A Cross-linguistic and Cross-cultural Study of Explicitness in English and Arabic Discourse

Dr. Adnan Abdul Dayem
Department of English Language
Shatt Al-Arab University College/ Basra

Abstract
In this article, an argument is made to account for the thesis that at various instances of language usage and on different linguistic levels Arabic discourse enjoys a higher degree of explicitness than English. To develop this position the tendency in Arabic discourse to produce more explicit utterances is highlighted on lexical, syntactic and textual levels. In addition to explicitness induced by purely linguistic constraints, a tradition of socio-cultural norms is found to exert a considerable influence on characterizing the relatively more explicit Arabic discourse strategy. A corpus of Arabic examples, involving material in Modern Standard Arabic and derived mainly from realistic writing, printed interviews as well as printed data, is investigated to reach the findings reported in this paper.

Keywords: language study, critical commentary, Arabic and English discourse

دراسة لغوية مشتركة بين الثقافات للشرح الناقد في الخطاب العربي والإنجليزي

د. عدنان عبد الدايم
قسم اللغة الانجليزية
كلية شط العرب الجامعة- البصرة

الخـــــلاصة:

في هذه المقالة ، تم طرح حجة لمراعاة أطروحة أنه في حالات مختلفة من استخدام اللغة وعلى مستويات لغوية مختلفة ، يتمتع الخطاب العربي بدرجة أعلى من الشهود مقارنة بالإنجليزية. لتطوير هذا الموقف ، يتم إبراز الاتجاه في الخطاب العربي لإنتاج كلمات أكثر وضوحا على المستويات المعجمية والنحوية والنصية. بالإضافة إلى الشرح الناجم عن القيود اللغوية البحتة ، تم العثور على تقليد من المعايير الاجتماعية والثقافية لممارسة تأثير كبير على توصيف استراتيجية الخطاب العربي أكثر وضوحا نسبيا. تم فحص مجموعة من الأمثلة العربية ، تتضمن مواد باللغة العربية الفصحى الحديثة والمستمدة أساسًا من الكتابة الواقعية والمقابلات المطبوعة والبيانات المطبوعة للوصول إلى النتائج الواردة في هذه الورقة.

الكلمات المفتاحية:دراسة لغوية،الشرح الناقد،الخطاب العربي والانكليزي

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.: 3 Vol.: 44 Yr. 2019

1. Introductio

General use of language is noticeably characterized by various degrees of explicitness. Speakers are not always expected to bother about spelling out every minute point of expression, and a strategy of leaving room for inference to be worked out by listeners is normally involved in actual linguistic interaction. Such an inference-drawing strategy is based on what Clark and Clark (1977: 92-97) describe as 'the given-new contract', a cooperative agreement between speech participants whereby a problematic kind of inference can be signified.

As a linguistic feature, explicitness is graded on a scale such that utterances are characterized to range from the most or fully explicit to the least explicit or implicit utterances. The relevant degree of explicitness displayed by an utterance is constrained by two interrelated linguistic properties: 1. how far the utterance is detailed so that it will be fully explicit when the required linguistic elements are all contained and no elliptical material is encountered; and 2. the extent to which the utterance is direct, as it will be more explicit if it requires no inference or deduction on the part of the receiver since all required items surface. This makes it true to say that the more detailed and more direct an utterance is, the more explicit it will be. The principle of detailed-direct expression tendency is taken up in this study to account for the degree Arabic discourse is explicit in comparison with that of English.

It has been found out upon research, for example Wierzbicka (1985), that the structure of languages manifests scalar degrees of explicitness and directness, and that linguistic differences of this kind, though inherently induced by purely linguistic determinants, may ultimately be associated with cultural differences such as intimacy versus distance and spontaneity versus toleration. In addition to purely linguistic distinctions, cultural differences are also related to the issue of explicitness and should therefore be considered as pertinent to the comparison purported to be expounded in the endeavor we undertake in this study. For purposes of clarity of discussion the presentation of relevant material is divided into purely linguistic and socio-cultural to coincide with the types of constraints which limit the degree of explicitness we seek to point out in the present analysis.

As preliminary exemplification, we may consider the following English utterance samples and their more likely Arabic counterparts.

1. The man killed in the battle.
   ar-rajul l-adhi qutila fi l-ma9rakah.

If the English utterance, consisting in the phrase where the relativizer is elliptical, is favorably rendered into the Arabic clause by having the relativizer kept on the surface, the Arabic utterance should obviously be more explicit according to the detailed expression principle.

2. Muslims in Britain.
   al-muslimuna l-adhiina yuqiimuna fi barit̲aaniya.
   al- muslimuna l-miqimuna fi barit̲aaniya.

If the Arabic utterances are favorably used as the equivalent of the English utterance in 2, they are more explicit than the English utterance since they have

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.:3 Vol.:44 Yr. 2019

the semantic relation in the prepositional phrase lexically explained which is not so displayed in the English utterance.

3. Will you forgive me my lord?
   ?arju ?an taghfira li yaa sayyidi.

When it is a tendency in Arabic to use the direct speech act of request for the predilection in English to use the indirect request as in 3, the Arabic utterance should be considered more explicit than the English utterance according to the principle of direct expression tendency.

2. Linguistic constraints

Arabic is characterized by kinds of lexical patterning and syntactic modeling grounded in repetition on different linguistic levels: morphological, lexical, syntactic, semantic and textual. These linguistic traits are highly favored by Arabic discourse (Koch 1983). A considerable part of the repetitious structure of Arabic discourse is underlain by choices which are linguistically induced, and can therefore be viewed to exert significant linguistic constraints on discourse tendencies. As it will be made clear in subsequent sections, these repetitions may have no little influence in assigning Arabic discourse a comparatively higher degree of explicitness.

2.1 Lexical patterning

Arabic morphology is characterized by a sort of root-pattern system. The root, being the radical verb and the bearer of the general lexical meaning, consists of three consonants usually represented by the letters f-9-l. It combines with the vocalic pattern (taf9iilah or siighah) to result in a derivation paradigm of maximal fifteen derivatives or lexical forms, not all of which are necessarily assumed by the trilateral verbs (for the complete paradigm of verbs see Wright (1975: 29).

This kind of morphological system is exploited in Arabic discourse to bring out the repetition of patterns as well as that of roots. The tendency to present co-occurring tandem forms modeled on one identical pattern accounts for a considerable part of lexical repetition. Such a strategy of discourse is linguistically manifested by what is known as lexical couplets (Johnston 1987), or word-strings (Al-Jubouri 1984: 105-107). These are pairs or series of words strung together to constitute one group mostly by being coordinated with 'wa' (and). Different relations giving rise to semantic parallelism are displayed by the constituents of the string, the most important of which and that which we are most concerned with is synonymy. Some of these couplets, or doublets as they may also be labeled, are morphologically parallel by having a common internal vowel, gemination or pre-fixation pattern:

4. at-tadmiir wa t-takhriib
Destruction and demolition.

5. yuhaddid wa yukhattit
   Define and delimit.
6. ?al-?amthal wa l-?akmal
   The most ideal and the most perfect.

