Original Article   Open Access

A Linguistic Analysis of Presupposition in Arabic

Mahmud Hussein Wardat
Department, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan
Email: maward98@yahoo.com

Abstract

The paper looks upon the linguistic nature of presupposition in Arabic. Following Lyons (1977), Yule (1996), and Beaver (2010), Beaver (2001), among others, the researcher finds that Arabic presuppositions displays eight linguistic categories in addition to their triggers: existential, factive, counter-factive, lexical, structural, iterative, sortally restricted, and structural. This sortally devices indicate the argument structure of what is presupposed. Arabic presuppositions are lexically and structurally motivated and controlled. The speaker uses these devices to indicate to the listener what is presupposed.

Keywords: Presupposition; Triggers; Analysis; Arabic; Categories.

1. Introduction

Speakers tend to use different mechanisms to fulfill communicative functions. They utilize presupposition (P) so that they can convey to hearers or listeners (L) a variety of information assumed by speakers (S). For an intelligible communication or conversation to occur, interlocutors hold assumptions towards each other. The speaker assumes that the listener can grasp what the former is saying, and the L also assumes that the S provides enough information enabling him to get the message intended. In the related literature, this aspect of communication is referred to as presupposition (P) and entailment. The former is the focus of this present paper.

A presupposition is what the S assumes that the L knows about the topic of the conversation. In this domain, Lyons (1977) maintains that a P indicates expressions which give information the speaker presents as given or unstressed; it can, thus, be recovered from the context. Also, "A presupposition is something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance. Speakers, not sentences, have presuppositions" (Yule, 1996). A presupposition is part of the meaning that should be seriously given due account to by the listener so as to get the meaning of the utterance (Verschueren, 1999). By the same token, Potts (2014) states that a P is information that the S of an utterance presupposes for the utterance to be meaningful in a given situation. For example, the utterance:

1.1. The Girl Visited the University

Presupposes the existence of a person, **the girl**, who did some act, visiting the university. This presupposition is the S's assumptions that assert a proposition which can, in terms of truth conditions, be true or false. Rooji (2010) states that a speaker's P need not be true since it is " based on an assumption that later turns to be false. He thus suggests relating a P to common belief rather than to common knowledge". Therefore, one should give due account to context so that one becomes familiar with common belief and knowledge in order to grasp a P. In this regard, Yingfang (2007) maintains that a P is the common knowledge known by the S and L "or at least the information that can be inferred according to context".

To understand P's, Geuerts (2010) proposes a binding theory of P's. The theory dictates that a listener can relate or bind a P to an appropriate antecedent or referent if an utterance has a presupposition trigger like definite noun phrases and certain verbs. Thus, if a P is not bound, "it will be inserted in some accessible discourse representation structure" (Geuerts, 2010). Consequently, both the S and L should worry about binders so that communication keeps flowing.

The truth value does not, however, change if an utterance is negated as in (2):

1.2. The Girl Did Not Visit the University

Yule (1996), calls this characteristic of presuppositions "constancy under negation", which means that the presupposition of a statement will remain constant (i.e. still true) even when that statement is negated. Similarly, Stubbs (1983) maintains that a P is a pre-condition for the truth value of a sentence. Thus, P's remain the same whether a sentence is negative, interrogative, or affirmative. He further states that if an existential presupposition is not achieved, "then the original presupposition has no truth value" (204). The S's assumptions or presuppositions are indicated by means of a variety of linguistic devices, verbs or predicates, phrases and constructions.

Knowing P's expressed in utterances or sentences implies knowing what linguistic mechanisms or devices employed by the S. It goes without saying that analysts present classes of devices which are solely intended to familiarize hearers with what is going on in a communicative act, be it an oral or written discourse. For example,

(Beaver, 2010) gives a number of verbs with examples showing how "factive verbs interact with implicatures". Illustrative verbs include **aware**, **know**, **find out**, **notice**, and the like.

Bonyadi and Samuel (2011), provide devices used to recognize P's in editorial discourse taken from two newspapers. The devices include noun phrases, existential phrases, factive verbs and phrases, non- factive verbs and phrases, and syntactic structures like adjective clauses.

