Some Evidence from Arabic for the Implicature of Quantity

Adnan A. Daym
Al-Isra Private University

Abstract: *The Gricean theory of Maxims and Implicature (Grice, 1975) is a pragmatic theory of communication in which pragmatics as the study of language in use is manifestly reflected. It originates in the inferential mode of communication already proposed by Grice as the concept of "non-natural meaning" (speaker meaning), and represented by the intention-recognition pattern of linguistic (and non-linguistic) communication.*

To supplement Grice's whole programme, and building on the premises of this pattern, the more interesting theory of maxims and implicature is set forth as a distinct theory which is mainly concerned with utterance interpretation. As it is primarily introduced, and applied to English, the theory is claimed to be grounded in logic of conversation. Its central core, i.e. the cooperative principle as embodied in the conversational maxims, is seen as emerging from rational considerations applicable to all types of cooperative verbal and non-verbal behaviour. Interaction is considered here as a species of rational purposive behaviour.

1. Introduction

As an independently motivated category of meaning, 'implicature' is the inference beyond the semantic content of utterance, or the assumptions required to preserve or reinstate cooperation by further assuming that the maxims are observed. The basic tenets of the theory make it seem as approximating to universal application to all languages and cultures.

The theory of maxims and implicature has a lot of affinities with the orthodox speech acts theory. They both have their origin in philosophy of language, both relate meaning to context of situation, and both make use of pragmatic rules operating approximately with similar mechanism to account for the communicative intent of the utterance. Some of the rules formulated in speech acts can also be taken as specific applications of the more general principles of conversational cooperation. For example, the second maxim of quantity "Do not make your contribution more informative than is required", and the maxim of relation "Be relevant" are clearly reflected in the preparatory rules for the speech act of assertion "it is not clear that H knows P". Such affinities would be enough to make Grice's theory no different from that of speech acts in relying on the wider range of cultural background in which language operates.

The mechanism with which the theory of maxims and implicature works has been found insightful in English. It can be adopted with relatively more adequate and easy-going application than other approaches to some problematic and less orderly areas of language use, like indirect speech acts and figurative

language. In linguistic communication of the most oblique and indirect cases, most of the recent approaches take up one or another version of Grice's theory. Two of these approaches are in order: Leech (1983), and Sperber and Wilson (1995). The latter approach is based on the elimination of what the authors regard redundancy in the maxims, and on the reduction of the maxims to one maxim of relevance.

2. Objectives and Rationale

The present study is an attempt to offer an application of Gricean theory of conversational maxims and implicature to Arabic in a way parallel to that it has been applied to English where the theory originates and seems to derive its basic tenets. The aim is to test the applicability of the theory in its original formulation to Arabic, and thereby contribute to the assessment of its universal plausibility. It should therefore be noted that we are mainly concerned with Arabic, and that contrast with English is touched upon only where it is necessary to pinpoint the idiosyncrasies that Arabic shows in the linguistic areas of the maxim application.

The analysis undertaken by the study is significant in gauging the operation of the conversational maxims, as represented by the basic maxim of quantity, along the lines specified by Grice by giving additional evidence from a language other than English. It is likewise significant in attesting to the culture-specificity of the conversational principles governing the realisation of conversational implicatures. In this respect, the study can give some import to the criticism that could be launched against speech-act studies, viz. against making statements to the effect that "what seems to hold for the speakers of English must hold true for people generally"(Wierzbicka, 1985: 145).

Differences in cultural norms and conventions, which should find expression in the structures of the two languages under scrutiny, are spelled out in this study by disclosing the features of the discoursal strategy in Arabic. Thus the study has its own contribution to the area of interethnic communication where cultural clashes manifested in linguistic structural features are unavoidable. In so far as English and Arabic are concerned, the study may pinpoint spots of communication breakdown in linguistic interaction via English between a native speaker of Arabic and a speaker of English non-native to Arabic language and culture. As each party conforms to the maxims and implicatures approved by his own speech community, they may resort to different interpretations of the utterances they exchange. It is ultimately expected that the investigation we carry out is insightful in the domain of teaching English to Arab learners, where cultural and linguistic differences between the two languages have a considerable role to play. Though some of the features of Arabic addressed here may have already been discussed by a number of linguists, e.g. Sa'adeddin, 1989, the findings of this study can stand in their own rights as distinct proposals for reconsidering Grice's quantity maxim in the light of the linguistic facts of Arabic explored by the analysis we offer.