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.:3 Vol.:44 Yr. 2019

Some other lexical couplets, or longer word strings, have no such expected morphological parallelism:

7. ?al-ta?yiid wa l-musaa9adah
   Aid and assistance.
8. ?al-wahm wa l-khayal
   Illusion and imagination.

Synonymy strings in Arabic, as the examples show, are not based on the concept of synonymy in the narrowest sense, where linguistic signs of absolutely the same meaning are used in juxtaposition to one another. For absolute synonymy to occur Lyons (1981: 148), among others, stipulates that lexemes must "have the same distribution, and are completely synonymous in all their meanings and in all their contexts of occurrence". Nor are word-strings expected to make use of "complete synonymy" defined by Lyons (ibid) as involving "the same descriptive, expressive, and social meaning in the range of certain contexts in question".

The kind of Arabic strings are expected to be concentrated in 'partial synonymy' where synonyms are differentiated in terms of any of the types of meaning as distinguished by Leech (1981: 10-12) or Lyons (1981: 152). To illustrate partial synonymy in Arabic word-strings we may consider the following utterance taken from Dayf (1977:76).

9. ?inna l-hasada ?aalamu wa ?aadha wa ?awja9u wa ?awda9u mina l-9adaawati.
   Envy is more painful, more hurtful, more aching than and more inferior to animosity.

Though the underlined synonyms all refer to pain, they are listed in accordance with the degree of pain which increases successively.

Partial synonymy involved in the wide-spread word-strings in Arabic makes it possible for synonyms to be used syntagmatically to reinforce one another in the same utterance. The resulting feature is the juxtaposition of items which are paratactically repeated. This, in turn, should point to the rich repository of Arabic synonyms and near synonyms.

It is not completely uncommon to encounter lexical couplets like "ways and means", and "aid and abet" in English discourse; nonetheless, the discrepancy they show with respect to the kind of lexical couplets in Arabic should be clear. Whereas the Arabic couplets are the result of a still-productive rule, and they still have spurts of productivity, the English couplets are frozen or semi-frozen idiomatic expressions. Al-Jubouri (1984: 104) cites a list of such prototypical English couplets. Some of these examples are:

10. Fair and square
    Each and every
    Law and order
    Give and bequeath
    Last will and testimony

Some of the lexical couplets in English may even turn out to be no more than pairs of co-existent cognate native and borrowed words; e.g. 'skirt and shirt'

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.: 3 Vol.: 44 Yr. 2019

or 'skipper and shipper', which are "rarely even descriptively synonymous" (Lyons 1981:206). For the ones which retain some degree of synonymy, Ullman (1962: 152) notes that a considerable number of the borrowed-based English couplets are the product of the tradition of "literary mannerism", according to which it was customary to explain a French word by adding to it a native English synonym. The following are examples which go back to the same tradition (ibid):

11. Mansion and house
    Lord and master
    Pray and beseech

On the other hand, as Koch (1983: 49) observes, Arabic word-strings are nonce forms. In so many instances of language usage, conjoined words with requisite coherence in meaning enable the speaker/writer to highlight different aspects of the designated object, and exert enrichment to the text by presenting additional semantic and evaluative values.

Another wide-spread sort of repetition on the morphological level is achieved by repeating morphological roots. One of the most noticeable structures which realize this repetition is the 'cognate accusative', a common construction in which a verbal form (verb, participle, verbal noun, etc.) is modified by a phrase consisting of a verbal noun from the same root plus an adjective. The following are some examples of this construction:

12. mimma yadillu dilaalatan qaati9atan 9alaa ?innahu
    (One thing which indicates a decisive indication that he…..)
    What decisively indicates that he ……
13. qaatala l-junuudu qitaalan baasilan
    (The soldiers fought a brave fighting)
    The soldiers fought bravely.

A cognate accusative may also come out with the verbal noun being made the second term of an ?idaafa, i.e. genitive, construction:

14. Kaana iltizaamuhu l-mabaadi?a ?ashadda ltizaam.
    (His adherence to the principles had been the strongest adherence)
    He had adhered most strongly to the principles.

Cognate accusatives in Arabic serve an essential syntactic function of providing adverbial modification for the matrix verb of the clause. They constitute an alternative to prepositional adverbial qualification. Though the construction is not completely obligatory, it is highly favored by the syntactic structure of Arabic in the sense that the choices are still limited (Johnston 1987: 92-93; Farghal 1990: 183).

Like couplets and longer word-series, the use of cognate accusatives points to the tendency in Arabic discourse to use paratactic repetition of parallel linguistic forms. On the level of content, both structures mark a single-word paraphrase which a speaker makes for explicating the utterance at hand. While cognate accusative is highly commendable in Arabic, it is much less so and even proscribed in English.

The kind of lexical repetition briefly accounted for will unmistakably point

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.: 3 Vol.: 44 Yr. 2019

to a trait which Arabic possesses as an inherent peculiarity. Arabic lexical morphology has the potential of derivatives which, due to the dynamic category of 'pattern' as vocabulary-generating device, can make open classes to accommodate the necessary lexical growth of the language (cf. Hassan 1971: 166-170). This process of derivation, referred to in Arabic as '?ishtiqaaq', is different from that of 'derivation' and 'compounding', as the two major sources of English vocabulary expansion. The latter are concerned with the formation of new lexemes by affixation and compounding from two or more potential stems (see Bauer 1983: 201).

As most Arab linguists agree that '?ishtiqaaq' is the most productive process of Arabic word-formation, the difference it shows as regards derivation in English should be clear: "unlike English which heavily relies on affixation in derivation, Arabic heavily relies on patterns and analogy in derivation. Arabic uses a few derivational suffixes" (Al-Najjar 2007:232). Whereas the process of "ishtiqaaq" is achieved by derivational patterns which have fixed structures and functions, analogy is used as a yardstick to derive new derivatives conforming in structure and function to existing derivatives. Thus, the pattern "?infa9ala" which is derived from the trilateral verb "fa9ala" has the form "fa9ala":"infa9ala" and the function of converting a transitive into a middle voice verb. Examples of verbs derived by this pattern may include "fataha": infataha, nasara: intasara, hasara: inhasara". Such discrepancies of lexical morphology between Arabic and English are naturally borne out by the discourse structures of the two languages. For Arabic the impact is that speakers and writers are encouraged to invest the rich paradigms and the enormous potentially available resources afforded by morphology. Thus it would seem legitimate to describe the morphological system of Arabic as the keystone of both linguistic and cultural structuring of the language (Koch 1983: 91-92).

It is now clear that a remarkably noticeable feature of the structure of Arabic reflected in the structure of Arabic discourse is lexical repetition. This, as witnessed above, is mostly represented by lexical couplets, longer word-strings, cognate accusatives, and other kinds of root repetition. What makes this feature pertinent to our purposes is that such conjoined words and phrases are rather related to acceptability than to grammaticality, and should therefore be considered to serve stylistic and discourse tendencies.

2.2 Syntactic modeling

2.2.1 Paratactic repetition in syntax

Arabic discourse is rhetorically effective partly through the kinds of repetition which are actually rooted in the syntactic structure of the language. Grammatical categories entailing the use of forms repeated in juxtaposition to one another are so inherent in Arabic syntax that they account for their pragmatic use in discourse. Such structural and paratactic repetition can on the whole be taken as embedded in parataxis. This is the general syntactic category which, together with hypotaxis, accounts for the system of inter-dependency or tactic system, as one dimension of the functional semantic relations that make up the logic of natural language (Halliday 1985: 193).

