



---

# Meaning And Structure In Language Between Linguistic Form And Pragmatic Usage

Younesse Zouaoui Ali Lounici University of Blida 2, (Algeria). [ey.zouaoui@univ-blida2.dz](mailto:ey.zouaoui@univ-blida2.dz)

Received: 23/02/2024

Accepted: 29/05/2024

Published: 26/06/2024

---

## Abstract:

Any language appears in the uses of its speakers. Based on this, this research paper examines the problem of clarifying language, both its verbal and semantic components, between the states of form and usage during communication. This paper argues that any language has its own system upon which it is based, and its uses, which are primarily attributed to the speaker within the pragmatic elements that control them.

The study also aims to identify the controls that govern these uses between speakers, focusing on the pragmatics of discourse, which the study concludes is essential and fundamental for understanding the nature of the transition from the fixed general law of language to individual use.

**Keywords:** Language; meaning, pragmatics, code, use.

## 1. Introduction:

The movement of linguistic research into the reality of language is accelerating, and linguistic fields and schools of linguistic analysis are increasingly diverse. This diversity and difference are due to the scientific philosophy underlying each school or thought. Thus, some view language as a living product, as long as it is connected to humans. They treat language as an evolutionary act, and investigate its historical dynamics and the development of its structures and levels. This cognitive perspective has produced diverse fields of knowledge, notably linguistic historicism, developmental aspects, and comparison. Comparative approaches, historical studies, and philological studies became popular in Europe during the "pre-Saussurean" period. Some scholars have analyzed language as a closed system that must be viewed from within. This system can only be analyzed by isolating it from any external element. From this intellectual background, several linguistic schools emerged in the modern era, all of which trace their roots back to what is known as "structuralism." Studies have branched out, and linguistic schools have varied, with their cognitive backgrounds and philosophical dimensions varying to this day and will remain so as long as the subject is language.

As is the case with any science, development and criticism are purely human traits. They thus fall within the cognitive tools that enable the humanities to transcend boundaries. This has allowed for the emergence of many linguistic schools and cognitive ideas throughout time, since humankind became aware of its existence. Language is humankind's companion and exists through its existence. This explains the differences between linguistic schools in their analysis of language, even though linguists are based on a single linguistic cognitive principle. Structuralism, which treated language as a system viewed through its linguistic elements, has, over the years, evolved into different, and sometimes contradictory, orientations. The linguistic thought advanced by Saussure, for example, is no longer the same as that advocated by

Bloomfield and the distributionalists, nor is it the same thought pursued by Halliday and his followers, such as Christian Matthiessen, Harris, Chomsky, Howard Lasnik, Deirdre Wilson, and many others.

Even early Arab linguists were not isolated from this divergence in linguistic analysis. Al-Khalil's view of language and his analysis of it differed from that of Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani, al-Jahiz, Ibn Jinni, and many others.

We do not attribute this multiplicity and diversity in various linguistic fields solely to the inevitability of human nature, which refuses to be limited by a specific cognitive limit—especially that which is intrinsically linked to it. It is true that what is connected to change (the human perception of the surrounding objects) will inevitably be affected by change and development. However, the greatest factor contributing to this significant difference in linguistic schools and the diversity of their research outputs is meaning. Yes! Every linguistic development has sought, within its mechanisms, methods, and themes, to conceptualize meaning and its correlates, each according to the perspective from which it is viewed, whether abstract rational, historical, social, psychological, or the like. If a person does not do so voluntarily at the outset, the language, which is the focus of study, will force him to do so by force of linguistic reality. Therefore, Bloomfield and the distributionalists in general did not persist in their exclusion of meaning, and Chomsky did not persist with his initial approach of ignoring semantics. Rather, this is what we see as the basis upon which Sibawayh prefaced his great encyclopedic book on the study of Arabic when he outlined the methods of linguistic correctness and made them inextricably linked to a duality: verbal correctness and semantic correctness. This is the essence of language, standing on two thresholds: the threshold of meaning and the threshold of structure.

