# Rationality and Gricean Inference with Reference to English-Arabic Translation

**Prof. Misbah M. D. Al-Sulaimaan**
(Ph.D in Linguistics)
Lebanese French University


**Asst. Lecturer. Teeba N.T. Al-Khaffaf**
(M.A. in Translation)
Mosul University

_____

## Abstract

The present study tackles "Rationality and Gricean inference" in English and its translation from English into Arabic. Inference can be defined as a logical conclusion that is drawn from a premise and it is used to describe that process which the reader (hearer) must go through to get from the literal meaning of what is written (or said) to what the writer (speaker) intended to convey. Rationality can be defined as thinking, speaking, reasoning, making a decision, or acting in a way that is generally reliable and efficient for achieving one's goals. This study aims at (1) specifying and studying a number of different patterns of inferences in books of Pragmatics and some Pragmatic periodicals in order to grasp their nature and role in the process of communication, (2) giving a comprehensive coverage of inferences in English and, (3) testing the translatability of the inferences in question which are linguistically, culturally and genetically different and (4) showing the realizations of the inferences in the TL (Arabic) and (5) showing that inferences in English cannot be successfully translated into Arabic without grasping cultural values, and linguistic variation. To achieve the above mentioned aims the study hypothesizes that: (1) inferences in English cannot be successfully translated into Arabic without grasping cultural values and linguistic variations, (2) multiplicity of inferences that can be concluded from every utterance results in different renderings by the subjects, (3) taking Grice's maxims of conversation into consideration enables the translators to arrive at how inferences in the utterances under investigation can be deduced and (4) inference cannot be deduced without the premise. The study is based on a corpus of (16) English examples involving inferences derived from various written speech situations in books of pragmatics. These examples are translated by 5 subjects (M. A students in the Department of Translation /College of Arts/University of Mosul). The utterances involving the respective inferences with their Arabic renderings have been analyzed in terms of "type of inference", "what is said" (natural meaning to use Grice's 1975 terms), what is inferred (non natural meaning), and method of translation (semantic or communicative). Each text analysis is supplemented by pragmatic interpretation and translational discussion. As for the proposed rendering, the most appropriate one will be chosen. In case of subjects' failure, a new rendering will be suggested. The main findings the study arrived at is that inference is regarded a problem in translation in the SL is different from that of the TL and it depends on many elements such as the context which specifies the situation, the speaker's observance of Grice's Maxims.
_____

## 1. Statement of the Problem

Much effort has been exerted on the study of inference. Inference is regarded as one of the most problematic fields of pragmatics, linguistic philosophy and translation. No doubt, the way that each culture uses its own language depends upon a variety of elements as customs and traditions, philosophical thinking, religious practicing, daily activities, social system and texture, etc. However, using language for shaping the world differs from one language to another, particularly, the use of inferences. Hence, the problem develops since each utterance is filled with more than one meaning and translators are reluctant whether to translate what is said or what is inferred. The main problem in our thesis is how to deduce the inference since participants are required to decide whether or not the conclusion follows necessarily from the premises (or in a variant of the task in which no conclusion is provided, to indicate what, if anything, follows from the premises). In addition, inference poses a problem in translation since the inference in the SL is different from that of the TL and it depends on many factors such as the context which specifies the situation, and the speaker's observance of Gricean Maxims, etc. Thus this thesis is a simple attempt to solve these problems.

## 2. Aims of the study

The present study seeks to achieve the following aims:

(1) Specifying and studying a number of different patterns of inferences in books of Pragmatics and some Pragmatic periodicals in order to grasp their nature and their role in the process of communication.
(2) Testing the translatability of the inferences in question which are linguistically, culturally and genetically different.
(3) Showing the realizations of English inferences in the TL (Arabic)
(4) Showing the areas of differences between the types of inferences in English and Arabic.
(5) Specifying the method of translation that has been used by the subjects.
(6) Choosing the most appropriate rendering in case of subject's success and proposing a new rendering in case of subject's failure.

## 3. Hypotheses

In the current study, it is hypothesized that:

(1) Inferences in English cannot be successfully translated into Arabic without grasping cultural values, linguistic variation and genetic affiliations.
(2) Multiplicity of inferences that can be concluded from every utterance results in different renderings by the subjects.
(3) Taking Grice's maxims of conversation into consideration enables the translators to arrive at how inferences in the utterances under investigation can be deduced.

(4) Inference cannot be deduced without premise.


## 4. Procedure and Data Collection:

The study is based on a corpus of (16) English examples with their inferences derived from various written natural speech situations in books of pragmatics. These examples are translated by 5 subjects ( some of M.A. students in the Department of Translation/College of Arts/University of Mosul). The utterances having the respective inferences with their Arabic renderings analyzed in terms of "type of inference", "what is said" (natural meaning to use "Grice's 1975 terms"), what is inferred (non natural meaning), method of translation (semantic or communicative). Each text analysis is supplemented by pragmatic interpretation and translational discussion. As for the proposed rendering, the most appropriate one will be chosen. In case of subjects' failure, a new rendering will be suggested.

## 5. The Concept of Rationality

It is generally accepted in philosophy that the concept of rationality is difficult to define. The most common definition is an appeal to the contrast between rationalism and empiricism. Roughly speaking, empiricism holds that sense experience is the key to knowledge, whereas rationalism denies the role of sense experience, and promotes reason as the basis of knowledge (Davies, 2000: 19).

Grice seems to accept the basic dichotomy between rationalism and empiricism. In Grice (1975: 48) he rejects the 'dull' empirical explanation in favour of his preferred approach: "A dull but adequate answer is that it is just a well-recognised empirical fact that people do behave in these ways." And this stance is reiterated in Grice (1986: 80), where he dismisses the empirical approach as "relatively unexciting, and not unfamiliar", and chooses to "set [his] sights higher" on ulterior principles which are based on some "rational demand".

Grice's attitude was probably linked to his general ethical views, therefore, Davies (2000: 20) suggests, that the cooperative principle ought to be a governing principle for rational agents on Kantian grounds. Thus, for rational agents of the kind he envisioned, they would follow the CP on moral not on practical grounds.

This view has some support, in that Grice's maxims are derived in name from the categories in Kant's Critique of Pure Reason (Sarangi and Slembrouk 1992: 118). Grice (1989: 48) himself refers to the maxims as "moral commandments" in his discussion of implications in the epilogue to *Studies in the Way of Words*: "Somewhat like moral commandments, these maxims are prevented from being just a disconnected heap of conversational obligations by their dependence on a single supreme Conversational Principle, that of cooperativeness" (Grice, 1989: 370).

However, it is hard to find other explicit references to a moral motivation. Grice's appeal to the modal "should not abandon" (emphasis in original) when denying the adequacy of the empirical approach, could be interpreted as an appeal to morality. But this could equally be seen as a general appeal to the importance of rational behaviour (Davies, 2000: 20) In his later work (e.g. Grice 1986, 1989), the terms favoured are 'value' and 'evaluating'. In their general overview of Grice's work, Grandy and Warner (1986: 20) show the link between rationality and evaluation. "On Grice's view, a person has 'evaluative principles' that can not change. Not because they are programmed in; rather, they are principles a person cannot abandon if he is to count as rational."

"…What a word means in a language is to say what it is in general optimal for speakers of that language to do with that word; what particular intentions on particular occasions it is proper for them to have, or optimal for them to have" (Grice, 1982: 238).

Rationality in our view is believing the believable, or believing something fathomable, and having a perfect knowledge of the maxims observing, and applying the maxims in an accurate way.

## 6. Rationality in the Thought of Grice

In this section we will begin by what Grice (1986: 65) states about the notion of rationality.