There are other researchers who have dealt with P's and analyzed them in terms of similar devices named P triggers or control. For other examples, see Lyons (1977), Palmer (1981), Stubbs (1983), Yule (1996), and Beaver (2010), among others.

Two types of P exist in literature: semantic and pragmatic. The former looks upon P's from a logic and semantic perspective; the latter studies P's from a pragmatic viewpoint (Yingfang, 2007). The semantic P is demonstrated by the grammatical features of the language; this type entails studying the form of sentences and can be considered as a formal P. On the other hand, the pragmatic P investigates utterances since pragmatics studies the relationship between language utterances, contexts and parties involved in an interaction in the outside world. Givon (1979) defines pragmatic presupposition as "assumptions the speaker makes about what the hearer is likely to accept without challenge". Consequently, P's clearly reflect our understanding of the S's and L's assumptions and shared knowledge about the outside world. In the present paper, the focus is on the linguistic structure of P's in Arabic.

The present paper will discuss these devices or forms in Standard Arabic (SA). The topic has not yet extensively been researched in Arabic linguistics, resulting in several potential types of presuppositions, following Yule (1996) proposed categories of these types. It will present types, lexical and structural triggers. Finally, it will also point out some pedagogical implications that should be considered in teaching Arabic as a foreign language.

2. Related Literature

The phenomenon of presupposition has attracted the attention of linguists who have researched it resulting in a wave of studies. In what follows, a review of the available studies is looked upon.

Sukmawti (2020), looks upon the types of P's and their meanings found in the "Wonder Woman" movie. She analyzed 118 occurrences of P's found in that movie. The findings show that there six types of P: existential, factive, lexical, structural, non-factive, and counterfactual. "Presupposition is an implicit assumption about the world or background belief relating to an utterance whose truth is taken for granted in discourse. P can occur in verbal and nonverbal language not only in daily conversation but also in movie conversation" (p. 2).

Diningsih and Muhammad (2019), investigate the pragmatic aspects of humor discourse in the book Humor Politik Indonesia. The findings reveal that the P and implicature aspects were the pragmatic humor aspects in the book under investigation. Lexical, structural, and counterfactual P's were the P aspects found in the book. Mockery and satirical forms were the implicature aspects. Such aspects are meant to create funny aspects in readers. They can also be used as a teaching-learning device and material for Indonesian senior high school students.

Gencturk (2018), studies the use of P in English reading textbooks and learners' familiarity with them. Given fourteen reading texts, a sample of 34 intermediate level students were examined to see their knowledge or familiarity the P's used in their reading textbooks. The students were given a survey of six sentences randomly chosen from the textbooks and were asked to "yes" or "no" showing familiarity with the P's. Data analysis reveals that P's are not widely used in the reading textbook, and that the most commonly used types are lexical and existential P triggers. The researcher maintains that learners' knowledge of P and the content of the reading material can help learners understand the content better.

Safwat (2018), deals with the P and implicature of English and Arabic magazine editorials. P and implicature show that magazine editorials have information that is not explicitly stated in the editorials. P's exhibit assumptions embedded in what was said. The researcher studies a sample of 20 magazines editorials taken from both languages, Arabic and English. Results show that the use of proper names of persons and placed is a distinctive feature in editorial types. Also, the definite article is a feature of Arabic editorials; this is due to the use of this article with adjectivals. Arabic uses more possessives and demonstratives than English. Also, various types of P are triggered by factive, non-factice, change of state, implicature and iterative verbs. Data analysis indicates both languages make use of syntactic structures exhibiting counterfactual conditions which are of two types: temporal clauses and if-clauses. Further, the findings show English and Arabic editorials use the lexical items: **and, but, or, must, may, might, some, and all.**

Hikmah (2017), examines the P language used in TV channels in Indonesia. Using note-taking as a research tool, the researcher finds that three types of P are used in the ads of TV channels in Indonesia: possessive and definite noun phrases, existential, structural and counterfactual P's. Further, she finds that English ads use existential, structural, and counterfactual P's.

