Constructing Common Ground in High-Context Cultures: The Case of Quranic Intertextuality

Thulfiqar Hussein Altahmazi, [5], Rasim Taeh Jahjuh, Abbas Lutfi Hussein

Abstract

The paper explores the construction of common ground in Arabic. The paper is premised on the view that Quranic intertextual references are "situation-bound utterances" (Kecskes, 2012), that trigger presupposed contextual knowledge necessary for common ground construction. Such a conceptualization provides an opportunity to test Edward Hall's (1976) classification of Arabic as a high-context culture. Methodologically, the paper first develops a questionnaire to probe Arabic native speakers' perception of a number of Quranic verses/phrases that are frequently cited in everyday language use. The questionnaire identifies which of these Quranic verses/phrases can be identified as situation-bound utterances. Then, the Arabic Web 2018 corpus is used to identify the frequencies and analyze the concordance of the high scoring Quranic situation-bound utterances. Based on the corpus linguistic analysis, examples of Quranic SBUs are identified and subjected to a qualitative analysis to provide in-depth insights as to how these Quranic SBUs are produced and interpreted in interaction. The results of the questionnaire and the corpus linguistic analysis of frequency and concordance indicate that these Quranic SBUs form the basis of an extensive communal common ground shared by Arabic speakers. The qualitative analysis highlights the fact that this extensive communal common ground is necessary to facilitate the transition from the implicated premises to the implicated conclusions about speaker's meaning. This provides empirical support to Hall's (1976) categorization of Arabic as high-context culture. From a theoretical perspective, the paper highlights the role of "associative reasoning" (Racanati, 2004) in processing presupposed contextual information and schematic knowledge necessary for strengthening existing contextual assumptions or for drawing further inferences about the speaker's intended meaning.

Keywords

[5] Mustansiriyah University, Department of English Language & Literature, email: edr.thulfiqar_al.tahmazi@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

Introduction

Intertextuality is an intrinsically important textual phenomenon; it provides social, cultural and historical cues that facilitate text comprehension. These kinds of social, cultural and historical cues are often taken for granted because they are reproduced from previous texts that are often well recognized and whose contexts are easily processed. This is, in fact, echoed in Fairclough's (1992: pp.120) argument that text comprehension relies on the implicit or explicit intertextual references that are often "taken by the producer of the text as already established or 'given'". Intertextuality has been explored extensively in both discourse analysis and literary studies. It was used as both a theoretical and analytical concept in these two fields of study. However, intertextuality has not been widely investigated in pragmatics, despite its relevance to pragmatic phenomena like presupposition and common ground. More importantly, as argued by Macagno (2023), very little effort has so far been exerted to provide an interactional perspective to the concept of common ground, which is often been conceptualized and analyzed from cognitive and logical perspectives.

This paper aims to address this conceptual lacuna by exploring the interplay of intertextuality, presupposition and common ground. The paper is premised on the argument that contextual assumptions, i.e. presuppositions, can be triggered by making references to contextually rich and easily recognizable texts. Such contextual assumptions establish common ground that facilitates text comprehension. In this paper, the interplay of intertextuality, presupposition and common ground is specifically investigated by focusing on the use of Quranic verses in everyday online interactions. More importantly, conceptualizing Quranic citations as a special type of intertextual references triggering contextual assumptions, i.e. presuppositions, provides an opportunity to test Edward Hall's (1976) classification of Arabic as a high-context culture. To that end, the paper addresses the following research questions:

RQ1: Can Quranic intertextual references be used in trigger presuppositions?
RQ2: If so, how do these presuppositions facilitate the construction of common ground?
RQ3: Does this lend empirical support for that Edward Hall's (1976) classification of Arabic as a high-context culture?

The paper is structured as follows: in Section Two, a theoretical background is provided by focusing on the concepts of intertextuality, presupposition and common ground. Data and methodology are discussed in Section Three, which provides an overview of the corpus and its construction and the selection criteria of the Quranic intertextual references. The framework and analytical procedures followed in the paper are also detailed in this section. Section Four presents and discusses the results which are interpreted in the light of the framework outlined in the previous section. In the final section, i.e. the conclusion, answers to the guiding research questions are provided and conceptual and theoretical implications are discussed.

