

- Hymes, Dell (1968). "The ethnography of speaking". In : Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.), 99 - 138 .
- Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark (1980). *Metaphors we live by* . Chicago & London : University of Chicago Press .
- Lounsbury, Floyd G. (1968). "Linguistics and psychology". In : Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.), 38-67 .
- Lyons, John (1981). *Language and linguistics : an introduction*. Cambridge : CUP.
- Mathiot, Madeleine (1979). "Folk definitions as a tool for the analysis of lexical meaning". In : Mathiot, Madeleine (ed.), 122 - 260 .
- Mazor, Marya (1989). "Really relativism : dialectic interpretations of Saussure". *Language & Communication* 9 : 1, 11 - 12 .
- Osborn, Rick (1987). "The Whorfian hypothesis today". In : Cashdan, Asher & Jordin, Martin (eds) : *Studies in communication*. Oxford : Basil Blackwell Ltd., 51 - 62 .
- Potter, Simeon (1960). *Language in the modern world*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin Books Ltd.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald (1986 [1987]). *An Introduction to sociolinguistics* . Oxford : Basil Blackwell Ltd.

- 6- Idiomatically, "the ins and outs" is a phrase "now generally used only figuratively, for the details of an event, story, argument, etc., or of a course of procedure; or with reference to the shifting fortunes of political parties in the House of Commons, where the Government represents the 'ins', and the Opposition the 'outs' "(Collins 1958 [1964]:145).
- 7- If a customer in a local restaurant asked the waiter to be served with 'rice' and a 'soup' of beens, he would be requested to identify his preference: 'green' or 'dry'; 'rice' in this case, compared with (5), becomes redundant.
- 8- "Green onions" are identified as "green & white" by a child informant. Generally, however, 'green' is the colour of leaves on a tree or the colour of summer grass but not the colour of spring grass which is "pale green" (see Mathiot 1979: 168; 173-174; 183 and 188).

## REFERENCES

- AL-Sheikh, Basil (1985). Sapir-Whorf hypothesis today. Munich University Ph.D. Thesis.
- Basilus, Harold (1968). "Neo-Humboldtian ethnolinguistics". In: Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.). Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 447-459.
- Bernstein, Basil (1964). "Aspects of language and learning in the genesis of the social process". In: Hymes, Dell (ed.). Language in culture and society: a reader in linguistics and anthropology. New York: Harper & Row, 251-263.
- Bilmes, Jack (1988). "The concept of preference in conversation analysis". Language in Society 17, 161-181.
- Chatterjee, Ranjit (1985). "Reading Whorf through Wittgenstein: a solution to the linguistic relativity problem". Lingua 67, 37-63.
- Collins, V.H. (1958 [1964]). A book of English idioms. London: Longmans.
- Coulmas, Florian (1981), ed. Conversational routine: explorations in standardized communication situation and prepatterned speech. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Denny, J. Peter (1979). "The extendedness variable in classifier semantics: universal features and cultural variation". In: Mathiot, Madeleine (ed.): Ethnolinguistics: Boas, Sapir and Whorf revisited. The Hague : Mouton Publishers, 97 - 119 .
- Farghal, Mohammed (1992). "Colloquial Jordanian tautologies". Journal of Pragmatics 17, 223 - 240 .
- Gorgis, Dinha T. (1992). "Courtesy expressions in Baghdadi Arabic". Adab Al-Rafidayn 24, 1-26. University of Mosul, College of Arts.
- Hymes, Dell (1972). "Toward ethnographies of communication : the analysis of communicative events". In : Giglioli, Pier Pado (ed.): Language and social context. Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin Books Ltd., 21-44 .

order in expression (4) and possibly (10) . It is not like reading out names on a list alphabetically that language can dictate such conventional orders . We simply use language as a medium that expresses our conceptual systems .

Socio- economic factors also seem important in deciding how we order concepts . With 'rice' in (5) goes a variety of 'soup' and, hence, the 'constant' placed before the 'variable' . We look forward to seeing, examining and buying the 'imported' stuff which is psychologically viewed as more trustworthy than the 'home- made' things; the English see the reverse . Generally, this is our view of the present state of affairs, which is liable to change in the course of industrialisation .