To further clarify the concept for the reader of this research paper, we refer him to the most prominent field of knowledge related to the structures of various linguistic systems, namely translation. We find many efforts made by Georges Mounin, Eugene Nida, and John Catford. These scholars sought to explore new mechanisms in translation, far removed from meaning and based entirely on pure structural analysis alone.'(Mokhtar Zouaoui, 2018, 13)

However, these efforts quickly collapsed in the face of pragmatics, and they realized their limitations when they viewed translation as merely a matter of systems. Pragmatics, with its various trends and schools, is replete with meaning and everything related to communication. This connection has led to its divergence in defining its concept. Rudolf Carnap mentioned various definitions in his introduction to the book *La pragmatique* from the series *Que sais-je?* For French linguist Françoise Armengaud. (Françoise Armengaud, 2007, 05)

we are not here to mention definitions or study pragmatics; but mentioning it here is a methodological necessity to clarify to us the extent of the importance of the meaning that made linguists go beyond the linguistic system in its fixed origin, which is called (Code), and not stop at it alone, but rather the matter goes beyond it to study its various usage cases (use), and in Arabic this interest in this duality and what is related to its actual use is embodied in a science that is considered one of the pillars of Arabic linguistic sciences, which is the science of rhetoric, and Al-Zamakhshari mentioned, quoting Al-Jahiz, a very accurate saying; In it, he explains the position of rhetoric and its sciences in understanding meaning, communicating, conveying the intended meaning and interpreting it between the speaker and the recipient, and gives us a picture of the movement of meaning and structure between situation and use, so he said: "The jurist, even if he excels over his peers in the science of fatwas and rulings, and the speaker, even if he excels over the people of the world in the art of speech, and the memorizer of stories and

news, even if he is from "Ibn Al-Qiriya" is more memorized, and the preacher, even if he is from "Al-Hasan Al-Basri" is more preaching, and the grammarian, even if he is more articulate than Sibawayh, and the linguist, even if he chews languages with the strength of his beard; None of them would undertake to follow those methods, nor would they delve into any of those truths except a man who has excelled in two sciences specializing in the Qur'an, which are: the science of semantics and the science of rhetoric. (Al-Zamakhshari , 1/2)

Rhetoric in Arabic is the linguistic science most closely connected and linked to discourse and most intersecting with it. It is the one most closely connected to meaning in discourse, and therefore Al-Jahiz made rhetoric the only way that allows you to delve into meanings that change with the change of usage and the situations of discourse.

If we refer to the definition of the word "balagha"(rhetoric) in Arabic dictionaries, we find that the linguistic root of the Arabic term "balagha" (rhetoric) carries the meaning of arrival and completion, as mentioned in Lisan al-Arab by Ibn Manzur. ( Ibn Manzur , 8/419)

As for the terminology, its situation is similar to that of the pragmatics in Western studies, where numerous definitions have been identified that cannot be enumerated. One definition, cited by al-Jahiz, is that it is brevity without inertia and prolixity without error. Many have defined it as "the conformity of speech to the requirements of the situation." Because each term is closely linked to the lexical meaning, the relationship between the linguistic and technical meanings of "balagha" is interconnected, given that Arabic rhetoric is a science that seeks to convey meaning within the circle of communication using the best and most correctly formulated structure, (Al-Jahiz, 1/99) based on the "requirements of the situation." That is, by considering the communicative elements associated with discourse during the actual use of the language. Thus, we can say that rhetoric among the Arabs is the art of using language, and it can only be achieved by considering the origin of its formation and the system that controls its structures

