

# opción

Revista de Antropología, Ciencias de la Comunicación y de la Información, Filosofía,  
Lingüística y Semiótica, Problemas del Desarrollo, la Ciencia y la Tecnología

Año 35, 2019, Especial N°

# 22

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales  
ISSN 1012-1537/ ISSNc: 2477-9385  
Depósito Legal pp 198402ZU45



Universidad del Zulia  
Facultad Experimental de Ciencias  
Departamento de Ciencias Humanas  
Maracaibo - Venezuela

# **The Impact Of Pragmatic Considerations On Grammatical Formations “A Practical Study In Arabic And English”**

**Anwar Turkey Atiyah**

**Computer Science Department, College of Computer Science and Information Technology, University of Al-Qadisiyha, Anwar.alsaadi@qu.edu.iq**

## **Abstract**

**The connection between grammatical formations and pragmatics reflects the ability to understand another speaker’s implicit meaning in a mechanism that is called pragmatic competence. In this context, the study aims at defining this pragmatic competence. In addition, it aims at clarifying and analyzing the connection between pragmatic considerations and grammatical formations through discussion and investigating the pragmatic objectives of the grammar of both English and Arabic language in the selected phrases that represent this connection in English and Arabic.**

**Key words: Pragmatics, grammar, linguistics, pragmatic competence.**

## **El Impacto De Las Consideraciones Pragmáticas En Las Formaciones Gramaticales “Un Estudio Práctico En Árabe E Inglés”**

### Resumen

La conexión entre las formaciones gramaticales y la pragmática refleja la capacidad de comprender el significado implícito de otro hablante en un mecanismo que se llama competencia pragmática. En este contexto, el estudio tiene como objetivo definir esta competencia pragmática. Además, tiene como objetivo aclarar y analizar la conexión entre las consideraciones pragmáticas y las formaciones gramaticales a través de la discusión e investigación de los objetivos pragmáticos de la gramática del idioma inglés y árabe en las frases seleccionadas que representan esta conexión en inglés y árabe.

Palabras clave: pragmática, gramática, lingüística, competencia pragmática.

### Introduction:

Pragmatics is a subclass of linguistic and semiotic arena which is associated with the way through which the context shapes the meaning. Pragmatics is connected to many areas of linguist studies, besides strong appearance in philosophy, and sociology. In linguistics, pragmatics deals with many other approaches and theories, such as speech act theory, conversational implicature, grammar, and talk in interaction. The connection between pragmatics and all these theories and approaches is the objective of conveying the meaning in a certain context. It is known that semantics is the linguistic branch that investigates and analyzes the coded meaning in a language, whereas pragmatics is associated to conveying the meaning according to context of the utterance rather than the structure. Grammar is the structural rules controlling the composition of sentences and clauses in any language. Despite grammar seems to be the rigid structural study of a language, it has many pragmatic dimensions as it not only associated to the structure of the speech, but also it has a pragmatic rule in conveying a certain message of the speaker/ writer. Both Arabic and English grammar have many pragmatic considerations on grammatical formations. In other words, any change in the

grammatical structure of a sentence can change the entire meaning of a sentence. For example, changing a sentence tense can change the meaning of a sentence, not only the tense of an action, but also the function of the sentence itself. That is why; the present study aims at defining, investigating, and analyzing the connection between English-Arabic grammar and pragmatics.

For achieving this purpose, the study examines some selected Arabic and English texts (or speeches) in which grammatical formations and pragmatic considerations affect each other's. In this regard, the study is divided into an introduction, a theoretical part that testifies the connection between pragmatic considerations and grammatical formations, discussion (practical part), and a conclusion that illustrates the results of the study.

#### Objectives:

The main objectives of the study:

Defining the pragmatic competence

Defining the similarities and differences between Arabic and English grammar

Clarifying and analyzing the connection between pragmatic considerations and grammatical formations

Defining the pragmatic aspects of some English and Arabic structures

Defining the pragmatic aspects of some English and Arabic grammatical rules

Investigating the pragmatic objectives of the grammar of both English and Arabic language

#### Literature Review:

Too many studies have dealt with pragmatics and grammar as linguistic issues that are responsible of establishing linguistics unites either on the semantic level or the structural level. For example, *Pragmatics and Grammar* (2008) is a book by Mira Arielin which the author attempts at shedding light on some controversial issues that are associated to the complicated relationship between grammar and pragmatics.