Thoyyibah (2017) looks upon the P triggers used in oral news and written outline news discourse. His objective is to identify the P triggers in both types of discourse. His data came from the CNN different news styles. The analysis covered two oral and written discourses in terms of the triggers: existential, factive, non-factive, lexical, counterfactual, adverbial, relative, and structural. Data analysis reveals that both varieties of discourse most extensively the existential trigger which holds attention to other parts of utterances or sentences.

Wardat (2017), investigates the pragmatic functions of Arabic P. The researcher collected data from a variety of sources. The analysis of data demonstrates that Arabic P's exhibits different functions: conciseness, euphemism, self-revelation, advising, caring, concealment, knowledge sharing, emphasizing, skill developing, interest arousing, and inferencing. Some of these functions (e.g., emphasis. Enlargement, economy) are arrived at by other researchers, but functions like advising, caring, protection, and skill developing are limited to Arabic.

Domaneschi (2016), carry out an experiment about presupposition selection in conditional sentences. The findings demonstrate that participants' selection of presupposition in conditional sentences was significantly higher than that of unconditional presuppositions. The result was attributed to the existence of dependence between the conditional presupposition and its antecedent. The dependence was governed by the availability of presupposition triggers like words and grammatical structures. The account of the findings does not seem to be convincing since all presuppositions are motivated by various types of triggers.

Polyzou (2015), deals with presupposition in relation to critical discourse analysis or societal pragmatics. He states that P reveals ideologies expressed in discourse, identifying discoursal functions. This researcher says that P should be investigated in terms of lexically triggered presuppositions, discourse P's, and presupposed pragmatic competence. As a matter of fact, this sort of investigation is necessary for understanding the participants' views and their world.

Lapore and Sennet (2014), maintain that understanding P's involves knowing presupposition triggers of a previous state of affairs. For instance, saying the student quit driving the car without a driving license triggers the P that the student used to drive without a license. Thus, P's are a property of various lexical items and syntactic structures which, according to those scholars, represent presupposition projection. In other words, P's project out of various triggers or inducers.

Soltan (2011) studies the presuppositional value of the question particle huwwa in Egyptian Arabic wh-questions. He maintains that the particle renders the question incompatible with the contexts of invitation. This is the case because it does not provide the listener with the opportunity of thinking about accepting or rejecting the invitation. That is to say, the use of the particle limits the choice open for the listener. Thus, a question introduced by huwwa shows the speaker's bias which the listener does not share with him.

Bonyadi and Samuel (2011), investigate the linguistic form of presupposition in both American and Persian daily editorials of New York Times and Tehran Times. The researchers find that in American English New York Times, writers use different linguistic devices to express P's; such devices include nominalization, possessive constructions, verbs and phrases. Editorial writers of Tehran Times use devices like nominalization, adverbial clauses, lexical items, various types of verbs, and parentheses. It is clear that editorial writers of both American and Persian newspapers use parallel devices "to make claims without actually asserting them directly in the editorial texts" (p.12). Yet there are differences between the two newspapers concerning the frequency of the devices employed by writers for presupposition purposes. functions in English advertisements. He states that P expresses eight functions: conciseness, interestingness, enlargement, emphasis, euphemism, concealment, persuasion, and self-protection. These functions demonstrate that presuppositions are mainly meant to produce the maximal advertising effects on consumers.

El-Gamal (2001) studies the relationship between presupposition and thematic meaning and how it is relevant to translation. He claims unshared P's are problematic in translation because of the cultural differences between languages which have peculiar systems. El-Gamal's findings are not novel because of the fact that differences are language specific, creating problems not only for translators but also for language learners.

Schmid (2001), studies syntactic structures of the type "The thing is that… or The problem was that… (N-be-that-constructions)". The analysis of data manifests that speakers, using such constructions having nouns like **problem**, **trouble, idea**, and **truth**, can deceive listeners or hearers into the unfounded or ungrounded belief that some information does not need contemplation, consideration or attention. Thus, Schmid concludes that "presuppositions can be a bluff".

The above presentation demonstrates a dearth of research on presupposition in Arabic. This area should not be underrated.

3. Types of Presuppositions Triggered by Linguistic Devices

Several types of P's motivated by a variety of linguistic devices or triggers are presented in literature (Beaver, 2001;2010; Lyons, 1977; Yule, 1996).The following presentation is based upon the ideas given in those sources and the ones cited therein.