3. Assumptions and Methodology

Although the theory of conversational maxims and implicature, as posited by Grice (1975), is based on the rationale of principles that might be universally made use of in any general cooperative transaction, whether linguistic or otherwise, it would be justifiable to assume that individual instances of implicature are culturally determined. The assumption that the principles governing conversational implicature are culture-specific is fundamentally based upon the major role socio-cultural determinants play in the interpretation of sequential utterances at the level of discourse.

The bearing of culturally constrained background knowledge on pragmatic inference is confirmed in statements by a considerable number of established scholars of whom the following are quoted: Cole (1975:268) thinks that "facts about the world constitute assumptions that allow deductions of the correct conversational implicature"; Brown and Yule (1983: 233) propose that "the knowledge we possess as users of language concerning social interaction via language is just one part of our general socio-cultural knowledge"; Gumperz (1982: 158), while discussing conversational inference, though in a broader sense than Gricean conversational implicature, states that "socio-cultural assumptions concerning role and status relationships as well as social values associated with various message components also play an important role".

It is further hypothesised in this respect that conversational implicatures, as generated by Gricean pragmatic maxims, are language-bound. This hypothesis is motivated by the fact that the structure of languages manifests scalar degrees of implicitness and directness. Linguistic differences of this sort are shown upon research, e.g. Wierzbicka (1985), to be associated with cultural differences such as intimacy versus distance and spontaneity versus toleration.

For testing the hypotheses already suggested the Gricean maxim of quantity, selected as the highly productive maxim, is applied to Arabic language context, taking into account the background basis of native-English usage. Any discrepancy that might be found concerning the kind of sub-maxim used and the outcome of the inferential process based on the observance of the respective maxim will count as a matter of the culture- specificity of the maxim in question.

That conversational implicature is governed by principles which are language-bound, rather than universal, is accounted for in this paper by singling out certain discrepancies that Arabic shows in the values of 'explicitness' and 'informativeness,' which are pertinent to the application of the quantity maxim and constitute part of the interaction norms of the relevant culture. It is expectable that these major points of difference could spell out some traits and tendencies of Arabic discourse, which might run counter to the universality of one or another of Gricean maxims.

As for data collection in Arabic, our examples involve material in Modern Standard Arabic which is derived from realistic writing, printed interviews, as well as printed data. In the most part, the data investigated reflect the sort of language which is written to be spoken, and thus might accord well with the linguistic types of communication purported to be accounted for via the Gricean

theory of maxims and implicature. Where contrasts with English are necessary to include for illustration purposes, similar kind of English data are made use of.

4. Application of quantity maxim to Arabic

For applying the maxim of quantity, as relating to both under-informativeness and over-informativeness, to Arabic a number of Arabic discoursal properties are isolated. These aspects structuring the informative status of Arabic utterance exist in correspondence to culturally defined values. In this sense, they are more or less pragmatically motivated.

4.1 Linguistic constraints

4.1.1 Repetitive (parallelistic) structure of Arabic discourse
  Repetition on different linguistic levels, i.e. morphological, lexical, syntactic, semantic and textual, is a feature which is highly favoured 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 discoursal tendencies.

4.1.1.1 Lexical / semantic repetition
Arabic morphology is characterised 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 of a paradigm of maximal fifteen derivatives or lexical forms, not all of which are necessarily assumed by the trilateral verbs (for the complete paradigms 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 modelled 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. Morphologically parallel couplets of this type, or doublets as they may also be labelled, clearly show their characterising parallelism through having a common internal vowel, gemination or prefixation pattern. Here are some examples of these couplets:

>   1. at-tadmiir wa t-takhriib
>   Destruction and demolition

yuḥaddid wa yukhaṭṭiṭ
Define and delimit

?al-?amthal wa l-?akmal
The most ideal and the most perfect

However, it is quite normal in Arabic discourse to encounter lexical couplets, or longer word-strings which are used with no such expected morphological parallelism. The following are some illustrative examples:

2. ?at-ta?yiid wa l-musaa9ada
Aid and assistance

?al-wahm wa l-khayaal
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 kinds of Arabic strings are only 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:

3. ?inna l-ḥasada ?<u>aalamu</u> wa <u>?aadha</u> wa <u>?awja9u</u> wa <u>?awda9u</u> mina l-9adaawati(Dayf, 1977: 76)
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 the English discourse; nevertheless, 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 examples of such prototypical English couplets. Some of these examples are

> 4. 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' 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).