Grice (1986: 65) believes that it might be held that the ultimate subject of all philosophy is ourselves, or at least our rational nature, and that the various subdivisions of philosophy are concerned with different aspects of this rational nature. But the characterization of this rational nature is not divisible into water-tight compartments; each aspect is intelligible only in relation to the others.

The view portrayed here is "a belief that the rational action is at the core of all human behavior, all types of action should have a rational explanation. It is therefore unsurprising that rationality is given such a high profile in the discussion of the CP. For Grice, even the process of philosophy is one of "rational enquiry" (Grice 1986: 87).

Warner (1989: 529) states that the concept of rationality can be seen in all the areas of Grice's work in philosophy: metaphysics and ethics as well as language.

Grice (1982: 235) argues that the process of the recognition of intentions and alterations in belief on the part of a hearer can be seen as rational behaviour. Grandy and Warner (1986: 2) make" the argument that as we can, speaker-meaning, then it is rational for us to do so; this position is supported in Grice's response to this argument "(Grice 1986). Avramides (1997: 25) also supports the link between intentions and rationality.

From what have been said so far, we can say that rationality is the essence of our behaviour and we cannot communicate without it since it is thinking, speaking, reasoning, deciding and believing in a way that is generally reliable and efficient for achieving our goals in conversation.

## 7. Inference: Preliminary Remarks

Reading between the lines has become the standard definition for inference, but this has never been clear enough or concrete enough for the reader to understand.

Marr states that inference is the heart of visual perception from the structure of an image to the structure of the real world outside (cited in Recanati, 2004: 50).

Levinson (1983: 103) notices that semantic inferences are not implicatures but rather inferences based on both the content of what has been said and some specific assumptions about the cooperative nature of the ordinary verbal interaction.

Sperber and Wilson (1986: 22) argue that inference is any conclusion that one is reasonably entitled to draw from a sentence or an utterance. Let us look at the following example:

> *(1) All human beings are rational.* (premise)
>
> *(A) Peter is a human being.* (premise)
>
> *(B) Peter is rational.* (conclusion)

Dole, et al (1991: 250) mention that inference is the heart of comprehension process, however, Chikalanga (1992: 697) defines inference as the cognitive process a reader goes beyond to obtain the implicit meaning of a written text on the basis of two origins of information: the proposition content of the text (i.e. , the information explicitly stated) and prior knowledge of the reader.

Yule (1996: 69) states that inference is the listener's use of additional knowledge to make sense of what is not explicit in an utterance whereas Schwarz (1996: 7) points out that Grice (1975) refers to inference as a conversational implicature that goes beyond the semantic meaning of what is being said by determining the pragmatic meaning of an utterance.

AL-Sulaimaan (2011: 183) defines inference as the process of deduction which listeners characteristically employ in interpreting utterances, let us consider the following example:

> *(2) I cleaned the house today. My mother in law is coming.*
>
> The speaker cleaned the house since his mother in law was coming.

To sum, one can deduce that inference is the meaning that is suggested rather than directly stated. Inferences are implied through clues that lead the reader to make assumptions and draw conclusions, or the act of passing from one proposition, statement or judgment considered as true to another whose truth is believed to follow from that of another, or is a logical conclusion that is drawn from a premise.

## 8. Inferences and Meaning

In Logic and Conversation, Grice (1975: 42) makes a very general distinction between what is said by a speaker and what he means or infers. Let us begin with one of his famous examples:

"Suppose that A and B are talking about a mutual friend, C, who is now working in a bank. A asks B how C is getting on in his job, and B replies, Oh quite well, I think; he likes his colleagues, and he hasn't been in prison yet" (Grice 1975: 43). Now what is interesting is Grice's comment: "I think it is clear that whatever B implied, suggested, meant, etc. , in this example, is distinct from what B said, which was simply that C had not been in prison yet" (Grice 1975: 43). In his commentary, Grice used the words implied, suggested and meant to describe what the speaker intended to convey. The important point is that Grice distinguishes between what is said and what is meant.

Grice (1975:44) sees a link between implicated and conventional meaning when the concept of conventional implicature is introduced. For the moment, however, it is important to state Grice's first criterion for distinguishing between what is said and what is implicated. As what is said must be understood in terms of what philosophers define as meaning, that is, sense and reference, what is said is "the result of a linguistic computation implying the description of a full proposition with a truth value" (Strawson,1971:180) .According to philosophy of language, reference is not a property of linguistic sentences, but instead, as Strawson explicitly states, a property of utterances: "Mentioning, or referring to, something is a characteristic of a use of an expression, as 'being about' something, and truth or-falsity, are characteristics of a use of a sentence" (Strawson 1971: 180). This implies that Grice's idea of what is said cannot be restricted to a merely linguistic notion of logical form: it is a full proposition with a truth value, as implied in the work of Searle in his seminal article on literal meaning (Searle 1979: 90), when he stated that the notion of literal meaning of a sentence only has application relative to a set of contextual or background assumptions.

Moeschler (2010: 6) says that this is a crucial step in the comprehension of non-natural meaning: one part of non natural meaning is what is said, which can be reduced to the truth-conditional aspect of meaning, while the other part is the non-truth-conditional aspect of meaning, known as inference and implicature.

From what have been said so far, one can say to achieve a successful inference, listeners/readers need to, accurately, identify the entities to which speakers/writers refer.

## 9. Conclusions

Inference can be defined as the logical conclusion that is drawn from a premise or as the cognitive process a reader goes beyond to obtain the implicit meaning of a written text on the basis of two origins of information (1) the proposition content of the text (i.e. , the information explicitly stated) and (2) the prior knowledge of the reader . Inference is the final result of the following elements which are lexis, grammar, layout and punctuation, thought, knowledge of context, experience, expectations and beliefs, knowledge of communication conventions. Rationality can be defined in our perspective as believing the believable, or believing something fathomable, and having a perfect knowledge of the maxims observing, and applying the maxims in an accurate way or it is the essence of our behaviour and we cannot communicate without it since it is thinking, speaking, reasoning, deciding and believing in a way that is generally reliable and efficient for achieving our goals in conversation, and we found in this study that the Gricean Maxims are the unique ways to be cooperative and they help us to be rational and tacit in our conversation and they are not rules. We have to learn, suggest that they may only come to our intention when we encounter speech which is hard with the assumption that they are being observed. For this reason, Grice's Maxims will be adopted as our inferential model for the analysis of the data under investigation.

**SL Text (1):**

(A)  : How many people should I ask to get a good sample ?
(B)  : You should ask 10 people (Spenader, 2004: 29).
**Context:** The speaker asks the addressee about the appropriate number to get a good sample.

**Inference:** 10 is the minimum.

**TL Texts:**

1. (أ) ما هو عدد الأشخاص المفروض إحضارهم للحصول على عينة جيدة؟

   (ب) يجب أن تحضر عشرة أشخاص.

   الاستدلال: يبلغ المعدل الأقل للحصول على عينة جيدة هو عشرة عينات.

2. (أ) كم يبلغ عدد الأشخاص المطلوب أن اسألهم للحصول على نموذج جيد؟

   (ب)  يجب أن تسال عشرة أشخاص.

الاستدلال: عشرة على الأقل.

3.  (أ) استفسر عن عدد الناس المطلوب إكماله للحصول على عينة جيدة؟

(ب)  يجب أن تحضر عشرة أشخاص.

الاستدلال: عشرة كمعدل أدنى.

4.  (أي) بلله عليك إنني استفسر عن إحضار العدد المناسب للأشخاص لغرض الحصول على  عينة متميزة؟

(بي)  يجب أن تحضر عشرة أشخاص.

الاستدلال: قم  بإحضار عشرة فقط لا غير.

5.  (أ) كم يصل العدد المناسب للأشخاص المطلوب إحضارهم بغية الحصول على عينة جيدة؟

(ب)   يجب أن تحضر عشرة أشخاص.