In addition to reversals, I have also shown that some patterned concepts in 1A are seem to be neutralisations in English, eg (35- 38), and, hence, the conclusion that our society is male- dominant . Some others escape conceptualisation in the English culture although translation is made possible . This is the case with (30), where rhetorical elements have been lost in translation, and (50), where illogical deduction is obvious, but alien to the English culture . That I have chosen (50), which belongs to NISC, as my last example, was to draw attention to the fact that all of the three types of culture that I have designated at the outset of this paper can at times be totally different across languages in terms of one- to- one correspondence . The MFOP, however, seems to conform more with the LRH across languages than in one language . But with conflicts in world view orientation, as has been made clear in the discussion of (13- 15) along with (21- 24) and (25- 28), the MFOP tends to apply more or less alike in the two cultures.

## NOTES

- 1- One of the best expositions of neo-Humboldtian ethnolinguistics can be found in Basilius (1968).
- 2- Yet the three types of culture share commonalities which naturally belong to CCC whereas NISC represents idiosyncrasies, eg expression (50). The ISC represents commonalities of its own, which may be in conflict with CCC as (1) and (2) below show. See Hymes (1972 : 35) for the term 'culture' which nearly corresponds to CCC. But 'sub-culture' is used in a special sense here ; it does not involve any socio - economic stratification as can be found in Bernstein (1964). But see Mathiot (1979 : 124) .
- 3- I shall not be using the notion of preference as originally proposed by Sacks in 1971 and critically reviewed by many social scientists during subsequent years (see Bilmes 1988). Here, it stands for a 'choice' that comes up to mind first as determined by language and / or other forces .
- 4- The sequence of concepts in this quotation must not be confused with the order of concepts in phrases that tend to be formulaic in nature .
- 5- Such antonyms as (3) or "great and small" چير و صغير and "summer and winter" ميف و شتا are also called "conventional phrases" (Lounsbury 1968: 61).

49. Queen & crown (or head and tail)

٤٩- طرة كنية

50. I get fainted and (then) electrically shocked

٥٠- اخرب وانكهرب

Except for (50) whose meaning sounds illogical in terms of order and for which no better literal translation I could find (see Gorgis 1992) all others are phrases in which the order of concepts may be explained in logical terms. In both cultures, We do not provide answers unless there are questions. We may cough without necessarily catching cold, but 'flue' presupposes some sort of 'cough'. That 'measles' be ordered before 'small-pox' is peculiar to the English culture. Rather, it is typical of the Iraqis who have experienced the former more than the latter; the less serious disease now with a longer history is placed before the more serious. Expression (47), however, is used figuratively in IA to mean 'all is bad' or 'it is getting worse'. Surprisingly, 'taking' in our culture comes up to mind first. If language shapes our thinking, or if language reflects reality, then one tends to say that we are a people which 'takes' more than it 'gives'. Yet (48) in both IA and English presupposes an equilibrium which I feel to be unquestionable in terms of conceptualisation. And, last but not least, the 'Queen' in English, like its equivalent 'picture' in IA, comes up to mind first. Although both concepts in (49) stand for the Saussurian 'sign' and are similarly understood in both cultures because they function alike, yet the concepts stand for different objects in the real world; the 'picture' on Iraqi coins is variable while the 'queen' on English coins is constant. Despite this difference, the first choice in both cultures is the same; hence the applicability of MFOP in terms of which the LRH is not at work, either in one language or across the two languages. But I cannot claim, however, that relativity is absent in the conception of individual concepts, were they to be separated from each other.

## CONCLUSION

Cooper and Ross (as reported by Lakoff and Johnson 1980) have implicitly delved into the problem of linguistic relativity in present-day American English by demonstrating what lexical item occurs first in an expression, viz the MORE normal, and what occurs second, viz the LESS normal, and hence the formulation of MFOP. I have taken up this principle in conjunction with an explicit mention of the weaker version of LRH to see whether a similar picture is true of the Iraqi Arabic culture. For this purpose, around one hundred expressions have been collected, half of which only have been accounted for along with the corresponding English translations. I have shown out that IA grammar partially determines our use of concepts in cases whereby we place the 'agentive' before the 'affected'. Although in English syntax the same order holds, it seems that social and /or psychological attitudes are more at work in selecting preferences. Hence, the 'relative' ordering in English, 'determinism' in IA, and RELATIVITY of MFOP across cultures.

