber	Niche lit from within	Sermon 87	Insight is a maintained interior state	miṣbāḥ al-hudā fī qalbih
Capacity / placement	Volume; correct lodging in cavities	Sayings 176, 41	Character is container geometry	saʿat al-ṣadr; the chiasmus of Saying 41

Table 4 reports, as Section 2 undertook, the genre distribution of every sub-model, counting independent loci as well as records, since several records can share a locus. The originally stated criterion, spread across the three genres, is applied as written, and independent-locus counts are reported as descriptive evidential support rather than as a retrospectively introduced threshold. At the schema level, the evidence demonstrates recurrence across all three genres: the 19 loci comprise 11 sermons, one letter, and six sayings, with the battle invocation unresolved. At the sub-model level, distribution is uneven: only the vessel sub-model spans all three genres; the store, dwelling, pressure-vessel,

lamp-chamber, and capacity/placement sub-models are attested in two (the pressure-vessel with one further, unresolved locus), and the gated chamber in sermons alone; the letters, moreover, contribute a single locus to the database. Accordingly, the cross-genre evidence supports corpus-wide recurrence of the schema but should not be taken as evidence of entrenchment for each sub-model individually.

Table 4. Genre distribution of the seven sub-models (genre columns count independent loci; a locus contributing records to more than one sub-model is counted under each; primary assignment as stated in Section 3).

Sub-model	Records (n)	Independent loci (n)	Sermons	Letters	Sayings	Unresolved	Number of genres
Vessel of knowledge	4	3	1	1	1	0	3
Secure store of secrets	3	3	2	0	1	0	2
Dwelling of faith/vice	4	4	3	1	0	0	2
Pressure-vessel of emotion	5	5	3	0	1	1	2
Gated chamber	2	2	2	0	0	0	1
Lamp-chamber	2	2	1	1	0	0	2
Capacity / placement	7	6	2	0	4	0	2
All records (distinct loci)	27	19	11	1	6	1	3

4.1 HEARTS ARE VESSELS OF KNOWLEDGE

The vessel sub-model is anchored in Saying 147 (flagged), the discourse addressed to Kumayl, which opens with a classification of hearts by capacity: inna hādhihi l-qulūba awʿiya fa-khayruhā awʿāhā (إِنَّ هٰذِهِ الْقُلُوبَ أَوْعِيَةٌ فَخَيْرُهَا أَوْعَاهَا), "these hearts are vessels, and the best of them is the most retentive." The predication makes understanding a matter of what a container keeps rather than of what reaches it, and the elative awʿāhā turns retention into a graded quantity. The same saying locates a stored load in the speaker's own interior, hā inna

hāhunā la-ʿilman jamman, "here is abundant knowledge," a store that waits for bearers fit to carry it, and it disqualifies the bearer in whose heart doubt strikes its spark, yanqadiḥu l-shakku fī qalbihi (Section 4.4). Sermon 189 (flagged) supplies the route by which such a load is taken in: samiʿathā udhunuhu wa-waʿāhā qalbuhu, "his ear heard it and his heart contained it," the ear receiving and the heart retaining. Letter 31 adds the receptacle before its first filling, the young heart ka-l-arḍi l-khāliya, "like empty ground" (Section 5.5). The sub-model's entailment package is thus complete: understanding is retention, capacity is gradable, the container's integrity is a moral property, and transmission is the physical transfer of a load between vessels. Two further consequences deserve notice. Porterage makes the teacher's problem one of finding sound containers rather than eloquent formulations, which is exactly how the Kumayl discourse proceeds, sorting humanity into the divinely learned, the learner on the path of rescue, and the rabble who follow every crier; and the ear's role as delivery point anticipates the aperture ethics developed in Section 4.5, where the same inlet that admits teaching admits the whisperer.