“From pragmatics to grammar: Diachronic reflections on complex pasts and futures in Romance.” (1983) is a study by Suzanne Fleischman, in which she reexamines in diachronic perspective two complex verb structures in Romance and English, the first is the so-called ‘perfect’(Fr. j’ai fait, Eng. I have done) whereas the second is the ‘go-future’(Fr. je vais faire, Eng. I’m going to do), with a view toward demonstrating the striking parallelism in their usage. The study is associated with French language; however, the method and approach of the study can be applied to many languages.

Grammar, Meaning and Pragmatics (vol. 5) (2009) is a book of ten volumes, which is edited by Frank Brisard, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jef Verschueren. The book illustrates the most recent issues in the field of pragmatics. The book links pragmatics to many interdisciplinary areas such as philosophical, cognitive, cultural, social fields.

Horst Simon’s paper, “From Pragmatics to Grammar” traces the development of respect” which is published in Diachronic perspectives on address term system (2003) discusses the relation between grammar and pragmatics in Modern Standard German (MSG) through various examples and different contexts.

“18 Some Interactions of Pragmatics and Grammar,” which is published as a part of The handbook of pragmatics (2004) by Georgia M. Green traces how generative grammar since the 1960s has acceptability of sentences depends on the referential and predicative intents imputed to the speaker/writer, highlighting how discourse meaning is affected by the context.

Arnulf Deppermann’s article, Pragmatics and grammar (2011) is published in Foundations of pragmatics tackles how “grammar” is utilized as an overarching concept, highlighting how it encompasses morphosyntax besides the syntax of the sentential structures, namely phrase structure and topological structure. Consequently, Deppermann deals with grammar as a unit that includes syntactic categories, functions, rules, and constructions.

Besides many studies that discuss and analyze the connection between pragmatics and grammar as the first area of this study, there are many studies that compares between Arabic and English grammar. For example, Aziz M. Khalil’s book, A contrastive Grammar

of English and Arabic (2010) introduces a full account of the area of contrastive Linguistics. The study sheds lights on the major differences and similarities between English and Arabic grammar; in addition to other areas such as (phonetics, phonology, morphology, etc.).

In addition, “A Comparison between the Arabic and the English Language” a study by Basma Ahmad Sedki Dajani and Fatima Mohamad Amin Omari (2012) aims at penetrating and analyzing the recesses of the Arabic and English languages with a view to outline the historical development and evolution of the two languages. Furthermore, the study introduces a comparison between state of the Arabic language and the language families of Europe amongst ages. Furthermore, the study deals with teaching Arabic as a foreign language, especially the grammatical patterns.

In spite of the long list of studies that deal with the areas of present study either “Arabic-English grammar” or “grammar versus pragmatics,” there are too few studies that deal with “grammar versus pragmatics” as a comparative-practical study between two languages (Arabic-English), so the present study aims at dealing with this gap.

Methodology:

The study adopts a theoretical approach that aims at clarifying and analyzing the connection between pragmatic considerations and grammatical formations. Moreover, this theoretical approach will define some similarities and differences between Arabic and English grammar. Then, this theoretical approach will expound the practical part that will investigate the connection between pragmatic considerations and grammatical formations.

Definition of the Pragmatic Competence:

In linguistics, pragmatic competence is the ability to use language effectively in a contextually appropriate fashion. Pragmatic competence is a fundamental aspect of a more general communicative competence. The term was introduced by sociolinguist Jenny Thomas in a 1983 Applied Linguistics article, “Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure, in which she defined it as “the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to

understand a language in context.”

Examples and Observations:

“Pragmatic competence . . . is understood as the knowledge of the linguistic resources available in a given language for realizing particular illocutions, knowledge of the sequential aspects of speech acts, and finally, knowledge of the appropriate contextual use of the particular language’s linguistic resources.”

(From “Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics” by linguist Anne Barron)

“A speaker’s ‘linguistic competence’ would be made up of grammatical competence (‘abstract’ or decontextualized knowledge of intonation, phonology, syntax, semantics, etc.) and pragmatic competence (the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context). This parallels Leech’s (1983) division of linguistics into ‘grammar’ (by which he means the decontextualized formal system of language) and ‘pragmatics’ (the use of language in a goal-oriented speech situation in which S [the speaker] is using language in order to produce a particular effect in the mind of the H [the hearer].”