Religion seems to be one of the most influential forces that determines the order of concepts in our daily life. No two speakers are likely expected to reverse

37. Workers (male & female)

٢٧- عمال وعمالات

38. Doctors (male & female)

٢٨- اطباء وطبيبات

39. Brothers and sisters

٢٩- ايها الاخوة والاحوات

40. Parents (fathers & mothers)

٤٠- آباء وامهات

41. Ladies and gentlemen

٤١- آيتها السيدات والسادة

42. Ladies (Misses) and gentlemen

٤٢- سيداتي آنساتي ساداتي

Except for (41) and its extension (42), both being loan translations of 'ladies first', the remaining instances, and many more like them, start with nouns that are masculine . This gender is often made generic when a group is addressed by the profession title while, just like 'children' in both languages ; gender in such cases is neutralised in English (see Farghal 1992) . From this, one may conclude that our society is male- dominant .

The above conclusion finds support in the culturally-bound expression (39) whose roots can be traced in Islamic teachings. This is why non-Arab Moslems are expected to address an audience of a similar religious affiliation as 'brothers and sisters' in, for example, English. But since such speakers do not constitute a portion of the English community, this expression is judged to be LESS normal in English. Except in church sermons and religious societies, called 'brotherhoods' in American English, an English audience would not be entitled to 'brotherhood'. Rather, (41) would be the MORE normal and, hence, in conflict with (33) and (34). It is crystal clear, however, that both Christianity and Islam place 'man' first; for propably God created Adam first and Eve second. But the Christian rule seems to have been largely violated in the Western world. It is we, including the speakers of Syriac, who still adhere to the rule of male-preference; in our culture, husbands in particular would like to see their wives give birth to 'boys' rather than to 'girls'. To be sure that we are more oriented in this fashion, I offer the following:

43. Cock or hen?

٤٣- ديج لو دجاجة ؟

44. Male or female?

٤٤- ذكر لو انثية ؟

The foregoing discussion has tended to be more of "a narrative reflection of reality than ... a structural analysis ... [for my purpose here is NOT] ... achieving the economies of the rules of the a grammer in relation to a series of analyses of texts" (Hymes 1968:103; brackets are mine). That I am concerned only with the exploration of MFOP in relation to RELATIVITY, I find excuse in not so doing. But surely the present work is a "structural analysis" of some sort. Concepts in the previous examples as well as in the following are structured in such a fashion that they do not easily lend themselves to the rules of grammer as they stand; for their order can be both conventional and conversational, In fact, they tend to be more of stock or formulaic expressions. Consider:

45. Question & answer

٤٥- سؤال وجواب

46. Flue & cough

٤٦- نشلة وكحة

47. Measles & small-pox

٤٧- حصبة وجدري

48. Give & take

٤٨- (الدنيا ) اخذ وعطا

offices; results are what matters us most. If we were to consider (18) as a metaphor we live by, to follow lakoff and Johnson (1980), then expressions such as :

25. Coming (IN), going (OUT) ;

٢٥- خاش طالع

26. Entry (IN), Exit (OUT) ;

٢٦- بخل و خدرج

27. Interior, exterior ; and

٢٧- وجه و كفا (بطانة)

28. Going forth and back

٢٨- رايح جاي

would only partially supports the thesis which still needs to be verified when checked against further data .

Undoubtedly, the more data we have at hand, the better testimonies we would be able to offer. Consider, however, (19) to which the following lend support :

29. Dry or still wet ? (7)

٢٩- خضرة لى يابسة

30. All was set ablaze .

٣٠- اشتبك الاخضر واليابس

The contrast between the literal and metaphoric uses of 'green' is obvious . It is here, as elsewhere, that pragmatics has a word to say and the LRH a voice of triumph . Translation is made possible, but rhetorical elements have been lost . Not only this , but background assumptions in the two cultures are different . Where the two concepts in (29) are associated with 'washing' and 'drying' machines in the English culture, their association is partly metaphorically made with 'rope' and how shiny the sun is up the roof or in the balcony . To my knowledge, the English people would use 'green' with 'cloth' to mean 'a gambling table' or with 'sea' to mean 'a quiet sea' . So the two conceptual systems must be different (8) .