4.2 THE BREAST IS A SECURE STORE OF SECRETS

A second cluster treats the breast as a secure store whose defining virtue is enclosure integrity and whose defining exposure is the sight of God. Its aphoristic anchor is Saying 6 (flagged): ṣadru l-ʿāqili ṣundūqu sirrihi (صَدْرُ الْعَاقِلِ صُنْدُوقُ سِرِّهِ), "the breast of the intelligent man is the strongbox of his secret," a copular predication that makes discretion a property of the container rather than of the content, and that the same saying deepens with a second container species, al-iḥtimālu qabru l-ʿuyūb, "forbearance is the grave of faults," the lockbox holding retrievable contents beside the grave holding irretrievable ones. The dramatic anchor is Sermon 5, where the attributed speaker declines disclosure in a doubled depth figure: bal indamajtu ʿalā maknūni ʿilmin, "rather I am folded shut upon a hidden knowledge," whose divulgence would set the hearers trembling "like well-ropes in a deep-sunk well," iḍṭirāba l-arshiyati fī l-ṭawiyyi l-baʿīda: the self is sealed over its contents, and the contents themselves have a well's depth, so that disclosure, bāḥa, is containment's precise antonym. Sermon 90 (flagged) supplies the theological ceiling: among what God has numbered is mā tukhfī ṣudūruhum mina l-ḍamīr, "what their breasts conceal of the inner content," ḍamīr being etymologically that which is enclosed, together with "their lodging-place and their place of deposit," mustaqarrihim wa-mustawdaʿihim, so

that human containers are opaque horizontally and transparent vertically, secure against neighbors and open to the Depositor. Saying 407 (flagged) carries the deposit vocabulary to its limit by making the intellect itself a deposit that God places in the person; because it reverses the usual relation of container and content, it is analyzed with the reversals of Section 4.7.

4.3 THE HEART IS A DWELLING OF FAITH AND VICE

The dwelling sub-model carries the corpus's most consequential theology, and its centerpiece is a single sentence of Sermon 189 (flagged): fa-mina l-īmāni mā yakūnu thābitan mustaqirran fī l-qulūb, wa-minhu mā yakūnu ʿawāriyya bayna l-qulūbi wa-l-ṣudūri ilā ajalin maʿlūm (فَمِنَ الإِيمَانِ مَا يَكُونُ ثَابِتًا مُسْتَقِرًّا فِي الْقُلُوبِ وَمِنْهُ مَا يَكُونُ عَوَارِيَّ بَيْنَ الْقُلُوبِ وَالصُّدُورِ إِلَى أَجَلٍ مَعْلُومٍ), "some faith is fixed and settled in the hearts, and some is on loan between the hearts and the breasts until an appointed term." The sentence distinguishes faith by tenure rather than by intensity: settled faith resides inside the hearts, while transient faith is lodged on loan at the threshold between hearts and breasts and must be returned when its term falls due (Section 5.2). The remaining loci supply the other stages of tenancy. Letter 31 supplies the open ground, the young heart that accepts whatever is cast into it (Section 5.5), and the duty of upkeep, ʿimārat qalbika bi-dhikrihi, "keeping your heart in repair through remembrance of Him." Sermon 192 supplies eviction and re-housing, ikhrājan li-l-takabbur … wa-iskānan li-l-tadhallul, "evicting arrogance … and housing humility." Sermon 7 supplies the hostile tenant, of whom it is said fa-bāḍa wa-farrakha fī ṣudūrihim, "he laid eggs and hatched in their breasts": possession is successful residency, an infestation completing its life-cycle inside the chamber, the demonic mirror of settled faith. The model thus supplies a complete tenancy cycle (open ground, first filling, maintained occupancy, eviction and re-housing, and hostile infestation), distributed across a testament, a doctrinal address, and two sermons.

4.4 THE HEART IS A PRESSURE-VESSEL OF EMOTION

A fourth cluster treats emotion as substance held in the body's containers, with volume, temperature, and pressure; every locus but one belongs to a scene of conflict, so the pressure-vessel is, on the evidence, the corpus's working model for affect precisely where affect is politically consequential. The first-person anchor is Sermon 27, delivered against negligent followers: la-qad malaʾtum qalbī qayḥan wa-shaḥantum ṣadrī ghayẓan (لَقَدْ مَلأْتُمْ قَلْبِي قَيْحًا وَشَحَنْتُمْ صَدْرِي غَيْظًا),