(From “Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure” Jenny Thomas)

“Intrinsic to this decision-making process [in using language to communicate] are several principles that concur to define the nature of pragmatic competence. In particular, individuals make choices and build strategies based on some of the unique properties of pragmatic/communicative competence, such as:

- Variability: the property of communication that defines the range of communicative possibilities, among which is formulating communicative choices;
- Negotiability: the possibility of making choices based on flexible strategies;
- Adaptability: the ability to modulate and regulate communicative choices in relation to the communicative context;
- Salience: the degree of awareness reached by communicative choices;

- Indeterminacy: the possibility to re-negotiate pragmatic choices as the interaction unfolds in order to fulfill communicative intentions;
- Dynamicity: development of the communicative interaction in time.”

(From “From Pragmatics to Neuropragmatics” by M. Balconi and S. Amenta)

“[Noam] Chomsky accepts that language is used purposefully; indeed, in later writings, he introduced the term pragmatic competence—knowledge of how language is related to the situation in which it is used. Pragmatic competence ‘places language in the institutional setting of its use, relating intentions and purposes to the linguistic means at hand’. As well as knowing the structure of a language, we have to know how to use it.

“There is little point in knowing the structure of: ‘Can you lift that box?’ if you can’t decide whether the speaker wants to discover how strong you are (a question) or wants you to move the box (a request). “It may be possible to have grammatical competence without pragmatic competence. A schoolboy in a Tom Sharpe novel ‘Vintage Stuff’ takes everything that is said literally; when asked to turn over a new leaf, he digs up the headmaster’s camellias. But knowledge of language use is different from knowledge of the language itself; pragmatic competence is not linguistic competence. The description of grammatical competence explains how the speaker knows that ‘Why are you making such a noise?’ is a possible sentence of English and that ‘Why you are making such a noise.’ is not.

“It is the province of pragmatic competence to explain whether the speaker who says: ‘Why are you making such a noise?’ is requesting someone to stop, or is asking a genuine question out of curiosity, or is muttering a *sotto voce* comment.”

Pragmatic competence in L2 research is usually defined as the ability to produce and comprehend utterances (discourse) that is adequate to the L2 socio-cultural context in which interaction takes place. Pragmatic competence in the L1 is the result of language socialization. Language and social development in the



L1 go hand in hand and are inseparable. However, this is not the case in L2 or subsequent languages. The socio-pragmatic norms concerning appropriateness developed through L1 are very influential and difficult to change. L2 learners see things in L2 through their L1 socio-cultural mind set. The chapter explains how pragmatic competence develops through conceptual socialization and how this process affects language use of multilingual. It is demonstrated how the use of situation-bound utterances reflects pragmatic competence. Instead of pragmatic transfer the chapter recommends talking about bidirectional pragmatic influence.

The Similarities and Differences between Arabic and English Grammar:

Arabic and English are two of the most popular languages on Earth. Their popularity is not based on their similarity, however. Both of these languages are very different in a number of significant ways.

#### Writing and Script:

When you compare the way in which Arabic and English appear on the page, you will immediately be struck by the fact that they appear very different. English script reads from left to right, while Arabic script reads from right to left. Print has been the standard way of presenting English writing for centuries, and Arabic is written in a curvy and fluid script. When students are learning Arabic as a second language, it can take some practice for them to learn to differentiate between different letters.

In many cases Arab speakers don't write most of the verbs they use onto the page. Instead, they write a type of shorthand that leaves the vowels out, trusting that the reader will insert them where they are needed to form the correct word.

An example of this abbreviated writing is the Arabic word, "maktab," which means office. It is often written as "mktb." Students who are trying to learn the language are faced with trying to infer which vowel should be used from the placement of the surrounding letters or the context of the sentence in which the word is being used.

- Consonant Sounds

There are marked differences between the two languages when it comes to consonants. English does not have six distinct sounds that are present in Arabic and for this reason, a number of Arabic words are difficult to translate into English. A number of Arabic sounds are challenging for English speakers to pronounce because they rely on the speaker contracting his or her epiglottis. This region of the larynx is not usually used when speaking English.

- Vowel Sounds

In English, there are only five vowels (a, e, i, o, u). Together, they can combine to make 22 distinct sounds. For example, a word like “float” includes a vowel combination that makes a distinct vowel sound. It is different from the one in “fought” or “fat.”

The Arabic language has six regular vowels and two occasional ones, in the same way that the letter “y” acts like a vowel on occasion in English. These vowels only make a single sound each, which means that English has close to three times as many vowel sounds as Arabic.