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.:3 Vol.:44 Yr. 2019

The distinction between paratactic and hypotactic relation is introduced to mark the type of taxis, or of the relationships within all complexes: words, groups, phrases or clauses. As more specifically contrasted, parataxis and hypotaxis define different logical structures. In a paratactic structure, two elements of equal status, one initiating and the other continuing, are linked. A hypotactic structure, on the other hand, involves a dependent element and its dominant, the element on which it is dependent. Thus a pair of related clauses in a hypotactic relation is of unequal status since the dominant element is free, but the dependent element is not. Such a kind of relation will make the latter structure necessarily one of subordination where the elements are combined on not equal footing (ibid: 195, 198)

For the paratactic juxtaposition of items from the same syntactic category coordination stands out as highly valued mode of expression in Arabic discourse. The great deal use of this kind of syntactically characterized paratactic relation creates a wide-range occurrence of coordinated parallel phrases and clauses as well as periphrastic and near-periphrastic conjunction. Such paratactic structures, as represented by coordinated and structurally conjoined forms, are opted for in contrast with all sorts of subordination which are constantly kept at a lower degree in the frequency of the occurrence of linguistic forms. A cursory look at any piece of Arabic discourse will conspicuously point to the discrepancy in the use of the structures in question. Here are examples taken from Zuqaaq Al-Midaq, a novel by Najeeb Mahfuz (Cairo, 1965), and its English translation (Cairo, 1966):

15. wa-lam yatul bi-lmar?ah al-?intidhaar, fa-sur9aana maa jaa?at um hamiidah muharwilatan wa-qad ghayyarat jilbaab al-bayt.
The visitor did not wait long; soon Hamida's mother rushed in, having just changed from her housecoat.

16. ?ama 9alimat bi-fadhiihat al-mu9allim Kirshah al-jadiidah? hiya kasaabiqaatihaa, wa-qad ?ittasala l-khabar bi-zawjatihi, fa-ta9aarakat ma9ahu wa-mazzaqat jubbatuhu.
Had she heard of Kirsha's new scandal? It was just like the previous ones and the news got back to his wife, who had a fight with him and tore his cloak.

17. ?anti sit 9aaqilah shariifah, wa-lkullu yashhadu bi-dhaalik.
You are a respectable and sensible person, as every one knows.

In each of these sentences, the underlined subordinate clause in English corresponds to a coordinate clause in Arabic. In 15, English uses a non-finite participial clause; whereas Arabic uses an independent clause. In 16, the subordinate clause in English which conveys a cause-effect relation with the previous part of the text corresponds to a coordinate clause introduced by 'fa'. In 17, the English subordinate clause of comment is equated by a coordinate clause introduced by "wa".

Texts using coordination are easier to comprehend than those using subordination, but they give the impression that they are loosely connected,

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.:3 Vol.:44 Yr. 2019

which is a characteristic of conversational language. Subordination increases the complexity of a text, and is often a characteristic of a formal or written style. However, languages differ in their use of the two methods of building a text. Some languages prefer subordination, others favor coordination, but probably all languages use both these methods; no language or text confines itself wholly to one of them only, to the exclusion of the other. It is probably true to say, as the above examples show, that generally English texts make more use of subordination than do Arabic texts, a tendency which on the whole characterizes Arabic discourse as more explicitly oriented.

In addition to coordination, other types of modification syntax constrain paratactic repetition of items in the context of Arabic discourse. For the linguistic source of this constraint, therefore, a number of modification categories, both verbal and nominal, would have to be seen pertinent. These modifiers commonly involve utilizing structures from the same syntactic category in a paratactic relation, and as such they are appositive in nature.

At the intra-sentential level, adverbial modification of the paratactic kind is typically represented by the circumstantial clause (jumlat l-haal). Being a linguistic alternative for qualifying the matrix verb in the modified clause, a circumstantial (haal) clause can either be nominal or verbal. These are some illustrative examples (from Al-Rajihi 1975: 269):

18. Nominal: ra?aytu zaydan wa huwa saghiir.
I saw Zayd when he was young.
Taraktu l-bahra ?amyajhu 9aniifa.
I left the sea (and) its waves were high.
Verbal: ra?aytu zaydan yakhruj.
I saw Zayd (and) he was going out.
lazimtu l-bayta wa qad hatala l-matar.
I was staying at home while it was raining.

In all cases, the circumstantial clause must be linked to the main clause it modifies. The linking device could be 'wa' (waw l-haal) ('wa' of condition), a pronoun co-referential with the subject of the noun phrase in the modified clause, either explicitly stated or implicitly construed, or both forms combined, as shown by the examples above. Though the two clauses are made syntactically and semantically combined by such a linkage, they are very much like independent clauses paratactically juxtaposed to each other. This is even clearer where the use of 'wa' is either possibly dispensed with or grammatically prohibited. In a sentence comprising such a circumstantial clause, whereas in English the clause is obligatorily reduced and its verb is made a participial modifier, i.e. going out, it is preferably kept with a finite verb in Arabic. As it is mostly used to introduce circumstantial clauses, however, 'wa' of condition might therefore be held to be no different from the coordination 'wa', and the two are seen as clearly historically related (Beeston 1970: 89).

As to nominal modification proper, certain types of relative clauses in Arabic are more appositive-like construction, incorporating paratactically related forms. Indefinite relative clauses in Arabic, for example, are introduced with no

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No. : 3 Vol. : 44 Yr. 2019

relativizers, and as such are formally no different from full independent clauses. What merely helps distinguish them as dependent clauses is the fact that they contain a pronoun co-referential with and taking the same marking of the head noun in the co-occurring super-ordinate clause. This is the linking pronoun, al-9aa?id, which, as in all relative clauses, is the precondition of this kind of subordination (see, for example, Al-Rajihi 1975: 5). Here is an illustrative example from Arabic discourse:

19. Rafada sayyadu l-?asmaaki ?ams muqtarahaatin jadiidatan taqaddamat bihaa l-hukuuma.
Fishermen yesterday rejected new proposals presented by the government.

The underlined indefinite relative clause can be seen as an appositive clause paratactically adjoined to the preceding main clause.

2.2.2 Syntactically motivated explicitness

A higher degree of explicitness of Arabic discourse is a function of the repetition in an utterance of lexical items carrying approximately similar meanings. Arabic couplets and word strings are lexical markers of over-informativeness, and hence over-explicit mode of expression. Though both monolingual and inter-lingual discrepancies are expected to exist as regards explicit and implicit characterization of verbal utterances, Arabic on the whole displays a tendency towards greater explicitness at various language levels. As Emery (1987), quoted in Al-Sa'adi (1989: 122), states "what is implicit in English has to be spelled out in Arabic".