> 5. 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 use, 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 realises 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:

> 6. mimma yadullu dilalatan qaati9atan 9ala ?innahu
> (One thing which indicates a decisive indication that he …)
> What decisively indicates that he…
>
> 7. 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:

> 8. 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 favoured by the syntactic structure of Arabic in the sense that the choices are still limited (Johnston, 1987: 92-93; Farghal, 1991: 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 a special purpose. While cognate accusative is highly commendable in Arabic, it is much less so and even proscribed in English.

Closely related to the cognate accusative is a construction where an "Arabic effected object" and its governing verb may be derived from the same root. This morphological option accounts for a high percentage of root repetition in Arabic (Farghal, 1991: 383). For these 'Arabic effected objects' consider the following examples:

9. yash9uru bi-mashaa9iri
(He feels of feelings)
He feels.

fa?inna 9anaasira s-sawqi l-9aam laa taf9alu fi9laha l-mu?aththir(Al-Thawra Daily,7.8, 1980).
(The elements of strategy do not do their effective deeds)
The elements of strategy are not so effective.

From the examples above, it is clear that English does not seem to have the same predilection for the use of such objects as Arabic quite obviously does.

The kind of lexical repetition briefly accounted for will unmistakably point to a trait which Arabic possesses as an inherent peculiarity. Arabic lexical morphology has the potentials 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, 1973: 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 fixed 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 middle voice verb. Examples of verbs derived by this pattern may include 'fata<u>h</u>a: infata<u>h</u>a, na<u>s</u>ara: inta<u>s</u>ara, <u>h</u>asara: in<u>h</u>asara'. 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 discoursal tendencies.

4.1.1.2 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 strategy 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).

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 a highly valued mode of expression in Arabic discourse. The great deal use of this kind of syntactically characterised paratactic repetition creates a wide-range occurrence of coordinated parallel phrases and clauses as well as paraphrastic and near-paraphrastic 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 is an example taken from a widely- read Arabic author (dayf, 1977: 67):

> 10. wa mahma yakun fa qadi rtaqati l-<u>kh</u>a<u>t</u>aabatu ruqiyyan ba9iidan fi l-9a<u>s</u>ri l-?umawi wa na<u>sh</u>a<u>t</u>at na<u>sh</u>aa<u>t</u>an la9alla l-9arab lam ya9rifuuhu fi 9a<u>s</u>rin min 9u<u>s</u>uurihim l-wasii<u>t</u>a, ?i<u>dh</u>i t-ta<u>kh</u>a<u>dh</u>uuha ?adaatahum lil<u>z</u>afari fi ?araa?ihim l-siyaasiyyati wa l-?inti<u>s</u>aari fi mujaadalaatihim l-ma<u>dh</u>ahabiyyati wa 9awwalu 9alayhaa fi qa<u>s</u>a<u>s</u>ihim wa mawaa9i<u>d</u>ihim wa wafaadatihim 9ala l-<u>kh</u>ulafaa?i.

And in any way oratory advanced far advancement (advanced very far) in the Umayyad period and got active an activity (got so active) that Arabs may have not known in any period of their medieval periods. They adopted it as a device for success in their political views and for triumph in their religious sectarian controversies, and relied on it in their tales and exhortations and in their arrivals to the Caliphs.

Paratactic repetition is achieved by using juxtaposed, structurally conjoined forms throughout the text. In the first sentence, the two verbal clauses "?irtaqati l-<u>kh</u>a<u>t</u>aabatu ruqiyyan" and "na<u>sh</u>a<u>t</u>at na<u>sh</u>aa<u>t</u>an" are coordinated by 'wa'. This instance of clausal coordination is characterised by partial parallelism: whereas the subject in the first clause is explicitly stated, it is only implicitly construed in the second. Apart from structural parallelism, however, the lexical repetition within the two paratactic clauses is not unintentional: the cognate accusatives "?irtaqat ruqiyyan" and "na<u>sh</u>a<u>t</u>at na<u>sh</u>aa<u>t</u>an", effected by repeating the roots of the relevant verbs as the modified verbal nouns in the accusative, are obviously used for rhetorical purposes.

