

RESEARCH ARTICLE

WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

Principles in constructing discourses and accepting them, presupposition and the principle of belief as a model

Dr. Djemai Lamine

Language Laboratory and Discourse Analysis
Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University, Jijel, Algeria.

Email: lamine.djemai@univ-jijel.dz.com

Received: 20/05/2025 Accepted: 11/06/2025 Published: 22/11/2025

Abstract:

Linking discourses with specific conceptions and assents in the different, possible, and well-known worlds may contribute in presenting and shaping meanings, and in perceiving and embodying concepts within a linguistic framework that gives communicative value to the linguistic sign in its various contexts; for the conceptions, in their openness and diversity, are represented by linguistic, semantic, and pragmatic concepts that define their nature and clarify the ways of their perception; which achieves certain assents related to the actual reading of the discourses and realizes semantic openness starting from the initial state up to the supposed interpretation and what accompanies it of general or specific meanings.

Keywords: Discourse, Meaning Construction, Semantic Openness, Pragmatic Interpretation.

Introduction:

The conception is the basis in producing meanings, and the assent and designation are a control to this conception, a correction to its path, and a clarification of its goal, and also what the speaker should be upon when constructing his text starting from the conception that exists in his mind, and what the receiver should be upon in receiving this conception which in its form when perceived is discourses carrying different meanings.

And the relation between the different conceptions and the specific and clarified assents

to them and the discourses and texts built according to them, always reveals to us a subjective relation between what is conceived and what is presented to us within an assentive framework that is recognized; this relation brings down what is conceived as a notional descent or existential descent, which produces for us in the construction of texts notional contexts and existential contexts, and both contexts complete each other; for the first may move from its abstract notional position to the position of existence, and the second may remain or vanish, all that depending on what is presented in the accompanying contexts of them in the act of communication.

1- Presupposition:

Presupposition includes intentionality, mind, and belief, and in its general concept it means a principle that precedes the utterance of speech, and that the speech intended from the self of the speaker is speech that was really meant for communication, “that is, it exists with the speakers and not in the sentences” (George, 2010, p. 51); so presupposition is a mental process that is non-verbal and not contained in the saying nor in the sentences, and it is shared between the speaker and the receiver, for each of them presupposes in his mind what corrects the communicative process and takes into account that each one of them wants that. From the speaker’s side, he mentally presupposes that his interlocutor (the receiver) is qualified to be a second party in the communicative process and

that he possesses possible cognitive and linguistic templates to understand his discourse or speech directed to him.

- And the presupposition expected to be applied by the receiver is that:
- The speaker uses his expression intending by it its meanings or one of its common meanings.
- That he is serious, not joking, that is, he indeed wants communication in a defined cognitive

framework.

It is also presupposed that the meaning of the word and that the meaning by the word are used and understood meanings and that they are not outside of the circulating conventions and that they are subject to different usages. And the difference between the meaning *of* the word and the meaning *by* the word is that the meaning *by* the word is its variation between truth and metaphor, as the speaker wills. Al-Qarafi says: "The meaning by the word is using the word either in its assigned meaning, which is the truth, or in other than its assigned meaning, which is metaphor" (Al-Qarafi, 2004, p. 28); so the speaker takes the word to express his intention truly or metaphorically, and does not go beyond these two usages; and that is in his pursuit to "make the listener understand what is in himself" (Al-Qarafi, 2004, p. 28); thus the word is a means by which the speaker indicates and uses it in various discourses as he wishes, truly or metaphorically.

As for the meaning *of* the word: it is the sum of meanings (correspondence, implication, and inclusion).

And Al-Qarafi clarified the difference between the meaning *by* the word and the meaning *of* the word; we summarize it as follows (Al-Qarafi, 1995, vol. 2, p. 566 and after):

1- The meaning of the word is a quality for the listener, and the meaning by the word is a quality for the speaker; that is, what the word indicates by implication and correspondence and inclusion; it is what the listener understands so it

becomes a quality for him not for others, as for the meaning of the word; it is using the word truly or metaphorically, so that is from the side of the speaker; to use it as he wishes.

2- The meaning of the word may be knowledge or supposition, and the meaning by the word are cut sounds, so the first one admits certainty, and admits supposition; it oscillates between that; relying on the various discourse indications, and the meaning by the word is using the word in an abstract manner, or connected to the flow of sounds, or the speaker himself in his vocal apparatus when speaking.

3- The meaning by the word is the constituting and causing for the meaning of the word; so whenever the word is used truly or metaphorically; it indicates a correspondence meaning, or inclusion meaning or implication meaning, and whenever the meaning of the word exists the meaning by the word exists; and the reverse happens in that; if the receiver knows the situation or the speaker's intention, but if not then the meaning of the word in this case is not realized.

