The Arab Epistemological Context of the Emergence of Arabic Pragmatics

Abla Benmansour

	University of Batna 1
	Algeria
	abla.01benmansour@gmail.com

Abstract

This study addresses the issue of contemporary Arabic pragmatics through the investigation entitled The Arab Episte-mological Context of the Emergence of Arabic Pragmatics. The research focuses on the rhetorical roots of pragmatics within the Arab intellectual heritage and the philosophical and linguistic influences that have contributed to the development of contemporary Arabic pragmatic studies. Moreover, the study highlights how pragmatic theory was formed in Arab thought, emphasizing that its emergence within the Arab context was a response to the need for understanding language within its social, communicative, and interactive contexts.

Introduction:

Ever since the revelation of the Holy Qur'an, the Arab self has been profoundly thirsty to uncover the secrets of this miraculous text. This linguistic marvel connects heaven and earth, the servant and his Lord. Indeed, it is more than that; it is the bearer of the secrets of existence and of all that exists—of the self and its relation to the other, to the past, the present, and the future, and to its Creator, the One and Only. Confronted with this transformative text that redirected it away from ignorance and polytheism, the Arab self was compelled to rediscover itself through it. The Qur'an commanded reflection, reading, and the use of reason in contemplating all that exists.

As language is the sole medium through which everything in existence may be expressed, this self strove to develop its intellectual capacity and invest all its linguistic and epistemological tools to comprehend itself and its vertical and horizontal relationships.

Indeed, the duality of the "self" and the "other" has shaped the horizon of many studies in human thought, wherein intellectual activity has taken place and critical questions have been raised. These are not only concerned with the relationship between "self" and "other" but also extend to modes of thinking, behavior, and the external realities that contribute, directly or indirectly, to the formation of consciousness and existence.

When considering the concepts of the "self" and the "other" from the perspective of understanding the other, it becomes evident that they represent one of the most significant manifestations of communication, both in thought and practice.

Rhetoric stands among the most important disciplines, particularly within Arab thought. From its earliest foundations, it has shown great interest in the linguistic and verbal dimensions of expression, aiming to dispel ambiguity and misunderstanding by selecting eloquent and precise terms. Rhetoric thus evolved into a discipline grounded in the careful selection of words and their

adaptation according to contextual demands. This close link between rhetoric and language laid the groundwork for the emergence of various sciences, bodies of knowledge, and theoretical frameworks concerned with studying language and its use—foremost among them, pragmatics.

Pragmatics is one of the most prominent contemporary concepts, raising numerous problems and questions in modern thought. It is an intellectual practice closely related to language and its uses, particularly in communication. Pragmatics is concerned with uncovering meanings and significances arising from the movement of words as they pass from speaker to listener while also accounting for the speaker's context, the extent of their influence on the receiver, and the effectiveness of their message.

Given the closeness between rhetoric and pragmatics, and in light of their shared significance, this study seeks to uncover the rhetorical foundations of the principal pragmatic concepts that derive their theoretical basis from classical rhetoric. This subject has increasingly attracted the attention of researchers; thus, it is legitimate to pose the following central question: **To what extent has Arabic pragmatics drawn from and been influenced by rhetorical scholarship?** Has pragmatics succeeded in addressing specific issues previously raised by rhetoric? Moreover, to what degree has Arabic pragmatics benefited from Western efforts in establishing its theoretical framework?

This research adopts a descriptive methodological approach to examine the rhetorical roots of contemporary pragmatics to answer these questions.

First, On the Concepts of Rhetoric and Pragmatics

1. Rhetoric (*Rhétorique*):

Undoubtedly, the Holy Qur'an laid the foundation for a new spiritual and intellectual life, fundamentally based on *tawḥīd* (monotheism), one of the most essential concepts in Islamic theology. It also called for contemplation, reasoning, deep reflection, and consideration—acts that cannot be conceived outside the scope of language. Therefore, a discipline was needed—one equipped with analytical tools and deductive methods—to guide one toward understanding the meanings of the Qur'anic text, attaining a state of awareness and comprehension, and achieving a coherent and clear vision.

Rhetoric emerged as one of the foremost disciplines in this regard, intrinsically linked from its inception to the Qur'an and the study of this miraculous text par excellence.

Anyone who contemplates the Arabic rhetorical tradition can easily observe the vast space dedicated to the concept of rhetoric—a concept both expansive and evolving since its very inception. *Abū Hilāl al-'Askarī* (d. 395 AH), in his book *Kitāb al-Ṣinā'atayn* (The Book of the Two Arts), which he devoted to numerous rhetorical terms and issues, defined rhetoric as follows:

"Rhetoric (balāgha) derives from their saying *balaghtu al-ghāyah*—'I have reached the goal'—or *balaghtuhā ghayrī*—'I have caused someone else to reach it.' It was therefore called *balāgha* because it conveys the meaning to the listener's heart so that he comprehends it... It is also called *balāgh*, and they say: *al-dunyā balāgh*—'this world is a means of reaching the afterlife'—and *balāgh* also means conveying [a message]."[1]

As for Al-Jāḥiẓ (d. 255 AH), in his seminal work *al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn*, he linked the concept of rhetoric to the degree of impact that meaning has upon the heart of the recipient. He stated:

"Speech does not deserve to be called rhetorical until its meaning races alongside its wording, and its wording alongside its meaning—such that the wording does not reach your ear before the meaning reaches your heart."[2]

This reflects a primarily affective goal of rhetoric—the necessity of influencing the listener and delivering meaning to their heart precisely and effectively.

