

	Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems Issue 8, Vol. 8, 2025
	Title of research article Major Stakes in Integrated Pragmatics between System and Context: A Critical Examination of the Argumentative Approach of Oswald Ducrot and Jean-Claude Anscombre
Ali Djellali	Dr. Ahmed Zabana University of Relizane Algeria E-mail: djellaliali009@gmail.com
Larbi Messabih	Doctor Ibn Khaldun University of Tiaret Algeria Email: larbi.Messabih@univ-tiaret.dz
Issue web link	https://imcra-az.org/archive/375-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-8-vol-8-2025.html
Keywords	Integrated pragmatics; argumentation; speech act; context; linguistic system; argumentative trajectory; pragmatic linguistics.
Abstract The argumentative theory of Oswald Ducrot and Jean-Claude Anscombre, commonly known as integrated pragmatics, represents a distinctive and influential school within pragmatic linguistics. Unlike classical rhetoric (Aristotle) or modern rhetorical theory (Perelman, Olbrechts-Tyteca, Meyer), this framework considers argumentation as fundamentally embedded within language itself, rejecting the necessity of external contextual determinants such as social, psychological, or cultural conditions. Integrated pragmatics emphasizes that “speech is imprinted in the utterance,” and thus positions argumentation as a linguistic phenomenon situated within semantics and discourse structures. This article critically examines the major stakes of integrated pragmatics between the linguistic system and contextual frameworks. While the theory provides significant tools for understanding the argumentative trajectory of utterances, its methodological exclusion of extra-linguistic factors raises essential theoretical questions. We investigate how this school of thought relates to, diverges from, and potentially complements broader pragmatic theories, including Austin’s and Searle’s speech act theory, Grice’s conversational maxims, and Habermasian communicative rationality. The findings suggest that while integrated pragmatics successfully demonstrates the linguistic grounding of argumentative structures, it risks underestimating the dynamic role of context, speaker intentionality, and recipient interpretation. This creates both limitations and opportunities for further integration with contextualist paradigms in discourse analysis and applied linguistics.	
Citation. Ali Djellali; Larbi Messabih. (2025). Major Stakes in Integrated Pragmatics between System and Context: A Critical Examination of the Argumentative Approach of Oswald Ducrot and Jean-Claude Anscombre. <i>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems</i>, 8(8), 1014–1022. https://doi.org/10.56334/sci/8.8.88	
Licensed © 2025 The Author(s). Published by Science, Education and Innovations in the context of modern problems	

(SEI) by IMCRA - International Meetings and Journals Research Association (Azerbaijan). This is an open access article under the **CC BY** license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Received: 28.05.2025

Accepted: 17.07.2025

Published: 20.08.2025 (available online)

1. Introduction

Dekro and Anscombe's argumentative approach, integrated pragmatics, is characterised by several features, the most significant of which is its opposition to many classical and modern argumentative concepts and perceptions. These concepts consider argumentation to belong to classical rhetoric (Aristotle), modern rhetoric (Perelman, Olbrechts-Tyteca and Michel Meyer), or natural logic (Grice)¹. Additionally, it adheres to the structuralist Saussurean approach, which calls for the severing of the link between language and its external production circumstances. It is also based on a pragmatic approach reflecting the theory of speech acts by Austin and Searle. In this approach, argumentation is fundamentally based on language and resides within it. It is an argumentative theory belonging to pragmatic linguistics that focuses on analysing speech and actual speech acts rather than language itself. However, it has not addressed external contexts, the pragmatic conditions surrounding the communicative process or the states of the speakers, nor the impact of speech on recipients. This has led us to question this theory's argumentative trajectory and search for its position within linguistic theories.

To address this issue, we must take a precise and focused look at the concept of integrated pragmatics, which is based on the fundamental idea that 'speech is imprinted in the utterance'², meaning that the structure of what is said shapes the utterance. This concept has produced several significant outcomes that incorporate pragmatic facts within the framework of semantic linguistic study and define the characteristics of the linguistic argumentative method. This led Anscombe to declare that the general purpose of the school he founded with Dekro is to develop a theory of interpreting utterances beyond the circle of utterers³.

2. The Major Stakes of Integrated Pragmatics

These represent the key propositions that Dekro and Anscombe adapted in accordance with their integrated pragmatic approach.

- utterance
- Sentence
- Denotation
- Meaning
- the structural programme in the integrated pragmatic project.