Learning to speak English is quite challenging for native Arabic speakers, and many of them have difficulty distinguishing between similar sounds like “sought” and “sod.”

- Verb Tenses

The English language has a number of verb tenses which do not occur in Arabic. One of them is that Arabic does not have one that corresponds to the verb “to be” in the present tense in English. Many people who are learning to speak English as a second language who are native Arabic speakers will not use the conjugations, “am” and “are” when they are forming sentences. They may say something like, “Where they go?” instead of “Where are they going?”

The Arabic language also doesn’t have a present perfect tense, so there is no way for a person to say the sentence, “I have finished my meal” in that language. An Arabic speaker would say instead, “I finished my meal.”

English and Arabic belong to two different and distant language families: Western Germanic, and Semitic. Consequently, their grammars are sharply different. So, there are major differences in the syntax of those two languages. This huge difference is caused by more than one factor like the order or the types of sentences for instance. In this analysis we intend to elaborate and clarify this topic furthermore.

3. English And Arabic Basic Sentence Structure: There are two major types of sentences, nominal and verbal. One of the main differences between Arabic and English grammar is that English has verbal sentences only, whereas Arabic has both nominal and verbal sentences.

4. A nominal sentence requires no verb of any kind. In general, it consists of two nouns, the first is called 'Topic/Subject' (المبتدأ/ المسند اليه) and the second is called 'Comment/Predicate' (الخبر/المسند) though English sentences start with a noun, this noun is called 'subject'

(الفعل) , followed by the main verb (الفعل) of the sentence and an object or a complement ( S + V + O/C ). The English sentence cannot be described as grammatically correct unless it contains a main verb (P.Ghazala, 1995). On the other hand, unlike English, Arabic has different types of sentences.

5. English: To understand sentence structures in the English language, you must first have a general understanding of the types of words that are used to make sentences. Any English sentence consists of three basic components or parts. The basic structure of the English sentence is (S + V + O/C).

6. S= Subject: the person or the thing that does something. She likes cats. ("She" is the subject, and it is a pronoun) □ V= Verb: a word that expresses an action, occurrence, or a state of being. ( "likes" is the verb ) □ O= object: the person or the thing that receives the action of the verb. ( "cats" is the object )

7. Arabic: On the other hand Arabic has different types of sentences and therefore, different structures. There are four types of Arabic sentences and they are: □ Verbal Sentences (الجملة الفعلية) □ Nominal Sentences (الجملة الاسمية) □ Functional Sentences (الجملة التي لها محل من الأعراب)

□ Non-Functional Sentences (الجملة التي ليس لها محل من الأعراب)

8. Of course we are mainly concerned with the first two types which are the main ones. - The structure of the Arabic verbal sentence is (V + S + O/C) . So, the order as you can obviously see is different, but the components are mainly the same of the English. There are variations on verbal sentence types in Arabic like the ‘kaana sentence’, the conditional sentence, the imperative sentence..Etc.

9. - The structure of the nominal sentence is (Topic + Comment), no verbs at all . Also, there are variations on nominal sentence types in Arabic like the ‘Inna sentence’, the prepositional sentence, the adverbial sentence, and the fronted comment and belated topic sentence.

10. The verb in verbal sentences usually precedes the subject but when it follows the subject, the sentence turns into a nominal one. The difference between a verbal and nominal sentence is that the former relates an act or event, whereas the latter gives a description of a person or thing.

11. -Examples: Arabic English the same English sentence can be translated into Arabic in two different ways: As a Nominal sentence: احمد يلعب كرة القدم. It can be translated this way and be grammatically correct. "أحمد" here is a topic not a subject. As a Verbal sentence: يلعب احمد كرة القدم changed the order of the verb and the subject making the structure: V + S + O Ahmed plays soccer. Although this sentence starts with a noun, this noun this noun is the subject of the verb that comes after and that does not make the sentence Nominal. English as we said has only verbal sentences, so this sentence is verbal. The structure: S + V + O and it's the same in all grammatically correct English sentences

12. One of the most common mistakes that students make is to translate the sentences between the two languages in the same order. Although it's a simple rule that each of them has its own structure and order, but students still make this mistake more often.