Of the cases that we are to explicate in this connection are modification structures and prepositional phrases. Explicitness is effected in the majority of these instances by having to incorporate additions and expansions which are syntactically motivated by the structure of the language. To single out the kind of discrepancy embodied in such differing tendencies of language usage we might offer some examples on the relevant areas in both English and Arabic discourse styles. In so far as modification is concerned, it should be observed that what is sometimes concisely expressed by a single or compound adjective in English has to be explained by a periphrastic post-nominal adjectival phrase or clause in Arabic:

20. But it was clear that the 35-year rule of Tito was all over.
(Newsweek, 25 February, 1980)

wa laakin kaana mina l-waadih ?anna hukma tito l-ladhi daama khamsatan wa thalaathiina 9aaman maa kaana lahu ?illa ?an yantahi.
Distribution of food in draught-stricken northern Uganda has been suspended. (The Observer, 6 July, 1980)

?inna Tawzii9 l-ghidha? fi shamaali ?ughanda l-lati yusiibuha l-jafaaf qad tamma ta9liiquhu.

As well as adjectives, explicitness in terms of expansion linguistically induced by Arabic structure may likewise involve other kinds of noun modification

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.: 3 Vol.: 44 Yr. 2019

constructions. In such instances, modification paraphrases have to be sometimes used to act as part of a disambiguation strategy:

21. The enemy's acts of piracy….
    ?a9maalu l-qarsanah l-bahriyyah l-lati yaquumu bihaa
    l-9aduw.

Explication of the same species of English utterances by means of periphrastic expression in Arabic can be further exemplified in the following commonly encountered examples:

22. Extended weather forecast.
    haalat l-taqs l-mutawwaqa9 khilaala l-?ayyam
    l-qaliila l-qaadima.
    Hunger-strike
    al-?idhraab 9an l-ta9aam.
    Freedom fighters.
    muqaatiluun min ?ajli l-huriyyah.

In line with the same strategy, prepositional phrases are often expanded in Arabic to explicate the kind of relation they are holding. This can be clearly attested by the way the following English utterance sample is usually rendered into Arabic:

23. A new development plan in preparation may stimulate performance. (The Economist, 3 November, 1980)
    khittah jadiidah lil-tanmiyyah yajri ?i9daaduhaa litahsiin
    l-?adaa?.

2.3 Inter-sentential or textual constraints

The strongly advocated requirement of junction in Arabic would contribute further evidence to the considerable degree of explicitness characterizing its discourse. Such conjunctive items as 'wa' (and), "fa' (and), with such a wider range of conjunctive relational marking potential are prominently used as cohesive signaling devices in Arabic discourse. Thus whereas conjunctive relations are signaled by the merely ever-present cohesive devices of this kind in Arabic, there are instances of English discourse where inter-positional relations may not be expressed by such surface signals (Hatim and Mayson 1990: 207). In the latter case, an increasing degree of inferring should always be processed to account for the kinds of relations between propositions which are left implicit. For this source of discrepancy, consider the following instances in both English and Arabic discourses:

24. yabdu ?anna qiyaadata j-jayshi fi bulivya lam taruq lahaa siyaasati s-sayyidah ghubrayl…fa-qaamat binqilaabin 9askariy wa-?ataahat bihaa.
    It seems that the army command in Bolivia does not like Mrs. Gobriel policy. (Therefore) they conducted a coup and toppled her down.
25. A disaster of huge proportions has hit north-east Africa. Hundreds of people, mainly children, are dying from starvation everyday. (The Economist, 14 June, 1980)

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.: 3 Vol.: 44 Yr. 2019

laqad darabat kaarithatun bi?ab9aadin haa?ilah shamaal sharq ?afriqiyah ….lidhaa fa?inna lmi?aat mina n-naas wa-ma9zamuhum mina l-?atfaal yamuutuuna kulla yawm.

From the two Arabic and English discourse samples above, it is clear that a cohesive relation is differently signaled: in the Arabic texts, formal markers, i.e. the conjunctive 'fa' and the connective 'lidhaa', explicitly mark the causative relations as represented by the binary cause-effect value in the conjoined sentences; however, the parallel relations in the English texts, rather than explicitly stated, are only implied by the cohesive power of the underlying semantic relation, in the sense of Halliday and Hasan (1976: 129). In so far as sentence connectivity is concerned, it would therefore be suggested that Arabic discourse is more explicitly expressed than its counterpart in English.

To pursue this line of argument we may consider the discrepancy between the comparable modes of discourse in Arabic and English in relation to the distinction between what may be termed syndetic and asyndetic coordination both intra-sententially and inter-sententially. In an iconic text where sentences are arranged in the same way the events happened in the outside world, the sentences of an English text may be assumed to be linked by an implied 'and'; they are asyndetically coordinated. Consider the following text attributed to Julius Caesar where no formal device is used to link the three sentences:

26. I came; I saw; I conquered.

In the corresponding Arabic text, however,

27. ji?tu; ra?aytu; ?intasartu,

one feels that the text lacks cohesion. Normally, the written text will be produced as:

28. ji?tu, wa-ra?aytu, wa-ntasartu.

Thus the Arabic text uses explicit cohesive devices, whereas the English text may use implied cohesive devices, which unmistakably makes it less explicit than its Arabic counterpart.

In a text where the order of sentences is irrelevant to cohesion, the English mode can also show the same discrepancy. The following may serve to illustrate the point at hand:

29. Ali is typing in his room; Layla is cooking dinner.
Layla is cooking dinner; Ali is typing in his room.

Both texts in 29 have cohesion; they describe two events taking place at the same time. The fact that the two sentences are placed together; i.e. contiguous sentences, and that they make sense helps the reader to envisage an implied cohesive device linking the two parts of the text. Here, too, the corresponding Arabic text prefers an explicit cohesive device:

30. ?ahmed yatba9 fi ghurfatihi; wa-laylaa tu9idd l-ta9aam.
laylaa tu9idd l-ta9aam; wa-?ahmed yutba9 fi ghurfatihi.

Here are some more examples where English uses implicit cohesion, while Arabic opts for explicit cohesion:

31. They stopped the race; it had started raining heavily.
?awqafu l-sibaaq. fa-qad ?ishtadda l-matar.

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.:3 Vol.:44 Yr. 2019

The garden was full of weeds; it has been neglected for a long time.

Kaanet l-hadiiqah malii?ah bi-l?a9shaab l- daarra. fa-qad ?uhmilat muddatan tawiilatan.

32. We did not meet any of the inhabitants; they had left their houses for fear of war.

lam nushaahid ?ayyan mina l-sukkan; ?idh tarakuu buyuutahum khawfan mina l-harb.

3. Socio-cultural constraints

Semantically enriched and explicitly expanded Arabic utterances, as the stereotypical features of Arabic discourse, can be explicated by socio-cultural determinants as well. The principle of detailed-direct expression tendency that accounts for explicit Arabic discourse can be ultimately found as grounded in some norms of a cultural tradition. It would not be off the point to suggest that these features derive from oratory and the speaking mode of discourse. Such an underlying characterization of Arabic is taken to be partly attributable to the centrality of the word, the dominance of the verbal art and the artistic use of language as historically cultural institutions of Arab society.

The role of culture in constraining discourse is such that different cultures would orient discourses in different ways. As Sa'adeddin (1989: 37) argues, though the mental orientations underlying text production are universal in a communally preconditioned way, "contrasts between texts written by producers from different language communities may arise from communal, sub-communal, and even individual preferences for one mode of text development over others".