"you have filled my heart with pus and charged my breast with rage." The battle invocation (flagged; placement unresolved) raises the temperature to boiling, jāshat marājilu l-aḍghān, "the cauldrons of rancor boiled," and Sermon 231 (flagged) locates the same heat in the breasts, al-ʿadāwati l-wāghirati fī l-ṣudūr, "the enmity seething in the breasts." Sermon 192 turns the physics into an instruction: aṭfiʾū mā kamana fī qulūbikum min nīrāni l-ʿaṣabiyya, "extinguish the fires of factionalism that lie banked in your hearts," where kamana gives the fire a hidden state from which it can flare again. The one locus outside open conflict is Saying 147 (flagged), where yanqadiḥu l-shakku fī qalbihi, "doubt strikes its spark in his heart": the same thermal physics applied to belief rather than to anger, and the reason the unreliable bearer cannot hold the load of Section 4.1.

4.5 THE HEART IS A GATED CHAMBER

The gated chamber governs receptivity and its failure. Its flagship is Sermon 191 (flagged): istaghlaqat ʿalā afʾidatihim aqfālu l-rayn, "the locks of encrustation have shut fast upon their hearts." The figure compounds two quarantined Qurʾanic images, the locked hearts of Q 47:24 and the encrustation of Q 83:14, into a lock made of rust (Section 5.3): the heart is not merely closed but corroded shut. The opposite failure is breach. In Sermon 83 the intruder nafadha fī l-ṣudūri khafiyyan wa-nafatha fī l-ādhān, "penetrates the breasts unseen and whispers into the ears," the ear serving as the inlet through which the intruder injects content. Moral failure can thus be an access failure or a security failure, two pathologies of one aperture.

4.6 THE HEART IS A LAMP-CHAMBER

The lamp-chamber governs insight. In Sermon 87 the beloved servant "made grief his inner garment and fear his cloak," and the result is stated as interior lighting: fa-zahara miṣbāḥu l-hudā fī qalbihi, "so the lamp of guidance shone in his heart." The light is the product of the inner discipline just described, so insight appears as an interior state that must be kept lit rather than a faculty possessed once and for all. Letter 31 makes the same upkeep an imperative, nawwirhu bi-l-ḥikma, "illumine it with wisdom," and with these two records, from one sermon and one letter, the lamp-chamber is among the least represented sub-models (Table 4).

4.7 Capacity, Placement, and Figure-Ground Reversibility

The final cluster operates on container geometry itself and yields the analysis's terminal finding. Capacity is moralized directly: ālatu l-riyāsati saʿatu l-ṣadr, "the instrument of leadership is capaciousness of breast" (Saying 176, flagged), quantifies political virtue as volume (what a leader can hold of grievance and dissent without overflow), and Saying 333 (flagged) crowns the believer awsaʿu shayʾin ṣadran, "the most capacious of things in breast," while assigning his grief a storage address, ḥuznuhu fī qalbihi, and his cheer a display surface, bishruhu fī wajhihi: composure is container discipline, each content at its proper address. Placement is then made definitional in the chiasmus of Saying 41 (flagged): qalbu l-aḥmaqi fī fīhi wa-lisānu l-ʿāqili fī qalbihi, "the fool's heart is in his mouth, and the intelligent man's tongue is in his heart." Prudence is correct containment, thought enclosing speech; folly is topological error, the heart exposed in the speech-cavity. On this foundation the corpus performs its most sophisticated move: it reverses figure and ground without strain. The heart, container of faith, fire, and secrets throughout the preceding sub-models, becomes content lodged in a larger container when the dead's "hearts died down inside their breasts," hamadati l-qulūbu fī ṣudūrihim (Sermon 221, flagged). Sermon 192 places the heart outside the body altogether, qulūbuhum fī l-jināni wa-ajsāduhum fī l-ʿamal, "their hearts are in the Gardens and their bodies at work," and Saying 407 (flagged) makes the intellect itself the content of a deposit, mā istawdaʿa Allāhu imraʾan ʿaqlan, "God has not deposited an intellect with any person …," with the person as vault and God as depositor. The terminal finding is thus that the corpus runs the schema in three orientations (the heart as container, the heart as content, and the intellect as deposited content) without strain, and reversal of this kind is the strongest of the manipulation tests developed in Section 5.3.