13. Example: English Arabic Some students translate the previous Arabic sentence this way: Studies Hend History. This is a huge mistake because it is completely wrong to duplicate the Arabic sentence structure. We do not translate words only. We have to pay attention

to the set of rules or grammar, the order, of each language. So, the correct translation is: Hind studies History. S + V + O تدرس هند التاريخ  
V+ S + O

The Connection between Pragmatic Considerations and Grammatical Formations:

If grammatical and contextual factors license the occurrence of implicit arguments in an intensive interaction as the complex approaches to implicit arguments suppose (cf. Section 2.5), then it is plausible to assume that grammar and pragmatics are not independent of each other. Moreover, the relationship between grammar and pragmatics cannot be considered one sided, as merely a relationship between grammar and post-grammatical pragmatics; instead, pragmatic information has to be licensed to interact with grammatical information. However, the problem of the interaction between grammar and pragmatics can only be investigated within a particular theory, depending on how it conceives of the concepts of grammar and pragmatics. In the literature there are various theories with significantly different conceptions of grammar and pragmatics; therefore it is necessary to examine, met theoretically reflect on, and compare the different definitions very carefully in order to make clear what definitions of grammar and pragmatics are applied in a particular research concept as well as to grasp what similarities and differences the particular theories can have in the treatment of implicit arguments which assume an interaction between grammar and pragmatics.

Pragmatics is one of the components of grammar (e.g. Levinson 1983). It intrudes into the lexicon, semantics and syntax (Levinson 2000). For example, in the lexicon some kinds of contextual information should be taken into consideration to define the meanings of lexemes. In this case we involve pragmatic information in the lexicon of grammar. The semantic component of grammar also requires pragmatic information, i.e. in order to construct the meaning of sentences with deictic and indexical phrases we should necessarily rely on the context. Levinson (2000) convincingly argues that syntax can also rely on pragmatics. The theory of generalized conversational implicatures helps syntax to account for

anaphoric relations in a more adequate way. Newmeyer (2006) also considers pragmatics a component of grammar. In harmony with the generative framework, he assumes grammar with a modular architecture, but his approach also differs from Chomsky's (1977, 1995) and Kasher's (1986), because he takes pragmatics into account as a module of grammar. Newmeyer presupposes different principles for each component of grammar, i.e. syntax, semantics and pragmatics. However, he emphasizes an intensive interaction between these modules, differently from the classical Fodorian (1983) modularity hypothesis and similarly to the latest versions of generative grammar (cf. Chomsky 1995; Engdahl 1999). To summarize approaches in the third group, it can be noted that here pragmatics as a component of grammar and other components of grammar are in a close relationship. The difference between the first and the third group of approaches appears when we consider where and how pragmatic information is situated. In the first group, the pragmatic pieces of information are not separately involved in grammar, while in the third group they are. The grammatical and pragmatic licensing and identifying factors of implicit arguments can be investigated together. Finally, the fourth group of theories considers pragmatics a component outside of grammar. There are at least two different approaches in this group. In addition to grammar, pragmatics is either a component of a theory of language (e.g. Kasher 1986) or cognition (e.g. Sperber and Wilson 2002). In the first case, pragmatics is mainly defined with regard to semantics, which is a component of grammar. There are theories which draw a strict dividing line between semantics and pragmatics, considering semantics truth conditional.

Powered by TCPDF ([www.tcpdf.org](http://www.tcpdf.org))

Pragmatics post semantic, as well as non-truth-conditional (e.g. Gazdar 1979), and there are theories which allow pragmatics to contact grammar through its semantic component (e.g. Leech 1983). Grammar and pragmatics are distinguished in the research framework of generative linguistics as well, but the treatment of the relationship between them has changed in the history of the generative grammatical theory. The generative framework defines grammar and pragmatics on the basis of the distinction between grammatical compe-

tence and pragmatic competence, which are two separate modules of the human mind. According to Chomsky (1977) and Kasher (1986), grammatical competence is independent of pragmatic competence; consequently, grammar is independent of pragmatics. However, pragmatics as a model of the faculty of language use cannot be considered independent of grammar, since its operation is based on grammar, i.e. the model of the knowledge of language. In the latest version of generative grammar, i.e. in the Minimalist Program, Chomsky (1995) emphasizes the interface character of the two interpretive components □ phonetic and logical forms □ in grammar. The logical form can be related to the conceptual-intentional system of the human mind. This potential relationship makes it possible to treat grammar and pragmatics as not independent, but to assume an interface between them (Engdahl 1999), which can yield a complex approach to implicit arguments as well.