The determinant parameters for the discourse features of informativeness are the communal preferences for aural vs. visual norms, as well as the degree of "power and solidarity" between the native text users. These cultural determinants can readily explain the kind of discrepancies already expounded between Arabic and English discourses. Such markers of over-emphasis as repetition, recursive plain lexis, exaggeration and the repetition of specific syntactic structures will be remarkably figuring out in the discourse that is produced in an aural mode, but neglected in a visually developed discourse.

That Arabic discourse is characterized by the above-mentioned features is due, to some degree, to its preference for aurally developed texts. English, on the other hand, opts for visually developed texts, which makes its discourse do without all what is associated with intimately and informally conveyed speech. The difference at hand is well summed up, and accounted for in terms of cultural orientations by Menacere (1992: 32), where he argues that "Arabic tends to favor repetition of what English may leave implicit. The explanation for this may be related to the fact that Arabic is more couched in aural culture than English". These contrasting traits of the two languages are further pinpointed such that "while Arabic discourse is often saturated with repetition, English is not so tolerant" (ibid: 33).

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.: 3 Vol.: 44 Yr. 2019

A lot of examples on Arabic discourse would obviously bring in such saturations of lexical or syntactic repetition of items. For convenience, however, let us consider an example where over-explicitness by a sequence of lexical items having almost similar meanings is taken to an extreme:

33. tazallu l-?ummatu ?asiirata d-da9fi wa- t-takhallufi wa-tafakkuki wa-taraakhi wa-tashardhumi.

(The nation remains imprisoned by weakness, backwardness, disintegration, looseness and disunity)

The nation remains backward and disintegrated.

or: The nation remains in the grip of backwardness and disintegration.

In its original form, this Arabic utterance can but strike a native English speaker of rhetorical and cultural expectations oriented towards preciseness as tantamount to a sheer redundancy.

Though, following Lyons (1981), it might be accepted that European languages have gradually for the last period switched from power to solidarity as reflected in, for example, the change of the non-reciprocal into reciprocal speech, for a native Arabic user solidarity is still differently employed; it involves such relations as friendliness, intimacy, warmth, and linguistic competence, all of which are viewed as being achievable by resorting to the informal and casual mode of discourse production. It is as such different from what a native English speaker expects of his discourse building where orientation is towards encoding message in isolation, in a noise-free setting, and towards respecting his conventions regarding social distance (cf. Sa'adeddin 1989: 39).

3.1 Indirectness of Arabic discourse culturally constrained

As defined by Gumperz (1982: 138), the strategy of indirectness relates to the orientation of not to verbalize explicitly what the conversation is about, and let the listener depend on his background knowledge for purposes of recovery. Arabic discourse can be allocated to a certain point on the scale of this strategy by highlighting some of the operative cultural values as they are engaged by native speakers of Arabic.

The aspects of Arabic culture that might be found to have some constraints on discourse directness include such norms as intimacy, cordiality, and warmth of feelings or emotionalism. As they stand, these cultural aspects suggest a clear contrast with some of their correlative values in the Anglo-Saxon culture where English is originally spoken as the native language. The latter would involve such values as privacy, individual autonomy, and toleration of individual idiosyncrasies and peculiarities as socio-cultural principles cultivated in the English-speaking community. The impact of any of these norms can be seen different from one area of linguistic communication to another in so far as the degree of indirectness is concerned. Thus it seems convenient to look at some selected speech areas where the above-mentioned English and Arabic cultural norms, different as they are, would provide linguistic differences.

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.: 3 Vol.: 44 Yr. 2019

3.1.1 Directives and other speech acts

In most speech acts of directives, i.e. the speech acts in which the speaker wants to get the addressee to do something, English language has developed a wide-range system of structural devices for indirect ways of encoding (cf. Green, 1975; Searle, 1975). In this category of speech acts, which represents utterances very widely pervasive in human verbal interaction, English shows a strikingly high degree of speech indirectness. The forms into which such English speech acts as 'request', 'advice' or 'suggestion' are realized embrace various structures in the interrogative, the conditional and the indicative moods. They are scarcely expressed in the imperative, the form with which they are directly associated, and even less so in the form of their explicit performative verbs, hence the indirectness they are characterized by in English. For example, 'request' and 'advice' are respectively given in such usual expressions as the following:

34. Won't you close the door, please?

35. Why don't you tell him the truth? I think it would be best. (Palmer, 1979: 118)

In contrast with these most favorable ways of expressions, the English verbs 'request' and 'advise' are seldom used performatively in ordinary speech. The following way of requesting or advising sounds stilted or formal in English:

36. I request you to close the door.

37. I advise you to tell him the truth.

Even when toned down by a politeness marker, 'request' or 'advice', or similar speech acts are restrictively realized in the imperative mood. The following utterances are comparatively less encountered in the English ordinary style of communication, having a noticeable touch of authoritative power incompatible with 'request' or 'advice'.

38. Close the door, please.

39. Tell him the truth, please.

In the literature on speech acts, it has been proposed that indirectness in the whole category of directives is chiefly motivated by politeness. Searle (1975: 64) considers that "ordinary conversation requirements of politeness make it awkward to issue flat imperative sentences or explicit performatives", and that it is only for this reason that "we seek to find indirect means to our illocutionary ends". This would establish politeness requirements as absolute rules which are expected to be universally followed to bring in comparable indirect means in different languages. However, even if we restrict our attention to English language, it is possible to encounter some communicative instances where these rules do not seem to hold on. Some of the grammatical devices, the interrogative in particular, can be found perfectly compatible with verbal abuse or verbal violence, as in the following examples (quoted in Wierzbicka, 1985: 153):

40. Can't you shut up?

41. Will you bloody well hurry up?

Clearly, the speech acts performed by these utterances could be more conveniently reported by means of the verbs "order" or "command", thus casting doubt upon the explanatory force of the claim that politeness is the chief

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.:3 Vol.:44 Yr. 2019

motivation for indirectness.

The predilection that English has for indirectness in this area of speech as well as in some other areas should therefore be sought to be explained at a level deeper than that of mere politeness principles. Rather than being exclusively associated with universal principles of politeness, this kind of indirectness can more convincingly be seen as a culture-specific feature, a manifestation of certain cultural norms. We will advance this position by dwelling upon material from Arabic whose cultural norms are manifestly different, leading to different strategies of linguistic presentation.

In Arabic, if the speaker asks the addressee to do something in a way the addressee is not forced to do it, he would normally put it in a relatively direct means of linguistic expression. Speech acts of 'request' in Arabic, more frequently than not, have an explicit form of lexical verbs performatively used to convey the act in question. This is an illustrative example:

42. Kazum: ?arju ?an taghfir li yaa sayyidi l-?ustaadh 9abd l-mawjuud. (Al-Tikarli, 1989: 6)

Kazum: (I request you to forgive me my lord Mr. Abdul Mawjud)

Kazum: Will you forgive me, my lord, Mr. Abdul Mawjud?

Arabic requests are no less often performed by issuing utterances containing an imperative form, usually with an accompanying politeness marker, as in the following examples:

43. Hisham: ?ijlisi raja?an.
Hind: (tajlis) na9am.
Hisham: (Sit down, please)
Hind: (getting sitting down) yes.
Hisham: Why don't you sit down?
Hind: (getting sitting down) yes.