Similarly, paratactic syntax strikes us as the dominating feature of the second sentence. Marked with less parallelism than that of the first sentence, the verbal clauses "?itta<u>kh</u>a<u>dh</u>uuha ?adaatahum" and "9awwalu 9alayhaa" are coordinated via the use of the heavy-duty 'wa'. Within this coordinate sentence, more paratactic coordination is employed for more persuasive argumentation. The structures coordinated here are adverbial, i.e. the prepositional phrase "lil<u>z</u>afari', annexed to the predicate of the first clause, is coordinated with the parallel phrase "lil?inti<u>s</u>aari fi"; furthermore, the two prepositional phrases "fi qa<u>s</u>a<u>s</u>ihim" and "fi wafaadatihim", annexed to the predicate of the second clause, are coordinated in a way parallel to that of the coordination in the first clause.

The excessive manipulation of 'wa' as a coordinator or ordinary conjunction is supported by recent works on Arabic discourse. In her data-based study of contemporary written Arabic, Koch (1981) identifies whole paragraphs as series of up to 18 clauses linked by 'wa'. Focusing on the textual functions of connectives, Al-Batal (1990: 164) analyses a sample of written Arabic. He finds out that among the occurrences of the intra-sentence connectives, 'wa' reveals the highest frequency, 48% of the combined total.

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 utilising 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. Some illustrative examples are these (from Al-Rajihi, 1975: 269):

11. Nominal: ra?aytu zaydan wa huwa saghiir
                I saw Zayd when he was young.

              taraktu l-bahra ?amwaajuhu 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. 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 lexeme 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 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, al9aa?id, which, as in all relative clauses, is the precondition this kind of

subordination (see, for example, Al-Rajihi, 1975: 5). Here is an illustrative example from Arabic discourse:

> 12. rafa<u>d</u>a <u>s</u>ayyadu l-?asmaaki ?ams muqtarahaatin jadiidatat <u>taqaddamat</u>
> <u>bihaa l-hukuuma</u>(Al-Thawra Daily, 8.8, 1980)
> 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.

4.1.2 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-informative, and hence over-explicit mode of expression. Though both monolingual and inter-lingual discrepancies are expected to exist as to the explicit and implicit characterisation 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 often has to be spelled out in Arabic"

Of the cases that we are to explicate in this connection are modification structures, sentence connectives 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 expanded by a paraphrastic post-nominal adjectival phrase or clause in Arabic:

> 13. But it was clear that the 35-year rule of Tito was all but over.
> (Newsweek, 25 February, 1980)
> wa laakin kaana min l-waa<u>d</u>ihi ?anna <u>h</u>ukma tito l-la<u>dh</u>i daama <u>kh</u>amsatan
> wa <u>th</u>alaa<u>th</u>iina 9aaman maa kaana lahu ?illa ?ay yantahi

Distribution of food in draught-stricken northern Uganda has been suspended. (The Observer, 6 July, 1980)

> ?inna tawzii9a l-<u>ghidh</u>aa?i fi <u>sh</u>amaali ?u<u>gh</u>anda l-lati yu<u>s</u>ibuhaa j-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 constructions. In such instances, modification paraphrases have to be sometimes used to act as part of a disambiguation strategy:

> 14. The enemy's acts of piracy…..
> ?a9maalu l-qar<u>s</u>anati l-ba<u>h</u>riyyati l-latti yaquumu bihaa l-9aduw.
> (Al-Iraq Daily, 11.8. 1980)

In line with the same strategy, prepositional phrases are often paraphrastically 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:

> 15. A new development plan in preparation may stimulate performance.
>   (The Economist, 3 November, 1980)
>   Khittatun jadiidatun liltanmiaya yajri ?i9daaduha.

The strongly advocated requirement of junction in Arabic would contribute further evidence to the considerable degree of explicitness characterising 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 signalling devices in Arabic discourse. Thus whereas conjunctive relations are signalled 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:

> 16. yabdu ?anna qiyaadata j-jayshi fi buliivya lam taruq lahaa siyaasata s-sayyida ghublayr… faqaamat binqilaabin 9askari wa ?ataahat bihaa.(AL-Thawra Daily, 14.9. 1980)
>   It seems that the army command in Bolivia does not like Mrs. Gobriel policy. (Therefore) they conducted a coup and toppled her down.
>
>   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)
>   laqad darabat kaarithatun bi?ab9aadin haa?ila shamaal sharq ?afriiqya…lidhaa fa?inna lmi?aati 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 signalled: 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; 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.