Similarly, al-Āmidī (d. 370 AH), in his work *al-Muwāzanah*, defined rhetoric as follows:

"The accurate attainment of meaning and the fulfilment of intent through smooth and pleasant expressions, free from affectation—neither excessively verbose beyond necessity, nor deficient to the point of falling short... And if this is accompanied by a subtle meaning, or rare wisdom, or refined literary expression, then it adds splendour to the speech. If not, the speech stands on its own, independent of any such additions."[3]

Here, too, the meaning of rhetoric revolves around clarifying meaning and impact upon the recipient. Accordingly, most scholars who engaged with the science of rhetoric regarded the speaker's rhetorical competence as a fundamental condition in the speech act to achieve the desired effect in communication.

In contrast, *rhetoric* (*balāgha*) has received considerable theoretical and practical attention in contemporary thought, particularly after exposure to various theories and methodologies. These approaches have succeeded in addressing issues central to reflection and inquiry—

especially those of a subtle nature—such as the communicative process, which is directly linked to language and how language can fulfill its affective function.

This renewed engagement with the science of rhetoric has led it to draw upon numerous procedural tools from various epistemological fields, including semiotics, structuralism, psychology, sociology, and others.

2. Pragmatics (*Pragmatique*):

Linguistic studies underwent a significant transformation at the beginning of the twentieth century, following Ferdinand de Saussure's 1916 publication of *Cours de linguistique générale* (*Course in General Linguistics*). This seminal work included studying the fundamental systems that contribute to the analysis of human language and all matters related to the structures of speech and communication.

Pragmatics is one of the modern linguistic terms that has influenced and been influenced by several fields of knowledge, including logic, philosophy, rhetoric, semiotics, and others. This influence has varied in degree, depending on the specificity of each field. The credit for introducing *pragmatics* into Western linguistic study is generally attributed to Charles Morris, who, in 1938, in his book *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*, referred to the branches of science concerned with the study of signs—namely, semiotics and semantics.

This marked the first attempt to define pragmatics as a science examining the relationships between sign systems and their users.

The field remained relatively unchanged until the 1980s when pragmatics opened up to cognitive sciences and research related to artificial intelligence—studies that fundamentally transformed pragmatics' general outlook and marked the birth of what is now known as cognitive pragmatics (*pragmatique cognitive*).[4]

Pragmatics encompasses various fields of knowledge and serves as a bridge between them. Despite this interdisciplinarity, it has established itself as an independent discipline in its own right. While pragmatics draws upon theories from several other sciences, this has led to diverse definitions depending on each scholar's perspective.

J. L. Austin defined pragmatics as:

"A branch of a broader science; it is the study of linguistic interaction insofar as it constitutes part of social interaction."[5]

As for George Yule, he sees pragmatics as

"the study of language use or in interaction."

especially as he points out that meaning is not inherent in words alone nor tied solely to the speaker or the listener. Instead, speech construction lies in the *language negotiation* between speaker and listener within a defined context (material, social, and linguistic) to arrive at the meaning embedded in a given utterance.[6]

In light of this definition, *pragmatics* concerns itself with discourse as both a product and a communicative act between two parties within a specific context. In other words, speech alone is not the criterion for the success of communication or discourse. Communication and influence are based on language, context, and meaning, considering everything surrounding the communicative act, including statements and circumstances.

These definitions reveal that **pragmatics** is a discipline concerned with studying the communicative process that cannot occur in isolation from the social and linguistic levels. It is a process contingent upon the interaction between these levels and the individuals involved in its creation.

When this is related to the views of Arab thinkers, we find that the concept of *pragmatics* encounters the issue of terminological plurality. Various thematic designations have referred to it, including *pragmatism, utilitarianism, instrumentalism, situational linguistics*, and *contextual linguistics*. Others have referred to it as the science of discourse. Pragmatics has placed itself at the center of the interests of Arab intellectuals and researchers. It has become one of the most significant fields concerned with studying language in use or the relationship between language and its users.

When we contemplate the concept of *pragmatics* among classical and modern Arab scholars, we find a variety of definitions and viewpoints. Some restricted themselves to its purely linguistic description, while others defined it as a linguistic phenomenon with meanings that extend beyond the lexical.