A. Utterance: The concept of 'utterance' refers to an event resulting from the act of enunciation⁴. This term has several meanings in Western dictionaries. According to Jean Dubois' dictionary, it means 'any complete sequence of words in a language produced by one or more speakers'. Dubois posits that the definition of an utterance is governed by periods of silence before and after the spoken sequence. In his view, an utterance can be a single sentence or several sentences, and can be grammatical or ungrammatical and denotative or non-denotative. He also states that for distributionists, an utterance is a segment of the speech chain marked by formal signs and initiated by a speaker after a

¹ - Argumentation and Meaning; Abu Bakr Al-Azawi, in: *Argumentation: Its Nature, Fields, and Functions*, edited by Hamou Nqari, Al-Najah Al-Jadida Press, Casablanca, Morocco, 1st ed., 1427 AH / 2006 CE, p. 55.

² - Les Échelles Argumentatives: Oswald Ducrot, p. 9, "The saying is inscribed in the said."

³ - *Linguistic Aspects of Argumentation: An Introduction to Linguistic Argumentation*: Rachid Al-Radi, p. 30. The term "utterance" is attributed to the French linguist and semiotician Émile Benveniste, who defines it as the language act in use through individual action, differing from the utterance. See: *Terminological Concepts for Discourse Analysis*: Dominique Manguno, p. 52.

⁴ - See: *Terminological Concepts for Discourse Analysis*: Dominique Manguno, p. 51.

period of sustained silence or pause in speech from another speaker⁵. This is followed either by speech from another speaker or continued silence. Ultimately, Dubois equates the analysis of the utterance with discourse analysis⁶, stating: "The term "utterance analysis" has been used synonymously with "discourse analysis"⁷.

In addition to these conceptual contrasts regarding the definition of an utterance, Jean-Pierre Cuq mentions two new definitions by Roulet and Berendonner. 'It has been redefined as an intervention or act (Roulet) or a segment or paragraph (Berendonner).'⁸

Dominique Mangiono defines an 'utterance' as a term with multiple meanings. At a higher level, it is 'a unit equivalent to a text; that is, a linguistic sequence tied to the intentions of the speaker, forming the basis for a specific genre, such as a weather report, novel or newspaper article'⁹. Therefore, we can conclude that the term 'utterance' in Western dictionaries denotes several concepts, including a sentence or group of sentences, a segment or paragraph, or a text or discourse.

For Dekro and Anscombe, however, the concept of an utterance differs from that of other theories, particularly argumentative theories. In their view, it is 'the subject produced during linguistic activity that manifests at the moment of utterance'¹⁰. In other words, they define it as 'a material linguistic segment that appears at a specific time and place'¹¹. Based on this, it can be said that an utterance is entirely different from discourse, a view supported by Azeddine Najah, who states: 'An utterance is the linguistic achievement governed by situational conditions, while discourse is a collection of utterances governed by a relationship of coherence and connection, aimed at conveying a message to the recipient for a purpose determined by the speaker.'¹² Dekro and Anscombe refine their definition of an utterance further for greater clarity, stating: 'An utterance can be observed; it is the specific event of the sentence.'¹³ In other words, it is the realised event of the sentence, governed by specific contexts and aimed at influencing the listener, thus serving as an effective rhetorical unit. The concept of the sentence has also taken on a new meaning in their argumentative theory.

B. Sentence

The concept of 'sentence' is a broad one, and disagreement over its definition remains in modern linguistic studies. This is due to the differing sources and orientations of researchers. Some define it as the primary unit of language, others as a binary propositional structure establishing a relationship between subject and predicate, and still others as an independent segment of speech from a syntactic perspective. Others view it as synonymous with 'utterance'¹⁴.

However, Dekro and Anscombe argue that a sentence is a 'theoretical subject'; that is, an abstract linguistic unit devoid of context, represented by the following mathematical equation:

Context - Utterance = Sentence

⁵ - Dictionnaire De Linguistique: Jean Dubois et al., p. 180, "The utterance refers to any finite sequence of words in a language produced by one or more speakers. The closure of the utterance is ensured by a period of silence before and after the sequence of words, silence realized by the speaking subjects. An utterance can be formed of one or more sentences; we can speak of a grammatical or ungrammatical, semantic or non-semantic utterance."