## **2. Language between form(code) and usage:**

Language, in its simplest description, is a human communicative system, a system based on a standard linguistic structure governed by laws that affect all linguistic levels, with the goal of communication between members of a single linguistic community, for the purpose of conveying the message that language is a complete, integrated whole in the minds of all its speakers. The communication process depends on status, from which it proceeds to usage. According to Sibawayh, status is "the affirmation of something for something else or the negation of this affirmation." Al-Sharif al-Radi defines it as follows: "Situation in language is the making of a word corresponding to a meaning. In terminology: the specification of one thing by another. Whenever it is stated, or the first thing is sensed, the second thing is understood from it. What is meant by generalization is the use of the word and the intention of the meaning, and the intention of feeling is the use of the word, more general than the intention of the meaning first." Thus, status is intrinsically linked to language in its system and structure, and can be described metaphorically as rigidity. If What takes the speaker of the language out of the rigidity of the system and its standardization to the dynamic, and in this way he achieves the "use" embodied primarily in speech,

The transition of language from its status to its usage is a transition from the law governing its origin to the event being used, which is speech. Hajj Saleh says: "Events are particular things because they are perceived by the sense of hearing as sounds. Each event has its own particularity. Language, on the other hand, is one of the universals because it is not perceived by hearing." This is what Al-Sharif meant in the text we cited earlier, when he said: "Sensation

is the use of the word." We have seen that the situation is a structural law, and that usage is a law subject to discourse and its various broad conditions based on what the language system and its communicative externalities impose. Therefore, the linguistic elements, when they are put in place, do not necessarily remain the same in usage, which diversifies the meaning and changes between situation and usage. In this regard, El Hadj Saleh says: "The word, when it is spoken, is necessarily affected by some change, ... just as the meaning is also affected by a great deal of change." The change that occurs in the meaning within usage is like a second meaning, which Al-Jurjani expressed with the term "the meaning of the meaning," as he says: "Here is a brief expression, which is: to say the meaning and the meaning of the meaning. By "meaning," he means the concept understood from the literal meaning of the word, which you arrive at without an intermediary. By "meaning of meaning," ( Al-Jurjani, 1992, 263).

he means that you comprehend a meaning from the word, and then that meaning leads you to another meaning. We find al-Tufi al-Sarsari( 1989, 36) clarifying the extent of the connection between usage and the direction of meanings when he mentioned the reason for the difference in interpretation of the Qur'an among Muslims, attributing it to the pragmatic elements controlling usage. He says: "According to what they understood from the difference in or dialectal performances, context, and circumstances." Since meaning in usage is variable due to its connection to communication, this leads us to the necessity of mentioning argumentation, even if in a brief form imposed by the subject of the study. We only mention argumentation because it is a communicative mechanism subject to pragmatic relations. It is no secret that rhetoric was based on an old conflict that was renewed with the pioneers of argumentation among linguists. This conflict is based on two concepts:

One: Rhetoric is an art of expression.

Second: Rhetoric is an art of persuasion.

From these two perspectives, rhetoric is a science that considers linguistic structure, discourse, and communication as part of its subject matter, and views the interlocutors from both emotional and rational perspectives. New rhetoric is a theory of argumentation that aims to study rhetorical techniques, stimulate the soul, and win the mind through arguments and related matters. ( Sabir Al Habasha, 2008, 15)

Any speaker relies in their discourse on employing multiple rhetorical devices to achieve communicative purposes and pragmatic dimensions. They therefore target the recipient's condition within the structure of language (the situation) without excluding it. Therefore, Jean-Claude Anscombe and Oswald Ducrot view argumentation as a verbal activity within the structure of language, which no longer remains a mere tool for argumentation but rather becomes its locus.

For example, if we say: "He swears that he owns a golden throat," the meaning in the context does not deviate from the binary of (belief/falsification) from the perspective of reality. Therefore, the first meaning is that the speaker swears that someone has a throat made of gold. The judgment on this is that the oath emphasizes an illogical meaning in reality, one that is neither acceptable nor compatible when ascribing ownership of a golden throat to a person through the linguistic context, and then describing it as golden. Therefore, examining the meaning based on context is examining it from the perspective of reality, which may agree or disagree with it. Thus, the judgment of belief or falsity arises. ( Rashid al Radi, 20)

However, the meaning established in the discourse does not remain within the context (the first meaning) and extends beyond it to another meaning revealed by usage outside the

structure of the language. Its definition is determined by elements related to the speaker, the listener, the circumstances of the discourse, and other communicative elements. The meaning of the situation is quickly overcome when we realize that the speaker is talking about the owner of a beautiful voice. The meaning of the usage becomes clear: the speaker has given a strong semantic load in describing the person with an extremely beautiful voice, and has placed the addressee in the position of a denier. It is as if any addressee, upon hearing the voice, would deny that it comes from a human being out of sheer amazement. Therefore, examining the meaning based on usage is examining it from the perspective of persuasion, which may or may not be achieved. Thus, we are faced with the success or failure of the meaning.