4- To perceive the meaning of the word the mind is employed and the senses are employed, opposite to the meaning by the word which can be only heard.

And in general it can be said; that the difference between the meaning of the word and the meaning by the word as summarized by (Al-Qarafi): "that the meaning of the word is a quality for the listener, and the meaning by the word is a quality for the speaker; and that the first is understood, and the second is used" (Al-Qarafi, 2004, p. 28). And the relation between the meaning of the word and the meaning by the word; that the second is a condition for the first, and that it accompanies it; condition of knowledge of the different usages of words, and that the first has a mental existence supported by a real or supposed circulation, and the second has an abstract existence; supported by a tangible circulatory existence, so the real or supposed circulation; is specific to the meaning realized in the scope of the sentence or the text, and the tangible real circulation is specific to the scope

of the sentence in its circulated usage, and the relation between the meaning and the circulation; in this framework; is determined by the transition from the supposed meaning to the sensed meaning, that is from the obtained conception to the realized assent; in sayings and actions; so the mental presupposition (meaning of the word) is affected by it (the abstract sensed presupposition) and it is follower to it, so if the second is realized (the meaning by the word) the first is realized (meaning of the word), and if the first is realized it makes the second realized actually and necessarily, and detailing of this is that; if the usage is realized and the meaning by it is known (actually); the listener's understanding of the speaker's intention is realized; by the meaning of the word in its usages truly or metaphorically.

And the relation of the communicative process to the presupposition is that whenever the presuppositions around the parties of the communicative process increase, the ratio of its success increases and whenever they decrease or one of the presuppositions is disrupted, the two parties fail in the communicative process, and whenever the probability of the receiver's trust in the speaker decreases and the probability of the speaker's contempt for the receiver and mocking his knowledge and abilities decreases, and whenever the communicative process is failed the realization process fails and the informing process fails.; that is because the conditions of the informative propositions are the conditions of the presupposition so the informative propositions are declarative propositions that admit truth or falsehood or let us say they admit assent and denial because the language in its original placement was placed for communication and since it was placed for communication then it is possible for truth alone not interspersed with falsehood so all its propositions are true in themselves. Rather the receiving process is the one that determines the degree of credibility of the sayings or not based on the context of the situation and conventions and position and belief and possible and supposed worlds and knowledge of gathering these things as a presupposition is what

determines the possibility of accepting these news or rejecting them.

So the receiver is always on a presupposition that qualifies the speaker to be worthy of communicating with him and that his speech coming to him in his actual position requires considering his belief and presupposition; so the belief for both parties has great importance in receiving the discourse or the speech production, and this is what pushed us to say that the language is true by placement and that the receiver according to his presupposition or belief is what drives him to assent or deny the speaker not assent or deny the language. For the sentences or texts are true in themselves since their components are from words and meanings placed to indicate things by real placement and assentive placement, and it is the subsequent usages that made its usages conceptual for the difference of the conceptions of those who use it.

And the judgment by assent or denial or the judgment by truth on the sayings of the speakers (not the judgment on the language) is the judgment on the news by assent or denial and not describing the news by truth or falsehood because it may be true from the side of a certain belief, false not acceptable really from another side, and it may be false from the side of belief and convention not acceptable really from its other side also, and the difference between assenting the news and denying it or in other words the judgment on the truthfulness of the speaker from his lying is not like the judgment on the truth of the news from its falsehood because the act of assenting and denying is a pragmatic act according to the conceptions of the receiver of the news and according to his presuppositions and because the presupposition upon which the communication process between the two parties is built requires that the usage of the circulated words between the two parties was basically placed for truth without falsehood and only as we explained previously that the two parties of the communicative process with their communication position are the ones who employ these components or these words in contexts and beliefs and presuppositions that

allow both of them to judge on them by assent or denial.

And determining the scope of the presupposition it happens according to the scope of the mind and the convention and the reality (the position) the actual realized or supposed to happen previously or in the future; so the mind (the rational receiver or the knowing) is aware of the habits and linguistic conventions that he presupposes in the speaker; and through them it is possible to infer from the witness which is the word or the words constituting the text or the discourse on the absent which is the meaning and the intention and the purpose and distinguishing by it between the intended purpose, because the witnesses which are the words multiple meanings and multiple interpretations through them the meaning is perceived and likewise inferred by the supposed conventions that both parties presuppose are shared between them and the speaker does not go out of them except by an indication sign clear by which the intended meaning is specified if he goes out of the common, and because breaching the habit sometimes is breaching the common between the speakers or between the one linguistic group; so it is not possible to perceive that breach of the habits and styles except by the mind. And the common among the students and people of language is that linking communication styles with their conventions and breaching the habits requires including all that with indications that enable or alert the receivers and notify them to the determined meaning or the intended purposed meaning.