Among the linguistic definitions is that found in *Lisān al-'Arab* by Ibn Manẓūr (d. 711 AH), where he states:

"*Tadāwalnā al-amr*—we took turns managing the matter. They say *dawwālīk*, meaning to alternate over an affair... *Dālat al-ayyām*—the days turned, and God alternates them among the people. *Tadāwalathu al-aydī*—it passed from one hand to another. *Tadāwalnā al-'amal wa al-amr baynanā*—we alternated the task or matter between us,

meaning we discussed it, one acting at one time, another at another."[7]

Al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538 AH), in his lexicon *Asās al-Balāgha*, offers a related definition:

"*Dālat lahu al-dawla*—the tide of power turned in his favour; *dālat al-ayyām*—the days turned; *adāla Allāh Banī Fulān min 'aduwwihim*—God gave the sons of so-and-so victory over their enemies... *wa Allāh yudāwil al-ayyām bayna al-nās*—God alternates the days between people, once for them and once against them... *Tadāwalū al-shay' baynahum*—they exchanged the thing among themselves; *al-māshī yudāwil bayna qadamayh*—a walker shifts between his feet..."[8]

These definitions show that the linguistic sense of *tadāwuliyya* (pragmatics) does not deviate from the core meanings of exchange, alternation, and reciprocal action.

However, *pragmatics* took on a different direction due to translation, cultural exchange, and exposure to foreign knowledge, theories, and methodologies.

Ṭāhā 'Abd al-Raḥmān is considered the first to employ the term *tadāwuliyya* as the Arabic equivalent of the Western term *pragmatique (pragmatics)*. He defines it as:

"A description of all that constitutes a manifestation of communication and interaction between the producers of tradition—both the general public and the elite. Moreover, within the context of this practice, the domain refers to everything that constitutes the spatial and temporal scope in which communication and interaction occur."[9]

Thus, *pragmatics*, in this sense, becomes a form of communication and interaction between the historical producers of tradition and those who study it.

He further defines it as:

"The field of study concerned with describing, and even interpreting, the relationships between natural signifiers and their meanings, as well as the relationship between those signifiers and those who use them. It addresses important areas of communicative, interactive, and informational inquiry, such as: speech acts, the intentions of interlocutors, and the rules of discourse."[10]

Presupposition, economy of expression, and rules of discourse are among the contemporary pragmatic concepts regarded as essential for achieving success in the communicative process.

Mas'ūd Ṣaḥrāwī defines pragmatics as:

"A linguistic doctrine that studies the relationship between linguistic activity and its users, the methods and ways of using linguistic signs effectively, the context and the various situational layers within which discourse is produced, and the investigation of the factors that make discourse a clear and successful communicative message."[11]

Second: The Roots of Pragmatics in Arabic Rhetoric

A close examination of contemporary linguistic studies reveals that there is scarcely a linguistic theory that does not find some reference in classical Arabic heritage and the language of the Arabs. If we consider pragmatics as the study of language in use or as a communicative activity between two parties (speaker and listener), taking into account the speaker's utterances and conditions—given that the speaker is the central agent in the communicative process—and assessing their influence through the conveyed message (understanding speech in its functional form), then Arabic rhetoric may be defined as the conformity of speech to the demands of the situation. Hence, the connection between pragmatics and rhetoric arises.

Jalāl al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī linked the notion of *Muqtada al-ḥāl* (the demands of the situation) to the eloquence of speech in his statement:

"Rhetoric in speech is its conformity to the demands of the situation in its eloquence."[12]

The *demands of the situation* are defined as:

"The appropriate consideration that necessitates the inclusion in speech of stylistic features and characteristics that are suited to the context or circumstance in which it is delivered."[13]

The concept of *Muqtada al-ḥāl* (the demands of the situation) is closely linked to the classical Arabic saying, *"For every situation, there is appropriate speech"*. Ṣalāḥ Faḍl states:

"The concept of pragmatics comes to systematically and methodically encompass the scope that classical rhetoric referred to with the phrase *Muqtada al-ḥāl*, which gave rise to the famous rhetorical maxim in Arabic: *' For every situation, there is appropriate speech.'"[14]

The notion of *maqām* (context or situational setting) is vital in communication, particularly when language is

regarded as a social phenomenon. In this regard, Tam-mām Ḥassān notes:

"By acknowledging the idea of *maqām*, classical Arab rhetoricians were nearly a thousand years ahead of their time, for the recognition of *maqām* (context) and *maqāl* (discourse) as two distinct and essential foundations in meaning analysis is now considered in the West as one of the discoveries resulting from the intellectual adventures of the contemporary mind in language study."[15]

Anyone reflecting on the Arabic rhetorical tradition cannot fail to observe the extent to which it has paid attention to the concept of *maqām* (context) as a phenomenon that aids in understanding the meanings of speech in various social situations.