### **3. Meaning and structure between structural position and pragmatic usage in Arabic:**

By returning to meaning in terms of usage, we encounter many chapters, particularly in Arabic rhetoric, that reflect the intended meaning. It is not hidden from anyone who carefully studies the outcome of the scientific movement in Arabic sciences that it is characterized by a multiplicity of linguistic topics studied, including the science of grammar, which has made the syntactic level of Arabic its subject. It is the most prominent of the Arabic linguistic sciences, and the science of rhetoric, which takes language at the level of its communication and usage as its subject. Usage cannot exist without context. Therefore, the Arab scholars' arrangement of the sciences was logical, prioritizing what was based on context. As al-Suyuti relates, "It is necessary to begin with verbal sciences, and the first thing to begin with is the verification of individual words. They discuss them from the perspective of language, then morphology, then derivation. Then they discuss them according to their structure, beginning with syntax, then what pertains to semantics, then rhetoric, then rhetorical devices, then the intended meaning, then deduction, then allusions." In light of what we have mentioned, this arrangement of the sciences is logical in its ability to comprehend contextual and usage-based meaning in all its forms. (Al-Suyuti, 1974, 227)

Arabic rhetoric is based on two main scientific fields: semantics and rhetoric, and a third branch, rhetorical devices. The subject of semantics, the field in which meaning appears most clearly in its usage and application, examines the word and its relationship to the context of discourse. It examines meaning in its original context, in terms of singularity and composition, and its connection to usage and communication. Rhetoricians call it "articulating speech according to its apparent meaning".

As for rhetoric, it studies how to arrive at a single meaning through various methods. "Meaning" here is what the speaker intends within the context of communication.

Since semantics examines meaning and its changes in usage and application, we will begin from it to embody the desired goal. This field is divided into eight chapters:

- 1Conditions of the predicate.
- 2Conditions of the subject.
- 3Conditions of the predicate.
- 4Conditions of the verb's related objects.
- 5Conciseness.
- 6Composition.

- 7 Disjunction and conjunction.

- 8 Brevity, prolixity, and equality. In the attributive relationship that carries the status of information, rhetoricians explain that the judgment results from the relation of one word to another within the "situation." That is, the judgment is the situational meaning, but it emerges into a usage meaning based on the inclusion of pragmatic elements that transcend the original situation. We call the structural meaning "benefit," that is, the benefit of information, and it is obtained primarily by the occurrence of the situation. We call the usage meaning "necessary benefit," and this can only be determined by usage. "Necessary benefit" is linked to the speaker within the discourse. An example of this is the sentence: "I know".

The meaning of the situation is that the speaker informs the addressee that he knows, and the benefit is achieved by attributing knowledge to the speaker's pronoun. However, we can deviate from this to another meaning through usage—where it is the determining factor—when the circumstances of the addressees lead us to give the speaker a second meaning, the content of which goes beyond the first meaning conveyed by the rules of composition, to a second meaning that serves as an implicit message that he knows. It is as if he is thereby saying to him, in a usage sense: I am not ignorant, and I am not one from whom matters are hidden. This can only be achieved by taking into account the external contexts, and through them, a new meaning can be understood, in that the speaker considers the addressee as if he would deny this, so he adds the element of affirmation "that," and this takes into account the condition of the addressee. We find this in classroom settings when a student answers. The content of the answer is the literal meaning, but through usage, the student transcends the language's context and its primary meaning to a second meaning perceived by the parties to the conversation: the student informs his teacher that he understands the content of the question and possesses the answer.