First, Existential Presuppositions:

This type is triggered by definite referring expressions like noun phrases illustrated in this classic example mentioned by different linguists:

The king of France is (not) bald. (Lyons, 1977)

This example presupposes that France has a king who is/ is not bald. Here the speaker not only asserts a proposition but also commits himself to its truth.

Second, Factive Presuppositions:

This type is manifested by factive verbs like **know** and **recognize,** indicating that the speaker is/ is not knowledgeable of what he is saying. Presuppositions do not change their truth whether they are negated or interrogated.

Third, Non-Factive Presuppositions:

This category is triggered by predicates like **pretend**, **think** and **imagine**, indicating that the speaker is not committed to the truth value of what is being presupposed.

Fourth, Counter-factive Presuppositions:

This type is controlled by triggers like **wish** and unreal adverbial conditional clauses like If she had worked hard, she would have got B+ on the final exam. Counter-factive P's commit the speaker to their falsity but not to their truth value.

Fifth, Lexical Presuppositions:

According to Yule (1996), the speaker uses a lexical item like **quit, give_up**, and **ask** to presuppose an implicit proposition.

Sixth, Iterative Presuppositions:

This type shows that some state or event is being repeated by the speaker's use of adverbs like **always** and **too**.

Seventh, Sortally restricted Presuppositions:

Beaver (2001), maintains that the speaker utilizes predicates like **dream** and **a bachelor**, presupposing that their arguments are of the suitable type. For example, the verb **dream** presupposes that its subject is human.

Eighth, Structural Presuppositions:

Here the speaker makes use of a variety of syntactic constructions or elements or parts of sentences to presuppose that an entity exists to view or analyze those elements, structural parts, and sentences as having true information. Examples of those structures include wh-questions and cleft-sentences.

To sum up, the foregoing presentation demonstrates that presuppositions can be triggered or expressed by means of lexical items and structural constructions. That is to say, presuppositions are lexically –and structurally- motivated and controlled. What the speaker assumes that a given piece of information is presupposed is revealed by the device he uses.

4. Methodology

The following methods are employed by the researcher to fulfill the ultimate goal of the current research which is an analysis of the linguistic structure of presupposition in Arabic.

4.1. Data Collection

The researcher has collected data necessary for the purpose of the study from the following sources. These are magazines, newspapers, textbooks, utterances and sentences given by the researcher and other native speakers of Arabic. Arabic speakers constitute the main source which is spoken discourse.

The variation in sources has been a significant source yielding a pretty large number of presuppositional instances.

It should be noted that the sources were used by the same researcher for another piece of research that dealt with Arabic pragmatic functions and was published in 2017.

4.2. Data Analysis

The collected data are analyzed as follows in terms of ideas and categories presented by Lyons (1977), Yule (1996), Schmid (2001), and Beaver (2001), Beaver (2010), among others.

The researcher has identified presuppositions and categorized them as to their linguistic components and triggers. Eight categories of presupposition in Arabic are identified in terms of their linguistic elements and structures. Besides, various triggers or controllers are also spotted and presented along with those categories.

Finally, the Arabic presupposition data are transcribed and/or transliterated by means of phonetic symbols well-known in the field.

4.3. Significance of the Study

The present research is significant. This linguistic phenomenon, presupposition in Arabic, has not extensively been so far investigated linguistically. The researcher could not get any research examining it in related literature. Therefore, it will be informative in the sense that it will broaden other researchers' knowledge of this significant aspect of language. More, the paper will motivate other linguists to further look upon presupposition in Arabic. Finally, the study will have some pedagogical implications for the field of teaching and learning Arabic as a foreign language.

5. A Linguistic Analysis of Arabic Presuppositions

This section is meant to linguistically analyze presuppositions in Arabic. Lyons (1977) and Yule (1996), among others, have come up with different categories of P given in previous sections. The goal here is to see whether Arabic exhibits those categories.

Consider the following examples:

1) ra?is wuzara? ?al-?urdun

 President ministers the-Jordan

 'Jordan Prime Minister'

2) fuqida kitabu ?al-walad

 Lost book the-boy

 'The boy's book was lost.'