More obvious differences between the two cultures derive from the corresponding language systems . IA seems to determine our use of expressions such as (16) and (20) after the grammatical pattern /fācil/ vs/ mafcūl/, ie the agentive first and the affected second, eg .

31. The prosecutor and the prosecuted

٣١- ظالم ومظلوم

Such matching does not seem to fit English well. I tend to claim that the firstly occurring concepts are associated with persons who have been obsessed or with persons of high esteem . This view, however, awaits confirmation . But there is no doubt that social attitudes , among many other forces, eg religion , can shape the order of concepts in language the way societies feel to be more appropriate . Sex, for example, is the most noticeable variable in our culture . Historically, preference has overwhelmingly been given to the male sex which corresponds to masculine gender in IA . The following bear much evidence to the said claim :

32. Qais and Layla

٣٢- قيس وليلى

33. Boys and girls

٣٣- بنين وبنات

34. Men and women

٣٤- رجال ونساء

35. Students (male & female)

٣٥- طلاب وماتليات

36. Teachers (male & female)

٣٦- معلمين ومعلمات

'fasting' than 'praying' for practising the latter without the former is insufficient for a Moslim to be counted as a devout person . So the foregrounding of 'fasting', rather 'praying' or 'non- fasting', in (10) and (11) is justifiable; it is a one- month obligation in a year, ie seasonal, whereas the second concepts reflect daily routines and, hence, put in the background . Similarly, orientation towards Islam in (12) is MORE normal than Christianity; for constitutionally the former is the religion of the Country, and because Moslims form a majority of the whole population . Analogously, the English 'major vs minor' is a case in point but, evidently, a corresponding religiously - oriented expression would be less normal in an English culture and, hence, relativity across cultures in terms of MFOP . But (17) seems to challenge relativity; the myth in both cultures often goes like this: the angel who is by your 'right' shoulder guards you, whereas the devil who is by your 'left' shoulder is in conflict with the former and always tries to tempt you . Thus 'good' appears before 'evil' in both cultures .

Explanations are not always easy to find; for expressions like (13), (14) and (15) may be said to conflict with each other in both IA and English . In our culture, we view 'life' and 'world' before 'death' and 'eternity' but, unexpectedly, 'night' before 'day' . In the English culture, 'death' is given preference, whereas 'night' is kept in the background . It is hard for me to resolve such conflicts without introspections . To confirm or reject them, however, would require appeal to the intuitions of many native speakers of both languages . At present, the least can be said about why 'night' be ordered before 'day' at the time other phrases such as the ones below are seen to be in conflict with this order :

- |                                      |                                |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 21. The sun and the moon .           | ٢١- الشمس والقمر               |
| 22. Sunrise and sunset .             | ٢٢- الشروق والغروب             |
| 23. Morning and evening, eg sessions | ٢٣- صباحي ومساءني (نوام مثلاً) |
| 24. Morning and afternoon            | ٢٤- صباح وعصر ، صباح ومساء     |

In these, as well as in (13) and (14) above, concepts which are associated with 'more light' or the 'more visible world' are placed first . One possible explanation for justifying order in (15) is that the Iraqis, if not all the Arabs , still seem to be echoing the beauties and magic of night as widely attested in classical poetry and /or enchanted by singers . Another might be attributed to the Qur'anic verse related to creation . The English, on the other hand, might be said to have been following the Latin pattern 'a.m. and p.m.' respectively and, hence, maintaining the temporal cycle without any conflict. It is only (13) that blurs the vivid picture, so to speak . While we are all men of the world in the first place as (14) shows, 'death' in the English culture is given preference probably because the 'deadly sin' is a reminder, or because religious belief dictates that eternal 'life' comes after 'death' .