Rhetoricians have enumerated a number of literal meanings governed by communicative elements outside the linguistic structure, including regret, sympathy, pride, advice, and many other meanings embodied in usage and linked to the speaker, the addressee, or others, and can only be arrived at through communicative clues. If you were with someone and said, "There is nothing more important than studying," one of the meanings derived from this usage is advice and guidance, which cannot be arrived at unless we understand the context in which it was said. This is a group of examples in which the literal meaning is transcended to the literal meaning, based on multiple indications related to taking into account the context of the speech, the recipient's circumstances, and the like.

In the Arabic linguistic system, we find a principle upon which it is based, which is the principle of "branching," which is similar to the principle of "transformation" in Chomsky's transformational generative linguistics. The branch in the Khalilian theory is based on the idea of starting from the nucleus (noun/verb), which is the origin of the branch, by adding to it to the right and left linguistic elements to form the "Generator pattern," which consists of a group of positions occupied by those linguistic elements. Thus, the position is an abstract, stable position in the linguistic situation, and the elements it occupies are something else controlled by usage. Sentences may be devoid of some linguistic elements in usage, but their positions are imagined in the "example" of sentences. The same is the case with what is lower than sentences (words) or what is higher (discourse). (ElHadj saleh, 1988, 221)

The concept of the example in this is the group of those conceptual positions imagined in the mind and arranged in a specific order. Therefore, we find the operative meaning

established in the mind when we delete elements whose presence is required by the context, such as omitting one of the two elements of the predicate. (ElHadj saleh, 1988, 224)

An example of this is the answer to the questioner's question: "Who moved?" You say: "I." The original context requires the phrase "I moved," and the context conveys the well-known meaning that the speaker moved. However, the context conveys a meaning that goes beyond the structure to deletion and abbreviation, for example, to express a challenge. This takes into account the speaker's situation, as mentioned above. The same is true when someone says to a soldier in battle, or a football player on the field, "Hit." The meaning of the linguistic structure is the command to hit, but the pragmatics elements above the structure lead us to a operative meaning, which is speed and the urgency of the event from the addressee.

Examples of usages that take into account the addressee's circumstances include a professor's statement to a lazy student: "Those who know are not the same as those who do not learn." Usage leads us to the meaning of encouragement and advice, which is informed by the context and the rhetorical situation, in addition to taking into account the addressee's circumstances.

An analogy to this is what we find in interrogatives, for example, such as when you say to someone you previously expelled from the classroom, only to find them there again: "Are you here?" The situation calls for a question and a request for an answer, but the discourse cycle is far removed from this. You neither expect an answer, nor does the addressee understand that you are asking a question and ponder the content of the question. This is because the preceding context conveys a sense of astonishment emanating from usage.

You may find, in the law of linguistic usage, an advancement or postponement of its elements, such as when you say: "Two things lead you to success: your diligence and your patience." The linguistic situation in this structure requires that the first element be "your effort and patience" because it is the element that occupies the position of the subject, but usage has delayed it and put the predicate before it. And because the arrangement of the positions is established and fixed in the mind, the elements of communication realize this, and they realize the utilitarian meaning that changed the arrangement of the spoken elements without changing the arrangement of the estimated positions. And the speaker in his usage of this creates a meaning of suspense in the discourse and makes the soul eager to know who will lead to success.

In summary, although usage alters the superficial structure of the language, it does not alter its rules and position, as it is fixed and predetermined. This is what makes meanings in usage diverse, multiple, and infinite.