The second approach which situates pragmatics outside of grammar considers pragmatics a component of cognition outside of the theory of language (Sperber and Wilson 2002). Its task is to describe and explain how ostensive-inferential communication operates. Since ostensive-inferential communication does not refer only to verbal communication but also to the various types of non-verbal communication as well as to the kinds of communication without any code use, pragmatics as a theory of ostensive-inferential communication is not an exclusively linguistic discipline. Natural languages enter ostensive-inferential communication in order to make information transmission in communication more effective and reliable (cf. Sperber 2000; Wharton 2003; Németh T. 2005), i.e. one of the main functions of languages in ostensive-inferential communication is to fulfil communicators' informative intentions. Language and linguistic communication are not independent in verbal communication; consequently, a contact can be supposed between grammar as a theory of language and pragmatics as a theory of communication. This contact makes it possible to analyse the behavior of implicit arguments taking into account both grammatical and pragmatic information.

The Pragmatic Aspects of Some English and Arabic Structures:

### Speech Acts:

Speech acts (Austin 1962) refer to the intended meaning (the illocutionary force) rather than the literal meaning (the locutionary force) of utterances in communication. While it is true that language users can mean exactly what they say in their utterances, it is also true that they can have their utterances mean much more than what they say. For example, the interrogative form in English and Arabic is used to ask questions in terms of locution and illocution; yet, while maintaining the same locution, it can be familiarly employed in both languages to perform many other illocutions including requesting, suggesting, rebuking, wishing, approval, disapproval, complaining, etc. Such illocutions are usually retrieved from the context in which they are produced, as can be illustrated in the examples below:

10- وكان اسماعيل يراقبه بإمعان , فقال باسمًا

- أين حسين ليشهد هذا المنظر ؟ ( قصر الشوق , ص: 362)

11- Ismail, who was watching him closely, smiled and said, “If only Hasayn were here to witness this.” (Palace of desire, p. 351).

12- وصاحت خديجة في سخرية :

- تتوظف دون الرابعة عشرة؟! وماذا تصنع إذا بلت على نفسك في الوظيفة ؟ ( بين القصرين , ص: 57).

13- Khadija yelled sarcastically, “You want to get a job before you’re fourteen! What will you do if you wet your pants at work?” (Palace Walk, p. 57)

In both of the Arabic examples, the interrogative form performs illocutions other than ‘questioning’, namely, the illocution of wishing and the illocution of disapproval, respectively. The translators (Hutchins and Kenny1990) have done well by capturing these intended illocutions. In the first example, they have opted for the wishing conventionalized form in English (if only ...) which conveys the illocutionary force in the ST. Yet, they also could have used the same interrogative form to perform the wishing illocution in English, viz. “Where’s Husayn to witness this?!” In the second example, the translators have maintained the same interrogative form to perform



the illocution of disapproval. Below are two examples where the same translator (P. Stewart 1981) generally succeeds in the first one (14) in conveying a similar illocution though not reflecting the semantics of the Arabic formula, while he seriously fails in the second (15) (Children of Gebelawi, 1981 and أولاد حارتنا , 1959):

14- وأيقظه من تهويته صوت عذب يقول :

- القهوة يا سيد قاسم.
- التفت وراءه فرأى " بدرية " تحمل الفنجان , فتناولته قائلاً :
- لم التعب ؟
- فقالت تعبك راحة يا سيدي.

15- A sweet voice roused him: "Coffee Mr. Qassem". He turned and saw Badria holding out the cup to him. He took it and said: "Why the trouble, don't bother yourself for me". Badria: "Don't mention it, sir!"

The Pragmatic Objectives of the Grammar of both English and Arabic Language:

Pragmatics deals with the interpretation of what people mean when uttering a particular sentence in a particular context and the relationship between the context and what is said. i.e., it is the study of contextual meaning. However, not only the relationship between context and the speaker is important, the listener or reader interpretation is also of great importance. Thus, pragmatics deals with the interpretation of what is unsaid in a particular context. Hence, a translator should be aware not only of the literal meaning of an utterance but should pay attention to the pragmatic meaning of the text s/he translates. From a conventional perspective pragmatics plays an important role in translation because it greatly affects the processing of the source text and the conceptualization of the target text (Kavamdi, Toulabi, & Asadi, 2014). Thus, in order to achieve an adequate translation a great awareness of pragmatic differences is needed. Phrased differently, the contextual meaning and the unsaid meaning of an utterance are of great importance in achieving authentic translation. The translator has to find out the context in which the utterance is uttered first, and then transfer the meaning