Theoretical Background
Intertextuality

Making reference to forms or content of previous texts is prevalent in ordinary and creative language uses. The reproduction and manipulation of textual forms and contents are generally referred to as intertextuality. The importance of intertextuality has long been identified by Bakhtin (1986), who perceives it as a phenomenon that infiltrates everything we say or write

(pp. 68-99). This justifies De Beaugrande and Dressler (1992, p. 182) insistence to include intertextuality in their seven standards of textuality. Intertextual references are used to highlight social and historical cues necessary for meaning processing and text comprehension. This is because intertextuality, according to Kristeva (1969, cited in Juvan, 2008: p. 12), is a "textual interaction produced within the text itself" that can describe "how the text reads history and locates itself in it". Intertextuality in this sense provides the background against which the text is interpreted.

Studying intertextuality from a pragmatic perspective falls within what Leech (1983) terms "textual rhetoric", in which "a textually well-behaved" utterance is perceived as an utterance that "anticipates and facilitates H's task in decoding, or making sense of, the text"(p. 60). This is traditionally studied under the heading of "information structure" (Culpeper and Haugh, 2014: p. 45). Pragmatically speaking, intertextuality may be explicitly demarcated or implicitly indicated via merging and assimilation (Fairclough, 1992, p. 84). The difference between explicit and implicit intertextual references is that the former can be attributed to specific texts whereas the latter cannot. Both explicit and implicit intertextual references aim "to activate a schema that provides a scaffold for interpreting linguistic information" (Culpeper and Haugh, 2014: p. 53). Schemas activated by intertextuality enable language users to develop understanding that involves content richer than what language itself provides. This type of content is always backgrounded, giving rise to default social and cultural values that contextualize the text in a frame of interpretation (cf. Hansen and Terkourafi, 2023; Macagno, 2023).

The frequent use of intertextual references can give rise to the conventionalization of form-context pairings of the original texts, i.e. the cited texts. This is particularly common when the intertextual reference is easily traced back to well-known texts. In this sense, such intertextual references evolve into utterance types, as opposed to tokens, with formulaic pragmatic points, or "situation-bound utterances" (henceforth SBUs), to use Kecskes' (2012) term, wherein the strong cognitive association of form and context determines use and meaning. In other words, these SBUs can always give rise to the contextual assumptions necessary for the recognition of the pragmatic acts being performed by them (Kecskes, 2010, 2894-5). In this sense, SBUs can be defined as multi-word pragmatic units conveying a presupposed contextual package.

Presupposition

Although originally produced as a semantic concept, presupposition constitutes a fundamental topic in pragmatics. A presupposition is a contextual assumption whose truth is taken for granted to maintain the felicity of the utterance. Traditionally, there are two types of approaches to account for presupposition, namely: the semantic approach and the pragmatic approach (Haugh, 2017: pp. 85-7). In the former approach, presuppositions are conceptualized as preconditions of truth value of their sentences. In this sense, sentences are perceived as bearer of presuppositions (Huang, 2017:85). In this sense, a presupposition of a sentence can be triggered regardless of the contextual factors or speaker's intention. The latter approach, on the other hand, conceptualizes presupposition as a context-sensitive meaning that arises as part of the speaker's packaging information in an utterance (Saeed, 2016: p. 98), or as necessary contextual assumptions of proper use of utterances (Huang, 2017:85).

Presuppositions are easily distinguishable from other logical inferences, e.g. entailment, because they arise even when the sentences in which they are produced are negated. Constancy under negation for presupposition is motivated by the fact that the negation affects

what is asserted only, i.e. focus of the utterance rather than what is assumed (Culpeper and Haugh, 2014:59). In this sense, presuppositions are always produced as "background information necessary for processing the new information asserted (or implicated) in the utterance" (see Culpeper and Haugh, 2014:p. 74). Although constant under negation, presuppositions are defeasible. Defeasibility, in this case, means that presuppositional triggers do not determine presuppositions, but potentially trigger an inference about what is presupposed (p. 59).