Sibawayh—one of the earliest Arab linguists—mentions the issue of meaning within the duality of position and usage. He illustrates the deletion of linguistic elements with the example of a man shooting an arrow. You say "the goal", meaning you want to say, "He will score a goal." Then, when you hear the arrow fall, you say "the goal" meaning you want to say, "He has hit the target." This precise example presented by Sibawayh - in addition to many others - shows us the role of communicative elements in determining or directing meaning, and demonstrates the relationship between meaning and usage. The Arabic linguistic situation in the phrase "the goal" is an embodiment of the example of the verbal sentence "verb + subject + object." Thus, the first position is a verb, but the determinant of the verb is communicative usage. When the vision was to attempt to score, the meaning was based on the verb "will hit," and when the circumstances of the discourse changed, the meaning became based on the verb "scored". (Sibawayh, 1988, 257)

#### 4. Rules for Transitioning from Linguistic Context to Discourse Usage:

Some of us may wonder about the criteria for transitioning from context to usage during discourse. Is usage subject to the discourse relationship between the speakers, or must it be regulated? Others may consider that if meaning is not satisfied with context and relies on usage, we are thus leaving the discourse between the speakers as absurd, freeing ourselves from the constant (the language system) and relying on the multiple (usage). The more we are connected to the variable, the more absurd the discourse becomes. Although this may seem so at first glance, rhetoricians have pointed out that language requires that any departure from a linguistic context into usage be accompanied by a condition that avoids ambiguity and distortion in communication. This is because the entire point lies in the "meaning," and anything that does not lead to its attainment should be abandoned. Indeed, if our departure from a linguistic context into a usage that conveys a meaning related to another linguistic context, then it is unacceptable. This has been acknowledged by both linguists and rhetoricians. It is unreasonable to omit an important linguistic element in the structure of the language in the absence of evidence to support it, nor to achieve the desired meaning in isolation from the context of the discourse. Otherwise, the discourse would become more like delirium and confusion. Since usage is primarily concerned with conveying meanings, usage when the meaning is ambiguous is restricted. If we consider the lowest level of language, which is the phonetic level, we would find that the Arabic phonetic situation allows the assimilation between two identical or similar sounds in terms of articulation or quality to ease pronunciation, which is what is called in phonetics the phenomenon of assimilation, such as the assimilation that occurs between the two homogeneous sounds qaf and kaf in the word "nakhalkum" /nax.lu.qu.kum/, which is a progressive assimilation, where the qaf /q/ affected the kaf /k/ and so assimilation occurred. The usage here can lead the word structure to assimilation /nax.lu.q̄kum/, but the Arabic phonetic system prevents at the same time the occurrence of this similarity between these two sounds in other cases, regardless of the usage, as in the word "khalaka" /xala.qaka/, and the reason for that is that although the kaf is a silent sound, in the "example of the word" it occupies the place of another word, being a connected pronoun, and the "example" of the word is the sum of the positions that contain its original letters, and so the letter kaf represents a word inside the position, not a sound. If the similarity occurs, the word becomes "Khalak" /xa.lak:a/, and the person addressed by this usage does not know the origins of the word, so ambiguity occurs.

The same applies to the addressee's ta', which cannot be dropped phonetically by total assimilation with any similar sound, such as the ta', although this is permissible if the ta' is not for addressing a female. This is because the addressee's ta' occupies the position of a complete word, and therefore assimilation is prohibited in usage. Sibawayh expressed this by saying, "Because this ta' is a sign of concealment, and it only comes for a meaning." Every linguistic sound that occupies the position of a word is, in its logical reality and the deep structure of the language, a collection of sounds, not a single sound. Therefore, it carries a functional significance. (Sibawayh, 4/471)

Any change in structure here, at the level of position, will affect the meaning and create ambiguity. At the level of structure as well, we find this prohibition in the structure during usage if it leads to confusion as well, as usage can make some elements of sentences advance or delay as we saw in previous examples, (Younesse Zouaoui, 2022, 10) but the point is in the circumstances of the discourse and the communicative evidence that control it, including that I say: I am handsome, the situation requires that "I" is its first rank, and "beautiful" is its second rank, on the basis that you are declaring that you are handsome, but the related discourse if it requires that you say it proudly then it is necessary to bring forward "beautiful" as long as

delaying it does not give this meaning. Linguists mentioned this, including Al-Radiy Al-Astarabadi. (Al-Radiy Al-Astarabadi , 1996, 301)

## 5. Conclusion:

Language is a communicative system, and therefore fluctuates between a fixed rule in its system and a variable usage in communication. The study concluded with a set of conclusions that can be summarized as follows: language must exist between a rule that regulates its levels and the use of a linguistic system created by the speaker for the intended purpose. The addressee must refer to this system in usage, given that the situation is fixed and usage is variable.

