# A PRESUPPOSITIONAL ANALYSIS OF SPECIFIC INDEFINITES WITH REFERENCE TO TRANSLATION FROM ENGLISH INTO ARABIC

**Prof. Misbah. M.D. AL-Sulaimaan**
Department of English, Lebanese French University - Erbil.
mmd_alsulaimaan@yahoo.com

**Asst.Lect. Ayed. H. Omar**
Department of English, University of Mosul.

## ARTICLE INFO

## ABSTRACT

Presupposition is a process which enables people to communicate through which the addressee uses semantic and pragmatic elements to understand the message. For the addresser, presuppositional analysis is to be done before delivering a speech; for the addressee before answering and for the translator before translating. Specificity is about specific individuality or thing in the mind of the addresser and this individual or thing is to be reached by the quantificational or referential method by the addressee. In both English and Arabic, the less indefinite the more specific and the more indefinite the less specific. This study seeks to achieve the following aims: (1) specifying and studying different patterns of specific indefinites in books and periodicals of semantics, semiotics and pragmatics, (2) discovering any matches between English and Arabic regarding indefinites in general and specificity in particular, (3) choosing presuppositional analysis as a model for translating the specified patterns of specific indefinites and then justifying them, and (4) pin-pointing the similarities and differences between specific indefinites and definites. To achieve the above mentioned aims, the current thesis hypothesises that: (1) in most cases indefinite articles do not determine specificity, but presuppositional analysis does, (2) the addressee may achieve specificity by means of presuppositional analysis, some adjectives, quantifiers as well as co-text and context, (3) the addressee faces problems for presupposing specific and non-

specific indefinites with the source language and the case will be more problematic for the translator, (4) specific indefinites may be known or un-known for the addresser, and the addressee depends only on context in presuppositional analysis, and (5) it is easier for the addressee, through presuppositional analysis, to reach specificity when the addresser reports and acts and not only reports. To test the validity of the aforementioned hypotheses, the following procedure is used: (1) six texts, of twelve well-known scholars, have been selected from books of semantics and pragmatics, (2) these texts have been rendered and analysed with respect to presuppositional analysis by ten M.A students in the Department of Translation / College of Arts / University of Mosul / 2012-2013, and (3) an eclectic model has been derived from Russell's (1905) and Fodor and Sag's (1982) for presuppositional analysis of specific indefinites. The main findings have verified the hypotheses and finally the study ends with some recommendations for pedagogical implications and some suggestions for further studies

## I. THE CONCEPT OF PRESUPPOSITION

The notion of presupposition is usually engendered by the use of particular lexical items and/or linguistic constructions. Lexical items and linguistic constructions that give rise to presupposition are called presupposition triggers. We could point out three directories regarding the relation between sentences and the presupposing sentences in the history of presupposition since Frege (1892) till now. The first trend, which is represented by Frege (1892) and Strawson (1950), looks at presupposition as semantic notion, i.e. it is related to reference, referentiality, denoting, conventionality, un-contextualized sentences, T-values, constant under negation, existentiality, true and false sentences, and bio-relational sentences. This phase which is called the pure semantic of presupposition is too much close to the entailment notion (Strawson, 1952:187, Gazdar, 1979:142, and Tossavainen, 1997:8).

The second phase is concentrated on pragmatic intuitions, and represented by so many scholars like Karttunen (1974), Stalnaker (1974), and others. They regard presupposition as pragmatic, conversational, contextualized sentences, sentences in utterance, inferential, tri-relation (addresser, addressee and utterance) (de Beaugrande, 1981:10, and Tossavainen, 1997:8).

The third direction is a combination between semantic and pragmatic intuitions and is represented by Strawson (1950 and 1964), Van Frassen (1968), Allwood (1972), Atlas (1975 and 1977), Kempson (1975 and 1988), and others. This group of scholars look at this relation as a controversial one (whether it is semantic, pragmatic or a combination of both) (Gazdar, 1979:143, and Tossavainen, 1997:13-14).

Semantic presupposition is represented by Frege (1892), who is a German mathematician who may be regarded as the first to study and explain presupposition in the modern linguistic history. His presupposition concept is: "presuppositions are special conditions that must be met in order for a linguistic expression to have a denotation" (cited in Beaver, 2001:6).

The second notion of presupposition is the pragmatic one which flourished in the 1970's and 1980's of the last century. Although those who adopt this notion express it in different ways and forms, it still represents their pragmatic views and intuitions about presupposition. For them meaning cannot be isolated from contexts as semanticists have done before.

Karttunen and Peters (1977:360) are of the first who discuss the pragmatic views of presupposition expressing them as: "presuppositions which the sentences are not primarily about but which have to be established prior to utterances of the sentences in order for communication to go smoothly".

To conclude, presupposition is a process which enables people to communicate and this process is so easy when an addresser uses semantic properties like entailment, T-values, definite descriptions, etc. and it is so difficult when he uses properties like inferences, conversational implicatures, etc. To reach the right presupposition and assumption, which an addresser means, an addressee is going to emerge semantic and pragmatic features.

## II. PRESUPPOSITION AND SPECIFIC INDEFINITES

## SPECIFICITY AND ITS BACKGROUND

Specificity and presupposition are related to each other. Geurts (2002) follows Foley and Van Valin (1985) and Foley (1994), among others, to distinguish between foreground and background distinction purely in terms of informational prominence. Foreground information is anchored to the context while background information does not entail giveness, so the latter is of less interest than the former (Geurts, 2002:140).

Specificity dates back to Givon (1978) on his determiner phrase (DP) while Donnellan (1966) relates specificity and non-specificity to refrentiality and attributivity. Guella, et al. (2008:58) take their examples from Donellan (1966) to illustrate:

1) **Smith's murderer must be insane.**

The indefinites can have specific or non-specific readings.

Specificity does not have a wide history in that it started to be studied in the late of the 1960's. Traditional grammarians do not address the contrasts associated with specificity directly. They are certainly aware of different readings of indefinites such as referents establishing, generic, and predicational readings, but they do not explicitly use or name the concept of specificity (Von Heusinger, 2011a:2). He adds that the first wave of investigation on specificity was initiated by Donnellan (1966) and Karttunen (1968, 1969 and 1976).

There are more than one definition of specificity. Von Heusinger (2002a:268) proposes a definition of specificity. In his definition "specificity indicates that an expression is referentially anchored to another object in the discourse". Referentially anchored means that the referent of the specific NP is functionally dependent on the referent of another expression. Furthermore, he assumes that this relation is sentence bound, i.e. a specific NP can only be anchored to discourse terms that are explicit in the same sentence (or to the addresser of the sentence). However, a similar definition proposed by Ionin (2003) is different from that of Von Heusinger (2002a) that it was based on Fodor and Sag's (1982). "The addresser of the context c refers to exactly one individual xc, and there exists a property y which the addresser considers noteworthy in c, and xc and y in c. "The specific reading of the DP is characterized by the certainty of the addresser about the identity of the referent in mind" (Guella, et al, 2008:59). Von Heusinger (2011b:9) produces another definition of it that "it is a semantic and pragmatic notion that distinguishes between different uses of interpretations of indefinite noun phrases".