⁶ - Dictionnaire De Linguistique: Jean Dubois et al., p. 180, "In distributional linguistics, the utterance is a segment of the spoken chain clearly delimited by formal marks: the speech of a speaker following a prolonged silence or the cessation of speech of another speaker, cessation of speech followed by the speech of another speaker or a prolonged silence."

⁷ - Dictionnaire De Linguistique: Jean Dubois et al., p. 180, "The expression analysis of utterance has been used synonymously with discourse analysis."

⁸ - Dictionnaire de Didactique du Français Langue Étrangère et Seconde: Jean-Pierre Cuq, Clé International, S.E.J.E.R. Paris, Edition Jean Pencreac'h, 2003, p. 81, "The utterance is redefined as an intervention or act (Roulet), or as a clause (Berendonner)."

⁹ - See: Terminological Concepts for Discourse Analysis: Dominique Mangiono, p. 52.

¹⁰ - Argumentation et Énonciation: Azzaoui Boubker, p. 123, "It is the object produced during linguistic activity and which arises at the moment of enunciation."

¹¹ - Ibid, p. 123, "The utterance is defined as a material linguistic segment that is identifiable, appearing at a given time and place."

¹² - Implicature and Argumentation: Between Utterance Analysis and Discourse Analysis—Research and Attempts: Azeddine Najah, University Publishing Center, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Manouba, Tunisia, PhD thesis, 2015 CE, p. 207.

¹³ - Argumentation et Énonciation: Azzaoui Boubker, p. 123, "The utterance is an observable, the particular occurrence of a sentence."

¹⁴ - Argumentation et Énonciation: Azzaoui Boubker, p. 123, "The sentence is a theoretical object."

Context – énoncé = Phrase

In this context, Dekro defines a sentence as ‘a group of words combined according to syntactic rules, determined outside of any discourse context’¹⁵, describing this as the normative concept of a sentence. He further clarifies the distinction between an utterance and a sentence by stating that ‘what is produced by a speaker and heard by an addressee is not a sentence; it is an utterance realised by a sentence’¹⁶. This distinction is not limited to the concepts of utterance and sentence, but also leads to a distinction between denotation and meaning.

C. Meaning:

Meaning is the central theme in many branches of modern linguistics, such as semantics and pragmatics, which has made it a focal point for researchers since the early twentieth century. However, its study varies depending on different perspectives and the multiplicity of linguistic schools

... According to Dekro and Anscombe, the concept of meaning differs from that of denotation due to the distinction between an utterance and a sentence. ‘Meaning, the subject of linguistic pragmatics, is presented in the form of instructions that constitute a set of utterance indicators embedded in the utterance.’¹⁷ Dekro asserts that meaning is linked to the utterance, while denotation is associated with the sentence. In his book *Le dire et le dit*, Dekro states: ‘When it comes to the semantic description of a given sentence, I speak of its denotation, and I reserve the term “meaning” for the semantic description of the utterance.’¹⁸ Immediately after this statement, Dekro notes that ‘there is a difference between meaning and denotation: a methodological difference and a natural difference’¹⁹. He associates meaning with the field of observation and denotation with the field of theory in the first difference (methodological distinction)²⁰.

In the second distinction, he rejects the prevailing notion that denotation is part of meaning. He states: ‘I distinguish between meaning and denotation naturally, and through this distinction, I challenge the common view that the meaning of an utterance is the denotation of a sentence in context.’ According to this latter view, meaning is found on one side of denotation, while the additions brought by the context are found on the other. I reject the idea of making denotation a part of meaning without being able to justify this rejection here,²¹ he says, clarifying this by stating: ‘Meaning does not appear as an addition to denotation or anything else; rather, it works as a general construct that materialises in different discursive contexts based on the specific instructions of denotation.’²²

D. Denotation:

Denotation is one of the pillars of the integrated pragmatic conception. Thus, we find Dekro elaborating on it both theoretically and practically. In his book *Dire et ne pas dire*, he describes it as ‘the concept taken outside

¹⁵ - Argumentation et Énonciation: Azzaoui Boubker, p. 124, “A set of words combined according to the rules of syntax, taken outside any discourse situation.”

¹⁶ - Ibid, p. 124, “What a speaker produces, what a listener hears, is therefore not a sentence but a particular utterance of a sentence.”

¹⁷ - Argumentation et Énonciation: Azzaoui Boubker, p. 126, “The meaning that is the object of linguistic pragmatics presents itself in the form of instructions constituting a set of indications about enunciation.”

