A Contrastive Study Of Implicitness And Intertextuality In English And Arabic Liberal Media Discourse

Ayhan Omer Ahmed , Prof. Dr. Qasim Obayes Al-Azzawi (Ph.D.)

1.Abstact

This study attempts to explore the status of implicitness and intertextuality, which are two vital elements in generating media discourse, by answering the questions: how are implicitness and intertextuality produced in English and Arabic Liberal Media? How do implicitness and intertextuality occur together in English and Arabic Liberal Media? What is the intention of speakers behind their use of intertextuality? Do the speakers intentionally or unintentionally use these concepts? What are the speakers' reasons for using intertextuality? To what extent implicitness and intertextuality are dependent on each other in liberal discourse?

2.Implicitness

According to Larson (1984: 41), implicit which means is categorized into referential implicit, regulatory implicit, and situational implied. By implicit referential which means, Larson refers back to the referential which means of words and sentences prepared into a semantic structure. Thus, it relates to "a positive aspect, event, ratio, or dating" that the interlocutors can understand or consider, in addition to something "happened or may happen or is imagined as happening".

2.1 Functions of Implicitness

Chen (2010 :147-149) presents the functions of using implicitness in speech, which are to achieve politeness principle, pragmatic parameters, and the adaptation theory. The below reasons are mentioned by Chen.

•Politeness Principle is chosen by most of the people to convey their ideas in speech in an indirect way. He also states that people follow the Cooperative Principle that has been developed by Grice (1975) to speak better with the four maxims. Chen also states that sometimes people sacrifice cooperative principle to maintain the politeness principle for example:

1. A. Can you lend me some money?

B. It is sunny today, isn't it?

The speaker (B) does not answer directly for the purpose of politeness and consideration of the face of (A) speaker. Therefore, politeness is considered to be one of the reasons for using implicitness in language rather than addressing others with relatively straightforward words.

• The pragmatic parameter is the second reason for using implicitness in language. Pragmatic parameter alludes to factors that influence what sort of utterance strategies people adopt for communication. Factors that are involved in pragmatic parameter are power, social distance, imposition, and right and obligation (Chen ,2010:147-149). These factors are as the following:

i. Relative Power: People tend to use language indirectly with those who have power or authority over them. For example, someone in a high-rank position would say to his employees 'Mind if I smoke' he would choose the direct way of speaking. But, if an employee wanted to smoke would say 'Excuse me, Sir.

Would it be all right if I smoke?' The employee would tend to use indirect utterance to implement his speech act (ibid.).

ii.   Social Distance: this parameter includes social status, age, gender, and intimacy, etc. People with similar social status, age, social class, employment type, gender, and race tend to use less indirect utterances in communication. Otherwise, they would use more indirect utterances in communication (ibid).

iii.   Imposition: the selection of utterance strategies is influenced by the different degrees of imposition. The degrees of imposition are different for someone borrowing one $ and 10,000$. The one who borrows 10,000$ needs to select indirect and polite expression in order to achieve his/ her aim (ibid.).

iv.   Rights and Obligation: a speaker tends to use direct way of speaking with someone when he believes that he has the right to oblige the listener to do something. In the same way, the addressee has the obligation to do so.

• Adaptation theory (Adaptability): the third reason for using implicitness in language is the adaptation theory. According to this theory, people use different types of languages in various environment and purposes (ibid.).

2.2 Types of Implicitness

Implicitness, as an umbrella term, covers many headings; entailment, presupposition, implicature, explicature, politeness, and impliciture.

1 Entailment

Lyons (1977: 85) points out that entailment is "a relation that holds between P and Q where P and Q are variables standing for propositions such that if the truth of Q necessarily follows from the truth of P (and the falsity of Q necessarily follows from the falsity of P), then P entails Q".

2 Presupposition

The idea of the presupposition has received a whole lot attention from semantics, which includes Kempson (1975), Wilson (1975), Gazdar (1979), Oh and Denin (1979), and Macaulay (1981) among others, who described it as a logical-binding concept. With the connotations of conditional truth.

Keenan (1971, referred to in Fillmore and Langendwin, 1971: 45) describes the concept of a semantic assumption as "a sentence S logically presupposes a sentence S1 and just in case S logically implies S1 and the negation of S, ~S also logically implies S1 ", i.e., The truth of that sentence is an important situation for the reality or falsity of it.

2.4   Types of Presupposition

There are two types of presuppositions: pragmatic presuppositions and semantic presuppositions. Pragmatic presuppositions deal with speaker action. While semantic assumptions trace the conservative features of the senses of certain words and buildings. Presuppositions are "the result of complex interactions between semantics and pragmatics" (Levinson, 1983:225).

2.4.1 Pragmatic Presupposition

Practical premisses, because the label suggests, are situations for the proper use of sentences and .lexical gadgets

Keenan (1971) (cited in Fillmore and Langendwin, 1971: 49) proposes a wellknown definition of the appropriateness of speech in context by stating that "an utterance of a sentence pragmatically presupposes that its context is appropriate." This approach that pragmatic assumptions are vital to interpret the sentence as appropriate   in   a   given
                                        context.

2.4.2 Sematic Presupposition

Strawson (1959:142) provides another way to look at presuppositions, and he defines it as an implication relation, holding amid statements, founded on a semantic entailment (or necessitation). Thus, he formulates presupposition as:

A→ B ("A necessitate B" or "A semantically entails B" if and lone if whenever A is true, B is too true).