In an attempt to develop and further broaden the traditional conceptualization of presupposition, Polyzou (2015) views presupposing as a phenomenon that covers all shared knowledge necessary for text comprehension, where he identifies three different levels of presupposed information. Although relevant and essential to utterance and discourse comprehension, some of these presuppositions are non-truth-functional (see Saussure, 2013). The first one is the lexical level presupposition, in which presupposed concepts are evoked by the use of lexical items that give rise to specific frames, such as calling someone a 'terrorist' instead of 'freedom fighter'. The second is the sentence-level presupposition, which is dependent on the notions of 'figure' and 'ground' in the sentence uttered, which is the type traditionally investigated by analytic philosophers and pragmaticians. The third is the discourse level presupposition, which is the type that activates cultural knowledge about the content and genre of the text. As far as content is concerned, the discourse producer presumes particular cultural knowledge on behalf of the (expected) audience in the "epistemic community" in which the discourse is produced and distributed (van Dijk, 2014). As far as genre is concerned, the discourse producer reflects his/her awareness "of the audience's expectations in respect to generic conventions of form and function" (Polyzou, 2015: pp. 133).

Common Ground

The term "common ground" refers to those assumptions which are hold by all interlocutors and "which they assume to be so shared" (Jucker & Smith, 1996: p. 2). Common ground should be consistent with our background knowledge (schemata) and the inferences derived therefrom (Culpeper and Haugh, 2014: p.76). These inferences, e.g. pragmatic presuppositions, define the felicity/appropriateness of utterances in which they made/triggered (see Levinson, 1983: pp. 204-205). Common ground information is always predictable and non-controversial conventions that can be linguistic or behavioral (Culpeper and Haugh, 2014: p.77).

Common ground information can be classified into different types based on their accessibility. Clark (2009:p. 117) distinguishes between communal and personal common grounds. The former is based on community co-membership, whereas the latter on personal acquaintance or joint (interactive) experience. This distinction is echoed in Kecskes' (2014) distinction between core common ground and emergent common ground. Core common ground is the relatively static, generalized common knowledge and beliefs that belong to a community as a result of prior interactions and experiences (Kecskes, 2014:p. 160; cf. van Dijk's 2014 concept of "epistemic community"). Alternatively, emergent common ground is more dynamic particularized knowledge arising in interaction.
In any interaction, interlocutors provide each other access points to (re)construct common ground. These access points can be granted via the reproduction of form or content of well-known texts, i.e. via intertextual references. These intertextual references activate schematic

knowledge necessary to draw default inferences about the common ground and actual context of use. For this reason, communication can be thought of as a common ground building a process operationalized by activating schemas and making inferences about what is shared between/among interlocutors. This is indeed indicated by Jucker and Smith (1996) who argue that language use primarily involves the negotiation of common ground. Along the same line, Relevance Theorists state that language comprehension is a "context building process through which contextual assumptions are incrementally added to an interpretative context subset" (Maillat, 2013: p. 190).

Data and Methodology

In order to investigate how Quranic intertextuality trigger the contextually presupposed package, the paper first develops a questionnaire to probe Arabic native speakers' perception of 30 Quranic verses/phrases that are frequently cited in everyday conversations. This questionnaire is used as a situation boundedness scale to explore which of these verses/phrases are perceived to be conventionally associated with particular contexts of uses, and as such to be identified as situation-bound utterances in Kecskes's (2010) sense. The questionnaire targeted participants from four age groups (i.e. 20-30; 31-40; 41-50; 51-60) to ensure that age was not a factor determining the extent of cultural knowledge presupposed in the Quranic SBUs. The education background of the participants was also probed to make sure that the presupposed contextual packages of these situation-bound utterances are general and not exclusively recognized by well-educated participants. The participants included both males and females to ensure gender balance.