الاستدلال: احضر عشرة كمعدل أدنى.


## Pragmatic Interpretation

10 is the minimum. If 5 is the minimum, A would be breaking the maxim of Quantity. This is a bridging inference based on the contrast and understanding new expressions.

## Translational Discussion

Subjecting renderings to the scrutiny one can say that the semantic translation is used by subject (2) since the inferred meaning is conveyed literally,however subjects (1,3 and 5) have used the communicative translation since the subjects are not confined with the words of the text itself they add and omitt the words in accordance with its suitability with the inferred meaning.. All the subjects in this table refer to the positive inferences in both the SL. and TL, but the fourth translation could be considered as a case of failure since it contains many utterances and it could be considered as a case of redundancy in translation and we are with the principle of economy in translation. Thus, one can illustrate this discussion by the following table:

## Text Analysis (1):

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said n. Meaning | What is Inferred nn. Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Semantic** | **Communicative** |

| SLT English | | Bridging | | Good | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TLTs Arabic** | **1** | Bridging | | Good | | **+** |
| | **2** | Bridging | | Good | **+** | |
| | **3** | Bridging | | Good | | **+** |
| | **4** | Bridging | | Good | failure | failure |
| | **5** | Bridging | | Good | | **+** |

## The Proposed Renderings

The most appropriate renderings are (2 and 3) since they are regarded as more suitable equivalents in the TL. Text as the inferred meaning has been conveyed more accurately and naturally from the SL into the TL.

1. (أ) كم يبلغ عدد الأشخاص المطلوب أن اسألهم  للحصول على نموذج جيد؟

(ب)  يجب أن تسال عشرة أشخاص.

الاستدلال: عشرة على الأقل.

2. (أ) استفسر عن عدد الناس المطلوب إكماله للحصول على عينة جيدة؟

(ب)  يجب أن تحضر عشرة أشخاص.

الاستدلال: عشرة كمعدل أدنى.

## SL Text (2):

I dropped the glass.

**Inference:** It broke. (AL-Sulaimaan, 2011: 184)

**Context:** The speaker informs the addressee that he dropped the glass to notify him.

## TL Texts:

1.  أسقطت القدح.

انكسر القدح (انكسر الشر)

2.  أسقطت القدح.

انكسر القدح.

3. كسرت القدح

تحول القدح إلى جزيئات صغيرة.

4. أسقطت القدح بدون قصد

تهشم القدح إلى أجزاء صغيرة

5. قمت بكسر القدح.

لم يبق من القدح سوى  جزيئات صغيرة.

## Pragmatic Interpretation

Most inferences are derived automatically from utterances and are part of the way in which consecutive utterances are assumed to be coherent.

## Translational Discussion

Regarding translation, one can figure out that subjects (1, 3, 4 and 5) have used a communicative translation because they are dissident from the standard. Subject (2) have used a semantic translation since the inferred meaning remains as it is .Subject (1) has conveyed the good connotations of this utterance (he/she translates the utterance from a normal English utterance into Arabic proverb, the rest of the subjects have conveyed the inferred meaning in bad connotations. However, this discussion can be illustrated by using the following table:

### Text Analysis (2):

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said n. Meaning | What is Inferred nn. Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Semantic | Communicative |
| SLT English | | Bridging | | Good (proverb) | | |
| TLTs Arabic | 1 | Bridging | | Bad | | + |
| | 2 | Bridging | | Bad | + | |
| | 3 | Bridging | | Bad | | + |
| | 4 | Bridging | | Bad | | + |
| | 5 | Bridging | | Bad | | + |

### The Proposed Renderings

Applying what have been said to the renderings, one can say that subjects (1 and4) have conveyed the inferred meaning more appropriately and successfully to the TL culture. As a result, we propose them

1.  أسقطت القدح.

    انكسر القدح. (انكسر الشر).

2. أسقطت القدح بدون قصد.

تهشم القدح إلى أجزاء صغيرة.

### SL Texts (3):

John: Where is Meredith?

Elizabeth: In the control room or the science lab. (Grice, 1975: 47)

**Inference:** Elizabeth does not know which of the two places Meredith is.

**Context:** John asks Elizabeth about Meredith's location.

### TL Texts:

(1)  جون: أين ميريدث؟

إليزابيث: في غرفة التحكم أو في مختبر العلوم.

الاستدلال: إن اليزابيث لا تعلم أيوجد ميريدث في غرفة التحكم أم في مختبر العلوم.

(2) جون: أرأيت ميريدث؟

إليزابيث: يتواجد ميريدث إما في مركز التحكم أو في مختبر العلوم.

الاستدلال: لا تعلم اليزابيث بالتحديد مكان وجود ميريدث

(3) جون: أين توجد ميريدث؟

اليزابيث: تستطيع إن تعثر عليه إما في مركز التحكم أو في مختبر العلوم.

الاستدلال: لا تعرف اليزابيث على وجه الدقة مكان ميريدث.

(4) جون: أين يتواجد ميريدث؟

الزابيث: إما في مركز التحكم أو في مختبر العلوم.

الاستدلال: لا تعرف اليزابيث أين يتواجد ميريدث هل في مركز التحكم ام في مختبر العلوم.

(5) جون: إنني لا اعلم مكان ميريديث. أرايته؟

الزابيث: اعتقد انه موجود إما في مقر التحكم أو في مختبر العلوم.

الاستدلال: اليزابيث لا تعلم بالضبط أين تتواجد ميريدث هل في مركز التحكم أم في مختبر العلوم.

## Pragmatic Interpretation

Flouting a maxim (major violation) to create a conversational inference clearly and obviously violating a maxim, one can imply something beyond what one says.

Maxim Violated: Quantity; Elizabeth did not give as much information as John wanted (Meredith's exact location), but instead gave a weaker statement (giving two possible options).

## Translational Discussion

Concerning translation, one can mention that semantic translation is used by subject (1). The rest of the subjects have used communicative translation since it is the suitable method to translate such a type of inference (conversational inference) which is created as a result of violating Grice's Maxims. The following table will explain what have been said in this discussion:

## Text Analysis (3):

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said n. Meaning | What is Inferred nn. Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Semantic | Communicative |
| **SLT English** | | Conversational | | Normal | | |
| **TLTs Arabic** | **1** | Conversational | | Normal | + | |
| | **2** | Conversational | | Normal | | + |
| | **3** | Conversational | | Normal | | + |
| | **4** | Conversational | | Normal | | + |
| | **5** | Conversational | | Normal | | + |

## The Proposed Renderings

As a result one can suggest the following two renderings (2 and 5) since the inferred meaning is conveyed more accurately and naturally from the SL into the TL:

(1) جون: إنني لا اعلم مكان ميريديث. أرايته؟

اليزابيث: اعتقد انه موجود إما في مقر التحكم أو في مختبر العلوم.

الاستدلال: اليزابيث لا تعلم بالضبط أين تتواجد ميريدث هل في مركز التحكم أم في مختبر العلوم.

(2) جون: أرأيت ميريدث؟

اليزابيث: تواجد ميريدث إما في مركز التحكم أو في مختبر العلوم.

الاستدلال: لا تعلم اليزابيث بالتحديد مكان وجود ميريدث.

## SL Texts (4):

If he went fishing then he had a fish supper. (Byrne, 1989: 62).

**Inference:** He went fishing.

**Context:** The speaker tells the hearer about the fishing.

## TL Texts:

(1) إذا ذهب للصيد بعدها سيتعشى السمك.

الاستدلال: ذهب للصيد.

(2) إذا ذهب لمزاولة الصيد بعدها سيتناول السمك في العشاء.

الاستدلال: ذهب لمزاولة الصيد.