The last example shows how extremely directly a request is conveyed in Arabic; besides the imperative verb, the politeness form rajaa?an (literally meaning 'requesting') indicates that even in politeness marking Arabic tends to be rather direct by using explicit performative markers.

The difference that Arabic shows in this regard can further be displayed by looking at some of the English interrogative forms and their literal equivalents in Arabic. The following utterances are regular examples of making requests in English (quoted in Green, 1975: 127, 130):

44. Why don't you be nice to your brother?
Why don't you be quiet?
Why don't you be a honey and start dinner now?

When translated literally into Arabic, these utterances could not be used with the communicative intent of 'request' as such. They are more likely interpreted as genuine questions with a sort of criticism for not doing what was the right thing to do.

Along similar lines, Arabic commonly tends to employ more direct means for extending one's piece of advice, in contrast with the linguistic structures employed in English to perform 'advice' indirectly. In Arabic, performative

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.:3 Vol.:44 Yr. 2019

verbs or periphrastic phrases explicitly meaning the same concept of advice are ordinarily used for this purpose. The following are examples:

45. The boss: hunaak…. ?ansahuka ?alla taqtarib minhuu. (Zangana, 1994: 108)

The boss: (There… I advise you not to get close to him.)

The boss: There… you ought not to get close to him.

46. mina l-?ahsani ?an taqra?a fi l-maktabati.

(It's better that you read in the library.)

You should read in the library.

The second of the above examples makes use of the expression "mina l-?ahsan" (it's better) to yield advice in a direct and explicit manner. Such periphrastic phrases together with the passive forms of lexical verbs like "yustahsanu" (it's better) are the semantic carriers of 'advice' since they explicitly mean that some beneficial action is suggested to be done. Similar periphrastic phrases or passive lexical verbs of approximately similar meanings are also used to make suggestions. Thus in addition to the performative verb "?aqtarih" (I suggest), proposals in Arabic can also be typically expressed in such utterances as the following:

47. ?aqtarihua ?an tada9a t-taqriira fi makaanin ?aakhar.

(I suggest that you put the report in another place.)

The report may be put in another place.

48. mina l-mufaddali ?an na9mala haflatan ?ukhraa.

(It's preferable that we make another party.)

We ought to make another party.

It is perhaps in "offer" and "invitation" that the difference between English and Arabic in the directness of linguistic expression is more clearly motivated. In performing both speech acts, an English speaker would consult the addressee's desires or opinions, and avoid imposing his will straightforwardly on the addressee. The speech act is therefore performed in a tentative manner, and is usually given in the interrogative form to help the speaker find out about the addressee's desire. English offers are consequently made indirectly in such structures as the following (quoted in Wierzbicka, 1985: 148-149).

49. How about a beer?

50. Would you like a beer?

51. Sure you wouldn't like a bush at some place.

The same strategy is followed in making invitations in English:

52. Would you like to come to the pub tomorrow night with me?

53. Hey, you wouldn't like to come to dinner tonight, would you?

On the other hand, in Arabic, such indirect and tentative utterances would make very poor offers or invitations. Arabic social conventions of hospitality would not encourage asking about the guest's desires as appropriate procedure to be followed by the host. A typical Arabic offer is a generous one, an offer in which the speaker assumes that the addressee can have some more of what is offered, and that it is good for him to have some more. Similarly, in invitation,

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.: 3 Vol.: 44 Yr. 2019

rather than asking about the addressee's desires, it is more appropriate according to Arabic social principles that the speaker expresses overtly an assumption that the addressee would like to do what he is being invited to. Arabic offers and invitations are therefore more directly realized in such linguistic structures as in the following examples:

54. The manager: tafaddal wa-rtaah fi s-saalati. (Zangana, 1994: 108)
The manager: (Come in and get comforted in the saloon.)
The manager: Would you like to come in and get comforted in the saloon?

55. ta9aala ?uskin ma9i….bayti huwa bayttuka.
(Come to live with me…my house is yours.)
Would you like to come to live with me?

The tendency of directness in Arabic, as distinct from the indirectness advocated by English speakers, can readily be explained in terms of cultural attitudes. Given that intimacy of relations and spontaneity of behavior that Arabs are culturally characterized by, native speakers of Arabic feel psychologically close to one another, finding no such private existence that sets them apart. This feeling of closeness, originally experienced in non-verbal interaction, is also reflected in their linguistic behavior. Since a basic device to build closeness is to be direct, the result in Arabic discourse is the sort of direct and spontaneous mode of communication we have observed in this major area of language use. Arabic native speakers, that is, find no cultural need which compels them to take around-about way in communicating these speech acts to one another. In contrast, such a cultural need is already established for native speakers of English. This is embedded in the Anglo-Saxon tradition which places special emphasis on the autonomy of every individual, a tradition which calls for respecting everyone privacy, for non-interfering in his affairs. These cultural principles presuppose distance rather than closeness, and as such they lead to indirectness as a distance-building device in verbal interaction.

The social distance in English discourse is in fact a reflection of a general socio-cultural norm according to which English people can be seen as the product of a society regulated by long-standing individualistic tradition. This is the tradition according to which reverence is given first and foremost to the individual independence. English individualism contrasts sharply with Arabic endeavors to respect the society and the family, the kind of social loyalty as a cultural institution overriding the individual status. The impact on their mode of discourse is that Arabs have become very affable, volunteering the flow of the encoded message with as much information as they generously find saying more a prerequisite of saying enough, i.e. of performing one's interactive goal.

3.1.2 General features of Arabic discourse directness

In addition to directives and similar speech acts, other areas of linguistic communication, especially assertives and expressives (cf. Searle 1979: VIII), show discrepancies of discourse indirectness as a conversational strategy between English and Arabic, which can be accounted for along similar lines of cultural differences. A noticeable discrepancy in this regard relates to the

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.: 3 Vol.: 44 Yr. 2019

hedged, tentative way a native speaker of English would express his opinions, comments or evaluations, as compared with their relatively more forceful and more direct expression by a native-Arabic speaker. Thus in a situation where it is preferable in Arabic to say

56. haadhaa sahiihun.
That's correct.

a typical English equivalent of this expression would be

57. I like it.
or even
I think I like it.

Whereas in Arabic the opinion is expressed in strong terms, and presented as if it were a fact, it is only tentatively and indirectly presented by the English speaker.

In English, a speaker is highly inclined to preface the opinions he expresses by phrases like "I think", "I believe" or "I guess" (the latter is more American) just to indicate the speaker's less commitment to what he is saying. Such expressions are very widely used in the English ordinary speech, and are used so informally and colloquially to have no intellectually contextual connotations whatsoever. Their conceivable Arabic equivalents (?atasawwar, ?azun, ?araa) would sound too intellectual to fit the same context in which they are commonly used. Consider these English examples:

58. Peter: I'm…I'm sorry; I didn't mean to…
Jerry: Forget it. I suppose you don't quite know what to make of me, eh? (Albee, 1976: 40)

59. I guess, I'd never get a haircut if you weren't in town. (Saroyan, 1965: 119)

In addition to "I guess" or "I suppose", there are other more co-occurring hedging-bound expressions like "sort of", and "would rather", as in the following English instances:

60. Christian: Well yes, sort of, I guess- I wasn't too clear at that time because I had a lot of things on my head. (Doneleavy, 1965: 150)

61. Christian: Mr. How, I'm- I think I'd rather be a messenger boy. (Ibid: 150)

In examples like these, it is obvious that the English speaker takes the tentative way in which he presents his opinions to a far-reaching point. The form "sort of", which is so recurrent on such occasions, is a peculiarly English hedging expression. Its conceivable Arabic equivalent "naw9amma" does not give exactly the same purely hedging influence. It is closer to the English "somewhat" which shows the speaker's inability to describe the quality in question, rather than his lack of full commitment to what he is saying. The multiple hedging "I think I'd rather" in the second example above simply makes the utterance sound too tentative, lacking in confidence for a native speaker of Arabic.