An addresser has a referent in his mind and he could identify it. This referent has an important role to play in the discourse. This referent could be a topic - has referentiality - has a number of anaphoric expressions, etc (Von Heusinger, et al. 2010:2), as in the following examples:

2)
   a. Every student recited a poem of Al – Jawahiree. (unmarked)
   b. Every student recited this poem of Al-Jawahiree. (referential).
   c. Every student recited some poem of Al – Jawahiree. (scope / partative).
   d. Every student recited a certain poem of Al – Jawahiree. (epistemic).

(a poem) in (2a.) refers to many poems. (This poem) in (2b.) refers to one poem. (some poem) in (2c.) refers to some of his poems. (a certain poem) in (2d.) refers to a one which is in the mind of the addresser and he knows, e.g.

**3)**

    a.  Susan wanted to meet <u>this doctor</u>. (there was a doctor).

    b.  Susan wanted to meet <u>a doctor</u>. (there is a doctor).

When an addresser talks about a specific indefinite the referent is unique. Von Heusinger, et al. (2010:3) believe that "specificity" and definiteness are two independent expressions. Definiteness is related to pragmatic familiarity, while specificity is a more referential structure of the item. The addresser is certain about the referent he talks about in specificity like (a certain). Specificity of NPs is not a subcategory of indefinite NPs, but an independent one. In specificity there is "specific vs. non specific", e.g.

**4) Ali is searching for a <u>book</u>.**

    a.  Ali is searching for a any book. / non - specific.

    b.  Ali is searching for a book namely, pragmatics by Palmer. / (specific).

Definite NPs are used when both (addresser and addressee) can identify the referent. Specific indefinite NPs are used when only (addresser) knows the referent, non-specific indefinites when no one of them can identify the referent. Some linguists define specificity as referentiality. The criteria of definiteness is identifiability by addresser or addressee, e.g.

**5) <u>The book</u> is over there.**

The definite is identifiable for both (addresser/addressee). We could refer to specificity in the following equations.

1- Specific indefinite NPs = addresser known/addressee unknown.

2- Non-specific indefinite NPs = addresser unknown/addressee unknown.

3- Definite NPs = addresser known/addressee known .

Not everything is identifiable, e.g.

**6) I told him a <u>secret</u>.**

In this example although "a secret" is unknown (its identity) by the addresser, still it is a specific NP. This case is known as "Relative specificity", e.g.

**7)**

    a.  <u>A man</u> was killed yesterday. (specific indefinite).

    b.  <u>A man</u> has two hands. ( non-specific indefinite).

    c.  <u>The man</u> I told you about is here. (specific definite).

One can conclude that old grammarians do not address the concepts associated with specificity directly. They do not use or name the concept explicitly. It does not have such a history. Referentially speaking, specificity means that the referent of the specific NP is functionally dependent on the referent of another expression. The referent is unique in specific indefinite, while the addresser and the addressee are familiar with the person, thing, individual, etc when the addresser uses a definite article.

## III. THE MODEL ADOPTED

The model adopted in this study is an eclectic one that comes from two models ; the first one is the quantificational by Russell (1905) (يعتمد على اللفظ )  which depends on the existence of the indefinites in the linguistic context ( co-text ), and the referential model ) by Fodor and Sag (1982) ( يعتمد على المعنى ) which is based on identifying specific indefinites as referring expressions and they are ambiguous. The outcome is a semantic and pragmatic model. The pragmatic analysis is to be taken in analyzing specific indefinites. Although some certain expressions are identifying specificity semantically i.e. within the linguistic context, but still they are to be adopted pragmatically when they are analyzed from the addressee's point of view . By this model we reach the communicative approach in translation .

## IV. TRANSLATION , DATA ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

### 1. PRESUPPOSITION AND TRANSLATION

Presupposition relates contextual information to linguistic structure, so it is useful for the study of translation. According to de Vasconcellos (1985:1), translation is concerned with capturing the meaningful components in an original text in order to reconstruct them in a text of the target language. The notion of "meaningful equivalence" is the main problematic area. Is it to be expanded from formal semantics to include contextual factors of the communicative situation in which translations are made?. There are two approaches to translation: (1) a prescriptive approach which proceeds from notions of how a translation should be made to the construction of a translation itself, and (2) a descriptive approach in which investigation begins with how translation has been made. The more recent approaches in the field of translation have been descriptive because they focus upon the actual practice of translation within a specific historical context. A descriptive approach will first establish a framework to capture context-dependent meaning, whereas perspective approach will first attempt to isolate a reader/translator-independent dimension of meaning in a text (see Hermans, 1985:13 and Lambert and Van Gorp, 1985:42). The goal of  descriptive approach is the same as that of translation of presupposition because they indicate relationships between text and context.

Regarding formal semantics as the single criterion means that translation is to be evaluated arbitrarily. Ehrman (1993:151) adds that focusing on formal semantics ignores that the source text and translation differ in terms of their information text. For him the descriptive approach determines relative factors in the process of translation and these factors govern both the production and the perception of a translation.

Prersupposition measures context and its influence on the translation process. Structures of knowledge of both ST and its translation are necessary. Knowing the structures of knowledge is to be achieved by presupposition. Presupposition is a link between the conceptual structure inside the text and that of its historical context (Ehrman, 1993:153).

From what has been said so far, one can say that presupposition is captured by conveying meaning from the ST to the TT, and as in presupposition, meaning is captured by linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge, so the process of translation is the same as that of presupposition. A good translator is a one who presupposes well and vice versa. Presuppositions are carried out by terms and inferences which a translator depends on in his job. For the researcher translation is presupposition. Not only there is a strong relation between translation and presupposition but we can say that presupposition is translation itself. Translators do their job by translating the surface meaning (in linguistic terms) and the deep meaning (in inferences) and the same is true for presupposition.

## 2. DATA ANALYSIS

The steps adopted in discussing data analysis are presenting: (1) the SL text, (2) the subjects' text analysis which reveals the cognitive conduct of the subjects, (3) TL texts that express the subjects' renderings, (4) the presuppositional analysis of the scholar, (5) the translational analysis of subjects' renderings, and (6) justification for the proposed rendering in case of the subjects' success or giving a new rendering in case of failure.

### SL Text (1)

(1)a. John tried to find a piano. ( but he did not succeed in finding   one ).

    b. John tried to lift a piano. ( but he did not succeed in lifting it ).

Karttunen (1976:368).