4.2 Socio-cultural constraints
The stereotypical features of Arabic discourse already singled out, i.e. parallelism, explicitness and lexical as well as syntactic repetition, can be

ultimately identified with 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 characterisation of Arabic, both the language and its discourse, 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 determining parameters of the discoursal 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 characterised 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 favour repetition of what English may leave implicit…The explanation for this may be related to the fact that Arabic is more couched in oral culture than English is". 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).

A lot of examples on Arabic discourse would obviously bring in such saturation 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 meaning is taken to an extreme:

17. tazallu l-?ummatu ?asiirata d-da9fi wa t-takhallufi wa t-tafakkuki wa t-taraakhi wa t-tashardhumi(Al-Thawra daily,8.10.1980)
(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: 381), 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).

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 Arabs' endeavours 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.

For the characterisation of quantity implicatures in Arabic, and for other Arabic implicatures as well, it would be necessary to account for some more prototypical culturally determined properties of Arabic. From the ethno-linguistic perspective, such peculiarities can be seen as generally according with a relatively established view, viz. distinctions in the grammatical or lexical structures of a language and whatever meaning they derive are exhibited by virtue of their correlation with functional distinctions in the culture in which it operates.

Thus Arabic is idiosyncratic as regards to cultural meaning, the meaning that a linguistic unit acquires through its reference to a specific segment of reality or worldview, or macro-cultural background which can be economic, social, religious or historical. Examples on this idiosyncrasy are pervasive in Arabic speech: the Arabic words for 'brother' and 'cousin', for instance, have, in addition to their basic cognitive meaning, different socio-cultural connotations related to nationalistic, religious, social or tribal links.

The point on cultural meaning of language units leads to other relevant observations. It is readily substantiated that many of the concepts operated with by speakers of different languages, like those of honesty, honour, sin, etc., are culture-bound. A commonplace reflection helps to find out that, for example, the standards by which someone is honourable in the Arab society are considerably different from what honour is measured against in the British culture. By the same token, the cultural associations of a linguistic item are manifested with different degrees from one culture to another. In addition, the meaning coverage of words that might be considered equivalent across languages varies according

to variations in cultural background. In English, for example, 'generous' is generally associated with the notion of giving freely, and rarely with what is splendour. However, its Arabic equivalent is normally used by Arabic-native speakers to cover both meanings; hence the acceptability of the Arabic expressions

> 18. rajulun kariim
> A generous man…
> And
> hayaatun kariima
> A noble life.

Allocating the impact of these discrepancies for utterance interpretation in Arabic, it would be clear that the reference of such culture-specific words and expressions is unique to the expectations of native-Arabic speakers. For them what these linguistic items culturally mean is part of their assumed shared knowledge. Since this knowledge takes part in the communicative intent of utterances, it seems plausible to hold that the end-result of deduction, i.e. implicature, will be specific to Arabic language and its native speakers.

4.3 Rhetorical constraints

Having explicated the lexical, syntactic and socio-cultural determinants of semantically enriched and explicitly expanded Arabic utterances, we turn now to pragmatic constraints exerted by Arabic rhetoric in connection with certain aspects of discoursal informativeness. It seems convenient in this regard to account for what might be considered the prototypical rhetoric features of informative Arabic discourse.

As narrowly understood by Arab predecessors, the technical sense of 'balaagha', the Arabic equivalent of rhetoric, is twofold: it relates rhetoric to speech as well as to speaker. Rhetoric of speech is the characterising traits that make it conform to context of situation; on the other hand, rhetoric of speaker refers to the linguistic capability by virtue of which he dispatches his speech in conformity with the context in which it is made. According to Arab rhetoricians, therefore, the type of utterance that can be appropriately used is pragmatically constrained by the context of situation. For them, the communicative potential of an utterance is increased or lowered according to whether that utterance is compatible or incompatible with the context in which it is embedded.

Most of the contextual variables identified in recent linguistic studies are considered by Arab rhetoricians as part of what they understand 'maqaam' (context of situation). However, of these factors it is the perceptual system of the receptor to whom the utterance is ultimately directed in actual conversational exchange that attracts most of their attention. In fact, the scope of the whole rhetoric discipline is confined by Arab scholars to the observance by the speaker of the receiver's contextual status (cf.AL-Hashimi, n.d.: 33- 34; Al-Shaykh, 1986: 37).