At the second stage of analysis, the Arabic Web 2018 corpus was used to identify frequencies and analyze concordance of the high scoring Quranic SBUs. The Arabic Web 2018 is the largest Arabic corpus and can be accessed and interrogated via Sketch Engine, a corpus linguistic tool developed by Lexical Computing (for details see https://www.sketchengine.eu/). The frequencies analysis can reveal the commonality of these Quranic SBUs across different genres and text types, as the corpus includes 10 different types of genres and text types. Concordance analysis, on the other hand, can reveal the Arabic native speakers' metapragmatic awareness of these SBUs. In the context of this paper, metapragmatic awareness is understood as a way to reveal native speakers' understanding of how linguistic (and non-linguistic) forms are anchored to their stereotypical contexts of use, including the choices they make in producing and interpreting talk or discourse (Culpeper and Haugh, 2014: p. 240). Metaphragmatic awareness, in this sense, functions as an anchoring device that locates "linguistic form in relation to context", and also functions as a signal "of the language users' reflexive interpretations of the activities they are engaged in" (Verschueren, 2000: p. 439). Metapragmatic awareness, in this sense, is considered "a crucial force behind the meaning-generating capacity of language in use" (p. 439).

The third stage of the analysis involves the identification of authentic examples in which the Quranic SBUs are used. The authentic examples to be subjected to a qualitative analysis to provide in-depth insights as to how these Quranic SBUs are produced and interpreted in interaction. For the lack of space in this paper, three authentic examples will be selected, each represents one of the high scoring categories (cf. table no. 1 below).

47

Thulfiqar Hussein Altahmazi,
Rasim Taeh Jahjuh & Abbas Lutfi Hussein   "Constructing Common Ground in High-Context
Cultures: The Case of Quranic Intertextuality"

Analysis

After administering the questionnaire to 155 participants, the results show that the participants has perceived most of these verses/phrases as SBUs, triggering specific contextual assumptions. Although 29 (out of 30) Quranic intertextual references scored higher than 55%, only the ones that scored 75% or higher were further investigated in the second stage of the analysis for the lack of space in this paper. This is also meant to ensure that these Quranic intertextual references are evidently considered SBUs by the vast majority of participants. The total number of intertextual references that are analyzed with a corpus linguistic tool is 15, divided in to three groups based on their situation-boundedness scores, as shown in the table below[6].

Table no. 1 (High scoring Quranic intertextual references)

No.	Category	Quranic Intertextual References	Conventional Context of Use	Score
1		‏"‏"ولا تحسبن الذين قتلوا في سبيل الله أمواتا"‏"‏ "Think not of those who are slain in God's way as dead"	عند الاستشهاد Upon martyrdom	98.7%
2		‏"ولا تقل لهما أف"‏ "Say not to them a word Of contempt"	عند التعامل مع الوالدين When dealing with parents	98.7%
3		‏"فإن مع العسر يسرا"‏ "So verily, With every difficulty, There is relief"	عند الشدة In distress	97.4%
4		‏"قل أعوذ برب الفلق"‏ "Say: I seek refuge With the Lord of the Dawn"	عند الخوف من الحسد Upon fear of evil eye/envy	95.5%
5	1st Category	‏"وخلق لكم من أنفسكم ازواجا لتسكنوا اليها"‏ ‏"وجعلنا بينكم مودة ورحمة"‏ "He created For you mates from among Yourselves, that ye may Dwell	عند الخطبة In engagement	95.8%

---

[6] All the translations of the Quranic citation are based on (Ysuf Ali, 2022). Available at
https://quranyusufali.com/#YusufAliQuran