Conflicts seem to be relatively persistent in both cultures . For example, where in expression (18) 'OUT' is MORE normal than 'IN' in IA, the English view the INS before the OUTs(6) . In our culture, we are more concerned about 'OUT' probably because tedious procedures are involved in handling out papers at

9. Ordinary, ie black & white, or colour? (5) -٩ عادي لى ملون

English makes explicit mention of the colours; hence the variable uses with reference to a TV set but the world remains the same . This is also true of expressions like (8) whereby the two cultures look forward to seeing the 'single' get 'married', but the 'new' precedes the 'given' in this case .

Precedence in terms of 'new' vs 'given' seems to abide by the LRH in both cultures; that is, none of the two notions receives a generalisation in either IA or English . This should also mean that the MFOP goes hand in hand with both notions when defining the concept that fills the first position in an expression. To make such a conclusion arrived at by having examined some 100 examples from IA along with a number of their English equivalents clearer, I offer the following :

10. Fasting, praying- type person

11. Fasting or non- fasting ?

12. Moslim, Christian

13. Death and life

14. World and eternity

15. Day and night

16. The oppressed and oppressor

17. The angel and the devil

18. IN & OUT

19. Green or dry onions ?

20. The murdered and murderer

١٠- صايم مصلي

١١- صايم لى مشطر ؟

١٢- مسلم مسيحي

١٣- حيا وموت

١٤- الدنيا والاخرة

١٥- ليل ونهار

١٦- ظالم ومظلوم

١٧- ملك وشيطان

١٨- صادرة و واردة

١٩- بصل اخضر لى يابس ؟

٢٠- قاتل ومقتول

In each of the above- stated expressions, there are two concepts for which the two labels 'new' and 'given' may variably be given . In IA, the first concepts in 10, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 20 as well as the second concepts in 12, 13, 14 and 17 are 'new' while their set members are 'given'. It is the first cocepts, whether 'new' or 'given', however, towards which the Iraqis are MORE conceptually oriented . Cross- culturally, the differences are obvious, with the exception of more probably 13, 15, 18 and less probably 20, the remaining instances would not mean much for an English native speaker . Not only this, but the exceptions themselves have the concepts in a switched order . So one is inclined to say here that the LRH finds support in MFOP more across two cultures than in one culture . But this is not always the case; for we also find the concept 'night' placed before 'day' in English prayers . To my thinking, such order is a violation of the norm . Therefore, I take it to belong to ISC while that displayed by 15- to CCC in English .

In our culture, a similar view is strongly held . My audience considered almost all of the utterances examined here as a 'given' . But I do not exclude the possibility of attesting at least some of them in the reversed order and, hence, as en bloc considered 'new' or 'marked' if you like . Yet what is significant about them is that they would be placed at the lower scale of relativity since they are MORE normal . The Iraqis are, for example conceptually more oriented towards



6. Imported or Iraqi made?;

7. Black & white; and

8. Single or married ?

١- مستورد أو عراقي ؟

٢- أسود، وأبيض

٣- أعزب أو متزوج ؟

Taking this 'little choice' to belong to NISC and, hence, marked or RELATIVE, I shall assume that expressions like 4-8 are mostly the property of CCC. One more point to be made clear here before I proceed is the question of markedness. So far, I have equated 'unmarked' with MORE normal vs 'marked' with LESS normal patterning. Although the notion of markedness does work elsewhere in IA (see, eg Gorgis 1992), my contention is that it does not work smoothly here because instances like (4) above are STRICTLY conventional; no 'marked' expression is possible. Therefore, I choose the notions 'new' and 'given' which are seen to capture more generalisations if extended to apply to whole utterances. So (4) would be described as 'given' for which there is no 'new' that can likely abide by the LRH.

Nevertheless, one may not feel happy about these notions all the way through; for what can be described as commonly 'given' in its entirety can sometimes raise problems as to what parts the labels 'new' and 'given' should be given and in what order. The Iraqis conceive of (5) above as the main dish of the day. Unlike the English whose conceptual system is MORE oriented towards 'soup' and 'snacks' or the lexicalized 'fish-n-chips', the Iraqis attach more importance to 'rice' than to 'soup'. I reckon that the concept 'rice' is placed first as a 'given' whereas 'soup' as a 'new' because one of its varieties at least needs to be identified later; further cognitive processing is still required. The order of the two notions, however, does not seem to work in this fashion at all times. In (6), for example, the concept 'imported' is given a priority by the Iraqis whereas 'home-made' by the English. So 'new' can assume a first position in an utterance in IA. Cross-culturally, the difference is obvious; as Iraq is not as industrial as, eg Britain or America, it is expected that we conceptualize 'imported' goods before the locally made stuff.