"Many scholars in the fields of Arabic linguistic, critical, and rhetorical heritage have pointed out that Arabic rhetoric was ahead of its time in engaging with pragmatic concerns in all their forms and at every level. This is clearly exemplified in the concept of *maqām* and its related elements, such as the speaker and the address-ee."[16]

The *ḥāl* (context) is the condition that prompts the speaker to employ a specific construction based on the *Muqtada al-ḥāl* (appropriate consideration), which is the particular form upon which the utterance is based. As for *Muqtada al-ḥāl*, it is to deliver a speech in that form.[17]

Because the contexts of speech differ and vary, Al-Qazwīnī said:

"Rhetoric in speech is its conformity to the demands of the situation with eloquence. These demands vary, for the contexts of speech differ: the context for indefiniteness differs from that of definiteness, the context for generality from that of restriction, for preposing from postponement, for mention from omission, for separation from connection, and for brevity from elaboration. Likewise, addressing the intelligent differs from addressing the dull-witted. Every word has its place with its counterpart. The merit and acceptance of speech lie in its accordance with the appropriate consideration, and its inferiority in the absence of it. Thus, *muqtada al-ḥāl* is the appropriate consideration."[18]

The *maqām* (situational context) encompasses all that lies outside the speech itself—temporal and spatial circumstances that assist in arriving at the intended or implied meaning. In modern linguistic study, *maqām* is called *context*, a concept that has received significant attention in pragmatic research. Indeed, some have even defined pragmatics in terms of context, stating that it is:

"The general study of how context influences the way we interpret sentences."[19]

Context can serve as a semantic point of departure for understanding discourse; it is another method of searching for meaning, and it structures and contributes to the formulation of meaning.

Tracing the movement of meaning cannot be achieved without understanding the *speaker* and attempting to uncover the meanings or significations that activate the various components of the communicative process. The speaker is regarded as the fundamental element and principal party in the communicative act; he is the initiator, the enabler, and the determiner of speech based on his attributes, conditions, and manner of speaking—whether serious or humorous, angry or content, knowledgeable or ignorant. The speaker determines the language that expresses a moment of participation between reason and emotion.

Each of us possesses a set of words with special meanings and associations. For instance, a word such as *home* may evoke feelings of mercy and tenderness in some, while it may arouse notions of misery and suffering in others. For yet another, it may bring to mind the image of a son or the experience of sitting in one's private room or study.

Tracing the movement of meaning cannot be achieved without understanding the *speaker* and attempting to uncover the meanings or significations that activate the various components of the communicative process. The speaker is regarded as the fundamental element and principal party in the communicative act; he is the initiator, the enabler, and the determiner of speech based on his attributes, conditions, and manner of speaking—whether serious or humorous, angry or content, knowledgeable or ignorant. The speaker determines the language that expresses a moment of participation between reason and emotion.

Each of us possesses a set of words with special meanings and associations. For instance, a word such as *home* may evoke feelings of mercy and tenderness in some, while it may arouse notions of misery and suffering in others. For yet another, it may bring to mind the image of a son or the experience of sitting in one's private room or study.

This means that what a word contains or implies is not tied to a single level of usage; on the contrary, it may vary according to different levels of usage—from one social class to another, from one country to another, and from one individual to another within the same language.[20]

For this reason, Arab rhetoricians emphasized the speaker, whose primary function is understanding, persuasion, and influence. Al-Jāḥiẓ stated:

"The foundation of the matter, and the goal toward which both speaker and listener strive, is understanding and being understood. By whatever means understanding is achieved and meaning clarified—this is *bayān* (clarity of expression) in that instance."[21]

Based on this, we may identify the following functions of the speaker: communication and understanding, persuasion, and influence—all of which are pragmatic functions that contemporary pragmatic studies have focused on. Perhaps the most important of these is persuasion, essentially the attempt to influence the receiver in a manner suited to their nature and level of understanding.

Adounil and Wekeble define persuasion as:

"A complex interactive process in which the sender engages the receiver through verbal and non-verbal symbols, whereby the persuader seeks to influence and alter the receiver's responses."[22]

As for Ṭāhā 'Abd al-Raḥmān, he holds that persuasion occurs:

"When a speaker invites another to share in their beliefs, the invitation does not carry a coercive tone, nor is it imposed through repressive methods. Rather, it follows various inferential paths which lead the other to persuasion by the speaker's view."[23]

Thus, persuasion is a process fundamentally based on argument and evidence, carried out sequentially and gradually to achieve the sender's goal of persuading and influencing the receiver.

The *listener* is considered an important and active participant in the communicative process. Most Arab rhetoricians focused on this element in their discussions of *maqām* (context) or what they called *Muqtada al-ḥāl* (the demands of the situation). The speaker is connected to the listener and attempts to shape their discourse through their perceptions.

In this regard, Al-Jāḥiẓ states:

"The speaker must know the value of meanings and balance them against the capacities of the listeners and the nature of the situations—assigning each class of listener a corresponding style, and each situation a suitable context—so that the levels of speech align with the levels of meaning, and the levels of meaning align with the

levels of context, and the listeners' capacities align with those situations."[24]

When the speaker considers the capacities of the listeners—their levels of knowledge, culture, age, psychological states, and even social status—this undoubtedly fulfills the objective of the communicative process: penetrating speech and grasping ambiguous meanings. The listener's thought becomes an extension of the speaker's as the listener begins to interpret the expressions, uncover their meanings, and reconstruct them according to their understanding. The listener thus grants the expressions broader and richer connotations.