## Subjects' Text Analysis

| Subj. | | Source Text (English) — Addresser — Indefinite — Specific — Known | Unknown | Non-Specific | Target Text (Arabic) — Addressee or Translator — Indefinite — Specific — Known | Unknown | Non-Specific | Definite |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | a |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  |  |
|  | b |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  |  |
| 2 | a | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |
|  | b | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 3 | a | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |
|  | b | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 4 | a |  |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |  |
|  | b |  |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |  |
| 5 | a | .. | .. | .. |  |  |  | ✓ |
|  | b | .. | .. | .. |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 6 | a | ✓ |  |  | .. | .. | .. | .. |
|  | b |  | ✓ |  | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 7 | a |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
|  | b | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 8 | a |  |  | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | b | | ﺤ | | | | ﺤ |
| 9 | a | ﺤ | | | | ﺤ | |
| | b | | ﺤ | | | ﺤ | |
| 10 | a | ﺤ | | | ﺤ | | |
| | b | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |

**TL Texts**

1- أ - حاول جون شراء بيانو الا أنهُ لم يجد أيَّ منها .

- ب - حاول جون سرقة بيانو الا أنهُ لم يفلح في ذلك .

2- أ - حاول جون ان يجد بيانو ( لكنه لم ينجح في العثور على واحد ) .

- ب - حاول جون ان يحمل بيانو لكنه لم ينجح في ذلك .

3-أ - حاول جون أن يجد آلة بيانو ( لكنه لم ينجح في ايجاد أي واحدة ) .

- ب - حاول جون أن يرفع آلة البيانو لكنه لم ينجح في ذلك .

4- أ - حاول جون ان يجد بيانو( لكنه لم ينجح في ايجاد واحد ( أو بيانو ) .

- ب - حاول جون رفع بيانو ( ولكنه لم ينجح في رفعه ) .

5- أ - حاول جون أن يعثر على آلة بيانو ( و لكنه لم ينجح في العثور على واحدة ) .

- ب - حاول جون حمل آلة بيانو ( ولكنه لم ينجح في حملها ) .

6- أ - حاول جون ايجاد بيانو ( لكن الحظ لم يكن حليفه في العثور على واحد ) .

- ب - حاول جون حمل بيانو ( بيد أنهُ لم يُفلح في ذلك ) .

7- أ - حاول جون أن يجد بيانو ( لكنه لم يفلح في ايجاده ) .

- ب - حاول جون أن يرفع ألبيانو لكنه لم يستطع .

8- أ - حاول جون العثور على البيانو ( ولكنه لم يفلح في ذلك ) .

- ب - حاول جون رفع البيانو ( لكنه لم يفلح في ذلك ) .

9- أ - حاول بيل العثور على بيانو الا أنه لم يفلح في العثور عليه .

- ب - حاول بيل رفع البيانو الا أنه لم يفلح في رفعه .

10- أ - حاول جون رفع بيانو لكن الحظ لم يحالفه في إيجاد واحدةً .

- ب - حاول جون رفع بيانو لكنه لم ينجح في رفعها .

### Presuppositional Analysis

There are also cases where the verbs involved partially disambiguate the sentence by making one interpretation far more plausible to the reader than the other. For example, the NP "a piano" in (1a.) is naturally understood non-specifically, that is, as meaning "any piano", while the same noun phrase in (1b.) suggests the interpretation "a certain piano". It is something about the verb "lift " that suggests that "a piano" describes some specific object. On the other hand, (1a.) is easily understood to inform us only about the kind of object John was trying to find. (1b.) establishes a discourse referent, i.e. "the piano that John tried to lift", but (1a.) certainly does not justify a latter reference to "the piano that John tried to find".

### Translational Analysis

In this text there is no adjective or what refers to specificity, so in this case the subjects have to depend on meaning to reach it. Triggers are so important in deciding whether the NP is specific or not because in this text there are two verbs (find and lift). These two verbs or triggers are different in meaning, and what gives a hint to specificity is the complement. In the first sentence using (one) is different from using (it) in the second sentence. It is used anaphorically to refer to the same noun which is used in the second sentence. Although the indefinite article is used in (1b.) in the ST, the subjects (3,7,8, and 9) used the definite article in the TT. This indicates that the subjects believe that the indefinite is specific in this sentence. In the ST (1a.) is specific (known) for subjects (2,3,6,9, and 10), specific (unknown) for (1, and 7), non-specific for (4, and 8), and there is no answer by (5). In the TT (3b.) is specific (known) for subject (1), specific (unknown) for (4, and 9), definite for (2,3,5, and 8), and there is no answer by (6). In the TT (1a.) is specific (known) for subjects (2,3, and 7), specific (unknown) for (1,6,8, and 9), non-specific for (4), and there is no answer by (5, and 10). In the TT (1b.) is specific (known) for subject (1), non-specific for (4, 9), definite for (2,3,5,7, and 8), and there is no answer by (6, and 10).

## Justifying the Proposed Rendering

| Text. | | Source Text (English) | | | Target Text (Arabic) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Addresser | | | Addressee or Translator | | | |
| | | Indefinite | | | Indefinite | | | Definite |
| | | Specific | | Non- | Specific | | Non- | |
| | | Known | Unknown | Specific | Known | Unknown | Specific | |
| 1 | a | | | �‎ﺢ | | | | ﻊ | |
| | b | ﻊ | | | | ﻊ | | |

The addresser is not John, but somebody is reporting something about him. In the ST and TT (1a.) is non-specific for the translator. In the ST (1b.) is specific (known) for the addresser and thus it reads as (John tried to lift a certain piano), while in the TT (1b.) is specific (unknown) for the translator. In texts like this, the quantificational model alone is not enough in deciding specificity, so the translator has to use the eclectic one.

## The Proposed Rendering

1. ﺃ - ﺣَﺎﻭَﻝَ ﺟﻮْﻥْ ﺃﻥْ ﻳَﺠِﺪَ ﺑْﻴَﺎﻧﻮْ ( ﺇﻻ ﺃﻧَّﻪُ ﻟَﻢْ ﻳَﻨْﺠَﺢْ ﻓﻲْ ﺃﻥْ ﻳَﺠِﺪَ ﻭَﺍﺣِﺪﺍً) .

ﺏ - ﺣَﺎﻭَﻝَ ﺟﻮْﻥْ ﺃﻥْ ﻳَﺮْﻓَﻊَﺑﻴَﺎﻧﻮْ (ﺇﻻ ﺃﻧَّﻪُ ﻟَﻢْ ﻳَﻨْﺠَﺢْ ﻓِﻲ ﺭَﻓْﻌِﻪِ ).

## SL Text (2)

(2)      I accused a certain student of cheating .Fodor and Sag(1982:362).

## Subjects' Text Analysis

| Subj. | | Source Text (English) | | | Target Text (Arabic) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Addresser | | | Addressee or Translator | | | |
| | | Indefinite | | | Indefinite | | | |
| | | Specific | | Non- | Specific | | Non- | Definite |
| | | Known | Unknown | Specific | Known | Unknown | Specific | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | ﺤ | | | ﺤ | | | |
| 2 | ﺤ | | | | | | ﺤ |
| 3 | ﺤ | | | | | ﺤ | |
| 4 | ﺤ | | | | ﺤ | | |
| 5 | ﺤ | | | | ﺤ | | |
| 6 | | | ﺤ | | | ﺤ | |
| 7 | | ﺤ | | | ﺤ | | |
| 8 | | ﺤ | | | | ﺤ | |
| 9 | ﺤ | | | ﺤ | | | |
| 10 | | ﺤ | | | ﺤ | | |

**TL Texts**

1- أُتهم طالباً بعينه في الغش .