Given that '9ilmi l-ma9aani' (the science of meanings) is the rhetoric sub-discipline where syntax is primarily linked with pragmatics, it is in this area of language use that Arabic informative utterances are rhetorically specified. More precisely, taking into account the communicative status of the receiver in terms of his immediate and long-term ideology, the speaker will dispatch utterances with varying degrees of informativeness to satisfy the needs of the receiver as they figure out on the relevant occasion. The cases that are particularly interesting are those where over-informative and thus over-explicitly made utterances are given by the speaker for that end. Crucially enough, informatively redundant yet functionally significant rhetoric aspects of Arabic discourse will obviously invalidate Grice's (1975: 46) claim inconclusively stated as "to be over-informative is merely a waste of time". The following are some instances of over-informative utterances made in response to especially identified patterns (cf. AL-Hashimi, n.d.: 228- 234 ; Al- Qazwini, n.d. :195- 210)

An utterance may seem over-informative just to interpret what is already included in the same utterance as a vague subject. Such an interpretation-after-vagueness kind of over-informativeness is justified from the rhetorical point of view by pragmatically appealing to the receiver as a psychological system: when one comes to something vague, one gets more interested to know about it, and thus on receiving this required information one should be more impressed. The redundancy in the information given is therefore functional; it makes the utterance more impressive for the receiver, or to assign what is conveyed more importance, emphasis and value. A lot of examples on such a kind of tautology can be found in the rhetorical language of different types of Arabic discourse such as the oratory and argumentative speech. Consider the following example from Al-Aqqad (1967: 144):

19. washaa9at sayyi?aatu l-harbi l-9aalamiyyati fi ?iqliimi ?aswaani l-?aamini l-wadii9, tajneedun ?ijbaariyyun wa 9tiqaalun mutakarrirun li shubuhatin wa li ghayri shubuha wa ?ataawaatin tufradu li9illatin wa lighayri 9illah.

The evils of the World War have expanded most badly to the calm, settled down province of Aswan ; compulsory recruitment, recurrent detainment for doubtful or even non-existent accusations, and taxes imposed for one or another alleged reason.

Clearly, in this utterance the word 'sayyi?aat' (evils) comes earlier as a general, vague term. By interpreting it later on with the addition of informative elements like 'tajneedun ?ijbaariyyun' (compulsory recruitment) and '?i9tiqaalun mutakarrirun' (recurrent detainment) the speaker/writer makes what he intends to convey more forceful, and thus more readily understandable for the receiver.

Another type of functionally informative redundancy can be found in utterances where what is particular is given together with what is general of the same species in one utterance. The rhetorical aim is to attach more value to the particular point such that it seems different from what is already mentioned. For such tautologies in Arabic we can offer the following example:

20. qara?tu l-?adaba l-9arabyya l-qadeem wa l-?adaba l-9abbaasi.(Al-Hashimi n.d. :231)
I read the old Arabic literature and the Abbasid literature.

As the utterance shows, the particular, i.e. Abbasid literature, is given twice: first as part of the general, i.e., the old Arabic literature, and second distinctly. It should therefore get more import in the whole communicative instance.
Extra information may also be found in having utterances with one word (usually in the dual form) interpreted by two following conjoined words. This is to induce the intended meaning in two different forms, and thus to make it more interesting to enjoy by the receiver, as in the Arabic saying:

21. ?al9ilmu 9ilmaan: 9ilmu l-?adyaani wa 9ilmu l-?abdaani.(Al-Qazwini, n.d. :206)
Science is of two sciences: science of religions and science of bodies.

Here, the dual form '9ilmaan' (two sciences) is interpreted by the following conjoined phrases.
Repetition of different kinds may also be rhetorically exploited in Arabic utterances to serve a variety of purposes. Of such utterances characterised by a repetitive type of information we may have such examples as

22. ?ati9ni wa laa ta9sni.(Ibid)
Obey me and don't disobey me.

The repetition of information in the utterance inheres in that asking someone to obey one's orders is a tautology of asking him not to disobey what one asks to do. The rhetoric effect is to emphasise the information being conveyed.