(3) إذا زاول الصيد سيتعشى بعدها السمك.

الاستدلال: ذهب سعيا لصيد السمك.

(4) إذا قصد الشاطئ للصيد سيكون السمك عشاؤه.

الاستدلال: ذهب لكي يصيد السمك.

(5) سيتناول السمك ليلا، إذا ذهب لصيد السمك.

الاستدلال: ذهب لصيد السمك.


**Pragmatic Interpretation:**

The hearer inferred that the speaker had a fish supper. However, the hearer tended not to draw this conclusion with the addition of certain conditional premises, such as the following:

If he went fishing, then he had fish for supper.

If he caught some fish, then he had fish for supper.

He went fishing.


**Translational Discussion**

A close look at the example reveals that the semantic method of translation is used by subject (1) .However, the rest of the subjects have used the communicative method of translation since there is an illusory inference in this utterance, so no suitable translation to satisfy this purpose but the communicative one. In these translations, the subjects add, omit and paraphrase the sentences in order to reach the appropriate meaning. This discussion can be simplified by the following table:

## Text Analysis (4):

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said n. Meaning | What is Inferred nn. Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Semantic** | **Communicative** |
| **SLT English** | | Illusory | | Good | | |
| **TLTs Arabic** | **1** | Illusory | | Good | + | |
| | **2** | Illusory | | Good | | **+** |
| | **3** | Illusory | | Good | | **+** |
| | **4** | Illusory | | Good | | **+** |
| | **5** | Illusory | | Good | | **+** |

### The Proposed Renderings

From what has been said so far, one can suggest the best renderings are (1 and 5) since they convey the inferred meaning in the SL in a more suitable and approximate way into the TL.

(1) إذا ذهب لمزاولة الصيد بعدها سيتناول السمك في العشاء.

الاستدلال: ذهب لمزاولة الصيد.

(2) سيتناول السمك ليلا، إذا ذهب لصيد السمك.

الاستدلال: ذهب لصيد السمك.

## SL Texts (5):

Ren left the town and fell in love.

**Inference:** Ren fell in love. (Irmer, 2009: 14).

**Context:** The speaker tells the addressee that Ren left the town and fell in love.

### TL Texts:

(1) غادرت رين المدينة ووقعت في الحب.

الاستدلال: وقعت رين في الحب.

(2) غادرت رين البلدة وهامت في الحب.

الاستدلال: هامت رين في الحب.

152

(3)    تركت رين المدينة وبعدها وقعت في الغرام.

الاستدلال: وقعت رين في شباك الغرام.

(4)    بعد أن تركت المدينة؛ وقعت رين في الحب.

الاستدلال: أصبحت رين عاشقة.

(5)    بعد أن هجرت المدينة؛ وقعت رين في الحب.

الاستدلال: وقعت رين في آهات الغرام.

**Pragmatic Interpretation:**

Grice's conversational implications have two crucial properties: they are inferences in a narrow sense in that participants are aware of them and can draw them consciously and they are post-propositional: they are drawn on the fact that a speaker has said a proposition. However, these two properties do not hold for the following cases, which nevertheless are widely acknowledged to be cases of conversational implicatures and inferences.

**Translational Discussion**

From a translational perspective, one can say that the semantic method of translation is used by subject (1), however, the rest of the subjects have used communicative translation. The utterance in this analysis has a conversational inference and all of these renderings express a good idea in the SL culture (love) where as in the TL culture the idea is not quite appealing. In order to grasp this discussion let us see the following table:

**Text Analysis (5):**

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said N Meaning | What is Inferred NN Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Semantic** | **Communicative** |
| **SLT English** | | Conversational | | Good | | |
| **TLTs Arabic** | **1** | Conversational | | Bad | + | |
| | **2** | Conversational | | Bad | | + |
| | **3** | Conversational | | Bad | | + |
| | **4** | Conversational | | Bad | | + |
| | **5** | Conversational | | Bad | | + |

## The Proposed Renderings

Applying what has been mentioned to the renderings, one can say that the subjects (3 and 5) have conveyed the inferred meaning more appropriately and successfully to the TL culture.

(1) تركت رين المدينة وبعدها وقعت في الغرام.

وقعت رين في شباك الغرام.

(2) بعد أن  هجرت المدينة ؛وقعت رين في الحب.

وقعت رين في آهات الغرام.

## SL Text (6):

I entered the room. The ceiling was beautiful.

**Inference:** Rooms have ceilings. (Al-Sulaimaan, 2011: 184)

**Context:** The speaker entered the room and described the ceilings.

## TL Texts:

(1)  دخلت الغرفة كان سقفها جميلا.

الاستدلال: يوجد سقوف في الغرف.

(2)  عندما دخلت الغرفة وجدت سقفها خلابا.

الاستدلال: يوجد سقوف خلابة في الغرف.

(3)  في الوقت الذي دخلت فيه الغرفة ألفيت سقفها جميلا.

الاستدلال: في الغرف سقوف جميلة.

(4)  عندما وطأت قدماي بلاط الغرفة وجدت سقفها مبهرا.

الاستدلال: من البديهي أن توجد سقوف جميلة في الغرف.

(5)  في اللحظة التي دخلت فيها الغرفة وقع نظري على سقفها الرائع.

الاستدلال: من الطبيعي أن يوجد سقوف في الغرف.

## Pragmatic Interpretation

This example is of automatic, or routine, inference is what linguists call "bridging inferences". These occur in sentences where speakers rely on general or background knowledge to fill in the gaps. In these cases, because it is a matter of general knowledge that rooms have ceilings and that tides occur on beaches, the listener is able to draw the appropriate inference linking the two sentences.

## Translational Discussion

The example under investigation reveals that semantic translation is utilized by subject (1) as the intended meaning is conveyed literally. However, the remaining subjects have used communicative translation since they add and omit words in accordance with the suitability with the inferred meaning, since this type of inference (bridging inference) depends on the shared knowledge between the speaker and hearer. So communicative translation is used more than the semantic one in order to make the inferred meaning easier and more understandable to the hearer. The following table is suggested to illustrate this discussion:

## Text Analysis (6):

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said n. Meaning | What is Inferred nn. Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Semantic** | **Communicative** |
| **SLT English** | | Bridging | | Good | | |
| **TLTs Arabic** | **1** | Bridging | | Good | + | |
| | **2** | Bridging | | Good | | + |
| | **3** | Bridging | | Good | | + |
| | **4** | Bridging | | Good | | + |
| | **5** | Bridging | | Good | | + |

## The Proposed Renderings:

Applying what has been said to the renderings, one can say that subjects (1 and 4) have conveyed the inferred meaning  more suitably and naturally to the TL culture.

(1) دخلت الغرفة؛ كان سقفها جميلا.

الاستدلال: يوجد سقوف في الغرف.

(2) عندما وطأت قدماي بلاط الغرفة وجدت سقفها مبهرا.

الاستدلال:من البديهي أن توجد سقوف جميلة في الغرف.

## SL Text (7):

Katie's father did not give her any supper.

**Inference:** Katie got no supper. (Al-Sulaimaan, 2011: 184)

**Context:** The speaker informs the hearer that Katie got no supper since her father did not give her any supper.

## TL Texts:

(1)  أن والد كيت لم يعطها أي طعام للعشاء.

الاستدلال: لم تتعشى كيت.

(2) إن أبو كيت لم يهب ابنته أي طعام للعشاء.

الاستدلال: لم تتناول كيت وجبة العشاء.

(3) لم يعط والد كيت ابنته طعاما للعشاء.

الاستدلال: لم تحصل كيت على وجبة العشاء.

(4) لم يطعم والد كيت ابنته في وجبة العشاء.

الاستدلال: لم تحصل كيت على وجبة العشاء.

(5) لم يغذي والد كيت ابنته في وجبة العشاء.