The different tendencies at hand are another manifestation of the same cultural differences. In Arabic, direct expression of opinion is encouraged by the

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.: 3 Vol.: 44 Yr. 2019

unwritten social law according to which people feel intimate, and thus tolerate opinions being directly given to one another. In English, hedged comments go in line with indirect suggestions or indirect requests. In an assertive or expressive speech act, lexical hedges like "I suppose", "I guess' or "sort of" can perform a function similar to that of interrogative or conditional structures in directive speech acts. In these areas of language use, English favors understatements, indirectness or hedging. By contrast, Arabic tends to overstate and thus emphasize what is being conveyed.

The different cultural assumptions between English and Arabic are reflected in other areas of linguistic communication. The discrepancy between the two languages in the use of tag questions, both quantitatively and qualitatively, could also be taken to have originated in different cultural traditions. In English, question tags are used in a far wider range of contexts than they are used in Arabic. This observation, though not statistically validated, can be ventured on a simple basis: reading through English and Arabic plays by different authors, one would encounter in the English texts a number of question tags which largely exceeds the number encountered in the Arabic texts. Thus in many of the contexts where question tags are preferably used by English speakers, direct expressions without a tag would be more familiar for speakers of Arabic. Consider, for example, the English tags in the following instance:

62. Girl: Oh, yes. I'm alive too, aren't I? I hadn't thought about that. When you're alive, you don't seem to notice it, do you? Being alive, I mean. (Campton, 1965: 184)

The speaker uses a question tag to consult the addressee's opinion about a commonplace fact, i.e. his being alive. The second tag is used to seek confirmation by the addressee on what appears as a more personal view.

In such cases, English question tags perform a function not very different from that they perform in directive speech acts like 'request' or 'invitation' in so far as indirect expression is concerned: "You'll come with me, won't you?" They are also not different from lexical hedges like 'I suppose' or 'sort of' in making linguistic communication seem less direct.

The major role tags have come to play in English would make it plausible to hold that their wide-spread use in the language reflects the same cultural attitudes in the use of indirect means or hedging forms of linguistic communication. The recurrent expression of the speaker's expectation that the addressee will confirm what he is saying signals a constant awareness of the possibility of differences of other people's opinions or points of view, which, according to cultural norms, should be respected as part of the individual's autonomy.

In Arabic, however, the range of contexts where the speaker would ask for confirmation is not precisely as wide as in English. Arabic cultural traditions do not foster constant attention to other people's points of view. A speaker here does not find it incumbent on him to be sensitive of other people's opinions in a way that the act of communication might be jeopardized by direct expression of his personal feelings or views. Arabic cultural norms would tolerate forceful,

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.: 3 Vol.: 44 Yr. 2019

direct expression of personal opinions or feelings. In most contexts, whatever the forcefulness of the extended view might be, tags can therefore be dispensed with, and the utterance is directly made.

However, though narrowly used, question tags in Arabic can nevertheless be detected on special occasions where a tentative, more indirect speech is purposefully introduced. Arabic tags, for most of their use, invite confirmation whether for simple general remarks or for cases of challenge, as in the following examples:

63. Sa'eed: ?aalaaf n-naas l-?aan fi l-hadaa?iqi yashrabuuna wa-yataaghaazaluuna, ?alaysa kadhaalik? (Al-Qaysi, 1979: 85)

Sa'eed: Thousands of people are now drinking and courting in parks, isn't that so?

64. laakinnaki takhaafina minhu, takhaafina haalata l-mawt, takhafina ?isma l- mawt, ?alaysa kadhaalik? (Nasser, 1989: 37)

But you fear it, you fear the state of death, you fear the name death, isn't that so?

Tags in Arabic are limited in form to the interrogative negative structure, regardless of the affirmative or negative status of the preceding clause. Generally, they have a short form like '?alaysa kadhaalik?" (isn't that so?) or "?alaysa dhalika sahiihan?" (isn't that right?". These are short forms which are originally derived from an independent clause used rhetorically for confirmation rather than merely as information-seeking questions (cf. for example, Al-Hashimi, n.d.: 94). The restrictions imposed on the structure of Arabic tags, as compared with the various forms English tags can be associated with, is linguistic evidence of the limited use of tags in Arabic.

Perhaps the more salient archetypes of Arabic cultural values that militate against the indirectness strategy are cordiality and unrestricted display of emotions. These socio-cultural traditions have encouraged native speakers of Arabic to be effusive, emotionally unreserved. In clear contrast with this behavior, public disapproval of showing one's feelings overtly and without restraint is a culturally bound trait characterizing the behavior of English speakers. On the other hand, uncontrollable saying of what is on one's mind, characteristic of native speakers of Arabic, would enhance the direct mode of expression in Arabic discourse. At the non-verbal level, this behavior is reflected in such physical experiences as kissing, hugging, and hand shaking which take place on a daily basis in Arab society. Clearly, such body contacts are heavily restricted in the Anglo-Saxon culture where people are to some degree kept psychologically apart from one another.

4. Conclusions

Our investigation of some areas of Arabic discourse, as compared with parallel English usage, makes it clear that from both linguistic and cultural points of view native speakers of Arabic generally tend to use their language in relatively more explicit ways. Given that utterances are explicit when they are detailed and direct, it can be convincingly argued that such utterances are abundantly used in Arabic discourse. The tendency towards explicitness as a favored mode of

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No.:3 Vol.:44 Yr. 2019

expression in Arabic discourse is a function of determinants on different linguistic levels.

On the lexical level, the repetition in an utterance of lexical items carrying approximately similar meanings in what may be termed lexical couplets, word-strings and cognate accusatives function as markers of over-explicitness. Such over-informative and redundancy-saturated utterances are a corollary of the rich derivation paradigms and enormous potentially available lexical resources afforded by Arabic morphological system. On the syntactic level, explicitly paratactic modification syntax is a remarkable linguistic trait of Arabic. By and large, Arabic discourse is characterized by explicitness in terms of expansion which is linguistically induced by Arabic structure. Also on the intra-sentential level, coordination of various linguistic groups is an explicit paratactic repetition of structures that likewise represents a highly recurrent mode of expression in Arabic. The almost ever-present formal cohesive devices used as inter-sentential connectives signal an explicit discourse strategy in Arabic. They explicate the kind of semantic relation between sentences instead of leaving it implicit to be interpreted by speech participants when no such formal devices are used, as it is often encountered in English.