5. Discussion:

The discussion synthesizes rather than repeats. Section 5.1 argues that the seven sub-models jointly moralize container physics into a moral anatomy; 5.2 defines and defends the first theoretical proposal, doctrinal load-bearing, on the case of Sermon 189; 5.3 defends the second, figure-ground reversibility, as the discriminator between fossil and live schema; 5.4 reads the system beside its quarantined Qurʾanic seeds as oratorical elaboration; and 5.5 offers one controlled comparison beyond the tradition.

5.1 Moral Anatomy in Container Physics:

Read together, the sub-models show that the corpus recruits nearly every physically distinct parameter of a container to ground a distinct virtue or pathology, and that no parameter it recruits is left morally idle. Wall integrity grounds trustworthiness (the ṣudūr amīna of Sermon 189; the strongbox of Saying 6); volume grounds tolerance and political competence (saʿat al-ṣadr as leadership's instrument); internal pressure and temperature ground the ethics of anger and rancor, from the filled heart of Sermon 27 through the boiling cauldrons of the battle invocation to the banked fires of Sermon 192; aperture control grounds the ethics of attention, the ear as inlet in Sermons 83 and 189; locking grounds culpable imperviousness, the aqfāl al-rayn of Sermon 191; illumination grounds insight, the miṣbāḥ al-hudā of Sermon 87; occupancy and tenure ground sincerity and hypocrisy, mustaqirr against ʿawārī; and correct placement grounds prudence itself, the chiasmus of Saying 41. The result is a moral anatomy stated in container physics, in which character is architecture: what a person can hold, how securely, at what temperature, behind which locks, under which lamp, and with each content at its proper address. Two refinements matter for embodiment theory. First, responsibility is distributed by grammar: the transitive malaʾtum and shaḥantum of Sermon 27 make provocation something others do to one's containers, so the schema carries a social ethics of affect and not only an individual one, a point that complicates purely intrapersonal readings of emotion metaphors (Kövecses, 2010). Second, the system is self-maintaining by prescription: ʿimārat qalbika makes upkeep of the interior a standing duty, so the schema arrives with its own ethic of maintenance attached. In both respects the corpus confirms, on classical Arabic ground, the claim that embodied schemas do load-bearing conceptual work rather than decorative grounding (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, 1999), while also illustrating the cultural selectivity of schema exploitation that comparative work leads one to expect (Kövecses, 2005). The completeness runs in both directions and should be stated as such: no recruited parameter is left morally idle, and no virtue in the seven sub-models is grounded in anything other than a container parameter, a bidirectional tightness that scattered attestations of the schema elsewhere in the literature do not exhibit and that justifies speaking of a system rather than a set.

5.2 Doctrinal Load-Bearing:

The first theoretical proposal concerns Sermon 189, and it requires a careful definition before any defense. Call a configuration doctrinal load-bearing when a doctrinal distinction is carried entirely by image-schematic structure, such that removing the schema removes the doctrine's statement, not merely its ornament. Sermon 189 meets the definition. The distinction between settled and transient faith is stated there only through location and tenure: one faith resides inside the hearts, mustaqirr fī l-qulūb, while the other is lodged on loan between the hearts and the breasts until an appointed term. Remove the spatial and possessive structure, and the distinction between settled residence and temporary loan is no longer encoded by the sentence. The definition carries its own falsification condition: a configuration is not doctrinally load-bearing if, within the sentence or structure analyzed, its image-schematic terms can be removed or replaced while the doctrinal distinction remains intact. For the study of the corpus, the proposal reframes the celebrated eloquence: what commentary has praised as a beautiful figure is, on this analysis, the load-bearing wall of a theology of sincerity, and the aesthetic and doctrinal readings converge on the same sentence for a principled reason, namely that the schema is doing both jobs at once. The proposal travels: candidate cases in other homiletic corpora can be tested with the same definition and the same falsification condition, which is what a theoretical contribution owes its field. A terminological convergence strengthens the case without deciding it: later theological prose distinguishes settled from deposited faith as īmān mustaqirr and īmān mustawdaʿ, whose semantics the sermon's topology anticipates; whether that vocabulary descends from such oratory is a question for the stratigraphic work of Section 7.