الاستدلال: ما أكلت كيت في وجبة العشاء.

## Pragmatic Interpretation

We can say that inferences are conclusions that one is reasonably entitled to draw from sentences or utterances. Inferences refer to the process of deduction which listeners characteristically employ in interpreting utterances.

## Translational Discussion

Subjecting renderings to the scrutiny, one can say that the semantic translation is used by subject (3) since the literal meaning remained as it was. However, the rest of the subjects have used communicative translation since it succeeds in expressing the status of Katie as her father did not let her eat in the supper. In this translation, the subjects

take the words in terms of their intended meaning, not their literal meaning since the literal translation takes the words from their literal level not their literary level and this is not useful in this work as the subjects contain a bridging inference type, so the subjects in the TL have used the imperfect + لم and ما + the perfect to express the negation in the past. Let us take a look on the following table to understand this discussion:

**Text Analysis (7):**

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said n. Meaning | What is Inferred nn. Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|-------|-----|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| | | | | | **Semantic** | **Communicative** |
| **SLT English** | | Bridging | | Bad | | |
| **TLTs Arabic** | **1** | Bridging | | Bad | | + |
| | **2** | Bridging | | Bad | | + |
| | **3** | Bridging | | Bad | + | |
| | **4** | Bridging | | Bad | | + |
| | **5** | Bridging | | Bad | | + |

### The Proposed Renderings

Applying what has been said to the renderings, one can say that subjects (2 and 4) have transmitted the meaning more appropriately and naturally to the TL. The proposed renderings are:

(1) إن أبو كيت لم يهب ابنته أي طعام للعشاء.

الاستدلال: لم تتناول كيت وجبة العشاء.

(2) لم يطعم والد كيت ابنته في وجبة العشاء.

الاستدلال: لم تحصل كيت على وجبة العشاء.

### SL Text (8):

Some of the students failed i the exam.

**Inference:** Not all the students failed the exam. (Spenader, 2004: 30).

**Context:** The speaker tells the hearer about the results of the exam.

**TL Texts:**

(1) فشل بعض الطلبة في الاختبار .

الاستدلال: لم يفشل كل الطلبة في الاختبار .

(2) لم يجتز بعض الطلبة الامتحان.

الاستدلال: نجح البعض الأخر من الطلبة في الامتحان.

(3) حقق بعض الطلاب نتيجة الفشل في الامتحان.

الاستدلال: لم يحقق كل الطلاب نتيجة الفشل في الامتحان.

(4) اخفق بعض الطلاب في الامتحان.

الاستدلال: لم يخفق جميع الطلاب في الامتحان.

(5) رسب بعض الطلاب في الامتحان.

الاستدلال: لم يرسب كل الطلبة في الامتحان .

## Pragmatic Interpretation

This is a bridging inference based on the contrast and understanding new expressions.

## Translational Discussion

In the example under discussion, it could be said that the subjects (2 and 3) have rendered the utterance communicatively by the use of the Arabic negation article (لم) that precedes the verb plus the Arabic scalar particles (جميع, كل) which infer and assert all the other forms higher are than the lower on the scale of values .The rest of the subjects have rendered the utterance semantically since they convey the inferred meaning literally without any addition or deletion. Finally, what has been said can be illustrated by the following table.

### Text Analysis (8):

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said n. Meaning | What is Inferred nn. Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|-------|-----|-------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| | | | | | **Semantic** | **Communicative** |
| **SLT English** | | Scalar | | Not all | | |
| **TLTs Arabic** | **1** | Scalar | | Some | + | |
| | **2** | Scalar | | Not all | | + |
| | **3** | Scalar | | Some | | + |
| | **4** | Scalar | | Some | + | |
| | **5** | Scalar | | Some | + | |

### The Proposed Renderings

Applying what has been said to the renderings, one can say that subjects in (1 and 5) have conveyed the inferred meaning more appropriately and naturally to the TL text.

(1) فشل بعض الطلبة في الاختبار .

الاستدلال: لم يفشل كل الطلبة في الاختبار .

(2) رسب بعض الطلاب في الامتحان.

الاستدلال: لم يرسب كل الطلبة في الامتحان .

### SL Text (9):

I am out of petrol. (Brown and Yule ,1983:32)

**Inference:** There is a garage round the corner.

**Context:** Grice invites us to imagine a person A "standing by an obviously immobilized car".

### TL Texts:

(1)  لقد نفد الوقود لدي .

الاستدلال: يوجد كراج قرب المفترق.

(2) لقد نفد عندي الوقود.

الاستدلال: غايتك في محطة بالقرب من هنا.

(3) لقد نفد من سيارتي البنزين.

الاستدلال: هنالك مراب عند المنعطف .

(4) سيارتي توقفت نظرا لنفاد الوقود فيها.

الاستدلال: هنالك مراب حول الزاوية بإمكانك التزود بالوقود منه .

(5) إنني واقف خارج محطة تعبئة الوقود.

الاستدلال: يتواجد موقف للعربات محيط بالزاوية.

## Pragmatic Interpretation

Grice observes that B's utterance allows A to infer that, as far as B knows, the garage in question is open.

## Translational discussion

Subjecting renderings to the scrutiny, one can mention that the semantic translation is used by the subjects (1 and 3) because the literal meaning remained without any changes .Consequently, communicative translation is used by subjects (2,4 and 5) .However, the fifth subject is failed to translate this utterance as the inferred meaning is not conveyed accurately .In this example , all the subjects have conveyed a normal concept ,their main concern is to convey the pragmatic inference from the SL into the TL in an appropriate way, and thus to illustrate what has been said. Let us consider the following table:

## Text Analysis (9):

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said n. Meaning | What is Inferred nn. Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Semantic** | **Communicative** |
| **SLT English** | | Pragmatic | | Normal | | |
| **TLTs Arabic** | **1** | Pragmatic | | Normal | + | |
| | **2** | Pragmatic | | Normal | | + |
| | **3** | Pragmatic | | Normal | + | |
| | **4** | Pragmatic | | Normal | | + |
| | **5** | Pragmatic | | Normal | Failure | Failure |

### The Proposed Renderings

Applying what has been mentioned to the renderings, one can say that subjects (1 and 2) have conveyed the inferred meaning more appropriately and successfully to the TL.

(1) لقد نفد الوقود لدي .

الاستدلال: يوجد كراج قرب المفترق.

(2) لقد نفد عندي الوقود.

الاستدلال: غايتك في محطة بالقرب من هنا..

### SL Text (10):

I went to a French restaurant. The waiter was very sexy. (Clark and (Haviland, 1974: 514).

**Inference:** There was a waiter in the French restaurant.

**Context:** the speaker informs us that there is a handsome waiter in the French restaurant.

### TL Texts:

(1) ذهبت إلى مطعم فرنسي  كان  النادل وسيما جدا.

الاستدلال :يوجد نادل في المطعم الفرنسي.

(2) رأيت نادلا جذابا في المطعم الفرنسي.

الاستدلال : يتواجد نادل جذاب في المطعم الفرنسي.

(3) رأيت خادما جذابا في المطعم الفرنسي الذي ارتاده.

الاستدلال :هنالك نادل جذاب في المطعم الفرنسي.

(4) عندما ذهبت إلى المطعم الفرنسي ألفيت النادل وسيما.

الاستدلال :سترى نادلا وسيما إذا ذهبت إلى المطعم الفرنسي.

(5) وقع نظري على نادل جذاب عندما كنت في المطعم الفرنسي.

الاستدلال : إذا ذهبت إلى المطعم الفرنسي سترى نادلا جذابا هناك.

## Pragmatic Interpretation

In this utterance the bridging assumption would be "there was a waiter in the French restaurant to which the speaker went to. This type of inference is called "bridging inference", and has been suggested that the process of bridging inference making is "time consuming".