As to explicitness in terms of directness, our exemplification of some areas of Arabic discourse, as compared with their parallels in English usage, demonstrates that native speakers of Arabic generally tend to use their language in relatively direct ways. Arabic, on the whole, preserves a higher degree of directness of speech than English does, a linguistic property that comes into play in such pervasive areas of linguistic communication as those of directive, expressive or assertive speech acts. Such markers of indirect discourse strategy characterizing native-English speech production as hedging and the overuse of question tags are comparatively more restrictively recurring in normal Arabic communicative style.

The tendency in Arabic discourse towards producing explicit utterances may in part be ultimately attributable to some stereotypical norms of Arabic cultural tradition. Chiefly among these cultural values are the speaking mode of text development, the communal preference for aurally, rather than visually, developed discourse, as well as the degree of solidarity. The latter Arabic cultural norm involves intimacy, cordiality, warmth of feelings or emotionalism, which contrast with the conventions of social distance, privacy, and individual autonomy, traditions that are highly respected in native-English conversational style.

References

Albee, E. (1976). "The Zoo Story". In J. Redmond and H. Tennyson (eds.), *Contemporary One-Act Plays,* London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Al-Jubouri, A. (1984). "The Role of Repetition in Arabic Argumentative Discourse". In J. Swales and H. Mustapha (eds.), (66-117). *English for Specific Purposes in the Arab World.*

Al-Hashimi, A. (n.d.). j*awaahir l-balaagha fi l-ma9aani wa-l-bayaan wa-l-badii9*. Beirut: Daar ?ihyaa? l-turaath l-9arabi.

Al-Rajihi, A. (1975). *?al-Tatbiiq l-nahwii*. Beirut: Daar l-Nahdha l-9arabiyya.
Al-Sa'adi, W. K. (1989). *Language Studies and Translation Teaching with Special Reference to Arabic and English*, Ph.D. Thesis, School of Modern Languages and International Studies of the University of Bath.
Al-Najjar, M. F. (2007). *English-Arabic Morphology and Arabic Lexical Translation*. Amman: Atlas International Publishing.
Al-Qaysi, J. (1979). m*asrahiyyat jaliil l-qaysi*. Baghdad: Daar l-Rashiid lil-Nashr.
Al-Tikarli, F. (1989). "lu9bat l-?ahlaam". In *Al-Qlaam 3 (1989)* (4-9). Baghdad: Daar l-Shu?uun l-thaqaafiyyah l-9aammah.
Beeston, A. F. L. (1970). *The Arabic Language Today*. London: Hutchinson.
Beuer, L. (1983). *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Presss.
Clark, H. and E. H. V. Clark (1977). *Psychology and Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
Campton, D. (1965). "Then (One-act Play)". In David Thompson (ed.), *The Theatre Today*. London: Longman.
Dayf, Shawqi (1977). *?al fan wa- medhaahibuhu fi l-nathri l-9arabi, 8th*. ed. Cairo: daar l-ma9aarif.
Doneleavy, J. P. (1965). "The Interview (One-Act Play)". In D. Thompson (ed.) *The Theatre Today*, 140-165. London: Longman Group Ltd.
Emery, G. P. (1987). "Aspects of English-Arabic Translation: A comparative Study", *The Linguist*, 26 (2), 43-46.
Farghal, M. (1990). "Barbara Johnston, Repetition in Arabic Discourse: a book review", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10, 379-385.
Green, G. M. (1975). "How to Get People to Do Things with Words: The Whimperative Questions". In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, 107-141.New York: Academic Press.
Gumperz, J.J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan, (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd.
Hassan, T. (1973). *?al-lugha l-9arabiyya: ma9naahaa wa-mabnaahaa*. Cairo: ?al-hay?a l-misriyya l-9amma lil-kitaab.
Hatim, B. and I. Mayson (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
Johnston, B. (1987). "Parataxis in Arabic: Modification as a model of Persuasion". In *Studies in Language*, 11 (1) 85- 98. John Benjamin Publishing Company.
Koch, B. (1983). "Presentation as Proof: the Language of Arabic Rhetoric". *Anthropological Linguistics*, 25 (1), 47-60.
Leech, G. N. (1981). *Semantics*, 2nd. Ed. London: Penguin Group Ltd.
Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and Linguistics, an Introduction*. London:

Cambridge University Press.
Menacere, M. (1992). "Arabic discourse: Overcoming Stylistic Difficulties in Translation". *Babel, 38 (1),* 28-37
Mahfuz, N. (1965). *Zuqaaq Al-Midaq. Cairo:* Maktabat Misr; translated by Le Gassick Trevor. (1966) *Midaq Alley. Cairo: American University Press.*
Nasser, A. (1989). " Sabaah l-khayr yaa batuul". In *?al-?aqlaam,*10, 86-91, Baghdad: daar l-shu?uun l-thaqaafiyyah l-9aammah.
Palmer, F. R. (1979). *Modality and the English Modals.* London: Longman Group Ltd.
Sa'adeddin, M.A. (1989). "Text Development and Arabic-English Negative Interference", *Applied Linguistics,* 10 (1), 38-51.
Saroyan, W. (1965). "The Oyster and the Pearle", In D. Thompson (ed.), *The Theater Today,*115-138, London: Longman Group Ltd.
Searle, J. R. (1975). "Indirect Speech Acts". In P. Cole and J. H. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts,* New York: Academic Press.
Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning, Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts.* London: Cambridge University Press.
Ullman, S. (1962). *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Wierzbicka, A. (1985). "Different Cultures, Different Languages, Different Speech Acts", *Journal of Pragmatics, 145- 178,* 9 (2, 3).
Wright, W. (1975). *A Grammar of Arabic Language,* Vol. 11, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Zangana, M. (1994). "mawt fannaan", in *?al-?aqlaam, 1,2,3,* 108-111, Baghdad: daar l-shu?uun l-thaqaafiyya l-9amma.

Appendix

Transliteration symbols for Arabic consonants and vowels that are used in the present work.

1. Consonants			
Arabic letters	Symbols	Examples	English equivalents
أ	?	?allah	God
ب	B	baab	door
ت	T	taht	under
ث	Th	thamiin	valuable
ج	J	jamiil	beautiful
ح	H	hakiim	wise
خ	Kh	khubz	bread
د	D	dumuu9	tears
ذ	Dh	dhaalik	that
ر	R	rabii9	spring
ز	Z	zayt	oil
س	S	sayf	sword

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences No. : 3 Vol. : 44 Yr. 2019

ش	Sh	shi9r	poetry
ص	S	sabaah	morning
ض	D	daw?	light
ط	T	taalib	student
ظ	Z	zil	shade
ع	9	9alaa	on
غ	Gh	ghuyuum	clouds
ف	F	fii	in
ق	Q	qariib	near
ك	K	kabiir	large
ل	L	layl	night
م	M	mundhu	since
ن	N	naar	fire
ه	H	hunaa	here
و	W	waraq	paper
ي	Y	yawm	day
2. **Vowels** (short)			
A		kanz	treasure
U		hum	they
I		sin	tooth
(long)			
Aa		laa	no
Uu		khuluud	immortality
Ii		hadiid	iron
(diphthongs)			
Ay		kayf	how
Aw		fawq	above