The interpretations I offer in this paper, however, are suggestive rather than definitive but, surely, interesting by themselves. To reiterate, 'preference' does not always mean or entail 'importance'. For example, a prototypical speaker of IA or of English would conceive of 'black' first not because this particular colour is his favourite or because the world is or looks black for him. One possible explanation for the order of colours in (7) is stated by Potter (1960, 165) who believes that this expression "became early associated in the mind of man with night and day, darkness and light, evil and good" (4). Another is that 'black' is a more visible colour than 'white' which shades off into several other ultracolours as we notice in a rainbow; hence 'given' vs 'new'. But a note should be made here; (7) considered as en bloc is the 'given' in both cultures; hence the failure of the LRH in case the world is similarly patterned. Yet, where this utterance is reduced to only one word in IA, eg.

The concept of sub- culture must be made clear at this point . Members belonging to well- defined institutions, eg a university, hospital, theatre. etc. do not necessarily opt for the LESS normal order . Rather, they are more likely to opt for the MORE normal order of concepts in their own sub- cultures that cannot be MORE or LESS normal in the core culture . By sub- culture proper, I mean experiences that may deviate from the common core and which do not necessarily constitute a domain or belong to an institution . Therefore, I would like to make a distinction between institutional sub- culture (ISC) and non-institutional sub- culture (NISC) and culture proper or common core culture (CCC)(2) .

This distinction will prove useful in the ensuing discussion . In order to circumvent some of the problems related to markedness and to put it more lucidly, I offer the following example :

### 1- Colleges of Arts and Sciences

١- كليتي الآداب والعلوم

Preference(3) is given to 'Arts' in an ISC; this is an unmarked order in this particular world for which the following explanation is believed to be good reason . But first let me say that preference does not always entail the attachment of importance; the 'Arts' is no more important than 'Sciences' . A plausible explanation can be based on the fact that the 'Arts' college was founded before the 'Sciences' college in the University of Baghdad . The expression was documented in this received order and has become widespread even in universities such as Mosul where the Medical College was founded before the 'Arts' . Although other explanations are possible, such that alphabetical ordering is recognized, there is no doubt that the 'Arts' concept comes up to mind first in the Iraqi learned culture, ie an ISC . A reversal of these two concepts with reference to the field of study rather than to colleges is more widespread in CCC. Thus

### 2. (will you be doing) sciences or arts?

٢- علمي ام ادبي ؟

is an annual debated issue among Iraqi families; it is the 'sciences' that comes up to mind first because parents attach more importance to pure sciences than social disciplines or the 'arts'.

This juxtaposition should mean that I am more interested in cases like (2) than (1) or

### 3. Water, greenness and a good-looking face!

٣- الماء والخصراء والوجه الحسن

Understandably, expressions like these are also unmarked, but mostly in educated circles. what I have in mind instead is the prototypical speaker of IA, a speaker who has either no choice in the ordering of concepts, eg

### 4. God, Mohammed and Ali be with you

٤- الله ومحمد وعلي وياك

as DETERMINED by a religious, or little choice as in :

### 5. Rice & soup (broth) ;

٥- اتمني ومرك

'relativity' across languages . Even when there is a one- to- one correspondence in the lexicons of any two (or more) languages 'relativity' can emerge . Consider, for example, the case of sex neutralization in English and Arabic tautologies (see Farghal 1992, 226- 7) .

The Boas- Sapir- Whorf tradition has in recent years been REVISITED with the weaker version of the LRH borne in mind . Mathiot (1979), for example, is an excellent collection of papers which all attempt to answer the traditional question : what meanings are communicated through language, and how do these meanings reflect the way in which the speakers conceive of the world? This should mean that invitations to re- examine the LRH are still open . A special, but demanding, invitation is offered by Lyons (1981, 311- 12) who suggests that we ought to seek the relationship that holds between the syntactic differences among languages of the world and the minds of their respective speakers. Obviously, this is not an easy task . But a similar line of thinking seems to have been put into practice with the LRH in the background, eg Coulmas (1981) in which we find different world views across languages .