		in tranquility with them, And He has put love And mercy between your (hearts)"		
6		"الأقربون أولى بالمعروف" "The closest ones are the first to be favored (Charity begins at home)"	عند تفضيل القريب Upon favoring the relatives	92.9%
7		"إن كيدهن/كيدكن عظيم" "Truly, mighty is your/their snare!"	عند التعامل مع النساء When dealing with women	92.8%
8		"لئن شكرتم لأزيدنكم" "If ye are grateful, I will Add more (favors) unto you"	عند الحصول على رزق Upon making earnings	87.7%
9		"إنا لله وإنا إليه راجعون" "To God we belong and to Him is our return"	عند الموت Upon hearing of death	87.5%
10	2nd Category	وجعلنا من بين ايديهم سدا ومن خلفهم سدا " "فأغشيناهم فهم لا يبصرون" "And We have put A bar in front of them And a bar behind them, And further, We have Covered them up ; so that They cannot see"	عند الخوف من المخاطر Upon fear of danger	85.6%
11		"واعتصموا بحبل الله جميعا ولا تفرقوا" "And hold fast all together by the rope which God (stretches out for you) and be not divided among yourselves"	عند الفرقة Upon disbanding	78.1%
12	3rd Category	"لا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله" "There is no might and no power except by God"	عند المصيبة Upon calamity	%76.8
13	3rd Category	حسبنا/حسبي الله ونعم الوكيل	عند الجزع	75.5%

49

		"For us God sufficeth and He is the best disposer of affairs"	Upon despondency	
14		"إن وعد الله حق" "Certainly The promise of God Is true"	عند الموت Upon death	75.3%
15		كفى الله المؤمنين (شر) القتال "And enough Is God for the Believers In their fight"	عند الخلاف Upon dispute	75.3%

As indicated by Table no. 1 above, the high scoring Quranic SBUs are associated with specific contexts of use originated by the Quranic verses in which they first appeared. These Quranic SBUs encode stereotypical contexts that are used to make sense of actual situational contexts. In this sense, they give rise to default inferences drawn on the basis of prior recurring contexts of reference which are triggered during the process of comprehension. This accords well with Meibauer's (2017: p. 117) argument that "default inferences are triggered when information about the current context is absent or not necessary for comprehension (it is already specified by the previous context and ''encapsulated'' in the linguistic items used)".

At the second stage of analysis, the frequency and concordance of each of these high scoring Quranic SBUs were analyzed in the Arabic Web 2018 corpus. The table below shows the high scoring Quranic SBUs frequencies.

Table no. 2 (Frequencies of Quranic intertextual references in the Arabic Web 2018 corpus)

No.	Quranic Intertextual References	Frequency
1	"ولا تحسبن الذين قتلوا في سبيل الله أمواتا" "Think not of those who are slain in God's way as dead"	1677
2	"ولا تقل لهما أف" "Say not to them a word Of contempt"	1176
3	"فإن مع العسر يسرا" "So verily, With every difficulty, There is relief"	2049
4	"قل أعوذ برب الفلق" "Say: I seek refuge With the Lord of the Dawn"	1489
5	" وخلق لكم من أنفسكم ازواجا لتسكنوا اليها وجعلنا بينكم مودة "ورحمة "He created For you mates from among	104

	Yourselves, that ye may Dwell in tranquility with them, And He has put love And mercy between your (hearts)"	
6	ال‏أقربون‏ أولى‏ بالمعروف" "The closest ones are the first to be favored (Charity begins at home)"	592
7	إن كيدهن/كيدكن عظيم" "Truly, mighty is your/their snare!"	987
8	لئن‏ شكرتم‏ لأزيدنكم" "If ye are grateful, I will Add more (favors) unto you"	1401
9	إنا لله وإنا إليه راجعون" "To God we belong and to Him is our return"	11561
10	وجعلنا من بين ايديهم سدا ومن خلفهم سدا فأغشيناهم فهم لا يبصرون" "And We have put A bar in front of them And a bar behind them, And further, We have Covered them up ; so that They cannot see"	60
11	واعتصموا بحبل الله جميعا ولا تفرقوا" "And hold fast all together by the rope which God (stretches out for you) and be not divided among yourselves"	3291
12	لا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله" "There is no might and no power except by God"	35062
13	حسبنا/حسبي الله ونعم الوكيل "For us God sufficeth and He is the best disposer of affairs"	15621
14	إن وعد الله حق" "Certainly The promise of God Is true"	860
15	كفى الله المؤمنين (شر) القتال "And enough Is God for the Believers In their fight"	1190

The corpus linguistic analysis of these Quranic SBUs shows that their frequencies are significantly higher than English SBUs that are usually studied in well-known English corpora like the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) (see for instance Kecskes et al, 2018). These frequencies become even more significant and relevant when one takes into consideration the fact that the numbers of hits in the corpus become significantly low for longer SBUs in comparison to two/three-word long SBUs. This is in fact accords well with Levshina's (2023: 6) discussion on the communicative efficiency of natural languages where she cites Zipf's Law of Abbreviation to argue that "more frequent words tend to be shorter than less frequent ones".