3) DaHaya HawadiTH ?al-sayr   khilal   ?ayyam

 Victims accidents the-traffic during   days

 'Car accidents victims during some days'   (**Addustour**, Sunday, Sep. 18, 2016: 40)

4) bayn ?al-?ingliz wal- ?alman

  Between   the-English and the- Germans

'Between the English and German armies' (**Al-qiblah**, Rabbi'?al-?awal, 1335H: 2)

Example (1) which is a noun phrase presupposes that Jordan has a prime minister. Number (2) which is a passive sentence expresses the proposition that the boy has a book which is lost. Example (3), also a noun phrase, presupposes that there are car accidents leading to serious casualties that have bad effects upon the country, its economy and its resources. Finally, (4), a prepositional phrase, indicates that there was a battle between the English and German armed forces.

Presuppositions in Arabic expressed through noun phrases, sentences, and prepositional phrases express what is called **Existential Presupposition.** This category is indicated by such verbs as yashtari 'buy', yamlik 'own, possess', and yaHsal 'obtain, get'. It is also indicated by particles like li 'to, for', lida 'have', 9ind 'have', and ma9 'with'.

Another type of P's in Arabic is illustrated in the following examples (5- 8):

5) yudrik   ?aT-Talibu dawr ?al-9amal   ?al-jama9i fi ?an-najaH

   Perceive   the- student role the- work   the-team in the- success

   'The student recognizes the role of team work in success.'

6) yu?sifuni ?anna l-baHiTHa lam yaHSal 9ala l-ja?iza

   Regret+I   that the-researcher not   get   at   the-reward

   'I regret that the researcher does not get the reward.'

7) ?al-?intikhabat ?an-niyabiyya … 9indama yuTHbit ?al-?urduniyun

   The-elections   the-parliamentary … when prove   the- Jordanians

   qudratahum 9ala taHwil ?at-taHadiyat ?ila ?al-furaS

   ability+their on   change the-challenges to the-opportunites

   'Parliamentary elections…   When Jordanians prove that they can change challenges into opportunities' (**Addustour**, Thursday, Sep. 22, 2016:5)

8) ?al-fa?iz   ?al-?awal … ?al-?urdun

    The- winner   the-first …   the-Jordan

    'The first winner is Jordan.' (**Addustour**, Thursday, Sep. 22, 2016: 7)

The speaker in (5) presupposes that the listener knows the significance of team work and its advantages; (6) which is a complex sentence shows the researcher's attempt to obtain a reward; example (7) which is both a noun phrase and an adverbial clause assumes that Jordanians are united and capable of achieving aims verbally and non-verbally. (8) presupposes that Jordan because of its solidarity and wise monarchy has achieved a memorable parliamentary election. Such examples indicate that Arabic has **Factive Presupposition** expressed in noun phrases, adverbial clauses, complex sentences and statements. This type is triggered by verbs and expressions like ya9rif 'know', yuSir 'insist', ya9tarif 'admit', ya?saf 'regret', yu9lin 'declare', bidun Shak 'undoubtedly', yafshal 'fail', ?innahu lamin ?almuHbiT ' It is frustrating that …'.

In brief, factive presuppositions in Arabic are expressed by verbs, noun phrases, adverb clauses, and complex sentences.

The third class of Arabic P's , **Non-factive Presupposition**, is exemplified in (9-11):

9) tathakkara ?ash-shurTiyyu kitabat ?at-taqrir

   Remember the- policeman   writing   the- report

   'The policeman remembered writing the report.'

10) za9uma ?al-baHiTHu ?anna baHTHahu   mumti9an

    Pretended the-researcher that   research+his   interesting

    'The researcher pretended that his research is interesting'.

11) tajruba muTHira   walakin !!!!

    Experiment exciting but

    'An exciting experience but !!!!'

Sentence (9) indicates the proposition that the policeman has a task to carry out; (10) presupposes that the researcher does research; finally, (11), a noun phrase, shows that the parliamentary elections are a fascinating experience for Jordanians, but they suffer certain pitfalls like bribery which were not thoroughly controlled.