4.4 Arabic quantity implicatures exemplified
The tendency towards over-informative verbal behaviour already shown as grounded in linguistic and cultural bases in Arabic should result in a distinct type of the quantity maxim application to Arabic discourse. Quantity flouting and the implicatures thereby generated come about in a wider range in Arabic as a result of providing more information than is normally required by the common purpose evolving at a particular stage of interaction. This, in effect, will establish the second Gricean sub-maxim of quantity, that participants must not give more information, as more valid and necessary for Arabic utterances interpretation in terms of implicature. Exemplification of Arabic quantity implicatures can be largely introduced in reference to the over-informative principle since the utterances it underlies are found more prevailing in Arabic discourse. Of the utterances where such implicatures are encountered we offer the following exchange as an example:

23. Al-Obaidi: hal ?ahbabt?
Al-Ali: ?allati ?ahbabtuhaa tazawwajtuhaa wa ?a9iishu l-?aan
            wasta ?usratin sa9iidatin mukawwanatin minni wa zawjati
            wa ?arba9ata banaatin wa waladayn wa ?a9taqidu fi haadhaa
            l-9asr ?anna tarbiyata l-waladi ?as9abu min tarbiyati l-binti

> fa l-bintu majaalu taharrukiha bihkmi tabii9ati mujtama9inaa
> mahduud bi9aksi l-walad l-ladhi yamurru bimaraahila 9umriyyah
> kullu marhala lahaa mashaakiluhaa.
> (from an interview published in Al-Iraq Daily, 16.4.1999)

Al-obaidi: Have you had any love experience?
Al-Ali: The girl whom I have loved I have married, and I'm living now
        amidst a happy family consisting of myself, four daughters and
        two sons. And I think at this time taking care of a son is more
        difficult than taking care of a daughter for, according to the nature
        of our society, the social ambit within which a girl can move is
        limited as opposed to that of a boy who passes through some age
        stages each one of them has its problems.

In this instance, the move of Al-Ali is a flouting of the second quantity maxim since it gives more information than is here required. The informativeness embodied in this utterance, in combination with the context and the background knowledge mutually shared by the participants and culturally constrained by Arabic social traditions, will yield an implicature which can be deduced by the receiver in the followings lines of argument: the speaker has given me more information than I want to receive; since he could have contributed with what is only required, but he has not done so, he must have intended me, the receiver, to infer some extra meaning he has not encoded in words; from the contextual factors surrounding the utterance where the ethical and socially acceptable traits are to be advanced (the interviewee holds an administrative media position, and is therefore responsible for spreading public education), as well as cultural constraints on the social movement of girls in Arab society, the implicature that can be deduced is something like "when a boy has love affairs with a girl, he must get married to her so as to live happily and to avoid detracting from the girl's moral reputation". From the purely linguistic point of view, the utterance shows the kinds of repetitions we have already described as characteristic of Arabic discourse. Thus similar structures are paratactically juxtaposed through the common use of such conjunctions as 'wa' and 'fa', and coordination is displayed as an outstanding feature. These syntactic and discoursal properties have the impact of prolonging the utterance, making it more explicit and more informative.

5. Conclusions
Our application of the quantity maxim to Arabic has revealed that the second sub-maxim of over-informativeness "don't make your contribution more informative than is required" as more operative and highly productive by being flouted for a large number of Arabic quantity implicatures. This is obviously attributable to our discovery that, due to cultural, syntactic, and rhetorical determinants, Arabic discourse generally favours over-informative and redundancy-saturated utterances.

     This Arabic trait would clearly invalidate Grice's observation, presumably based on the English tendencies, that "to be over-infomative is not a

transgression of the cooperative principle but merely a waste of time" (1975: 46). It is important to mention therefore that this is a point which represents a culture-specific discrepancy in the formulation of one basic maxim of Grice's proposals.

Closely related to the tendency towards over-informative utterances, explicitness can also be noticed as a favoured mode of expression in Arabic discourse. Arabic lexical patterning and syntactic modelling exert such constraints on the structure of Arabic discourse as to make it more explicit and more repetitive in character. This is especially represented by the wide-spread use of lexical couplets, longer word-strings and explicitly paratactical modification syntax as dominant features of the language and its discourse. By and large, Arabic discourse is characterised by explicitness in terms of expansion which is linguistically induced by Arabic structure. Such explicitness is expected to have the influence of decreasing the occurrence frequency of implicature as a discoursal aspect where implicit meaning is at issue.

Arabic discoursal determinants and examples of Arabic implicature clearly isolate a distinct type of socio-cultural values engaged by native speakers of Arabic. In addition to Arabic culture-bound concepts, cultural associations of linguistic items are manifestly different in Arabic, and the meaning coverage of words and expressions in Arabic varies in accordance with variation of Arabic cultural background. The reference of such culture-specific segments is unique to the expectations of native-Arabic speakers, constituting part of their assumed shared knowledge. Since this kind of knowledge takes part as an important contextual factor in the deduction of implicature, it is plausible to hold that this deduction will be unique to Arabic language and its native speakers.