Moreover, the concordance analysis of these Quranic SBUs reflects the Arabic native speakers' metapragmatic awareness of the presupposed contextual packages triggered by these SBUs. This indeed indicates an extensive communal common ground shared by the native speakers of Arabic. Such a communal common ground can be showcased in the concordance analysis of the SBU "Truly, mighty is their snare!" All the authentic uses of this Quranic SBU appearing in the figure below indicate that native speakers tend to associate the linguistic form of this SBU with the stereotypical context of womanly cunning. This is in fact consistent with the original Quranic context of use.

Figure no. 1 (Concordance Analysis of a Quranic SBU)
When selecting random examples of authentic interaction from the Arabic Web 2018, the examples show that these Quranic SBUs give rise to the default inferences about the context of their uses. The significance of default inferences lies in their use in drawing further inferences about speaker's meaning and text comprehension or strengthening existing assumptions. This is acknowledged in both pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis. In pragmatics, default inferences are envisaged as implicated premises, to use relevance theorists' term, to draw implicated conclusions about speaker's meaning (see Clark, 2013: p.227 ff.; see examples 1, 2 and 3 below). In Critical Discourse Analysis, the significance of

such default inference is epitomized in Fairclough (2003: p. 40), "what is 'said' in a text is 'said' against a background of what is 'unsaid', but taken as given". See the examples below, which is a commentary on a TV interview with a well-known Arab woman singer.

Example 1:

الأناقة و الجمال الذي تتميز بهما الفنانة لطيفة دائما دفعتا منتصر إلى توجيه سؤال لها، أكد لها أنه منذ الثمانينات إلى غاية اليوم شباب و حيوية و جمال لطيفة لم يتغير.ليتسائل عن السر لترد عليه " قل أعوذ برب الفلق " السر رباني و الحمد لله.

The elegance and beauty that make the artist Latifa special have always prompted Montaser to ask her a question, He assured her that since the eighties, Latifa's youth, vitality, and beauty have not changed. He wondered why that is so. She replied "Say: I seek refuge With the Lord of the Dawn". This is a divine secret; thanks to God.

In the example above, the Quranic "Say: I seek refuge With the Lord of the Dawn" is used by Latifa as a spell for protection from evil eye, which may harm her youth, vitality, and beauty. Understanding Latifa's use of this Quranic SBU as an implicated contextual premise helps the addressee and the audience draw a further inference, i.e. an implicated conclusion, about her intended meaning and the expressive illocutionary act she performs in her response (cf. Alqarni, 2020 views on evil eye expressive speech acts in Saudi Arabic). The presupposed contextual knowledge required to draw the implicated premise is triggered by the use of the Quranic SBU. The use of this SBU activates schematic background knowledge stored in the "social memory" (van Dijk, 1998: 29) about evil-eying and transfers it to the working memory, which is the center of attention, in order to process the utterance (Félix-Brasdefer, 2017: 433; Culpeper and Haugh, 2014:35). The connection between the default contextual assumptions triggered by this Quranic SBU and its actual context is understood based on associative reasoning (Racanati, 2004). As argued by Mazzone (2011: p. 2155), associative reasoning has its own logical structure that can be causal, spatial, temporal or textual in nature. In the case of this example, the associative reasoning of the original Quranic context of this SBU and its current context is (inter)textual in nature. Reliance on such an associative process highlights the fact that common ground is not purely a cognitive or logical construct, but it is rather a dynamic one that evolves constantly in interaction (see Macagno, 2023). The example below shows how another Quranic SBUs, i.e. "Truly, mighty is their snare!" is used in an authentic legal deposition.