Arabic non-factive P's are induced by verbs like yatakhayyal 'imagine', yaHlum 'dream', yadda9i 'pretend, claim', yaz9um 'pretend, claim', yatathakkar ' remember, recall', yukhbir 'inform', yabdu 'seem', ya9taqid ' believe', yaqul 'say', yatanabba? 'predict', yata?ammal ' contemplate', ya?mal 'hope', and yuqni9 'convince'.

The fourth category of Arabic P's is **Counter-factual**. It demonstrates that the speaker's or writer's presupposition is contrary to known facts or information. Consider (12-16):

12) law thahabtu   ?ila l-madrasa laqabaltu ?al-mudir

    If went+I to the-school met+I the-headmaster

    'If I had gone to school, I would have met the headmaster'.

13) ?atamanna law ?anna ?akhi huna

    Wish+I if that brother+I here

    'I wish my brother were here'.

14) baynama kana ?al-waladu yadrus, daqqa l-baba rajulun gharib

    While was the-boy study knocked the-door man strange

    'While the boy was studying, a strange man knocked the door'.

15) lam yadfa9 ?ar-rajul THaman ?ash-shuqqa ?allati ?ishtaraha

    Not pay the-man price the-apartment which bought+he

    'The man did not pay the price of the apartment which he bought'.

16) sa9ada l-mudir ?al-mar?ah badalan min ?aT-Talib

    Helped   the- headmaster the-woman   instead   from the-student

'Thee headmaster helped the woman rather than/instead of the student'.

Counter-factual P's are induced by verbs like <u>yatamanna</u> 'wish, desire', conditional sentences like (12) above, adverbial temporal clauses like (14), particles like <u>lam</u> 'not', and adjective clauses like (15). Therefore, we can say that triggers like these ones trigger presuppositions   which are counter-factual to what is true or known.

    Lexical Presuppositions constitute the fifth type in Arabic. This category is triggered by lexical items showing the speaker's or writer's proposition representing an understood meaning Yule (1996).This is illustrated in (17-20):

17) taraka ?ar-rajulu ?ata-dakhin

    Gave up the- man the- smoking

    'The man quit smoking'.

18) yas?alu ?al-baHiTHu ?as?iltan   hamah

    Ask the- researcher questions important

    'The researcher asks important questions'.

19) ?anjazat ?al-jami9atu   mashru9an ?akhar

    Accomplished   the-university   project another

    'The university accomplished another project'.

20) Owais yu9linu   tafaSil   taqdim Talabat ?al-?iltiHaq

    Owais declare details submitting applications the- enrolling

    biddiblum ?al-fanni ghada

In the diplom   the- technical   tomorrow

'Owais   declares   the   details   of   applying   for   the   technical   training   program   tomorrow'. (**Addustour**, Saturday Sep. 24,2016: 2)

Sentence (17) presupposes the man used to smoke; (18) presupposes the researcher's habit of raising significant questions; (19) expresses the proposition that the university is accustomed to carrying projects; finally, (20) demonstrates that the Ministry of Higher Education in Jordan offers a technical or vocational program intended to train students who are expected to contribute to the development of the country.

Triggers of lexical presupposition include verbs like <u>yuTHir</u> 'raise, ask', <u>yas?al</u> 'ask', <u>yuqaddim</u> 'introduce', <u>yu9lin</u> 'declare', <u>yastamir</u> 'continue', <u>yarfuD</u> 'reject, refuse', <u>yuassis</u> 'establish', <u>yabda?</u> 'begin, start', <u>yunjiz</u> 'accomplish', <u>yabda?</u> 'begin, start', and <u>yatawaqqaf</u> 'stop, quit'.

The sixth kind of Arabic presupposition is **Structural Presupposition**. This means that there is a part of the structure or sentence indicating the proposition expressed by the speaker or writer, and this part is viewed as true by the listener or reader. This kind is elucidated in (21-24):

21) man?allathi ba9a   ?al-mazra9a ?

    Who   who   sold   the-farm

    'Who sold the farm?'

22) mata ?ishtara ?at-tajiru ?al-bayt   fi   ?ar-rif?

    When bought the- merchant   the- house in   the- countryside

    'When did the merchant buy the house in the countryside?'