Ṭāhā 'Abd al-Raḥmān states:

"The Arabic language distinguishes itself from many others by its tendency toward conciseness of expression and the concealment of shared knowledge, relying on the listener's ability to retrieve what has been implied in the speech, to recall its contextual indicators, and even to generate them independently whenever understanding requires it. It is known that to the extent that the speaker excels in implication, the listener must exert corresponding effort in comprehension."[25]

Therefore, the sender's or speaker's speech is targeted by the receiver, the sole agent responsible for constructing the meanings embedded within that speech. This stems from the fact that the receiver is one of the two principal parties in the communicative process and is considered.

"Essential to the continuation of understanding and communication between speaker and addressee. Thus, the speaker cannot make their speech independent of the listener's comprehension and understanding; they cannot continue speaking without knowledge of the listener's social and psychological circumstances."[26]

The receiver is also a constructor of meaning, as the speaker attempts to express thoughts or emotions that language may struggle to convey fully, and the speech itself may redirect or distort the intended message. Thus, the intended meaning becomes dependent on the receiver. From this, it may be said that the relationship between speaker and receiver is founded on the speaker's attempt to clarify and persuade with the intended meaning and the receiver's effort to understand and grasp it.

This implies that

"Communicative interaction requires from interlocutors a broad knowledge of language and its uses, as well as an understanding of what each context demands in terms of appropriate expressions to clarify the intended meaning...

The speaker's knowledge of language and its modes of use helps them to employ the suitable context for each utterance."[27]

This led al-Āmidī (d. 631 AH) to state:

"The signification of words does not derive from their inherent nature, but rather follows the intention and will of the speaker."[28]

The discussion here on the concept of *intentionality* leads us to the subject of *meaning*, as Ṭāhā 'Abd al-Raḥmān draws a connection between the notions of intention and meaning. He states:

"This classification is governed by what we may call the principle of intentionality, which holds that there is no speech without intention. Its formulation is: intention is fundamental to speech. It is known that the intention behind an utterance imparts to it its contextual or situational character and implications."[29]

This is also the view expressed by Abū Hilāl al-'Askarī (d. 395 AH), who linked meaning to intention, stating:

"Meaning is the intention by which speech is directed in one manner rather than another; thus, the meaning of speech is that which the intention is attached to."[30]

Intention, then, determines the choice of words, the trajectory of speech, and its purpose. Speech thus embodies a mental state bound to a specific intention—an intention that reveals the speaker's message, broadens the receiver's scope of understanding, and achieves communicative influence. This is based on the idea that.

"Influence cannot be achieved without the understanding of expression and its recognition by the receiver. Therefore, the concept of intentionality must be present, which in this context signifies meaning and understanding."[31]

"Signification means the necessity of communicative intent on the part of the sender, and understanding means the receiver's acknowledgment of the sender's intent to communicate."[32]

Multiple means are inseparable from the speaker's message, revealing the speaker's intentions and understanding of the meanings they aim to convey. These means contribute to the delivery of the message and support its fulfillment.

Conclusion

Arabic rhetoric constitutes a unique experience in classical Arab thought, serving as a foundational reference for many of the concepts and insights proposed by contemporary theories—particularly those claimed to be modern, as in the case of pragmatic studies. This has led many Arab scholars to challenge the epistemological rupture with the tradition and to attempt a renewed reading of this heritage, aiming to uncover its various concepts with greater clarity and deeper awareness.

The research concludes with a set of findings that, if indicative of anything, demonstrate the awareness and keen interest of classical Arab rhetoricians in language and its uses. The most significant of these findings are as follows:

1. Most definitions of the science of rhetoric exhibit pragmatic features.
2. Most definitions of rhetoric highlight the importance of two key participants in the communicative process: the speaker and the listener.
3. The primary aim of rhetoric is to achieve influence.
4. Pragmatics is the discipline that has secured a prominent position in contemporary studies, serving as a tool for analyzing the communicative process and as the most capable framework for studying language in use.
5. Arabic rhetoric's most prominent pragmatic elements are context (*maqām*), the speaker, the receiver, meaning, and intentionality.
6. Arabic rhetoric has never been separate from contemporary linguistic studies.

Endnotes

[1] Abū Hilāl al-'Askarī, *al-Ṣinā'atayn (al-Kitāba wa al-Shi'r)*, ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bajjāwī and Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-ʿArabiyyah, 1st ed., 1952), 6.

[2] Abū Hilāl al-'Askarī, *al-Ṣinā'atayn (al-Kitāba wa al-Shi'r)*, ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bajjāwī and Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-ʿArabiyyah, 1st ed., 1952), 6.

[3] Abū al-Qāsim al-Āmidī, *al-Muwāzanah bayna al-Ṭāʾiyayn*, ed. al-Sayyid Aḥmad Ṣaqr, vol. 1 (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, n.d., 1961), 40, 401.

[4] Jawād Khattām, *al-Tadāwuliyyah: Uṣūluhā wa Ittijāhātuhā* (Amman: Dār Kunūz al-Maʿrifah, 1st ed., 2016), 21.