A presuppose B if and only if A → B and A → B.

3. Intertextuality

The idea of intertextuality become first introduced by using Kristeva (1969). Kristeva asserts that no textual content is absolutely "empty" from other texts (Hawkes, 1977: one hundred forty four; Mcguire, 1980: 79). Intertextuality refers to empirical commonalities. While constantly referring to their messages internally, texts additionally refer externally to other texts. For any given text, there can be some thing very just like it. They are all connected.

3.1 Forms or Techniques of Intertextuality by Fairclough

Fairclough (1992 :118- 124) presents five forms of intertextuality. He discusses the explicit relation between different texts in relation to these five forms. These forms comprise dissertation picture, assumption, negation, metadiscourse, and irony.

3.1.1 Discourse Representation

Discourse representation is the first form of explicit intertextuality in which additives of different texts are integrated into the textual content. They are typically marked with explicit devices such as fees and reporting phrases. This technique paperwork a first-rate a part of news

discourse; Representations of what the people with the newsletter have said. It is likewise essential in other types of discourse such as evidence, in courts, in political discourse, and in regular conversations (Richardson ,2007: 102-106).

3.1.2 Presupposition

According to Fairclough (1992) some accounts of presupposition treat them in a non-intertextual way, and thus, only text producers' propositions count. Based on the previous discussion, an intertextual explanation of assumption, where the assumed proposition does establish information occupied for decided by writer/speaker, can best be accounted for in terms of intertextual relatives with previous texts. Moreover, in the same account, even the presupposed proposition, that is taken for granted as the property of the text creator, can be understood in terms of intertextual relatives with previous texts.

3.1.3 Negation

Negative sentences carry particular kinds of the presupposition that are Merging other texts only to undertaking and reject them. Example For example, a ruby trial man hits'. This negative part of this example presupposes the proposition that the being cited here did murder a 'squealer' (Fairclough, 1992).

3.1.4 Metadiscourse

Metadiscourse is one of the most common forms of manifest intertextuality. The author, in this type, differentiates dissimilar levels within the text, distancing from certain level of the text, and giving the dissociated level as if it was another, external, text. There are many ways of achieving this type, such as hedging, reformulation, and paraphrasing. The speaker, in metadiscourse, is situated outside or above the uttered dissertation and is in a position to switch and operate it (Fairclough ,1992).

4. **Media Discourse**

Media discourse specifically refers to the diverse approach of communique directed at readers as well as listeners and visitors. This kind of discourse is commonly distinguished through primary functions, its incidence and presence for .unique sorts of audience

Bell's (1991:1) declaration that "the language of media dominates society" indicates that the media, and hence the information, are prolific sources of real-global discourse. But what are the factors that influence the production of such discourse? News media discourse is inspired with the aid of different factors consisting of who owns a news media corporation or newspaper, what editorial coverage is observed, who has get entry to to it, what have an effect on advertisers have on the information provided, and what readers and audiences are centered.

5. Data Collection

The whole texts of this study are taken from four areas in media. They are news headlines, and tweets of US Presidential candidates, speeches of Barack Obama, and interviews.

5.1Analysis of News Headlines

Text (1) A Safer World, Thanks to the Iran Deal. (The New York Times, January 17, 2016)

This is a moment for which many thoughts will in no way come: Iran has fulfilled its obligation under a 2015 agreement with the USA and different foremost powers to curb or cast off the maximum risky factors of its nuclear program. The global is now more secure for this. On the implicitness side, this headline is formed by pragmatic presupposition. The reporter, in this headline used expressive speech act that indicates the addresser's psychological state or mental attitude like 'thank'. The function of implicitness

is politeness principle. Intertextuality is formed with discourse representation by using free indirect quotation. The function of intertextuality is attract attention.

4. Conclusions

This study comes up with some conclusions that are listed below:

1.   Both implicitness and intertextuality are produced by the use of different forms, techniques, types and functions.
2.   Both implicitness and intertextuality equally occur in all areas and channels of liberal media ; headlines, election campaigns, speeches of Obama, and speeches of interviewer and interviewee. But they are different in the forms and types that are used in these channels. For example, presupposition is mostly used than other types of implicitness in the speeches of Barack Obama. While discourse representation is used more by news reporters in news headlines rather than other forms of intertextuality.
3.   The intention of speakers behind their use of implicitness and intertextuality in media discourse to produce hidden or implicit references.

References

Bell, A. (1991) The Language of News Media. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chen, P. (2010) On Pragmatic Strategies for Avoidance of Explicitness in Language, Asian Social Science, 6(10), pp. 147–151. doi: 10.5539/ass.v6n10p147.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Hawkes T. (1977) Structuralism and Semiotics. London: Methuen.

Keenan, Edward L. (1971). Two Kinds of Presuppositions in Fillmore, Charles J., and D.

Terence Langendoen (eds.) (1971). Studies in Linguistic Semantics. New York: Irvingtnon. pp. 45-54.

Larson, M. L. (1984). Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence (Vol. 366). Lanham, MD:University press of America

Levinson, S., C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1977). New Horizons in Linguistics. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Book.

McGwire, B.S. (1980) Translation Studies. London: Mthuen and Co.

Strawson, Peter, (1959). Introduction to Logical Theory. London: Methuen