## Translational Discussion

Considering the renderings, one can figure out that subject (1) has used semantic translation as the inferred meaning is conveyed literally without any changes . The rest of the subjects have used the communicative translation since the translator is free to add, omit and paraphrase the utterances in accordance with its suitability with the inferred meaning. All the subjects have used the Arabic definite article (أل) in their renderings that denote a specific country (France) .Here the renderings adhered to the maxim of quantity by the use of the Arabic definite article .Inaddition, this utterance conveys a good inference that transmits the notion of admiration which is an ordinary concept according to the culture of the SL on the contrary of the TL culture which considers this notion as a bad idea and the words and expressions expressing this idea are regarded as a taboo expressions, so the translator must be careful in translating such a concept.   The following table will illustrate this discussion:

**Text Analysis (10):**

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said n Meaning | What is Inferred nn. Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Semantic** | **Communicative** |
| **SLT English** | | Bridging | | Good | | |
| **TLTs Arabic** | **1** | Bridging | | Bad | + | |
| | **2** | Bridging | | Bad | | + |
| | **3** | Bridging | | Bad | | + |
| | **4** | Bridging | | Bad | | + |
| | **5** | Bridging | | Bad | | + |

### The Proposed Renderings

It could be suggested that the appropriate renderings are (3and 5) since they convey the inferred meaning more appropriately and successfully from the SL into the TL, the proposed renderings are:

(1) وقع نظري على نادل جذاب عندما كنت في المطعم الفرنسي.

الاستدلال: إذا ذهبت إلى المطعم الفرنسي سترى نادلا جذابا هناك.

(2) رأيت نادلا جذابا في المطعم الفرنسي الذي ارتاده.

الاستدلال : هنالك نادل جذاب في المطعم الفرنسي.

### SL Text (11):

John ate some of the cookies. (Irmer, 2009: 19)

**Inference**. John ate not all of the cookies.

**Context:** The speaker tells the addressee that John does not ate all the cookies.

### TL Texts:

(1) أكل جون بعضا من قطع البسكويت.

الاستدلال: لم يأكل جون قطع البسكويت كلها.

(2) أكل جون بعضا من البسكويت.

الاستدلال: لم يأكل جون البسكويت كله.

(3) تناول جون البعض من قطع البسكويت.

الاستدلال: لم يتناول جون قطع البسكويت كلها.

(4) تناول جون البعض من قطع المعجنات.

الاستدلال: لم يتناول جون قطع المعجنات كلها.

(5) التهم جون بعضا من قطع الحلوى.

الاستدلال: لم يلتهم جون قطع الحلوى كلها.

## Pragmatic Interpretation

Inferences are mostly scalar and clausal implicatures. Scalar inferences involve a scale, an n-tuple of expressions with related meanings, which is partially ordered in such a way that each element logically entails its successors. Examples of scales are <hot, warm>, <all, most, some>, or <know, believe>, or <and, or>. If a weaker expression is used then the Q-implicature arises that the stronger expression is not valid.

## Translational Discussion

As far as the renderings are concerned, one can mention that the semantic translation is used by subject (3), however, the communicative translation is used by the rest of the subjects as they are not confined with the literal meaning of the words themselves, the main concern in this analysis is to convey the inferred meaning in an elevated way all the utterances under discussion convey normal inferences, During translation, the meaning of the source text is preserved and presented according to the target language grammar, style, vocabulary and phonology. So the appropriate translation is the translation of meaning, both semantic and pragmatic, and nothing else. However, the fifth subject could be considered as a case of failure since the translator has conveyed the inferred meaning in a negative way and does not adhere to the original meaning of the SL text since the text contains the word (eat) not (devour) to translate it in this way and so, here we inferred the implications and hidden meanings which are intended by the writer of the source text or the speaker. Let us look at the following table which illustrates this discussion:

**Text Analysis (11):**

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said n Meaning | What is Inferred nn. Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|-------|-----|-------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| | | | | | **Semantic** | **Communicative** |
| **SLT English** | | Scalar | | Not all | | |
| **TLTs Arabic** | **1** | Scalar | | Not all | | + |
| | **2** | Scalar | | Not all | + | |
| | **3** | Scalar | | Not all | | + |
| | **4** | Scalar | | Some | | + |
| | **5** | Scalar | | Some | Failure | Failure |

## The Proposed Renderings

Applying what have been said to the renderings one can suggest the following two renderings since they have conveyed the inferred meaning more appropriately and naturally from the SL into the TL:

(1) تناول جون البعض من قطع البسكويت.

الاستدلال: لم يتناول جون قطع البسكويت كلها.

(2) أكل جون بعضا من البسكويت.

الاستدلال: لم يأكل جون البسكويت كله.

## SL Text (12):

I saw some of your children today. (Daniell, 2009: 3)

**Inference:** The speaker did not see all of the hearer's children

today.

**Context:** The speaker told the hearer that he saw some of his children.

## TL Texts:

(1) لمحت اليوم البعض من ذريتك.
الاستدلال: المتحدث لم يلمح ذرية السامع كلهم.

(2) ألفيت اليوم البعض من أولادك.
الاستدلال: المتكلم لم ير أولاد السامع كلهم.

(3) رأيت اليوم البعض من أطفالك.
الاستدلال: المتحدث لم ير أطفال السامع جميعهم.

(4) اليوم رأيت البعض من أطفالك.
الاستدلال: لم ير المتكلم أطفال المتلقي جميعا.

(5) أبصرت اليوم البعض من أطفالك.

الاستدلال: لم يبصر المتكلم أطفال المستمع جميعا.

## Pragmatic Interpretation

This inference from the quantifier some to some but not all relies on the idea that there is a semantically stronger alternative all which not uttered.

For Grice, this is where Game Theoretic Pragmatics comes in. The project is to try to assess the extent to which pragmatic inference can be modeled using other ideas about rational human action.

**Translational Discussion**

A close examination of the renderings shows us that the semantic translation is used by subject (3) as the literal meaning does not change at all; however, the remaining subjects have used the communicative translation since the subjects have taken Grice's maxims into consideration. All the subjects in the utterances discussed above express normal connotations in both the SL and TL text. This discussion can be illustrated by the following table.

**Text Analysis (12):**

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said N Meaning | What is Inferred NN Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|-------|-----|-------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | | | | | Semantic | Communicative |
| SLT English | | Pragmatic | | Not all | | |
| TLTs Arabic | 1 | Pragmatic | | Not all | | + |
| | 2 | Pragmatic | | Not all | | + |
| | 3 | Pragmatic | | Not all | + | |
| | 4 | Pragmatic | | Not all | | + |
| | 5 | Pragmatic | | Not all | | + |

**The Proposed Renderings**

From what have been said so far, it could be suggested that the suitable renderings are: (1 and 2) since the intended meaning have been conveyed more appropriately and suitably from the SL to the TL.

(1) رأيت اليوم البعض من أطفالك.

الاستدلال: المتحدث لم ير أطفال السامع جميعهم.

(2) ألفيت اليوم البعض من أولادك.

الاستدلال: المتكلم لم ير أولاد السامع كلهم.

**SL Text (13):**

Could you pass the salt ? (Grice, 1975: 49).

**Inference:** A speaker asks the hearer to pass him the salt.

**Context:** A speaker asks the hearer to pass him the salt in a form of question.

**TL Texts:**

(1) هل بإمكانك تمرير الملح؟

الاستدلال: يطلب المتحدث من السامع أن يمرر الملح.

(2) أ من الممكن إن تمرر الملح؟

الاستدلال: إن المتحدث يطلب من المتلقي أن يمرر الملح.

(3) لطفا أتستطيع إمرار الملح؟

الاستدلال: إن المتكلم يطلب من السامع أن يقوم بإمرار الملح.