[5] Sāmiyah bint Yāminah, "al-Ittiṣāl al-Lisānī bayn al-Balāghah wa al-Tadāwuliyyah," *Majallat Dirāsāt Adabiyyah*, al-Baṣīrah Centre for Research, no. 1 (May 28, 1429 AH), 57; see also: Rāḍah Khafīf Bakrī, "al-Tadāwuliyyah wa Taḥlīl al-Khiṭāb al-Adabī," *al-Mawqif al-Adabī*, Damascus: Arab Writers Union, no. 399 (July 2004), 56.

[6] Maḥmūd Aḥmad Nakhlah, *Āfāq Jadīdah fī al-Baḥth al-Lughawī al-Muʿāṣir* (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, n.d., 2002), 14.

[7] Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab*, vol. 11 (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 3rd ed., 1994), 253.

[8] Abū al-Qāsim al-Zamakhsharī, *Asās al-Balāghah*, ed. Muḥammad Bāsil ʿAwn al-Sūd, vol. 1 (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1st ed., 1998), 303.

[9] Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, *Tajdīd al-Manhaj fī Taqwīm al-Turāth* (Casablanca: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī, 3rd ed., 2007), 244.

[10] Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, *Fī Uṣūl al-Ḥiwār wa Tajdīd ʿIlm al-Kalām* (Casablanca: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī, 2nd ed., 2000), 28.

[11] Masʿūd Ṣaḥrāwī, *al-Tadāwuliyyah ʿinda al-ʿUlamāʾ al-ʿArab: Dirāsah Tadāwuliyyah li-Ẓāhirat al-Afʿāl al-Kalāmiyyah fī al-Turāth al-Lisānī* (Beirut: Dār al-Ṭalīʿah, 1st ed., 2005), 5.

[12] Samīr ʿAdlī Muḥammad Rizq, *Muqtada al-Ḥāl: Mafhūmuhu wa Zawāyāh fī Ḍawʾ Uslūb al-Qurʾān al-Karīm*, Majmaʿ al-Lughah al-ʿArabiyyah ʿala al-Shabakah al-ʿĀlamiyyah, published 18–08–2017 (AM 05:08); see also: Jalāl al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī, *al-Talkhīṣ fī ʿIlm al-Balāghah*, ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Barqūqī (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1st ed., 1902), 33.

[13] Samīr ʿAdlī Muḥammad Rizq, *Muqtada al-Ḥāl: Mafhūmuhu wa Zawāyāh*, op. cit.

[14] Ṣalāḥ Faḍl, *Balāghat al-Khiṭāb wa ʿIlm al-Naṣṣ* (Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Miṣrī; Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī, 1st ed., 2004), 26.

[15] Sāmiyah bint Yāminah, *Siyāq al-Ḥāl fī al-Fiʿl al-Kalānī – Muqāranah Tadāwuliyyah*, PhD diss., University of Oran, supervised by Aḥmad ʿAzzūz, 15; see also: Tammām Ḥassān, *al-Lughah al-ʿArabiyyah: Maʿnāhā wa Ṣināʿatuhā* (Casablanca: Dār al-Thaqāfah, n.d.), 337.

[16] Rābiḥ ibn Khawīlah, "Tamazhurāt Tadāwuliyyah fī al-Balāghah al-ʿArabiyyah," *al-Arshīf al-ʿArabī al-ʿIlnī*, 2018, 4.

[17] Aḥmad Muṣṭafā al-Marāghī, *ʿUlūm al-Balāghah (al-Bayān wa al-Maʿānī wa al-Badīʿ)* (Cairo: Dār al-Qalam, n.d.), 36–37.

[18] Umm al-Ḥayz Salfāwī, *al-Buʿd al-Tadāwulī fī al-Balāghah al-ʿArabiyyah: Min Khilāl Miftāḥ al-ʿUlūm li-l-Sakkākī*, Master's thesis, University of Kasdi Merbah Ouargla, supervised by Aḥmad Balkhaḍr, 2009, 54; see also: al-Qazwīnī, *al-Talkhīṣ fī ʿIlm al-Balāghah*, 10.

[19] Muḥammad Muḥammad Yūnus ʿAlī, *Waṣf al-Lughah al-ʿArabiyyah Dalālan fī Ḍawʾ Mafhūm al-Dalālah al-Markaziyyah* (Tripoli: University of al-Fātiḥ Publications, 1993), 137.

[20] ʿAbd al-Munʿim Khalīl, *Naẓariyyat al-Siyāq bayn al-Qudamāʾ wa al-Muḥdathīn* (Alexandria: Dār al-Wafāʾ li-Dunyā al-Ṭibāʿah wa al-Nashr, 1st ed., 2007), 86.

[21] Al-Jāḥiẓ, *al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn*, vol. 1, 76.

[22] Adounil and Wekeble, *al-Daʿāyah wa al-Nazariyyāt wa al-Tawajjuhāt al-Ḥadīthah* (Riyadh: Dār al-Nashr wa al-Tawzīʿ wa al-Ṭibāʿah, n.d., 1413 AH), 96.

[23] Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, *Min Uṣūl al-Ḥiwār wa Tajdīd ʿIlm al-Kalām*, 3rd ed. (Casablanca: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī, 2007), 38.