2- اتهمت طالباً معينا بالغش .

3- اتهمت أحد الطلاب بالغش .

4-ً اتهمت طالباً محددا ( أو معيناً ) بالغش .

5- اتهمت طالباً معينا بالغش .

6- اتهمت طالباً لاعلى التعيين بالغش .

7- اتهمت طالباً معينا بالغش .

8- اتهمت احد الطلبة بالغش .

9- اتهمت طالباً معين بالغش .

10- اتهمت طالباً من الطلبة بالغش .

## Presuppositional Analysis

The modifier "certain" in (2) favors a referential understanding of an indefinite. The stronger claim is sometimes make "certain and particular" force maximally wide scope interpretations of a quantifier with respect to higher predicates, negation, and so forth.

## Translational Analysis

There is what refers to specificity in this text by using (certain) in the ST. This makes a difficult job easier for the subjects to know that the indefinite here is specific at least for the addresser, but it is difficult for the addressee or (translator) to know. The renderings of subjects (3,6,8, and 10) are not obvious regarding specificity because the translation of adjective (certain) does not appear in the TT. The other renderings (1,2,4,5,7, and 9) use the equivalent adjective ( معينا , محددا , بعينه ) in the TT. The indefinite article (a certain student) in the ST is nothing but specific for the addresser. In the SL text, (2) is specific (known) for subjects (1,2,3,4,5, and 9), specific (unknown) for (7,8, and 10), and non-specific for (6). In the TL text (2), is specific (known) for subjects (1, and 9), specific (unknown) for (4,5,7, and 10), non-specific for (3,6, and 8), and definite for (2).

## Justifying the Proposed Rendering

| Text. | Source Text (English) | | | Target Text (Arabic) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Addresser | | | Addressee or Translator | | | |
| | Indefinite | | | Indefinite | | | Definite |
| | Specific | | Non-Specific | Specific | | Non-Specific | |
| | Known | Unknown | | Known | Unknown | | |
| 2 | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |

The addresser is not reporting but saying something about himself. In the ST the indefinite is specific (known) for the addresser while it is specific (unknown) for the translator. The quantificational model is of great use, but still the referential model is important to decide specificity. What is known for the addresser may be unknown for the addressee, and this cannot be reached but through the eclectic model.

**The Proposed Rendering**

2- إتَّهَمْتُ طَالِباً مُعيّناً بِالْغِشّ .

**SL Text (3)**

(3)     There is this giant spider in the cupboard. Geurts (2002:130).

**Subjects' Text Analysis**

| Subj. | Source Text (English) | | | Target Text (Arabic) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Addresser | | | Addressee or Translator | | | |
| | Indefinite | | | Indefinite | | | Definite |
| | Specific | | Non-Specific | Specific | | Non-Specific | |
| | Known | Unknown | | Known | Unknown | | |
| 1 | � | | | | | | � |
| 2 | ﬥ | | | | | | ﬥ |
| 3 | ﬥ | | | ﬥ | | | |
| 4 | ﬥ | | | | | ﬥ | |
| 5 | ﬥ | | | | | | ﬥ |
| 6 | ﬥ | | | | ﬥ | | |
| 7 | ﬥ | | | | | | ﬥ |
| 8 | ﬥ | | | | | | ﬥ |
| 9 | ﬥ | | | | ﬥ | | |
| 10 | ﬥ | | | ﬥ | | | |

**TL Texts**

1- كان هذا العنكبوت العملاق في خزانة الملابس .

2- هنالك عنكبوت عملاق في الخزانة .

3- ياله من عنكبوت كبير في الخزانة .

4- يوجد هنا عنكبوت ضخم في الخزانة .

5- يوجد عنكبوت عملاق في الخزانة .

6- هنالك عنكبوت كبير في خزانة الملابس .

7- هنا ذلك العنكبوت الضخم في الخزانة .

8- هذا العنكبوت العملاق موجود في الخزانة .

9- ثمة عنكبوت بهذا الحجم في الخزانة .

10- هنالك عنكبوت كبير في الخزانة .

**Presuppositional Analysis**

Although formally "this" is a definite article, it sometimes appears to function as if it were indefinite. When used in this manner, these NPs function as indefinites because, intuitively, they introduce discourse entities that are new.

**Translational Analysis**

Generally speaking, the demonstrative (this) is used with definiteness, but in some cases it is used to refer to indefiniteness. Definiteness is used in a discourse when the indefinite is mentioned for the second time, so it is to be known within the discourse and not within the real world. The words (this) and (giant) indicate specificity. Subjects (1,4, and 8) use ( هذا ) which is equivalent to (this) in the ST. Subjects (2,3,5,6,9, and 10) use the indefiniteness in the TT and subject (7) uses the definiteness in the TT. In the ST, the indefinite article is specific (known) for subjects (1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9, and 10). All subjects agree upon this result because of the demonstrative "this". In the TT, indefiniteness is specific (known) for subjects (3, and 10), specific (unknown) for (6, and 9), non-specific for (4), and definite for (1,2,5,7, and 8).

## Justifying the Proposed Rendering

| Text. | Source Text (English) | | | Target Text (Arabic) | | | |
| | Addresser | | | Addressee or Translator | | | |
| | Indefinite | | | Indefinite | | | Definite |
| | Specific | | Non- | Specific | | Non- | |
| | Known | Unknown | Specific | Known | Unknown | Specific | |
| 3 | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |

In the ST, the indefinite article is specific (known) for the addresser because the demonstrative "this" carries the meaning of specificity and in most cases it refers to something definite. This word helps the addressee or the translator through the quantificational model to reach specificity. In the TT, the indefiniteness is specific (unknown) for the translator.

## The Proposed Rendering

3- هَذَا العَنْكَبُوتُ الكَبِيرُ موجود فيْ الخِزَانَةِ .

## SL Text (4)

(4)    If three relatives of mine die, I will inherit a house.

Geurts (2002:130).

## Subjects' Text Analysis

| Subj. | Source Text (English) | | | Target Text (Arabic) | | | |
| | Addresser | | | Addressee or Translator | | | |
| | Indefinite | | | Indefinite | | | Definite |
| | Specific | | Non- | Specific | | Non- | |
| | Known | Unknown | Specific | Known | Unknown | Specific | |
| 1 | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2** | � | | | | | | ﺢ | | | ﺢ |
| **3** | | | ﺢ | | | | ﺢ |
| **4** | | | ﺢ | | | ﺢ | |
| **5** | | | ﺢ | | | | ﺢ |
| **6** | ﺢ | | | | ﺢ | | |
| **7** | | | ﺢ | | | ﺢ | |
| **8** | | | ﺢ | | ﺢ | | |
| **9** | | | ﺢ | | | | ﺢ |
| **10** | ﺢ | | | ﺢ | | | |

**TL Texts**

1- سأرث بيتاً لو توفيّ ثلاثةُ من اقربائي .