## DISCUSSION

Having kept all of this sketchy background in mind, I shall attempt to bring the LRH into the foreground as only revealed by research into the ME- FIRST Orientation principle (MFOP) advanced by William E. Cooper and John Robert Ross in the form reported by Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 132- 33) . The phenomenon accounted for in terms of MFOP and, hence, the LRH involves word order preference in Iraqi Arabic (IA) with special reference to English . Although 'word order' has often been taken as a syntactic issue, I take it here as mainly involving referential semantic and pragmatic accounts; for the world is at the heart of the matter . In a word, I would like to see the kind of world the Iraqi Arabs collectively view, which is, therefore, assumed to correspond to the order of concepts in everyday language use . This would constitute a cultural view which may or may not coincide with the English culture whose members adhere generally to the MFOP . Yet sub- cultures (see below) cannot be ignored .

According to the MFOP, native speakers of English, if not speakers of many other languages, view themselves more of 'here', 'now', 'present', 'face', 'up', 'active', 'speaking' and 'working' than 'there', 'then', 'absent', 'back', 'down', 'passive', 'writing' and 'idle'. This picture seems to be more oriented in their conceptual system. That is, this is how a prototypical member of an English culture (here American) would view the world . So the MORE normal pattern is to order, for example, 'up' before 'down'; the LESS normal the reverse . It is the latter order which is dubbed the notion of RELATIVITY in one language. If the former order varies across languages of the world , then the LRH will, despite the said translatability counter claim, be strengthened . But when two or more cultures agree on the MORE normal patterning of concepts, the LRH collapses and, hence, the acceptability of UNIVERSALISM .

# World order and word order in Iraqi Arabic with special reference to English

Dinha T. Gorgis

Department of English, College of Arts, Mosul University

## INTRODUCTION

The relation of language to world view is an issue over which numerous heated arguments have been run for over the last two centuries. Although Humboldt's philosophy of language, which later influenced linguistics, is often equated with the concept of world view, "the idea that a system of language shaped the thinking of its speakers was first formulated by Herder" (Schaff 1973, 8 cited in Al-Sheikh 1985, 8). It was Boas, the anthropologist and then linguist, who brought the seeds of Humboldtian structuralism, however, to America and passed them over to Sapir with whom Whorf worked during his last years. Boas believed that languages of the world are to a large extent structurally the same irrespective of respective cultures or ethnic groups (see, eg Wardaugh 1986 [1987], 207). Conversely, Sapir believed that languages are structurally different, i.e. there are no limits to the differences among languages of the world. Therefore, their respective speakers see the world differently; hence relativity. A more extreme view is held by Whorf who, like Herder, believed that the language we use wholly determines (or shapes) the categories in which we think as if language and thought were equivalent (cf. Mazor 1989 and Chatterjee 1985); hence 'determinism', a term with which the name of F. de Saussure as a neo-Humboldtian is also associated in current debates (see Mazor 1989 for a critical assessment and the references cited therein).

It is the 'Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis' (LRH), however, that bears the names of Sapir and Whorf; it includes both 'relativity' and 'determinism'. Often 'Whorfianism' is equated with the LRH which has been taken up by Wittgenstein (cf. Chatterjee 1985). This hypothesis was tested experimentally by psychologists in the 50's and 60's. In addition to the little evidence the LRH offered in conjunction with observation and memory, it was rejected on firmer grounds, viz that translation would not have been possible. Subsequently, however, a weaker version of the hypothesis was introduced: linguistic and social deterministic influences as well as relative forces are seen to coexist (interact) in any language community (cf. Osborn 1987, 60 and Denny 1979, 97). And across languages, one aspect of relativity is best seen in translation.

No doubt, translators are confronted with the problem of finding one-to-one correspondence; no two languages can always match in this fashion. What is important for one language community can be expressed by a single word; for another by a lexicalized item and, yet, for others by a phrase or sentence (see Osborn 1987 for further details and the references cited therein). Nevertheless, it is not a matter of importance attachment that would exclusively give rise to