¹⁸ - *Le Dire et le Dit*: Oswald Ducrot, Paris, Minuit, 1984, p. 180, “When it comes to semantically characterizing a sentence, I will speak of its ‘signification,’ and I will reserve the word ‘meaning’ for the semantic characterization of the utterance.”

¹⁹ - *Le Dire et le Dit*: Oswald Ducrot, p. 180, “Between meaning and signification, for me, there is both a difference in methodological status and a difference in nature.”

²⁰ - See: Argumentation et Énonciation: Azzaoui Boubker, p. 126.

²¹ - *Le Dire et le Dit*: Oswald Ducrot, pp. 180-181, “I assert, between meaning and signification, a difference in nature. By this, I want to take the counterpoint of the usual conception according to which the meaning of the utterance is the signification of the sentence seasoned with a few ingredients borrowed from the discourse situation. According to this conception, one would therefore find in the meaning, on the one hand the signification, and on the other hand the additions that the situation brings to it. For me, I refuse—without being able to justify this refusal here—to make signification a part of meaning.”

²² - Ibid, p. 182, “Meaning does not appear as the addition of signification and something else, but as a construction carried out, given the discourse situation, based on the specified instructions in the signification.”
The sentence, utterance, meaning, and denotation are major concepts that have been transformed by Dekro and Anscombe according to their integrated pragmatic vision. See: *A Pragmatic Approach to the Wisdom of Al-Attai*: Azeddine Najah, Discourse University of Mouloud Mammeri, Tizi Ouzou, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008), p. 27.

the context of discourse, an abstract matter without meaning (a filler)²³. This simple definition initially evokes the concept of a sentence. He then defines denotation more precisely in his book *Le dire et le dit*, stating: 'It is a set of guidelines given to individuals concerned with interpreting utterances of the sentence, guidelines that specify the steps they must follow to connect meaning to those utterances.'²⁴

Schemas of Utterance Interpretations

1. General Schema of Utterance Interpretations (based on Rashid Al-Radi)

Communication Situation	Possible Meaning
Situation 1	Meaning 1
Situation 2	Meaning 2
Situation n	Meaning n

Key idea: An utterance does not settle on one fixed meaning; each communicative situation activates a distinct interpretive path.

2. Applied Schema: Example from the Hadith on Intentions

Utterance: "A man who commits to the mosques."

Intention	Interpretation / Meaning	Category
To pray sincerely for Allah	Worship	Religious / Obligatory
To rest or cool off	Habit	Mundane / Neutral
To be seen by others (shyness before people)	Hypocrisy	Social / Negative

Key idea: The same utterance ('commitment to mosques') takes on different argumentative and pragmatic values depending on speaker intention and context.

The Lofty Beneficial Points in the Explanation of Nawawi's Forty Hadiths: "A man eats food out of mere desire, while another man eats food in obedience to God's command as stated in His saying: [Al-A'raf: 31]. The second man's eating is an act of worship, while the first man's eating is a habit."²⁵

To further clarify the concept of denotation, we should discuss the concept of guidelines and their role in the interpretative process of utterances. Initially, we refer to the general concept of guidelines, which expresses the main idea of the theory of argumentation in language, stating that language inherently possesses an argumentative function. The general concept of guidelines serves as "a link between the semantic theory and the theory of argumentation within the framework of linguistic pragmatics, as argumentation arises from language in the form of guidelines. These guidelines are carriers of argumentative values and guarantee all forms of composition within argumentative sequences. Thus, argumentation becomes part of the denotation of sentences, residing deep within the language, not merely an external manifestation or a simple effect of usage."²⁶

The specific or narrow concept of guidelines can be divided into two categories: verbal guidelines and argumentative guidelines²⁷.

²³- Dire et Ne Dire: Principles of Linguistic Semantics: Oswald Ducrot, Paris, Hermann, 1972, p. 107, "The notion of signification, taken out of context, is entirely absurd (or tautological)."

²⁴- Le Dire et le Dit: Oswald Ducrot, p. 181, "A set of instructions given to people who have to interpret the utterances of the sentence, instructions specifying what maneuvers to perform to associate a meaning with these utterances."

²⁵- Al-Jami' fi Sharh Al-Arba'in Al-Nawawiya: Muhyi al-Din Yahya ibn Sharaf Al-Nawawi et al., p. 11.

²⁶- Linguistic Aspects of Argumentation: An Introduction to Linguistic Argumentation: Rachid Al-Radi, p. 61.