2- سأرث منزلاً اذا توفي ثلاث أقارب لي .

3- سوف أرث منزلاً اذا توفى ثلاث من أقربائي .

4- إذا توفى ثلاثة من أقربائي , فسأرثُ منزلاً .

5- سوف أرث منزلاً في حال توفي ثلاث من اقاربي .

6- سأرث بيتاً , إذا لقي ثلاث من أقاربي حتفهم .

7- إذا توفى ثلاثة من أقربائي  فسأرثُ بيتاًَ .

8- سأرث منزلاً اذا توفي ثلاثة من اقربائي .

9- إن توفى ثلاثة من أقاربي سأرثُ منزلاً .

10- إن مات ثلاثاً من أقربائي , عندها سأرثُ البيت .

## Presuppositional Analysis

On the most likely reading of (4) the indefinite "three relatives of mine" is construed with narrow scope, but if it gets a specific reading and out-scopes the if-clause, then it can only be understood collectively. That is to say, if the indefinite is specific it means that "all of the three relatives of mine die".

## Translational Analysis

The addresser has more than three relatives, so the three that he is talking about are non-specific. If the addresser has only three relatives, so in this case the NP is specific. The rendering of subject (2) differs from these of others in ( ثلاث أقارب لي ) reveals that the indefinite is specific (known) while it is ( ثلاثة من أقربائي ). The latter is more accurate because it points out that the addresser has more than three relatives. In the ST, the indefinite article "three relatives of mine" is specific (known) for subjects (2,6, and 10), specific (unknown) for (1), and non-specific for (3,4,5,7,8, and 9). In the TT, the indefinite is specific (known) for subject (10), specific (unknown) for (1,6, and 8), non-specific for (4, 7), and definite for (2,3,5, and 9). Presupposition is blocked by using "If clause" so the complement may be non detachable.

## Justifying the Proposed Rendering

| Text. | Source Text (English) | | | Target Text (Arabic) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Addresser | | | Addressee or Translator | | | |
| | Indefinite | | | Indefinite | | | Definite |
| | Specific | | Non- | Specific | | Non- | |
| | Known | Unknown | Specific | Known | Unknown | Specific | |
| 4 | | | � | | | ﻟ | |

The addresser has more than three relatives, so in this case he is not talking about three specific relatives but three non-specific relatives which means that the three relatives are non-specific. The indefinite article is non-specific for the addresser in the ST and also for the translator in the TT.

## The Proposed Rendering

4- إذَا وَافَى الأَجَلُ ثَلاثَةً مِنْ أَقاربي فأَنِّيْ سأَرِثُ بَيْتَاً .

## SL Text (5)

(5)     There are three relatives of mine such that, if they all die , I will

inherit  a house.  Geurts (2002:133).

## Subjects' Text Analysis

| Subj. | Source Text (English) | | | Target Text (Arabic) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Addresser | | | Addressee or Translator | | | |
| | Indefinite | | | Indefinite | | | Definite |
| | Specific | | Non-Specific | Specific | | Non-Specific | |
| | Known | Unknown | | Known | Unknown | | |
| 1 | | � | | | � | | |
| 2 | � | | | | | | ﺿ |
| 3 | ﺿ | | | | | | ﺿ |
| 4 | ﺿ | | | | ﺿ | | |
| 5 | ﺿ | | | | | | ﺿ |
| 6 | ﺿ | | | | ﺿ | | |
| 7 | ﺿ | | | ﺿ | | | |
| 8 | ﺿ | | | | ﺿ | | |
| 9 | ﺿ | | | | | | ﺿ |
| 10 | ﺿ | | | ﺿ | | | |

**TL Texts**

1- سأرثُ بيتاً في حالة وفاة اقربائي الثلاثة من الورثة .

2- عندي ثلاث اقارب في حال موتهم جميعاً , سأرث منزلاً .

3- لدي ثلاثٌ من الاقرباء وفي حالة وفاتهم سأرث منزلاً .

4- هنالك ثلاثة من أقربائي جميعاً , سأرث منزلاً .

5- لدي ثلاثةُ اقارب في حال موتهم جميعاً سأرثُ منزلاً .

6- هنالك ثلاثُ أقارب لي ولو أنّ جميعهم لقي حتفهم , سأرثُ منزلاً .

7- عندي ثلاثة أقرباء , فأذا توفي هؤلاء كلهم , سأرث بيتاً .

8- سأرث منزلا اذا توفي اقربائي الثلاثة كلهم .

9- ثمة ثلاثة من اقاربي لو ماتوا كلهم , في هذه الحالة سأرث منزلاً .

10- هنالك ثلاث من اقربائي سأرث البيت إن لاقو المنية .

**Presuppositional Analysis**

The reading of this sentence is specific because there are the three relatives no more no less, whom the addresser puts in mind collectively.

**Translational Analysis**

In this text, there are only three relatives, so they are specific for the addresser. This means that these three relatives are known by him. There are two indefinite noun phrases; (three relatives of mine) and (a house). The first nine subjects keep using the indefiniteness in the TT (منزلا أو بيتا) while only the tenth subject uses the definite noun (ألبيت). Using definiteness in the TT means that (a house) is specific. The concentration in this text is on the first indefinite article "three relatives of mine". The presupposition in this text is blocked by the conditional "If" which means that the addresser may or may not inherit a house. The rendering of subject (4) is not complete because "If" does not appear. In the ST, the indefinite article is specific (known) for subjects (2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9, and 10), and specific (unknown) for (1). In the TT, the indefinite article is specific (known) for subjects (7, and 10), specific (unknown) for (1,4,6, and 8), and definite for (2,3,5, and 9).

### Justifying the Proposed Rendering

| Text. | Source Text (English) | | | Target Text (Arabic) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Addresser | | | Addressee or Translator | | | |
| | Indefinite | | Non- | Indefinite | | Non- | Definite |
| | Specific | | | Specific | | | |
| | Known | Unknown | Specific | Known | Unknown | Specific | |
| **5** | ٮ | | | | ٮ | | |

The addresser has three of his relatives in mind i.e. the indefinite article is specific for him. There is no hint in the text that the translator depends on, so he uses the referential model as well as the quantificational one to reach specificity. In the ST, the indefinite article is specific (known) for the addresser while it is specific (unknown) for the translator in the TT. The same analysis of "three relatives of mine" can be applied to the indefinite "a house".

### The Proposed Rendering

<div dir="rtl">

5- هنالِكَ ثلاثَةٌ مِنْ أَقارِبِيْ إذَا وَافَاهُمُ الأَجَلُ جَمِيْعاً سَأَرِثُ بَيْتاً .