5.3 Figure-Ground Reversibility

The second proposal addresses a deflationary hypothesis that any container study of Arabic must meet: that qalb and ṣadr arrive pre-packaged with containment, so the corpus's expressions are lexicalized fossils, inherited with the words rather than thought with the schema. The discriminating evidence is manipulation, and the corpus supplies it in ascending strength. Weakest, gradation: the elative awʿāhā of Saying 147 presupposes a live capacity scale, since fossils do not take degrees. Stronger, parameter moralization: Section 5.1's anatomy requires the schema's physics to be productively available (wall, volume, pressure, aperture, lock, lamp, tenancy, placement), each recruited for a

distinct moral job. Stronger still, novel blending on scriptural seeds: aqfāl al-rayn compounds two quarantined Qurʾanic images into a figure attested in neither, the lock made of rust, and blends are by definition constructed, not inherited (Fauconnier & Turner, 2002). Strongest, reversal: the corpus runs the schema in three orientations, the heart as container of faith, fire, and secrets; the heart as content, cooling inside the breast in Sermon 221 and residing in the Gardens in Sermon 192; and the intellect as deposited content in Saying 407, with the person as vault and God as depositor.

5.4 Qurʾanic Seeds and Oratorical Elaboration

The system's relation to the Qurʾan is elaborative, not repetitive, and the quarantine register keeps the strata clean. The Qurʾan supplies seeds: the retaining ear of Q 69:12, the locked hearts of Q 47:24, the encrustation of Q 83:14, the expanded breast of Q 94:1, the lodging and deposit of Q 6:98, and the concealing breasts of Q 40:19. Table 5 sets each seed beside the Nahj loci that elaborate it and names the feature the corpus adds; the verses remain in the quarantined register and are not counted as records. In every row the corpus supplies a parameter that the seed does not state, whether a scale of capacity, a blended figure, a moral assignment, or a reversal of container and content, and this added parameter is what distinguishes elaboration from repetition.

Table 5. Qurʾanic seeds (quarantined register) and their elaboration in Nahj al-Balāgha.

Qurʾanic seed	Nahj locus (record)	Elaborated feature
Q 69:12, the retaining ear	Sermon 189 (Record 13); Saying 147 (Record 1)	Retention moves from the ear to the heart, and capacity becomes graded (awʿāhā)
Q 47:24, locked hearts; Q 83:14, encrustation	Sermon 191 (Record 15)	The two images blended into one figure: a lock made of rust
Q 94:1, the expanded breast	Sayings 176 and 333 (Records 23a, 23b)	Capacity of breast moralized as political and ethical virtue, and graded (awsaʿ)
Q 6:98, lodging and deposit	Sermon 189 (Record 12); Sermon 90 (Record 11); Saying 407 (Record 24)	Tenure applied to faith (settled or on loan); deposit applied to the intellect, reversing container and content
Q 40:19, what the breasts conceal	Sermon 90 (Record 11)	Concealed content named as ḍamīr; human containers opaque to others yet transparent to God

5.5 Controlled Comparison: The Empty Ground and the Blank Slate

One comparison beyond the tradition is warranted, provided its terms are fixed. Letter 31 grounds its pedagogy in the young heart as empty ground, ka-l-arḍi l-khāliya: "whatever is cast into it, it accepts." The figure invites juxtaposition with the blank slate of early modern empiricism, canonically Locke's white paper "void of all characters" on which experience writes (Locke, 1690/1975, bk. II, ch. i, sec. 2). The comparison is offered at schema level only, with no claim of transmission in either direction; its value is to show that a single image schema, differently parameterized, yields an empiricist epistemology in one tradition and an ethics of formation under time pressure in the other, the cultural variation in schema exploitation that comparative metaphor research predicts (Kövecses, 2005). For cognitive stylistics the methodological moral is that controlled comparisons of this kind (one schema, two traditions, explicit parameterization) extract more from classical corpora than genealogical speculation does, and cost nothing in philological caution.