دعواه التى حملت رقم ٥٦٨٠ لسنة ٢٠١٥ أمام محكمة الأسرة: "تحملت صوتها العالى وعنادها طوال ٥ سنوات، ورغم ذلك كنت الزوج والأب والحبيب لها، ولكنها كانت لا ترضى ودائمًا تتطلع إلى ما فى أيدى الآخرين وتقارن نفسها بهم. وأكمل الزوج: أحببتها ولكن بالفعل إن كيدهن لعظيم فهى نجح ت فى استغلال ذلك فى الضغط عليا واستنفاذى ماديا ومعنويا، وجعلتنى أخسر كل ما أملكه.

His lawsuit, numbered 5680 in 2015 was presented before the Family Court: "I have endured her loud voice and stubbornness for 5 years, and despite that, I was her husband, father, and lover, but she was not satisfied and always looked forward to what was in the hands of others and compared herself to them." The husband continued: "I loved her, but truly, mighty is their snare!, as she succeeded in exploiting that and in putting pressure on me and in exhausting me financially and morally, and made me lose everything.

In the example above, the Quranic "truly, mighty is their snare!" is used in a legal text about a man complaining about his wife's mistreatment and manipulation. The plaintiff employs this Quranic as a textual means to frame his complaint in "frame of interpretation" (cf. Hansen and Terkourafi, 2023) similar to that used in the original Quranic text, which is about the cunning of Potiphar's wife who wanted to seduce Joseph.

The schematic knowledge in this Quranic SBU plays a vital role in maximizing communicative efficiency and in minimizing exchange and processing of information that is highly accessible and predictable (Levshina, 2023: 18 ff.). Understanding this type of schematic knowledge is based on an associative relation between the original Quranic context of this SBU and the context in which it is employed in the example. In the case of this example the associative relation between the original Quranic context of this SBU and its current context is (inter)textual in nature (Mazzone 2011: p. 2155). The schematic knowledge presupposed in the Quranic SBU provides background information that strengthens presumptions about the interlocutor's intended meaning and the expressive illocutionary of complaint he performs in his deposition. This is because, as argued by relevance theorists, the informative value of any utterance is not only limited to offering new conclusions drawn from connections between existing and new assumptions; they can also involve information supporting the existing assumptions (Clark, 2013: p. 102).

The example below shows how another Quranic SBUs, i.e. "For us God sufficeth and He is the best disposer of affairs" is used in an authentic online interaction.

التسيب الذي وقع لها من تاخير في المواعيد حتي تهالكت وانتقلت لرحمه خالقها. من سيحاسب المسؤل فوالله لو كانت اختي من ال فلان وال علان لجلبت لها الكبد من وراء البحار من الدقيقه التي تطأ قدمها المستشفي. ولكنها كانت من عامه الشعب لا اقول الا حسبي الله ونعم الوكيل . فحق اختي لن يضيع ان شالله والله فوق العالمين.

The neglect was that she suffered due to the delay of appointments, until she collapsed and moved to the mercy of her Creator. Who will be held accountable? By God, if my sister was from the family of so-and-so, she would have brought a liver from overseas the minute she set foot in the hospital. But she was from a commoner, for us God sufficeth and He is the best disposer of affairs. The right of my sister will not be lost, God willing, and God is above the worlds.

In the example above, the Quranic "for us God sufficeth and He is the best disposer of affairs" is used in an online interaction by someone complaining about his/her sister's death due to poor medical services and due to discrimination, i.e. By God, if my sister was from the family of so-and-so…..But she was from a commoner. The interlocutor employs this Quranic SBU to frame his complaint in "frame of interpretation" (cf. Hansen and Terkourafi, 2023) similar to that used in the original Quranic text, which is about asking for providence and heavenly support in the time of despondency. This schematic knowledge serves as an implicated premise to draw a further inference, i.e. implicated conclusions, about the interlocutor's expressive illocutionary act in which s/he seeks sympathy from the audience. This indeed reflects the interactional and dynamic nature of common ground construction.