</div>

### SL Text (6)

(6)    Most Professors recommend a certain book , namely their Ph.D.  thesis. Jäger (2007:123).

### Subjects' Text Analysis

| Subj. | Source Text (English) | | | Target Text (Arabic) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Addresser | | | Addressee or Translator | | | |
| | Indefinite | | Non- | Indefinite | | Non- | Definite |
| | Specific | | | Specific | | | |
| | Known | Unknown | Specific | Known | Unknown | Specific | |
| **1** | | | ٮ | | | ٮ | |
| **2** | | | ٮ | | | | ٮ |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3** | ﻉ | | | | | | ﻉ |
| **4** | | | ﻉ | | | ﻉ | |
| **5** | ﻉ | | | | | | ﻉ |
| **6** | ﻉ | | | | | | ﻉ |
| **7** | ﻉ | | | | | | ﻉ |
| **8** | ﻉ | | | | | ﻉ | |
| **9** | | | ﻉ | | | ﻉ | |
| **10** | ﻉ | | | ﻉ | | | |

**TL Texts**

1- يطلب معظم الاساتذة من طلابهم قراءة مصدر معين ولاسيما اطروحات الدكتوراه العائدة لهم

2- أوصى اغلب الاساتذة بكتاب معين وبالاخص اطاريح الدكتوراه خاصتهم .

3- ينصح معظم الاساتذة بكتاب معين . معين اطروحة الدكتوراه الخاصة بهم .

4- يوصي معظم اساتذة الجامعة ( البروفيسور ) بكتاب معين , الا وهو اطروحتهم في الدكتوراه

5- ينصح معظم الاساتذة الجامعيين بكتاب معين ومايقصدوه هي اطاريحهم الخاصة بشهادة الدكتوراه.

6- يوصي اغلب الاساتذة بكتاب معين , تحديداً اطروحتهم للدكتوراه .

7- يوصي اغلب الاساتذة باحد الكتب أعني رسالة الدكتوراه الخاصة بهم .

8- معظم الاساتذة ينصحون طلبتهم بقراءة كتاب معين ولاسيما اطاريحهم في الدكتوراه .

9- ينصح اغلب الاساتذة بقراءة كتاب معين وبالتحديد اطاريح الدكتوراه خاصتهم .

10- معظم الاساتذة ينصحون بكتاب معين , وغالبا ماتكون رسالة الدكتوراه خاصتهم .

**Presuppositional Analysis**

Every professor has his own Ph.D. thesis, so this is something specific. It is not any thesis but a certain thesis of every one of them. A certain book means a thesis which belongs to him. In this respect "a certain book" is specific one.

## Translational Analysis

There is what refers to the noun (book) which is (a certain). Every professor has his own and specific thesis, and it is known by him. Through out the co-text, the addressee or (translator) knows that this noun is specific. Nevertheless, they resort to their own context to do the analysis. The analysis cannot be achieved without using pragmatics, contextual meaning, and presuppositional analysis to reach that the indefinite is specific or not. All subjects use the indefiniteness in the TT ( كتاب ) , but it is specific ( معين ) . A book here is not any book, but it is the Ph.D. thesis, so this gives another hint to specificity.

## Justifying the Proposed Rendering

| Text. | Source Text (English) | | | Target Text (Arabic) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Addresser | | | Addressee or Translator | | | |
| | Indefinite | | | Indefinite | | | Definite |
| | Specific | | Non-Specific | Specific | | Non-Specific | |
| | Known | Unknown | | Known | Unknown | | |
| 6 | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | |

Although "a certain book" is specific (known) by the professors they are not the addresser. According to the addresser, the indefinite article is specific (unknown), so it can be read as "Most Professors recommend a certain book, namely their Ph.D. thesis but I do not know it". In the TT, the indefinite article is specific (unknown) for the translator. The adjective "certain" helps to point out that the indefinite is specific but we still in need for the quantificational model to reach the degree of specificity.

## The Proposed Rendering

6- أَغْلَبُ اَلَّذِيْنَ هُمْ بِدَرَجَةِ أَستاذ يُوصُوْنَ بِكِتَأْبَ مُعَيَّنٍ هُوَ رِسَأْلَتَهُمْ فِيْ اَلِدِكْتُوْرَأْه .

## 3. CONCLUSIONS

In the light of our findings in the practical part, the study has arrived at the following conclusions:

1. The addressee or the translator was unable to deduce the right choice of specificity unless they knew the shared context between them and the addresser. Knowing the shared context resulted in effective translation and this confirms hypotheses No.1,2,and 3.
2. What is known for the addresser may not be known for the addressee or the  translator through the use of presuppositional analysis and this led to failure in giving an effective translation and this confirms hypothesis No.3.
3. The existence of adjectives, relative clauses or quantifiers in texts may not lead to specifying the specific indefinites. Consequently, this resulted in failure to some extent in giving appropriate translations and this confirms hypothesis No.1.
4. Mistakes of specifying specificity or non-specificity which occurred in texts where the addresser only reported are more than those in texts where the addresser reported and acted. As a result subject translators depended on both reporting and acting to give adequate translations and this confirms hypothesis No.4.
5. Using presuppositional analysis, the translator used both his own co-text and context to grasp specificity depending on the eclectic model. In this case the communicative approach to translation was found to be the most effective one and this confirms hypothesis No.1.
6. In texts where adjectives, relative clauses or quantifiers are used, subject translators arrived at specificity in the ST more than that of the TT. Nonetheless, they failed to some extent in giving effective renderings and this confirms hypothesis No.1.
7. In texts where adjectives, relative clauses or quantifiers are not used, subject translators determined specificity by means of presuppositional analysis in the TT more than that of the ST. This led to effective renderings and this confirms hypothesis No.1.
8. In texts where the addresser reports and acts, subject translators reached both specificity and non-specificity in the ST more than that of the TT. Nonetheless, they failed to some extent to give appropriate renderings and this confirms hypothesis No.4.
9. The addressee or the translator depended on both context and co-text in use of presuppositional analysis to arrive at specificity and thus gave effective renderings.

## V.  REFERENCES

Allwood, J. (1972). "Negation and The Strength of Presuppositions".  In: Dahl, Ö. (ed.): Logic , Pragmatics and Grammar, Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg, pp.11-52.

Atlas, J. D. (1975). "Frege's Polymorphous Concept of Presupposition and Its Role in a Theory of Meaning". Semantikos, Vol.1, pp.29-44.

............... (1977). "Negation , Ambiguity and Presupposition".  Linguistics and Philosophy, Vol.1, pp.321-336.

Beaver, D.   (2001). Presupposition and Assertion in Dynamic Semantics, Stanford CA: CSLI Publications.

deBeaugrande, R. and Dressler, W. (1981). Introduction to Text Linguistics, London: Longman Group Ltd.

deVasconcellos, M. H. (1985). Theme and Focus : Cross – Language Comparison via Translations from Extended Discourse, Georgetown:  Georgetown University Press.