23) ?inna ?ar-rajula ?al-ghaniy huwa ?allathi sa9ada   ?al-fuqara?

    That the-man   the-rich   he   who   helped   the-poor people

    'It is the rich man who helped the poor'.

24) ?alaysa hatha bilHaqq? Fama ba9d ?al-Haq   ?illa ?aD-Dalal

    Is this the truth? What after the- truth save the-error

    'Is this the truth? After the truth is the error'.

    (**Alqiblah**, Monday Rabi' ?al?awal 1335: 4)

Sentence (21), a wh-qustion, presupposes that there was a farm sold; similarly, the wh-question (22) also expresses the proposition that a house was there in the countryside sold by somebody; the cleft sentence (23) demonstrates there are poor people supported by a rich man. The yes-no question in (24) and the structure following it indicate that the writer presupposes that the reader is aware of the fact that people are ready to defend their faith, and are loyal to their country.

As can be evidently seen in such examples, structural presuppositions can be triggered by interrogative and cleft sentences. Thus, an interrogation and clefting are related to presupposition.

The seventh type of Arabic presuppositions is **Iterative Presupposition**. This type expresses repetition of an action, clarified in (25-28):

25) ?istamarra ?al-muzari9u bizira9ati ?al-?arDi

    Continued the-farmer in+farming the-land

    'The farmer continued farming the land'.

26) kataba   ?al-waladu risalatahan marratan ?ukhra

    Wrote the-boy letter time another

    'The boy wrote a letter again'.

27) yunaqish ?al-9amid ?al-qararat da?iman

    Discuss the-dean the- decisions   always

    'The dean always discusses the decisions'.

28) rafaDa ?al-9amid taghyir ?al-jadwal

    refused the-dean change the-timetable

'The dean refused changing the schedule'.

Such examples manifest the repetition of a given event. Sentence (25) presupposes that the referent, the farmer, goes on farming the land; (26) expresses the proposition that the repeats writing the letter once again; (27) presupposes the dean's iterative action of discussing decisions; finally, (28) presupposes the refusal of the dean to change the schedule. Thus, repetition of a given event, a state, or action involves presupposition.

Iterative presupposition is induced by verbs like yabda? 'begin, start', yastamir 'continue', yarfuD 'reject, refuse', and yu?assis 'establish', and adverbs like da?iman 'always', ghaliban 'often', bayna ?alHini wal?akhar 'every now and then', maarra ?ukhra 'again', and ?ayDan ' too, also'.

The last kind of presupposition in Arabic is **Sortally Restricted Presupposition**. Beaver (2001), maintains that sortally restricted presuppositions presuppose that their arguments are of the appropriate sort. Examples like (29-30) elucidate this category in Arabic:

29) yaHlamu ?al-waladu ?al-miskin bishira?i sayyara

 Dream the-boy the- little in buying   car

'The poor boy is dreaming of buying a car'.

30) qabaltu shabban 9aziban/?a9zab

 Met+I young man bachelor

'I met a youg bachelor'.

Dreaming involves animacy of the subject argument which is what is presupposed in (29) since the human being, the boy, is capable of doing this sort of act. What is given in (30) presupposes that the bachelor is a male adult. Thus, presuppositions of this sort involve proper arguments related to predicates.

Sortally restricted presuppositions are triggered by both verbs and nouns in Arabic like yaHlam 'dream', yashtari 'buy', yutajir 'trade', ?a9zab ' bachelor', muTallaq 'divorced', ?armal 'widowed', and mutazawwij ' married'.

To recapitulate, the foregoing discussion has presented eight types of presuppositions in Arabic on the basis of their linguistic elements and structures. Additionally, their triggers are pointed out. With respect to linguistically motivated categories of presuppositions and triggers, the presentation demonstrates that Arabic expresses and exhibits presuppositions similar to those given by other scholars like Lyons (1977), Yule (1996), Beaver (2001), Beaver (2010), and Schmid (2001).