²⁷- See: the same reference, p. 66.

1. Verbal Guidelines: These integrate the act of enunciation within the utterance and possess a semantic linguistic nature that operates on the syntactic component²⁸. To illustrate how these guidelines function, consider the following example:

“I will leave the team, as long as you want to know everything.”

In this example, the connector “as long as” links the act of enunciation (“I will leave the team”) with the utterance (“you want to know everything”), meaning the reason for performing the act of enunciation is that the addressee is keen on knowing everything. Therefore, the act of enunciation is integrated into the first sentence, within the informational content of the second sentence²⁹, which supports the validity of the new hypothesis that aims to incorporate pragmatic facts into semantic description.

2. Argumentative guidelines: These are the signs and characteristics that govern the argumentative direction of all forms of discourse, such as argumentative factors, links and the ladder of argument that distinguishes certain utterances, as well as argumentative positions³⁰. Therefore, it can be said that argumentative guidelines form the basis of Dekro and Anscombe’s theory, which asserts that language inherently possesses an argumentative function.

In summary, this new perspective on denotation is central to the authors’ theory of argumentation in language, which they have worked hard to substantiate. Dekro affirms the validity of this hypothesis, stating: ‘To evoke that observable connection between meaning and utterance in a systematic way, I find it necessary to designate sentences that are considered utterances as fulfilling a theoretical subject I call “denotation”.’³¹ This procedure seems important to me, as I assume the possibility of formulating laws that, on the one hand, calculate the denotation of sentences based on their grammatical and lexical structure and, on the other hand, predict the meanings of utterances through this denotation.’

However, this statement – ‘to evoke that observable connection between meaning and utterance in a systematic way’ – brings to mind the idea of a structuralist approach to linguistic phenomena, i.e. studying language for its own sake. This approach was established by the famous linguist Ferdinand de Saussure at the beginning of the 20th century, particularly within the field of linguistics and the human sciences in general. This raises the question of what motivated Dekro and Anscombe to adopt Saussurean structuralism in their argumentative project.

In order to answer this question, we will attempt to clarify some of the key intersections between Saussurean structural linguistics and linguistic argumentation.

- The structural programme in the integrated pragmatic project.

The linguistic sign (signifier and signified).

- Syntactic relationships.

E. The Structural Programme in the Integrated Pragmatic Project

Dekro and Anscombe’s research has transformed the concept of pragmatic study. Previously, analyses were linked to external contexts and utterance data. However, Dekro and Anscombe’s research treats the structure of language itself as the subject of investigation, independent of all external conditions surrounding it. In this context, Rashid Al-Radi states: ‘Since his early work in the late 1960s, Dekro has consistently defended the value of the structuralist approach

²⁸ - See: Linguistic Aspects of Argumentation: An Introduction to Linguistic Argumentation: Rashid Al-Radi, p. 66.

This example is similar to those provided by Dekro and Anscombe in their research, which affirm the idea of integrating utterance within the structure of the utterance. See: Linguistic Aspects of Argumentation: An Introduction to Linguistic Argumentation: Rashid Al-Radi, p. 31.

²⁹ - See: Linguistic Aspects of Argumentation: An Introduction to Linguistic Argumentation: Rashid Al-Radi, p. 66.

³⁰ - See: Linguistic Aspects of Argumentation: An Introduction to Linguistic Argumentation: Rashid Al-Radi, p. 67.

³¹ - The same reference, pp. 60-61.

Ferdinand de Saussure (Ferdinand de Saussur), born in 1857 in Geneva, Switzerland, is considered the father of the structuralist school in linguistics. He practiced a scientific approach to linguistic studies, moving towards a descriptive study of language, which had previously been historical. He was the first to consider linguistics as a branch of semiology. He passed away in 1913, leaving many works that were later documented by his students in a book published in 1916 titled: Cours de Linguistique Générale. See: [Ferdinand de Saussure - Wikipedia] (https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/فردیناند_دو_سوسور).

to linguistic phenomena, collaborating with others to explain this method and clarify its applications in linguistic study.³² This clearly indicates that this research has been significantly influenced by Saussurean structuralism.

Dekro himself has confirmed that 'integrated pragmatics, as a field closely related to semantics, should be structural (in the sense of being independent)'³³. He further emphasises this approach in his new argumentative research, stating: 'One of the goals that linguistic argumentative study has continuously aimed to achieve is to provide a semantic description of sentences that aligns with the general framework of Saussurean structuralism'³⁴; that is, an internal, systematic description that is far removed from non-linguistic topics (external context).