Donnellan, K. S. (1966). "Reference and Definite Descriptions".   Philosophical Review, Vol.75, pp.281-304.

Ehrman, J. F. (1993). "Pragmatics and Translation : The Problem of Presupposition". TTR :Traduction, Terminologie , Rédaction, Vol.6, No.1, pp.149-170.

Fodor, J. A. & Sag, I. A. (1982). "Referential and Quantificational Indefinites ". Linguistics and Philosophy, Vol.5, pp.355-398.

Foley, W. A. and Van Valin, R. D. (1985). "Information Packaging in The Clause". In: Shopen, T. (ed.) : Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Vol.1, pp.282-364.

Foley, W. A. (1994). "Information Structure". In: Asher, R. E. (ed.): The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, Oxford: Pergamon Press, Vol.3, pp.1678-1685.

Frege, G. (1892)(1952). Über Sinn and Bedeutung .ZeitschriftfürPhilosophie und PhilosophischeKritik NE 100: 25 -50 . (Trans  As )" On Sense and Reference". In: Geach, P. and Black, M. (eds.): Translations from the Philosophical Writings of GottlobFrege, (3rd Edition) , pp.56-78.

Gazdar, G. (1979). Pragmatics :Implicature , Presupposition and Logical Form, New York: New York Academic Press.

Geurts, B. (2002). "Specific Indefinites , Presupposition ,and Scope".    In: Bäuerle, Rainer. U, Reyle. Uwe. and Zimmermann, Thomas. E. (eds.): Presuppositions and Discourse, Emerald: Bingley,  pp.125-158.

Givon, T. (1978). "Definiteness and Referentiality". In: Greenberg, J. &Fergusen, C. &Moravesik, E. (eds.): Universals of Human Language, Stanford: Stanford University Press, Vol.4, pp.291-330.

Guella, H. Déprez, V. and Sleeman, P. (2008). "Article Choice Parameters in L2". In: Slabakova, Roumyana. (ed.): Proceedings of The 9th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference, Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp.57-69.

Hermans, T. (1985). "Introduction : Translation Studies and a New Paradigm". In: Hermans, Theo. (ed.): The Manipulation of Literature : Studies in Literary Translation, London: Croom Helm,  pp.7-15.

Ionin, T. (2003). Article Semantics in Second Language Acquisition , (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation), Cambridge, MA:  MIT Press .

Jäger, G. (2007). "Partial Variables and Specificity". In: Sauerland, Uli. andStateva, Penka. (eds.): Presupposition and Implicature in Compositional Semantics, London:  Palgrave McMillan, pp.121-162.

Karttunen, L. (1968). What Do Referential Indices Refer to ?, Santa Monica: The RAND Corporation.

……………   (1969)(1976). "Discourse Referents". In: McCawley, J. (ed.): Syntax and Semantics : Notes from The Linguistic Underground, New York: New York Academic Press, Vol.7, pp.363-385.

…………… (1974). "Presupposition and Linguistic Context".   Theoretical Linguistics, Vol.1, pp.181-193.

Karttunen, L. and Peters, S. (1977). "Requiem for Presupposition". Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Barkeley Linguistics Society, pp.360-371.

Kempson, R. (1975). Presupposition and Delimitation of Semantics,  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

…………… (1988). "Grammar and Conversational Principles". In: Newmeyer, Fredrick. J. (ed.): Linguistics : The Cambridge Survey, Vol.2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.139-164.

Lambert, J. and Van Gorp, H. (1985). "On Describing Translations". In: Hermans, Theo. (ed.): The Manipulation of Literature : Studies in Literary Translation, London: Croom Helm, pp.42-53.

Stalnaker, R. (1974). "Pragmatic Presuppositions". In: Munitz, M. & Unger, P. (eds.): Semantics and Philosophy, New York: New York University Press, pp. 197-214.

Strawson, P. F. (1950). "On Referring". Mind, Vol.59, pp320-344.

…………… (1952). Introduction to Logical Theory, London: Methuen.

…………… (1964). "Intention and Convention in Speech acts". Philosophical Review, Vol.73, pp.439-460.

Tossavainen, H. (1997). Presupposition in Reading Literary Writing, (Unpublished M.A Thesis) , University of JYV ASKYLA.

Van Frassen, P. (1968). "Presupposition , Implication and Self-Reference". Journal of Philosophy, Vol.65, pp.136-152.

Von Heusinger, K. (2002a). " Specificity and Definiteness in Sentence and Discourse Structure ". Journal of Semantics, Vol.19, No.3, pp.245-274.

Von Heusinger, K. Chiriacescu, S.&Deischsel, A. (2010). Two Specific Indefinite Articles in German, Santa Cruz: University of California Press.

Von Heusinger, K. (2011a). "Specificity". In: Von Heusinger, K. &Maienborn, C. &Portner, P. (eds.): Semantics : An International Handbook of Natural Languages Meaning, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, Vol.2, pp.1-50.

…………… (2011b). " Specificity ,Referentiality and Discourse Prominence : German Indefinite Demonstratives". In: Reich, Ingo. (ed.): Proceedings of Sinn &Bedeutung, Universaar, Saarland: Saarland University Press, Vol.15, pp.9-30.

**پوخته:**

گریمانه پرۆسەیەکە که توانای پەیوەندی کردن دەدات به کەسەکان و کەسی گوێگر رەگەزه وێژەیی و واقیعییەکان بەکاردێنێ بۆ تێگەیشتنی پەیامەکه. بۆ کەسی بێژەر، پێویسته شیکردنەوەی گریمانەیی بەر له قسەکردن ئەنجام بدرێ، هەروەها بۆ کەسی گوێگر بەر له وەڵامدانەوه، وه بۆ وەرگێڕێك بەر له وەرگێڕان. تایبەتمەندێتی پەیوەسته به تاكێکی تایبەت یان شتێکی تایبەت له هزری گوتەبێژەکه، یاخود بەستنەوەیه به کەسێك لەلایەن گوێگرەوه. له هەردوو زمانی ئینگلیزی و عەرەبیدا، تا نەناسراوی کەمتر بێت تایبەتی زیاتر دەبێت، وه تا نەناسراوی زیاتر بێت تایبەتی کەمتر دەبێت.

توێژینەوەکە هەوڵدەدات ئەم ئامانجانە بەدەست بێنێ: (1) دەستنیشان کردن و شرۆڤەکردنی شێوازی جیاوازی نەناسراویی تایبەت لە کتێبەکان وە هەروەها شێوازی خولیی ئامرازەکانی ئاخافتن و پراگماتیکی و سیمیائی. (2) دۆزینەوەی هەر پەیوەندییەك لە نێوان ئینگلیزی و عەرەبی لە رووی نەناسراوی بە گشتی و هەروەها تایبەتمەندیتی بە تایبەتی. (3) هەڵبژاردنی شرۆڤەکردنی گریمانەیی وەك رێگایەك بۆ وەرگێرانی شێوازەکانی نەناسراوی وە پاشان رێکخستنیان. (4) دەستنیشان کردنی لێکچوون و جیاوازییەکانی نێوان نەناسراویی تایبەت و ناسراوی.