6. Conclusion

The foregoing presentation looks upon presupposition in Arabic from a linguistic perspective. Linguistically, following Lyons (1977), and Beaver (2001), among others, the analysis of the data gathered from a variety of sources reveals that Arabic exhibits eight types of presupposition: existential, factive, non-factive, counter-factual, lexical, structural, iterative, and sortally restricted. Additionally, triggers or inducers of these types are also identified. The triggers include single lexical items and verbs, phrases and a variety of syntactic structures. Arabic presupposition categories and triggers look similar to those arrived at by other linguists including Beaver (2001), Beaver (2010), Schmid (2001), Yule (1996), and Lyons (1977). Consequently, I would say that presupposition categories seem to be universal. This point needs further verification.

In this regard, the researcher invites other scholars to verify the universality claim of the linguistic nature of presupposition.

Presuppositions held by the two interlocuters   of a communicative activity have significant pedagogical implications for the process of teaching and learning Arabic as a foreign or second language. The learner, attempting to comprehend the meaning of a communicative activity, should be familiar with the form or the linguistic nature of utterances and syntactic structures. He should be taught and be aware of presupposition triggers so that he can grasp the speaker's presupposed meaning.

References

Beaver (2001). *Presupposition and assertion in dynamic semantics.* CSLI Publications: Stanford, CA.

Beaver (2010). *Have you noticed that your belly button lint color is related to the color of your clothing?* Bauerle, Reyle, and Zimmermann. 65-100.

Bonyadi, A. and Samuel, M. (2011). Linguistic nature of presupposition in american and persian newspaper editorials. *International Journal of Linguistics,* 3(1): 1-16.

Diningsih, S. W. W. and Muhammad, R. M. (2019). Literature learning: Pragmatic study of humor discourse in indonesian political humor book. *International Journal of Educational Research Review,* (Special Issue): 680- 90.

Domaneschi, F. (2016). Selecting presuppositions in conditional sentences. Frontiers in psychology 6.: Available: www.Frontiersin.org

El-Gamal, A. (2001). Presupposition relativity and translation theory. *Revista Alicantina de Estuios Ingleses,* 14(2001): 37-62.

Gencturk, S. (2018). Analysis of presupposition triggers in english reading textbooks: Learners' familiarity. *International Journal of Science and Education,* 1(1): 1-10.

Geuerts, B. (2010). *Specific indefinites, presupposition and scope.* Bauerle, Reyle, and Zimmermann. 125-58.

Givon, T. (1979). *On undrstanding grammar.* Academic Press: New York.

Hikmah, S. N. (2017). *An analysis of language presupposition in adversisements of tv channels in Indonesia. MA thesis.* Adab and Humanity Faculty of Alauddin State Islamic University: Indonesia.

Lapore, E. and Sennet, A. (2014). Presupposition and context sensitivity. *Mind and Language,* 29(5): 613-27.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics 2.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge London.

Palmer, F. R. (1981). *Semantics.* 2nd Ed edn: Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Polyzou, A. (2015). Presupposition in discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies,* 12(2): 123-38.

Potts, C. (2014). *Presupposition and Implicature.* ONR Grant.

Rooji, R. V. (2010). *Presupposition: An (un)common attitude?* Bauerle, Reyle, and Zimmermann. 1-37.

Safwat, S. (2018). *Presupposition and implicature in english and arabic magazine editorials.* Research Gate .net/ Publication and LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.

Schmid, H.-J. (2001). Presupposition can be a bluff: How abstract nouns can be used as presupposition triggers. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 33(10): 1529-52.

Soltan, U., 2011. "On strategies question-formation and the grammatical status of the q-particle huwwa in egyptian arabic wh-questions." In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics.*

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis.* The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

Sukmawti, S. (2020). *Presupposition as found in "wonder woman" movie: A pragmatic analysis. B.A. Paper, department of english education.* Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

Thoyyibah, L. (2017). Presupposition triggers- a comparative analysis between oral news and written news discourse. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy,* 1(2): 10-23.

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics.* Arnold: London.

Wardat, M. (2017). Pragmatic functions of presupposition in Arabic. *US-China Foreign Language,* 15(5): 303- 10.

Yingfang, W. (2007). Analysis of presupposition and its functions in advertisement. *Canadian Social Science,* 3(4): 55-60.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford University Press: Oxford, New York.