6. Limitations:

Six limitations bound the claims, each with a stated mitigation. First, attribution and dating: the compilation postdates its attributed speaker by three and a half centuries, and the authenticity of individual pieces has been debated in classical and modern scholarship (al-Ḥusaynī al-Khaṭīb, 1975; Djebli, 1993); accordingly, all claims concern the compiled literary corpus, and no chronological argument rests on attribution. Second, recension and numbering: the ʿAbduh and Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ editions diverge in numbering at the higher sermon ranges and among the sayings, and occasionally in wording; the two-tier protocol decouples wording (verified verbatim against the full digitized matn) from location (flagged wherever collation with the printed edition is pending), and only wording bears theoretical weight, with the battle invocation's placement explicitly unresolved. Third, retrieval: the eighty-character co-occurrence design can in principle miss containment realized without the container-field vocabulary, across a wider span, or through anaphora; the field list was made deliberately broad and every hit was read in full context, but completeness is claimed only for the retrieval stage, not for records that do not themselves contain the retrieval pair, nor absolutely. Fourth, historical semantics: the MIP gate requires basic senses, reconstructed here from a lexicographical tradition that postdates the corpus's dramatic date even where it predates its compilation

date; anachronism is contained, not eliminated, by preferring senses attested in early poetry and Qurʾanic usage. Fifth, boundary classification: routing the codex, mirror, field, vegetation, and adhesion figures to a boundary register required judgments about where CONTAINER ends and adjacent schemas begin, and such judgments are contestable; the mitigation is partial, since the boundary categories are named here so that the classification can be re-examined under a different boundary, whereas the item-level register is not reproduced in this article. Record 4 (Letter 31's empty ground) is boundary-sensitive: it is retained because its construal is carried by two container-field parameters listed in Table 1, emptiness (khalā) and intake (alqā/qabila), although the ground itself belongs to the field imagery routed elsewhere. The central findings, tenure theology and reversibility, rest on Records 12, 18, 19, and 24, none of which falls within the named boundary categories. Sixth, single-analyst coding: no inter-coder reliability figure exists because coding was performed by one analyst; the mitigation is that retrieval follows fixed, published parameters (normalization rules, lexical fields, and co-occurrence window) rather than analyst judgment, although the record-level retrieval log is not reproduced here, and a second-coder robustness check on the MIP and boundary decisions is recommended as the first extension of this work. The six limitations interact: a different boundary decision changes what retrieval must find, and a different recension can relocate a boundary item, which is why they are reported jointly here; and one presentational trade-off is acknowledged rather than defended: the deliberately literal translations sacrifice English elegance to keep container imagery visible, and are analytical instruments, not proposals for literary rendering of the corpus.

7. Conclusion:

This article set out to map, under a documented protocol, how the compiled literary corpus of Nahj al-Balāgha conceptualizes the heart/mind complex through the CONTAINER image schema. Twenty-seven verified records resolve into seven sub-models (vessel, store, dwelling, pressure-vessel, gated chamber, lamp-chamber, and capacity/placement), which jointly moralize the schema's physical parameters into a moral anatomy: integrity, volume, pressure, access, illumination, tenure, and placement each ground a distinct virtue or pathology, and the ear functions throughout as the aperture whose policing is the ethics of attention.

The contribution is threefold. Theoretically, the article offers two portable proposals, the first stated with a falsification condition derived from its definition: doctrinal load-bearing, demonstrated on Sermon 189's tenure theology, and figure-ground reversibility, demonstrated on the heart's three orientations, as a philological test for schema vitality. Methodologically, it supplies a procedure with fixed, published parameters (normalized co-occurrence retrieval, an MIP gate with historically reconstructed basic senses, boundary routing with named categories, and two-tier verification with intertext quarantine), whose output database is designed to outlive the interpretations defended here. Empirically, it extends cognitive-stylistic work on Islamic discourse to a classical oratory corpus in which, on the present evidence, the interior of the person is a built environment, and character, in the corpus's own physics, is architecture.