بۆ بەدەستهێنانی ئەو ئامانجانەی سەرەوە، ئەم تویژینەوەیە جەخت دەکاتەوە کە: (1) لە زۆربەی حاڵەتەکان ئامرازی نەناسراوی تایبەتمەندیتی دیاری ناکات، بەڵام شیکردنەوەی گریمانەیی دیاریی دەکات. (2): گوێگر دەتوانێ بەهۆی شیکردنەوەی گریمانەیی و هەندێ ئاوەڵناو و هەروەها ناوەرۆکەوە بگات بە تایبەتمەندیتی. (3) گوێگر تووشی کێشە دەبێ لە خەمڵاندنی نەناسراویی تایبەت و ناتایبەتدا لە زمانە سەرەکییەکە وە حاڵەتەکە بۆ وەرگێرێك پڕ کێشەتریش دەبێ. (4) هەندێ نەناسراویی تایبەت رەنگە لەلایەن بێژەرەوە زانراو بێت یان نەزانراو بێت وە گوێگر لە شیکردنەوەی گریمانەییدا تەنها پشت بە ناوەرۆك دەبەستێ. (5) ئاسانتر دەبێت بۆ گوێگر کە لە رێگای شیکردنەوەی گریمانەییەوە بگات بە تایبەتمەندیتی ئەگەر بێژەر راپۆرت بدات و نمایش بکات، نەك تەنها راپۆرت بدات.

بۆ تاقیکردنەوەی راستی و دروستیی ئەو خاڵانەی لەسەرەوە باسکران، ئەم پرۆسەیەی خوارەوە بەکارهاتووە: (1) سی و سێ تێکستی دوازده بیرمەندی ناسراو لە کتێبی پراگماتیك و ئامرازەکانی ئاخافتنەوە هەڵبژێردراون. (2) ئەم تێکستانە پێشکەش کراون و لە رووی شیکردنەوەی گریمانەییەوە شرۆڤە کراون لەلایەن ده قوتابیی ماستەر لە بەشی وەرگێرانی کۆلیژی ئەدەبیاتی زانکۆی موسڵ 2013- 2012 وە هەروەها (3) شێوازێکی گوڵبژێر داتاشراوه لەشیکردنەوەی گریمانەیی نەناسراوی تایبەتەوە لەلایەن رەسڵ (1905) و فۆدۆر و ساگ (1982).

ئەنجامە سەرەکییەکان گریمانەکانی پشتراست کردۆتەوه و لە کۆتاییشدا پێشنیازی هەندێ کرداری پەروەردەیی و تویژینەوەی زیاتر دەکات.

## الملخص:

الافتراض المسبق هو عملية تمكين الاشخاص من التواصل فيما بينهم. فالشخص المخاطب يستخدم كل ماهو دلالي وتداولي للوصول الى الافتراض الصحيح. يتم الافتراض المسبق بالنسبة للمتحدث قبل الحديث وللمخاطب قبل الاجابة اما بالنسبة للمترجم فانه يتم قبل عملية الترجمة. ان مانعنيه بالمقصود في ادوات النكرة هو ان يكون هنالك شخص او شي ما في ذهن المتحدث وان هذا الشخص او الشي يتوصل اليه المخاطب عن طريق اللفظ بواسطة المعنى. وفي كلتا اللغتين الانكليزية والعربية كلما كان التنكير قليلا كلما كان المقصود في ادوات النكرة كبيرا، وكلما كان المقصود في ادوات النكرة قليلا.

تهدف هذه الدراسة الى تحقيق الاهداف الاتية: اولا، تحديد ودراسة الاوجه المختلفة للنكرة المقصودة في كتب ودوريات علم الدلالة والسيمائية والتداولية. ثانيا، تبيان اوجه التشابه والاختلاف بين اللغتين الانكليزية والعربية فيما يخص النكرات بشكل عام وما هو مقصود بشكل خاص. ثالثا، اختيار التحليل الافتراضي المسبق كطريقة مناسبة لترجمة التعابير قيد الدراسة وتعليل ذلك. رابعا، معرفة اوجه التشابه والاختلاف بين النكرة والمعرفة.

ولتحقيق هذه الاهداف المذكورة انفاً فان هذه الدراسة تفترض: اولا، ان مايحدد المقصود في معظم الحالات هو التحليل الافتراضي المسبق وليس التنكير او ادوات النكرة. ثانيا: ربما يستطيع المخاطب الوصول لما هو مقصود بواسطة التحليل الافتراضي المسبق وبعض الصفات والمحددات اضافة الى السياق اللغوي وسياق الحال. ثالثا، يواجه المخاطب صعوبات في الوصول الى ما هو مقصود وماهو غير مقصود من النكرة في اللغة نفسها والمهمة اصعب بالنسبة للمترجم. رابعا، النكرة المقصودة اما تكون معروفة او غير معروفة بالنسبة للمتحدث ويعتمد المخاطب على سياقه الخاص ومن خلال التحليل الافتراضي المسبق لمعرفة ذلك. خامسا، يكون الوصول الى ماهو مقصود بواسطة التحليل الافتراضي المسبق بالنسبة للمخاطب اسهل عندما يكون المتحدث ناقلا وفاعلا وليس ناقلا فقط.

ولاختبار صحة الفرضيات اعلاه استخدمت الاجراءات الاتية: اولا، اختيار ست نصوص لاثني عشر عالما من كتب علم الدلالة والتداولية. ثانيا، قام بترجمة وتحليل هذه النصوص عشرة طلاب من مرحلة الماجستير/ قسم الترجمة/ كلية الاداب/ جامعة الموصل للعام الدراسي 2012-2013 ثالثا، استخدمت طريقة دمج انموذج العالم (رسل) Russell (عام 1905) والعالمتين (فودر) Fodor و (سالك) Sag (عام 1982) في التحليل الافتراضي المسبق للنكرة المقصودة.

ان اهم النتائج التي توصلت اليها الدراسة هي: اولا، ماهو معروف للمتحدث ربما لا يكون كذلك بالنسبة للمخاطب او المترجم. ثانيا، وجود الصفات وعبارات الربط ومحددات الاسماء لم يكن ذا فائدة كبيرة للمخاطب او المترجم. ثالثا، يكون الوصول الى ماهو مقصود من ادوات النكرة والنصوص التي يكون فيها المتحدث ناقلا وفاعلا اسهل من الوصول اليها عندما يكون المتحدث ناقلا للحدث فقط. رابعا، يعتمد المخاطب او المترجم على سياق الحال والسياق اللغوي للوصول الى ماهو مقصود من النكرة.

وانتهت الدراسة الى تقديم بعض التوصيات بغية الاستفادة منها في الاهداف التعليمة والتطبيقية وتقديم بعض المقترحات لمزيد من الدراسات المستقبلية.