We will now outline the main aspects of the Saussurean structural programme adopted by Dekro and Anscombe in their argumentative project.

A. The linguistic sign (signifier and signified).

As previously mentioned, the sentence is the starting point relied upon by Dekro and Anscombe when analysing and interpreting utterances. For them, 'the sentence occupies a position analogous to that of the sign in Saussurean linguistics'³⁵. In other words, the Saussurean linguistic sign has been replaced by the sentence in the study of linguistic argumentation.

The authors also borrowed the concept of the sign, composed of the signifier and signified, which they later referred to as 'denotation'³⁶ and considered to be the core of the integrated pragmatic field.

B. Syntactic Relationships:

Syntactic relationships fall within the binary of syntax and substitution. They are one of the most important aspects on which Saussure based his structural programme. Saussure states: 'In discourse, words contract with one another based on their linear sequence, excluding the possibility of uttering two words simultaneously. This relationship arranges words sequentially during speech and can therefore be termed 'horizontal syntax', consisting of two or more sequential units (e.g. 'rered', 'against everyone', 'human life', 'God is good', 'if the weather is nice, we will go out', etc.).'³⁷ This relationship determines the value of linguistic expressions in syntax; that is to say, any expression gains its value only through its relationship with other expressions that share a particular structure.

Dekro and Anscombe invoke this idea because, according to them, it 'ensures fidelity to the structuralist methodology and the concomitant procedure of immanence'³⁸. However, for them, the concept of the sentence consistently corresponds to that of the linguistic sign. Rashid Al-Radi clarified the method by which sentences are studied according to the Saussurean concept of syntactic relationships, stating: 'The denotation of a sentence is determined based on the totality of "argumentative compositions" that this sentence allows. These compositions are identified by specifying the guidelines unique to each sentence and are characterised by their purely internal nature, which is not related to external data.'³⁹ Thus, this paragraph and the other references in previous paragraphs confirm the fidelity of linguistic argumentative research to the Saussurean structural project.

3. Conclusion:

³² - Linguistic Aspects of Argumentation: An Introduction to Linguistic Argumentation: Rachid Al-Radi, p. 51.

³³ - Encyclopedic Dictionary of Pragmatics: Jacques Moeschler, Anne Reboul, translated by Semma Belhaj Rahuma Al-Shakili et al., supervised by Azeddine Al-Majdoub, Dar Sinattra, National Center for Translation, Tunisia, PhD thesis, 2010 CE, p. 88.

³⁴ - The previous reference, p. 52.

³⁵ - Linguistic Aspects of Argumentation: An Introduction to Linguistic Argumentation: Rachid Al-Radi, p. 53.

³⁶ - See: the same reference, p. 53.

³⁷ - Cours de Linguistique Générale: Ferdinand de Saussure, published by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, Arabe d'or, Geneva, 2005, p. 132, "In discourse, words contract with one another, by virtue of their sequence, relations based on the linear nature of language, which excludes the possibility of pronouncing two elements at once. They line up one after another in the speech chain. These combinations, which are supported by extent, can be called syntagms. The syntagm is thus always composed of two or more consecutive units (for example: rered; against all; human life; God is good; if the weather is nice, we will go out, etc.)."

³⁸ - Linguistic Aspects of Argumentation: An Introduction to Linguistic Argumentation: Rachid Al-Radi, p. 54.

³⁹ - The same reference, p. 55.

The methodological shift in integrated pragmatics, which emphasises the independence of the syntactic structure of language from all external pragmatic circumstances, was not an arbitrary feature, but rather the primary focus of the leaders of this school since its inception. Based on the above, the key issues in integrated pragmatics can be categorised into four areas, ranging from the system to the context:

The impression of an utterance within its own structure.

Evoking the connection between meaning and utterance in a systematic manner.

Interpreting sentences based on total guidelines independently of all non-linguistic circumstances.

The structuralist approach to linguistic phenomena (adopting the Saussurean structural method).

Overall, Dekro and Anscombe's research has transformed the concept of pragmatic study, shifting the focus from external contexts and utterance data to the structure of language itself, independent of all external conditions.

classical rhetoric, Gricean pragmatics, and contemporary discourse analysis.