Future work follows three paths: a junction study of the loci where the container system meets the corpus's journey-and-provision imagery; a stratigraphic study tracing the quarantined Qurʾanic seeds through the ḥadīth corpus into the compilation, with the aqfāl al-rayn blend as a datable marker of elaboration; and a psycholinguistic study of whether these container figures retain cognitive traction for contemporary Arabic readers. Within its stated limits, the conclusion the evidence supports is restrained but firm: in this corpus the CONTAINER schema is not inherited furniture but an operated instrument, and what it operates on is nothing less than the doctrine of the sincere heart.

References:

al-Ḥusaynī al-Khaṭīb, ʿA. (1975). *Maṣādir Nahj al-balāgha wa-asānīduh* (Vols. 1–4). Muʾassasat al-Aʿlamī.

al-Sharīf al-Raḍī. (n.d.). *Nahj al-balāgha* (M. ʿAbduh, Comm.). Dār al-Maʿrifa.

al-Sharīf al-Raḍī. (1967). *Nahj al-balāgha* (Ṣ. al-Ṣāliḥ, Ed.). Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī.

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230000612

Djebli, M. (1993). Nahdj al-Balāgha. In *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed., Vol. 7, pp. 903–904). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_5752

Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. Basic Books.

Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd. (1959–1964). *Sharḥ Nahj al-balāgha* (M. Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, Ed.; Vols. 1–20). Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyya.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. University of Chicago Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614408

Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*. Basic Books.

Locke, J. (1975). *An essay concerning human understanding* (P. H. Nidditch, Ed.). Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1690)

Musolff, A. (2006). Metaphor scenarios in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol, 21*(1), 23–38. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms2101_2

OpenITI. (n.d.). *1323MuhammadCabduh.NahjBalagha* [Data set]. Open Islamicate Texts Initiative. https://github.com/OpenITI

Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol, 22*(1), 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926480709336752

Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge University Press.

Semino, E., & Culpeper, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Cognitive stylistics: Language and cognition in text analysis*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lal.1

Soskice, J. M. (1985). *Metaphor and religious language*. Clarendon Press.

Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. (2010). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.14

Stockwell, P. (2002). *Cognitive poetics: An introduction*. Routledge.

Appendix A:

Verified HEART/MIND AS CONTAINER Database (27 Records, 19 Loci)

Arabic wording verified verbatim against the digitized matn (OpenITI, n.d.); vocalization editorial. "Flagged" = Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ number pending collation with the printed edition. Full translations appear in the main text; the appendix and references are excluded from the article's word count. Wording verification applies to each record; location status applies to the locus and is shared by every record at that locus. Records 5a–5b and 23a–23c result from the record definition stated in Section 3. Current status: 12 of 19 loci flagged (63.2%, locus level), corresponding to 16 of 27 records (59.3%, record level); the battle invocation's placement is unresolved.