(4) قم بإمرار الملح من فضلك.

الاستدلال: إن المتكلم يسال السامع بان يمرر الملح.

(5) هل تستطيع إمرار الملح؟

الاستدلال: المتكلم يطلب من السامع القيام بإمرار الملح.

**Pragmatic Interpretation**

Interpretation of an utterance relies on more than just the literal meaning of the sentence (conventionalization). Speaker expects the hearer to draw certain inferences. A hearer can only understand an utterance correctly and react adequately if (at least unconsciously) familiar with conversational maxims.

**Translational Discussion**

A first look at the renderings reveals that the semantic method of translation is used by the subject (5) since he/she preserved the literal meaning as it was, however, the rest of the subjects have used the communicative method of translation since the intended meaning  has been conveyed successfully from the SL into the TL and this type of inference (imperative inference) requires a type of translation like this type, and there are different styles which express the orders in both the SL and TL texts and in these renderings the subjects have used the form of question in their renderings to convey the polite request such as  هل بإمكانك؟ أتستطيع؟, the following table may illustrate what we discuss:

## Text Analysis (13):

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said N Meaning | What is Inferred NN Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Semantic | Communicative |
| SLT English | | Imperative | | Good | | |
| TLTs Arabic | 1 | Imperative | | Good | | + |
| | 2 | Imperative | | Good | | + |
| | 3 | Imperative | | Good | | + |
| | 4 | Imperative | | Good | | + |
| | 5 | Imperative | | Good | + | |

## The Proposed Renderings

From this brief one can suggest the appropriate renderings are (3 and 4) since the inferred meaning is transferred more accurately and successfully from the SL into the TL.

(1) لطفا أتستطيع إمرار الملح؟

الاستدلال: إن المتكلم يطلب من السامع أن يقوم بإمرار الملح.

(2) قم بإمرار الملح من فضلك.

الاستدلال: إن المتكلم يسال السامع بان يمرر الملح.

## SL Text (14):

Please give me a pen or pencil. (Geurts, 2009: 18)

**Inference:** The addressee need not provide both a pen and a pencil

**Context:** The speaker asked the addressee to give him a pen or a pencil.

## TL Texts:

(1) رجاءا أعطني قلم حبر أو رصاص.

الاستدلال: لا يوجد لدى المتلقي كلا النوعين.

(2) هل من الممكن أن تعطني قلم حبر أو رصاص؟

الاستدلال: لا يملك المتلقي كلا النوعين.

(3) امن الممكن أن تعيرني قلم جاف أو رصاص؟

الاستدلال: لا يملك السامع لا قلم حبر ولا رصاص.

(4) هل بالإمكان أن تعطني قلم حبر أو رصاص؟

الاستدلال: ليس لدى السامع كلا النوعين.

(5) هل لك أن تتفضل بإعطائي إما قلم حبر أو رصاص.

الاستدلال: لا يتوفر لدى السامع كلا النوعين.

## Pragmatic Interpretation

This inference is naturally explained as a imperative inference, if the request had been for a pen and a pencil, the speaker should have said, "Please give me a pen and a pencil".

## Translational Discussion

The example under investigation reveals that the subject (1) has used the semantic method of translation .However, the rest of the subjects have used the communicative method of translation since the meaning has been altered from its literal form into its literary form.In addition, the act of addition and deletion has been applied to the SL text since this type of inference (imperative inference) requires such a translation as the imperative statements in both the SL and TL have a different realizations and different forms expressing them. In fact, translation is a communication process that involves the transference of a message from a source language to a target language and so. Let us have a glance at the following table to grasp this discussion:

## Text Analysis (14):

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said N Meaning | What is Inferred NN Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Semantic | Communicative |
| SLT English | | Imperative | | Good | | |
| TLTs Arabic | 1 | Imperative | | Good | + | |
| | 2 | Imperative | | Good | | + |
| | 3 | Imperative | | Good | | + |
| | 4 | Imperative | | Good | | + |
| | 5 | Imperative | | Good | | + |

## The Proposed Renderings

One can suggest that the suitable two renderings are (3 and 5) as they conveyed the intended meaning from the SL more accurately and naturally to the TL.

The proposed renderings are:

(1) امن الممكن أن تعيرني قلم جاف أو رصاص؟

الاستدلال: لا يملك السامع لا قلم حبر ولا رصاص.

(2) هل لك أن تتفضل بإعطائي قلم حبر أو رصاص.

الاستدلال: لا يتوفر لدى السامع كلا النوعين.

## SL Text (15):

A. Are you coming to the stage night?  (Sperber and Wilson, 1986: 22)

B. I've spent all my money.

**Inference:** B is not going to the stage tonight**.**

**Context:** The speaker A asked B about his going to the stage.

## TL Texts:

(1)  أ– هل ستأتي إلى المسرح هذه الليلة؟
ب – لقد صرفت كل نقودي.

الاستدلال: لن يأت (ب) إلى المسرح هذه الليلة.

(2)  أ– هل ستأتي إلى خشبة المسرح الليلة؟
ب– لا اعتقد لا أنني أنفقت كل ما لدي .

الاستدلال: لن يأت (ب) إلى المسرحية الليلة.

(3)  أ– أ تأتي إلى المسرح الليلة؟
ب– آسف لأنني قد صرفت كل مالي.

الاستدلال: ليس لدى (ب) النية في القدوم إلى المسرح.

(4)  أ– أ لديك النية في القدوم إلى المسرح الليلة؟

<div dir="rtl">

ب– أخشى ذلك لأنني لا املك المال الكافي للقدوم.

الاستدلال: (ب) غير آت إلى المسرح.

(5) أي– لنذهب إلى المسرح الليلة !

بي– لا مال لدي للقدوم.

الاستدلال: لا يريد (بي) القدوم إلى المسرح.

</div>

## Pragmatic Interpretation

According to the relevance theory, A creates a context in order to understand B's answers. This context is the one B expected A to create from the several premises.

## Translational Discussion

Subjecting renderings to scrutiny, one can figure out that subject (1) has used the semantic translation, the rest of the subjects have used communicative translation. They rendered B's response according to the maxim of relevance by giving the answer "No" inferred in different shades of Arabic expressions as the following (لا (),(آسف),(أخشى ذلك اعتقد) followed by the justification that he has no money. Hence forth the translator should seek the appropriate equivalence which is called the Pragmatic equivalence, when referring to inferences and strategies of avoidance during the translation process. Inference is not about what is explicitly said but what is implied. Therefore, the translator needs to work out inferred meanings in translation in order to get the ST message across, and thus, let us consider the following table which illustrates what we say:

## Text Analysis (15):

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said N Meaning | What is Inferred NN Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Semantic** | **Communicative** |
| **SLT English** | | Pragmatic | | Normal | | |
| **TLTs Arabic** | **1** | pragmatic | | Normal | **+** | |
| | **2** | Pragmatic | | Normal | | **+** |
| | **3** | Pragmatic | | Normal | | **+** |
| | **4** | Pragmatic | | Normal | | **+** |
| | **5** | Pragmatic | | Normal | | **+** |

## The Proposed Renderings

The role of the translator is to recreate the author's intention in another culture in such a way that enables the TL reader to understand it clearly. So the more appropriate utterances are (1 and 2) since these renderings are applied to what have been said in this discussion.

(1) أ– هل ستأتي إلى المسرح هذه الليلة؟

ب– لقد صرفت كل نقودي.

الاستدلال: لن يأت (ب) إلى المسرح هذه الليلة.

(2) أ– هل ستأتي إلى خشبة المسرح الليلة؟

ب–        لقد أنفقت كل نقودي    .

الاستدلال: لن يأت (ب) إلى المسرحية الليلة.