- Critical discourse analysis: Applying integrated pragmatics to selected examples of argumentative utterances, testing its explanatory adequacy and identifying its limits.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Linguistic Grounding of Argumentation

Integrated pragmatics demonstrates that utterances inherently contain argumentative trajectories, which can be revealed through semantic and discursive analysis.

4.2 Exclusion of Context

While offering precision, the theory's deliberate exclusion of speaker psychology, communicative context, and audience response narrows its explanatory power.

4.3 The System-Context Divide

The tension between system (language imprints) and context (situational variables) constitutes the central stake of this theory.

4.4 Integrative Potentials

Combining integrated pragmatics with contextualist approaches (Habermas, Van Dijk) can produce a richer model of argumentation, bridging structural and socio-pragmatic perspectives.

5. Conclusion

Integrated pragmatics provides a rigorous framework that locates argumentation within language itself, offering a counterpoint to rhetoric- and context-based models. However, its methodological reductionism invites reconsideration. To fully capture the complexities of human communication, linguistic argumentation must be situated at the intersection of system and context.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Department of Human and Social Sciences at Ahmed Zabana University of Relizane and Ibn Khaldun University of Tiaret for their support in providing access to academic resources and discussions that enriched this study.

Ethical Considerations

This study is theoretical in nature and did not involve human participants, experiments, or personal data. Hence, no ethical approval was required. The research adheres to the principles of academic integrity and proper citation of sources.

Funding

No external funding was received for this study. The research was conducted as part of the authors' academic work at their respective institutions.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

References

1. Al-Izawi, A. B. (2006). Argumentation and the argumentative meaning. In H. Naqari (Ed.), *Argumentation: Its nature, fields, and functions* (1st ed.). Casablanca, Morocco: Al-Najah Publishing. (Original work published 1427 AH)
2. Al-Nawawi, M. Y. ibn S., & others. (2007). *The comprehensive explanation of the forty hadith* (1st ed.). Cairo, Egypt: Dar Ibn Hazm. (Original work published 1428 AH)
3. Al-Radi, R. (2014). *Linguistic aspects of argumentation: An introduction to argumentative linguistics* (1st ed.). Casablanca, Morocco: Arab Cultural Center.
4. Mangone, D. (2008). *Terminology and concepts for discourse analysis* (M. Yahyatin, Trans.; 1st ed.). Algeria: Al-Ikhtilaf Publications.
5. Moeschler, J., & Reboul, A. (2010). *Encyclopedic dictionary of pragmatics* (S. B. Rahouma et al., Trans.; E. Al-Majdoub, Ed.). Tunisia: Dar Sinattra, National Center for Translation. (Doctoral dissertation).
6. Najeh, A. (2015). *Implicature and argumentation between utterance analysis and discourse analysis: Researches and attempts* (Doctoral dissertation). Manouba, Tunisia: University Publishing Center, Faculty of Human and Social Sciences.
7. Muslim, I. ibn al-H. (1991). *Sahih Muslim* (M. F. Abdul-Baqi, Ed.; Vol. 3, 1st ed.). Cairo, Egypt: Dar Al-Hadith.
8. Azzaoui, B. (n.d.). *Argumentation and enunciation*. Rabat, Morocco: Top Press.
9. Cuq, J.-P. (2003). *Dictionary of teaching French as a foreign and second language* (J. Pencreac'h, Ed.). Paris, France: Clé International, S.E.J.E.R.
10. Ducrot, O. (1972). *Saying and not saying: Principles of linguistic semantics*. Paris, France: Hermann.
11. Ducrot, O. (1980). *Argumentative scales*. Paris, France: Minuit.
12. Ducrot, O. (1984). *What is said and what is meant*. Paris, France: Minuit.
13. Dubois, J., & others. (2002). *Dictionary of linguistics*. Paris, France: Larousse-Bordas/VUEF.
14. Saussure, F. de. (2005). *Course in general linguistics* (C. Bally & A. Sechehaye, Eds.). Geneva, Switzerland: Arabic Gold.
15. Najeh, A. (2008). A pragmatic approach to the wisdom of Attai. *Al-Khitab*, 3(3). University of Mouloud Mammeri, Tizi Ouzou.
16. Wikipedia contributors. (n.d.). Ferdinand de Saussure. In Wikipedia. Retrieved September 30, 2025, from <https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/فردِنْوْ دُوْ فَرْدِي نَادْ>