[24] Al-Jāḥiẓ, *al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn*, vol. 1, 138–139.

[25] Laylā Kāda, *al-Mukawwin al-Tadāwulī fī al-Naẓariyyah al-Lisāniyyah al-ʿArabiyyah: Ẓāhirat al-Istilzām al-Takhāṭubī Namūdhajan*, PhD diss., University of Ḥāj Lakhdar, Batna, supervised by Bilqāsim Daffah, 326; see also: *al-Lisān wa al-Mīzān aw al-Takāthur al-ʿAqlī*, 112.

[26] Laylā Kāda, *al-Mukawwin al-Tadāwulī fī al-Naẓariyyah al-Lisāniyyah al-ʿArabiyyah: Ẓāhirat al-Istilzām al-Takhāṭubī Namūdhajan*, 325–326; see also: Karīm Ḥusayn Nāṣiḥ, *Murāʿāt al-Mukhāṭab fī al-Aḥkām al-Naḥwiyyah fī Kitāb Sībawayh*, 28.See : Karīm Ḥusayn Nāṣiḥ, *Murāʿāt al-Mukhāṭab fī al-Aḥkām al-Naḥwiyyah fī Kitāb Sībawayh*, 28.

[27] Dalāl Washn, *al-Qaṣdiyyah fī al-Murūth al-Lisānī al-ʿArabī: Dirāsah fī al-Uṣūl al-Naẓariyyah wa al-Ijrāʾiyyah li-l-Balāghah al-ʿArabiyyah*, PhD diss., University of Muḥammad Khīḍr Biskra, 2015–2016, 194.

[28] Ibid., quoting ʿAlī Āyit Ūshān, *al-Siyāq wa al-Naṣṣ al-Shiʿrī*, 115.

[29] Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, *Tajdīd al-Manhaj fī Taqwīm al-Turāth* (Morocco: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī, n.d., 1994), 98.

[30] Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī, *al-Furūq al-Lughawiyyah*, ed. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm (Amman: Dār al-ʿIlm wa al-Thaqāfah li-l-Nashr wa al-Tawzīʿ, 1st ed., n.d.), 33.

[31] Muḥammad Miftaḥ, *Taḥlīl al-Khiṭāb al-Shiʿrī: Istrātījiyyat al-Tanāṣṣ* (Casablanca: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī, 3rd ed., 1992), 140.

[32] Ibid., 140; see also: J. Lyons, *Sémantique linguistique* (La Sousse, Paris, 198), 351.

References

Books

1. Ibn Manẓūr. *Lisān al-ʿArab*, vol. 11. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 3rd ed., 1994.
2. Abū al-Qāsim al-Āmidī. *al-Muwāzanah bayna al-Ṭāʾiyayn (Poetry of Abū Tammām and al-Buḥturī)*. Edited by al-Sayyid Aḥmad Ṣaqr, vol. 1. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1961.
3. Abū al-Qāsim al-Zamakhsharī. *Asās al-Balāghah*. Edited by Muḥammad Bāsil ʿAwn al-Sūd, vol. 1. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1st ed., 1998.
4. Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī. *al-Ṣināʿatayn (Writing and Poetry)*. Edited by ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bajjāwī and Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. Cairo: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-ʿArabiyyah, 1st ed., 1952.

5. Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī. *al-Furūq al-Lughawiyyah*. Edited by Muḥammad Ibrāhīm. Amman: Dār al-ʿIlm wa al-Thaqāfah li-l-Nashr wa al-Tawzīʿ, 1st ed., n.d.

6. Aḥmad Muṣṭafā al-Marāghī. *ʿUlūm al-Balāghah (al-Bayān, al-Maʿānī, al-Badīʿ)*. Cairo: Dār al-Qalam, n.d.

7. Adounil and Wekeble. *al-Daʿāyah wa al-Naẓariyyāt wa al-Tawajjuhāt al-Ḥadīthah*. Riyadh: Dār al-Nashr wa al-Tawzīʿ wa al-Ṭibāʿah, 1413 AH.

8. Tammām Ḥassān. *al-Lughah al-ʿArabiyyah: Maʿnāhā wa Ṣināʿatuhā*. Casablanca: Dār al-Thaqāfah, n.d.

9. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī al-Khaṭīb. *al-Talkhīṣ fī ʿIlm al-Balāghah*. Edited and annotated by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Barqūqī. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1st ed., 1902.

10. Jawād Khattām. *al-Tadāwuliyyah: Uṣūluhā wa Ittijāhātuhā*. Amman: Dār Kunūz al-Maʿrifah, 1st ed., 2016.

11. Rābiḥ ibn Khawīlah. *Tamazhurāt Tadāwuliyyah fī al-Balāghah al-ʿArabiyyah*. Arab Scientific Archive, 2018.

12. Samīr ʿAdlī Muḥammad Rizq. *Muqtada al-Ḥāl: Mafhūmuhu wa Zawāyāh fī Ḍawʾ Uslūb al-Qurʾān al-Karīm*. Majmaʿ al-Lughah al-ʿArabiyyah on the World Wide Web, published 18 August 2017.

13. Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān:

14. — *Tajdīd al-Manhaj fī Taqwīm al-Qurʾān*. Casablanca: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī, 3rd ed., 2007.

15. — *Fī Uṣūl al-Ḥiwār wa Tajdīd ʿIlm al-Kalām*. Casablanca: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī, 2nd ed., 2000.

16. — *Min Uṣūl al-Ḥiwār wa Tajdīd al-Kalām*. Casablanca: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī, 3rd ed., 2007.

17. — *Tajdīd al-Manhaj fī Taqwīm al-Turāth*. Morocco: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī, n.d., 1994.

18. ʿAbd al-Munʿim Khalīl. *Naẓariyyat al-Siyāq bayn al-Qudamāʾ wa al-Muḥdathīn: Dirāsah Lughawiyyah Naḥwiyyah Dalāliyyah*. Alexandria: Dār al-Wafāʾ li-Dunyā al-Ṭibāʿah wa al-Nashr, 1st ed., 2007.

19. ʿAmr ibn Baḥr al-Jāḥiẓ. *al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn*. Edited by Fawzī ʿAṭwī. Beirut: Dār Ṣaʿb, 1st ed., n.d.

20. Karīm Ḥusayn Nāṣiḥ. *Murāʿāt al-Mukhāṭab fī al-Aḥkām al-Naḥwiyyah fī Kitāb Sībawayh*.

21. Muḥammad Aḥmad Nakhlah. *Āfāq Jadīdah fī al-Baḥth al-Lughawī al-Muʿāṣir*. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 2002.

22. Muḥammad Muḥammad Yūnus ʿAlī. *Waṣf al-Lughah al-ʿArabiyyah Dalālan fī Ḍawʾ Mafhūm al-Dalālah al-Markaziyyah: Dirāsat al-Maʿnā wa Ẓilāl al-Maʿnā*. Tripoli: University of al-Fātiḥ Publications, 1993.

23. Muḥammad Miftāḥ. *Taḥlīl al-Khiṭāb al-Shiʿrī: Istrātījiyyat al-Tanāṣṣ*. Casablanca: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī, 3rd ed., 1992.

24. Masʿūd Ṣaḥrāwī. *al-Tadāwuliyyah ʿinda al-ʿUlamāʾ al-ʿArab: Dirāsah Tadāwuliyyah li-Ẓāhirat al-Afʿāl al-Kalāmiyyah fī al-Turāth al-Lisānī*. Beirut: Dār al-Ṭalīʿah, 1st ed., 2005.

Journals and Periodicals

1. Rāḍiyah Khafīf Bakrī. "al-Tadāwuliyyah wa Taḥlīl al-Khiṭāb al-Adabī." *Majallat al-Mawqif al-Adabī*. Damascus: Arab Writers Union, no. 399, July 2004.

2. Ṣalāḥ Faḍl. *Balāghat al-Khiṭāb wa ʿIlm al-Naṣṣ*. Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Miṣrī; Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī, 1st ed., 2004.

3. Sāmiyah bint Yāminah. "al-Ittiṣāl al-Lisānī bayn al-Balāghah wa al-Tadāwuliyyah." *Majallat Dirāsāt Adabiyyah*. Centre al-Baṣīrah for Research and Educational Services, no. 1, 28 May 1429 AH (Algeria).

Unpublished Theses and Dissertations

1. Umm al-Ḥayz Salfāwī. *al-Buʿd al-Tadāwulī fī al-Balāghah al-ʿArabiyyah: Min Khilāl Miftāḥ al-ʿUlūm li-l-Sakkākī*. Master's thesis, University of Kasdi Merbah Ouargla, supervised by Aḥmad Balkhaḍr, 2009.

2. Dalāl Washn. *al-Qaṣdiyyah fī al-Munūth al-Lisānī al-ʿArabī: Dirāsah fī al-Uṣūl al-Naẓariyyah wa al-Ijrāʾiyyah li-l-Balāghah al-ʿArabiyyah*. PhD diss., University of Muḥammad Khīḍr Biskra, supervised by Muḥammad Khān, 2015–2016.

3. Sāmiyah bint Yāminah. *Siyāq al-Ḥāl fī al-Fiʿl al-Kalāmī – Muqāranah Tadāwuliyyah*. PhD diss., The University of Oran, supervised by Aḥmad ʿAzzūz.

4. Laylā Kāda. *al-Mukawwin al-Tadāwulī fī al-Naẓariyyah al-Lisāniyyah al-ʿArabiyyah: Ẓāhirat al-Istilzām al-Takhāṭubī Namūdhajan*. PhD diss., University of Ḥāj Lakhdar Batna, supervised by Bilqāsim Daffah.

Foreign References

J. Lyons. *Sémantique linguistique*. La Sousse, Paris, 1980.

McCombie S., Al Masaeed Kh. (2025). *L2 Arabic pragmatics in the classroom: Insights from language instructors ` beliefs and practices, System Journa*l, Volume 128, 2025, 103546, ISSN 0346-251X, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103546. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X24003282