## SL Text (16):

A: Where does C live? (Grice, 1989: 33)

B: Somewhere in the South of France.

**Inference**: B does not know where C live.

**Context:** The speaker A asks B about the location of the speaker C and B replies that somewhere in the south of France.

## TL Texts:

(1) أ– أين يعيش ج؟

ب– في مكان ما جنوب فرنسا.

الاستدلال: ب لا يعرف أين يعيش ج.

(2) أ– أين يقطن ج؟

ب– في موقع ما جنوب فرنسا.

الاستدلال: ب لا يعلم أين يقطن ج.

(3) أي– أين يوجد سي؟

بي– اعتقد انه متواجد في مكان ما جنوب فرنسا.

الاستدلال: بي لا يدري أين يتواجد سي.

(4) أ– أين يتواجد ج؟

ب– أظن أنه متواجد في موقع ما جنوبي فرنسا.

الاستدلال: ب لا يعرف موقع ج.

(5)C؟ أ– هل تعرف أين يسكن

ب– اعتقد أنه يسكن في جنوب فرنسا.

الاستدلالB لا يعرف أين يسكن C .

## Pragmatic Interpretation

Grice glosses this case as follows:

B's answer is less informative than is required to meet A's needs. This infringement of the first maxim of Quantity can be explained only by the supposition that B is aware that to be more informative would be to say something that infringed the second maxim of Quality, "Don't say what you lack adequate evidence for", so B implicates that he does not know in which town C lives. Grice's gloss states rather categorically that B's infringement of the Quantity maxim can be explained only by assuming that B lacks the evidence that would warrant a more specific claim, but that is clearly too strong. It could be, for example, that B considers his answer precise enough for A's purposes (Grice simply states that this isn't the case, but it might be), or A and B might be playing a guessing game in which the players aren't supposed to give fully specific answers, and there are many more possible situations in which (B) would not implicate that the speaker doesn't know where C lives, though it may be that such situations tend to be rather special.

## Translational Discussion

The example under investigation reveals that subject (1) has used the semantic method of translation, however, the rest of the subjects have used the communicative method of translation as they are not committed with the literal meaning of the words themselves. In this utterance there is a pragmatic inference which conveys a normal idea in both of the SL and TL. Let us consider the following table to grasp this discussion:

## Text Analysis (16):

| Title | No. | Type of Inference | What is Said N Meaning | What is Inferred NN Meaning | Method of Translation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Semantic | Communicative |
| SLT English | | Pragmatic | | Normal | | |
| TLTs Arabic | 1 | Pragmatic | | Normal | + | |
| | 2 | Pragmatic | | Normal | | + |
| | 3 | Pragmatic | | Normal | | + |
| | 4 | Pragmatic | | Normal | | + |
| | 5 | Pragmatic | | Normal | | + |

## The Proposed Renderings

The best two renderings which are (1 and 2) since the inferred meaning has been conveyed more appropriately and successfully from the SL into the TL:

(1) أ– أين يعيش ج؟

ب– في مكان ما جنوب فرنسا.

الاستدلال: ب لا يعرف أين يعيش ج.

(2) أ– أين يقطن ج؟

ب– في موقع ما جنوب فرنسا.

الاستدلال: ب لا يعلم أين يقطن ج.

## Conclusions

The major conclusions that can be derived from the previous sections are the following:

1. Inference is a logical conclusion that is drawn from a premise or as the cognitive process a reader goes beyond to obtain the implicit meaning of a written text on the basis of two origins of information: the proposition content of the text (i.e., the information explicitly stated) and prior knowledge of the reader.
2. There are many types of inferences, namely pragmatic inference, bridging inference, conversational inference, rice's inference, scalar inference, illusory inference and imperative inference.
3. In regard to effective renderings, it seems that most subjects are unaware of the importance of the word order, fronting and backing whether in English or Arabic since they are after normal structures and they ignore the intention of the SL writer

when he deviates in his style from the norm of achieving stylistic functions and conveying the force of his message.

4.  As for failure, only few cases are failure. This can be attributed to the principle of economy of translation and the honesty in conveying the original meaning since the subjects in these examples have used additional words to convey the inferred meaning in an appropriate way and these additional words have spoiled the original meaning.

5. Using a communicative translation which is based on dynamic equivalence (to use Nida's terms) is much more useful than using a semantic translation which is based on formal equivalence in transferring inferences from English into Arabic. This is why the percentage of using the communicative translation is much more than those of the semantic ones.

6.  Sometimes utterances are loaded with a variety of inferences. This results in the possibility of giving more than one effective rendering.

7. Ignorance of what is said and what is inferred by some subjects' results in misunderstanding the inferences in question and thus misrendering.

8.  Understanding inferences in the SL culture helps most of the subjects to give effective renderings. In regard to this point, it has been found that some of the subjects are ignorant of the general basic features and cultural norms of the inferences; therefore their evaluations are hampered by this lack of knowledge.

9.  The common conversational maxims used in expressing inferences can be sorted out through special context and context.

10. Problems encountered in translation are due to some subjects' ignorance of differences in conversational maxims in the respected languages.

## References

1.AL-Sulaimaan, M. M. (2011): Semantics and Pragmatics, Mosul: Dar Ibn AL-Atheer for Publishing and Distribution.

2.Avramides, A (1997): "Intention and Convention". In: Hale B. and Wright, C. (eds.), A Companion to the Philosophy of Language, Vol.2, pp.20-40.

3.Davies, B. (2000): "Grice's Cooperative Principle: Getting the Meaning Across". In: Nelson, D. and Foulkes, P. (eds.), Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol.8, No. 3, pp.1-26.

4.Chikalanga, L. (1992): "A Suggested Taxonomy of Inferences for the Reading Teacher". In: Reading in a Foreign Language, Vol.8, No. 2, pp.697-709.

5.Dole, J. A., Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., and Person, P. D. (1991): "Moving from the Old to the New: Research on Reading Comprehension Instruction". In: Review of Educational Research, Vol.61, pp.239-264.

6.Grandy, R. E. and Warner, R. (1986): "Paul Grice: a View of his Work". In: Grandy, R. and Warner, R. E. (eds.). Philosophical Grounds of Rationality,Vol.3, pp.1-44.

7.Grice, H. P. (1975): "Logic and Conversation". In: Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds.), Syntax and Semantics, Speech Acts,  Vol.3,     pp.41-58.

8.(1981): "Presupposition and Conversational Implicature". In Cole, P. (ed.) Radical Pragmatics, Vol.5, pp.183-197.

9.(1982): "Meaning Revisited". In: Smith, N. V. (ed.) Mutual Knowledge,Vol.5, pp.223

10. (1986): "Reply to Richards". In: Grandy, R. and Warner, R. E. (eds.), Philosophical Grounds of Rationality, Vol.5, No. 2, pp 45-106.

11. (1989): Studies in the Way of Words, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

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

13.Moeschler, J. (2010): "Conversational and Conventional Implicatures". In: Alessandro Capone (ed.), Perspectives on Language, Use, Pragmatics,Vol.3, pp.1-38.

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

15.Sarangi, S. K. and Slembrouk, S. (1992): "Non-Cooperation in Communication: A Reassessment of Gricean Pragmatics". In: Journal of Pragmatics, Vol.17, No. 2, pp.117

16.Schwarz, N. (1996): "Cognition and Communication". In: Judgmental Biases, Research Methods and the Logic of Conversation, Vol.5,No.2, pp.1-25.

17.Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986): "Relevance". In: Communication and Cognition, Vol.5,pp.20-40.

18.Warner, R. (1989): "Reply to Baker and Grandy".In: The Journal of Philosophy, Vol.86, pp.528-529.

19.Yule, G. (1996): Pragmatics, Oxford: Oxford University Press.