Conclusion

The present paper advances the argument that presuppositions can be triggered by making references to contextually rich and easily recognizable intertextual references. These presuppositions construct common ground and facilitate text comprehension. The paper attempts to provide a fresh perspective to the interplay of intertextuality, presupposition and common ground. In this respect, the analysis demonstrates that Quranic intertextual references used in online interactions can better be conceptualized as SBUs that trigger presuppositions

about the schematic knowledge necessary for common ground construction. This is reflected in situation-boundedness scores of these Quranic intertextual references (see Table no. 1) and their frequency and concordance analysis in the Arabic Web 2018 corpus (see Table no. 2). From an empirical perspective, analyzing speakers' metapragmatic awareness about the investigated Quranic SBUs, their number of hits and concordance in the corpus, and the authentic examples of their use conjointly indicate the extensive communal common ground shared by Arabic speaker and highlight those speakers' heavy reliance on schematic knowledge and presupposed contextual packages in facilitating the transition from the implicated premises to the implicated conclusions.

From an empirical perspective, the analysis lends empirical support for that Edward Hall's (1976) classification of Arabic as a high-context culture. This is because the analysis has shown that the informative value of these SBUs lies in their ability to strengthen existing contextual assumptions or to draw further inferences about the speaker's intended meaning. From a theoretical perspective, the analysis first highlights the fact that common ground is a dynamic construct rather than a purely cognitive and a logical one, as it constantly evolves in interaction (see Macagno 2023). Secondly, the analysis shows that processing schematic knowledge and presupposed contextual package in such SBUs is made via "associative reasoning" (Racanati, 2004), which can facilitate more conscious inferential processing. Finally, as the presupposed contextual packages of these SBUs minimize the effort of processing easily accessible and predictable information, they can be argued to maximize the communicative efficiency of high-context (lingua)cultures (cf. Levshina, 2023).

References

Alqarni, M. (2020). Mock impoliteness in Saudi Arabia: Evil eye expressive and responsive strategies. Journal of Pragmatics, 167, 4-19.

Bakhtin, M. (1986). Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Clark, B. (2013). Relevance Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, H. (2009) Context and common ground. In Mey, J. (Ed.) Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 116-119.

Culpeper, J. and Haugh, M. (2014). Pragmatics and the English Language. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

De Beaugrande, R.A. and Dressler, W.U. (1992). Introduction to text linguistics. New York: Longman.

De Saussure, L. (2013) Background Relevance. Journal of Pragmatics, 59 (2013) 178-189.

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

Fairclough, N. (2003). Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research. London: Routledge.

Félix-Brasdefer, C. (2017). Interlanguage Pragmatics. In Huang (Ed.), The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hansen, M. B. M., & Terkourafi, M. (2023). We need to talk about Hearer's Meaning!. Journal of Pragmatics. 208, 99-114.

Huang, Y. (2017). Pragmatics. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jucker, A. H. and Smith, S. (1996). Explicit and implicit ways of enhancing common ground in conversations. Pragmatics, 6(1): 1–18.

Juvan, M. (2008). History and poetics of intertextuality. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press.

Kecskes, I. (2010). Situation-bound utterances as pragmatic acts. Journal of Pragmatics, 42(11), 2889-2897.

Kecskes, I. (2012). Situation-bound utterances in L1 and L2. (Vol. 19). Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.

Kecskes, I. (2014). Intercultural pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kecskes, I., Obdalova, O., Minakova, L., & Soboleva, A. (2018). A study of the perception of situation-bound utterances as culture-specific pragmatic units by Russian learners of English. System. 76 (1) 219-232.

Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman.

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

Levshina, N. (2023). Communicative Efficiency: Language Structure and Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macagno, F. (2023). Presupposition failures and the negotiation of the common ground. In Kecskes, I. (Ed.) Common Ground in First Language and Intercultural Interaction. Berlin: Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Maillat, D. (2013). Constraining context selection: On the pragmatic inevitability of manipulation. Journal of Pragmatics, 59, 190-199.

Polyzou, A. (2015). Presupposition in discourse: Theoretical and methodological issues. Critical Discourse Studies, 12(2), 123-138.

Recanati, F. (2004). Literal Meaning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saeed, J. (2016). Semantics. 4th Edition. Oxen: Blackwell Publishing.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach. London: Sage.

56