into the target language. Additionally, translation and pragmatics share common features since they are both semiotic in nature and they both aim at facilitating communication (Hassan, 2011). Morris (1938) claims that pragmatics is a division of semiotics (the relation of sign to user) while translation is a kind of semiotic interpretation (Cited in Hassan, 2011). “Semiotics is the science that studies sign systems or structures, sign processes and sign function” (Bassnet, 1991:13), moreover, Levy (2000: 156) argues that “as all semiotic processes translation has its pragmatic dimensions as well.” More importantly, Bell (1991) stresses that there are three main pragmatic features that can be applied in translation. These pragmatic features are situationality, intentionality, and acceptability (Hassan, 2011). Situationality means the appropriate use in a particular situation, i.e., place and time of communication while intentionality means the intention of the producer. Acceptability is the effect of the target text on the target audience (ibid).

Conclusion:

Language is a unique quality that sets apart the human race from all other species. Language has allowed mankind to communicate and express ideas, which has had a major factor in our development over time. However, language does not merely consist of words and phrases. Different types of expression are embedded in our language; most of which we use without even noticing.

References:

- Thomas, Jenny. “Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure,” 1983. Rpt. in *World Englishes: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*, Vol. 4, ed. by Kingsley Bolton and Braj B. Kachru. Routledge, 2006
- Balconi, M.; Amenta, S. “From Pragmatics to Neuropragmatics.” *Neuropsychology of Communication*, Springer, 2010
- Cook, V.J.; M. Newson, M. “Chomsky’s Universal Grammar: An Introduction.” Wiley-Blackwell, 1996)
- Gazalah .H , (1995). *Translation As Problems And Solutions: A Text Book For University Students And Trainee Translators* Pp. 46.
- Carston, Robyn (2009) *The explicit/implicit distinction in pragmatics and the limits of communication*. *International Review*

of Pragmatics 1: 35–62.

- Carston, Robyn (2010) Explicit communication and ‘free’ pragmatic enrichment. In Belén Soria and Esther Romero (eds.) *Explicit Communication. Essays on Robyn Carston’s Pragmatics* 217–287. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Chomsky, Noam (1957) *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam (1977) *Essays on Form and Interpretation*. New York: North Holland.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding. The Pisa Lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986) *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York: Praeger.
- Coppok, Elizabeth and Wechsler, Stephen (2012) The objective conjugation in Hungarian: Agreement without phi-features. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 30: 699–740.
- Coppok, Elizabeth (2013) A semantic solution to the problem of Hungarian object agreement. *Natural Language Semantics* 21: 345–371.
- Cornish, Francis (2005) Null complements, event structure, predication and anaphora: A functional discourse grammar account. J. Lachlan Mackenzie and M. A. Gómez-González (eds.) *Studies in Functional Discourse Grammar* 21–47. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Cote, Sharon A. (1996) *Grammatical and Discourse Properties of Null Arguments in English*. PhD dissertation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Culicover, Peter W. and Jackendoff, Ray (2005) *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jeddah, JED: Konooz AL-Marifa Company. □ Moubaidin, A., Toffaha, A., Obeid, N., & Hammo, B. (2013, December 14).
- Swain, M. (1984). *Cross-cultural dialogues*. Yarmouth, Maine: International Press
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: an introduction*

to pragmatics. Longman: London.

- Toury, G. (1995). Descriptive translation studies and beyond. Amsterdam, Philadelphia. John Benjamins
- Tunç, O. R. (1998). A critical re\_evaluation of Gideon Toury's target oriented approach to translation phenomena. Bogaziçi University.
- Unger, C. (2001). On the cognitive role of genre: a relevance-theoretic perspective. University of London: PhD Thesis, pp. 19-29
- Venuti, L. (2000). The translation studies reader. Routledge: New York



**UNIVERSIDAD  
DEL ZULIA**

---

# **opción**

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Año 35, Especial No. 22 (2019)

Esta revista fue editada en formato digital por el personal de la Oficina de Publicaciones Científicas de la Facultad Experimental de Ciencias, Universidad del Zulia.

Maracaibo - Venezuela

**[www.luz.edu.ve](http://www.luz.edu.ve)**

**[www.serbi.luz.edu.ve](http://www.serbi.luz.edu.ve)**

**[produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve](http://produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve)**