The speaker also relies on various communicative elements to convey meaning in usage, which are the means by which meaning in usage can be arrived at. We have seen that, despite its multiple uses, it is subject only to the meaning established in the speaker's mind. Indeed, despite the multiple uses, anyone who fails to achieve the meaning imposed by the communicative requirements of discourse is rejected, even if it conforms to the situation. Because meaning is the basis of usage and the reason for deviation from the established norm, we find it also the main criterion for transitioning from the established norms in the language system and its ideals. Anything that involves ambiguity in conveying and obtaining meaning is unacceptable in usage.

## 6. Bibliography:

- 1) -Abd Al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī: Dala'il Al-I'jāz fi 'Ilm Al-Ma'ānī, ed. Mahmoud Shakir, Al-Madani Press, Cairo, Egypt, 3rd ed., 1992.
- 2) -Abd el Rahman El Hadj Saleh, "Aqā'im Akhwāk" and the Method of Interpreting It According to Sibawayh and Al-Radi Based on the Concepts of Position and Example. Journal of the Arabic Language Academy in Cairo, No. 82, 1988.
- 3) -Abd el Rahman El Hadj Saleh: Discourse and Communication in the Theory of Arabic Position and Usage, National Institution for Printing Arts, Algeria, 2012.
- 4) -Ahmed Moumen: Linguistics: Origins and Development, Office of University Publications, Algeria, 2nd ed., 2000.
- 5) -Al-Jahiz: Al-Bayan wa al-Tabyin, Dar and Library al-Hilal, Lebanon, 1423 AH.
- 6) -Al-Radiy al-Istrabadi, Sharh Kafiyyah Ibn al-Hajib, trans. Hussein al-Hafzi, Hijr Printing, Publishing, and Distribution, Saudi Arabia, 1st ed., 1996.
- 7) -Al-Sharīf Al-Jurjānī: Kitāb al-Ta'rifāt, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah, Lebanon, 1st ed., 1983.
- 8) -Al-Zamakhshari: Al-Kashaf 'an Aqa'iq Ghamadih al-Tanzil, Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi, Lebanon, 2nd ed., 1407 AH, vol. 1.
- 9) -Armengaud, Françoise. La pragmatique. 5th ed., Que sais-je ?, Presses Universitaires de France, 2007.
- 10) -Ibn Manzur: Lisan al-Arab, Dar Sadir, Lebanon, 3rd ed., 1414 AH.
- 11) -Mokhtar Zouaoui, Chapters on the Pragmatics of Translating the Qur'anic Text, Ibn al-Nadim Publishing and Distribution, Algeria, 1st ed., 2018.
- 12) -Rashid Al-Radi, Theoretical and Methodological Principles of Linguistic Argumentation, Believers Without Borders Foundation for Studies and Research, Morocco, 1st ed., n.d. Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti, Al-Itqan fi Ulum al-Quran, trans. Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim, Egyptian General Book Authority, Egypt, 1st ed., 1974.
- 13) -Saber Al-Habasha, Pragmatics and Argumentation, Safahat for Studies and Publishing, Damascus, Syria, 1st ed., 2008.
- 14) -Sibawayh, trans. Abd al-Salam Harun, Al-Khanji Library, Egypt, 3rd ed., 1988.

- 15)-Sulayman Al-Tufī, *Al-Iksīr fi 'Ilm Al-Tafsīr*, ed. Abdul Qadir Husayn, Dar Al-Awza'i, Lebanon, 2nd ed., 1989.
- 16)-Younesse Zouaoui, *The Structure of the Arabic Phonological System and Its Laws Controlling the Juxtaposition of Arabic Linguistic Sounds*, *djessour al maarifa*, vol. 8, no. 3, September 2022.