No.	Locus	Arabic key phrase	Transliteration — literal gloss	Sub-model / Status
1	Saying 147	إِنَّ هٰذِهِ الْقُلُوبَ أَوْعِيَةٌ فَخَيْرُهَا أَوْعَاهَا	inna hādhihi l-qulūba awʿiya — "hearts are vessels"	Vessel / flagged
2	Saying 147	هَا إِنَّ هَاهُنَا لَعِلْمًا جَمًّا	hāhunā la-ʿilman jamman — "here is abundant knowledge"	Vessel–Store (context-dependent) / flagged
3	Saying 147	يَنْقَدِحُ الشَّكُّ فِي قَلْبِهِ	yanqadiḥu l-shakk — "doubt strikes its spark"	Pressure / flagged
4	Letter 31	قَلْبُ الْحَدَثِ كَالأَرْضِ الْخَالِيَةِ	ka-l-arḍi l-khāliya — "like empty ground"	Vessel–Gated / confirmed
5a	Letter 31	عِمَارَةِ قَلْبِكَ بِذِكْرِهِ	ʿimārat qalbika — "keep in repair"	Dwelling / confirmed
5b	Letter 31	وَنَوِّرْهُ بِالْحِكْمَةِ	nawwirhu — "illumine"	Lamp / confirmed
6	Sermon 7	فَبَاضَ وَفَرَّخَ فِي صُدُورِهِمْ	bāḍa wa-farrakha — "laid eggs and hatched"	Dwelling / confirmed
7	Sermon 27	مَلأْتُمْ قَلْبِي قَيْحًا وَشَحَنْتُمْ صَدْرِي غَيْظًا	malaʾtum... shaḥantum — "filled... charged"	Pressure / confirmed
8	Sermon 5	انْدَمَجْتُ عَلَى مَكْنُونِ عِلْمٍ	indamajtu ʿalā maknūni ʿilm — "folded shut upon hidden knowledge"	Store / confirmed
9	Saying 6	صَدْرُ الْعَاقِلِ صُنْدُوقُ سِرِّهِ	ṣundūqu sirrih — "strongbox of his secret"	Store / flagged
10	Battle invocation	جَاشَتْ مَرَاجِلُ الأَضْغَانِ	jāshat marājilu l-aḍghān — "cauldrons of rancor boiled"	Pressure / flagged
11	Sermon 90	مَا تُخْفِي صُدُورُهُمْ مِنَ الضَّمِيرِ	mā tukhfī ṣudūruhum — "what breasts conceal"	Store / flagged
12	Sermon 189	ثَابِتًا مُسْتَقِرًّا فِي الْقُلُوبِ... عَوَارِيَّ	mustaqirr / ʿawārī — "settled / on loan"	Dwelling / flagged
13	Sermon 189	سَمِعَتْهَا أُذُنُهُ وَوَعَاهَا قَلْبُهُ	waʿāhā qalbuhu — "his heart contained it"	Vessel / flagged
14	Sermon 87	فَزَهَرَ مِصْبَاحُ الْهُدَى فِي قَلْبِهِ	miṣbāḥu l-hudā — "lamp of guidance"	Lamp / confirmed
15	Sermon 191	اسْتَغْلَقَتْ عَلَى أَفْئِدَتِهِمْ أَقْفَالُ الرَّيْنِ	aqfālu l-rayn — "locks of encrustation"	Gated (blend) / flagged
16	Sermon 192	أَطْفِئُوا مَا كَمَنَ فِي قُلُوبِكُمْ مِنْ نِيرَانِ الْعَصَبِيَّةِ	nīrān al-ʿaṣabiyya — "fires of factionalism"	Pressure / confirmed
17	Sermon 192	إِخْرَاجًا لِلتَّكَبُّرِ... وَإِسْكَانًا لِلتَّذَلُّلِ	ikhrāj / iskān — "eviction / housing"	Dwelling / confirmed
18	Sermon 192	قُلُوبُهُمْ فِي الْجِنَانِ وَأَجْسَادُهُمْ فِي الْعَمَلِ	qulūbuhum fī l-jinān — "hearts in the Gardens"	Reversal / confirmed

19	Sermon 221	وَ هَمَدَتِ الْقُلُوبُ فِي صُدُورِهِمْ	hamadati l-qulūb — "hearts died down"	Reversal / flagged
20	Sermon 231	الْعَدَاوَةِ الْوَاغِرَةِ فِي الصُّدُورِ	al-wāghira fī l-ṣudūr — "seething in the breasts"	Pressure / flagged
21	Sermon 83	نَفَذَ فِي الصُّدُورِ خَفِيًّا وَنَفَثَ فِي الآذَانِ	nafadha... nafatha — "penetrates... whispers"	Gated / confirmed
22	Saying 41	قَلْبُ الأَحْمَقِ فِي فِيهِ وَلِسَانُ الْعَاقِلِ فِي قَلْبِهِ	the chiasmus — "fool's heart in his mouth"	Placement / flagged
23a	Saying 176	آلَةُ الرِّيَاسَةِ سَعَةُ الصَّدْرِ	saʿat al-ṣadr — "capaciousness of breast"	Capacity / flagged
23b	Saying 333	أَوْسَعُ شَيْءٍ صَدْرًا	awsaʿu shayʾin ṣadran — "the most capacious of things in breast"	Capacity / flagged
23c	Saying 333	حُزْنُهُ فِي قَلْبِهِ	ḥuznuhu fī qalbihi — "his grief in his heart"	Placement / flagged
24	Saying 407	مَا اسْتَوْدَعَ اللهُ امْرَأً عَقْلًا	istawdaʿa... ʿaqlan — "deposited intellect"	Reversal–Store / flagged