References

al-Batal, M. (1990) "Connectives as Cohesive Elements in a Modern Expository Arabic Text", in E. Mushira and J. McCarthy (eds.) *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics*, 11, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 234-262.

al-Hashimi, A. (n.d.) Jawaahir l-Balaagha fi l-Ma9aani wa l-Bayaan wa l-Badii9, Beirut: Daar ?ihyaa? l-turaath l-9arabi.

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

al-Najjar, M. F. (2007) *English-Arabic Morphology and Arabic Lexical Translation*, Amman, Atlas International Publishing.

al-Qazwiini, J.M.A. (n.d.) al-?iidhaah fi 9uluum l-Balaagha, 2 Vols., Reprint. Baghdad : Maktabat Al-Muthanna.

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, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis,

School of Modern Languages and International Studies of the University of Bath.

al-Shaykh, A. H. (1986) Diraasaat fi l-Balaagha 9inda Diyaa?i l-Diin bin l-?athiir. Alexandria: Mu?assasat Shabaab l-Jaami9a lil Tab9i wa l-Nashr wa l-Tawzii9.

Bauer, L. (1983) *English Word-Formation,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown G. and G. Yule (1983) *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cole P. (1975) "The Syncnhronic and Dianchronic Status of Conversational Implicature, in P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.) Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Acts, New York: Academic Press, 257-288

Dayf, Shawqi. (1977) Alfan wa Medhaahibuhu fi l-Nathri l-9arabi, 8th ed. Cairo: Daar l-Ma9aarif.

Emery, G. P. (1987) "Aspects of English-Arabic Translation: a Contrastive Study", *The Linguist*, 26(2), 43-46.

Farghal, M. (1991) "Barbara Johnston, Repetition in Arabic Discourse: a book review", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10, 379-385.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982) Discourse Strategies, Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Grice H.P. (1975) "Logic and Conversation" in P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985) an Introduction to Functional Grammar, London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd.

Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan (1976) *Cohesion in English*, London: Longman Group Ltd.

Hassan, T. (1973) Al-Lugha l-9arabiyya: Ma9naaha wa Mebnaaha, Cairo: Al-Hay?ah l-Musriyya 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", *Studies in Language*, 11(1), John Benjamin Publishing Company, 85-98.

Koch, B. (1983) "Persuasion as Proof: the Language of Arabic Rhetoric", *Anthropological Linguistics*, 25(1), 47-60.

Leech, G.N. (1981) Semantics, 2nd ed., London: Penguin Books Ltd.
_____. (1983) Principles of Pragmatics, London: Longman 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.

Sa'adeddin, M.A. (1989) "Text Development and Arabic-English Negative Interference", *Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 38-51.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson (1995) *Relevance: Communication and Cognitio*n, 2nd ed., Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

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*, 9(2/3), 145-178).

Wright, W. (1975) *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, Vol. 11, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix 1 (System of Transliteration)

The following system of transliteration has been adopted for the Arabic examples in the present work.

1. **Consonants**

Arabic letters	Symbols	Examples	English equivalents
أ	?	?allah	God
ب	b	baab	door
ت	t	ta<u>h</u>t	under
ث	<u>th</u>	<u>th</u>amiin	valuable
ج	j	jamiil	beautiful
ح	<u>h</u>	<u>h</u>akiim	wise
خ	<u>kh</u>	<u>kh</u>ubz	bread
د	d	dumuu9	tears
ذ	<u>dh</u>	<u>dh</u>aalik	that
ر	r	rabii9	spring
ز	z	zayt	oil
س	s	sayf	sword
ش	<u>sh</u>	<u>sh</u>i9r	poetry
ص	<u>s</u>	<u>s</u>abaah	morning
ض	<u>d</u>	<u>d</u>aw?	light
ط	<u>t</u>	<u>t</u>aalib	student
ظ	<u>z</u>	<u>z</u>il	shade
ع	9	9alaa	on
غ	<u>gh</u>	<u>gh</u>uyuum	clouds
ف	f	fii	in
ق	q	qariib	near
ك	k	kabiir	large
ل	l	layl	night
م	m	mun<u>dh</u>u	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