Taking all that and perceiving it by the mind is the basis of judging the communicative process by success and not perceiving it will not happen for the participants certainty in a meaning or an intention or purpose since the sharing of the mind in perceiving all that is realizing the perception of the available evidences and employed in the communication process and realizing a successful communicative process.

The cooperation of the mind with language styles as a presupposition through which it is

perceived that the speaker is worthy of communication and that his styles and way of his speech and that the used language is within the framework of what the linguistic community has agreed upon so in this case the speaker should present the collective mind which is the sum of what the linguistic group has agreed upon in its communication ways and its humility ways in the initial placement and the subsequent usage; so the individual mind that is the individual usage becomes follower to the collective usage and the collective usage in this case is followed so the individual does not precede the collective except by a guiding indication or a linguistic evidence that allows specifying the meaning.

And the following of the mind (individual) to the language (community) does not mean placing limits in the usage but rather the scope is open in their conceptions and imaginations and sayings and styles so if the individual mind wants to exceed the collective mind (the language) it is necessary to show what it exceeded to otherwise it fails in its communication process.

The communication process or the process of constructing texts and discourses does not proceed with a language contrary as known by the mind; so considering the mind in both parties of the communication process is a necessary condition from the conditions of speech systems so that this speech becomes considered and acceptable and capable of reply or belief for the considered speech rationally is the speech through which it is possible to determine the degree of success of the communication process and which happens through it and through it together minimum distinction and clarification.

Presupposing the mind from the speaker's side in the listener or the listener presupposing the mind in the speaker is obligatory for both parties in including both styles and words and meanings according to the ability of each party and according to the presupposition expected from both of them, so from the receiver's side if he presupposes that it is obligatory on him to carry the meaning on assent or denial if the speech is good according to the realized cause

that necessitates issuing the judgment on the speaker's speech.

Entering the mind as a prior presupposition in the communication process between its two parties is making it basically perceiver of the meaning and judge on it by assent or denial for itself not for the language itself used in whose framework the meaning is; that is because the language in its basis as we mentioned before that it was placed for communication truly and if it was so a considered judgment in itself and agreed upon among its communities so it is true in its basis not false and its usages here according to the conventions and possible worlds and believed with its truth and realization is what judges by the truth of what he informed about not by the truth of what he informed with.

Making the mind perceiver of the meaning and judge on it is arranging for a realized result between the two mentioned premises (the perception and the judgment) so the first is causative and the second is follower realizing (assent) and conceptually; so the perception process which is a premise its nature is to lead to a result which is issuing the judgment on the intended conception to be conveyed to the receiver from the speaker's side so it starts basically from the origin of the words which is the sum of abstract conventions and which is the material of the communication process and material of every intended pronounced speech and material of every action starting from it so perceiving it in an abstract form and by a conception that allows the receiver to judge on "the essences of the things realized in it without negation or affirmation" (Al-Jurjani, n.d., p. 53), because obtaining its material in the mind is employing the mind in a subsequent stage to judge on it by assent and employing a inference process that can approach the representation method by which the things are realized and clarified from its abstract form to its real form extracted.

The perception process that the receiver does is a process built on the set of available premises that the speaker presented and helped

him to perceive it within the framework of the designation and cooperation process which is a process as we will see later that it concerns actively in perceiving those premises, and perhaps the urgent need for such things in the communication process is the need of both parties of the communication process whether in constructing their texts or in the process of perceiving the meanings of these texts and interpreting them and reading them correctly according to an approach that allows in the end perceiving the worlds of the meanings included in the words and approaching the speaker's intention and purpose according to what he really wanted; and the mentioned process (designation cooperation) its necessity first for the receiver to perceive what he wants and tracking the intended meaning and its patterns even if that according to a general mental conception of the abstract topics according to a presupposition for laws governing the process of constructing texts and discourses and before that according to laws governing the material of the work which is the language in its general and specific limits.

The presupposition that the speaker puts in his mind is a presupposed relation that enters him into a new relation with a new receiver that requires him to be aware that he is entering into a new world and new conception with a new receiver supposed or not supposed all his worlds and conceptions and perceptions and assents and facts that enable him to judge on the speaker's speech and his belief truly or reject it absolutely; so the transition from the speaker's conception to a new conception at the receiver is a transition for the worlds of the meanings that the words carry to a new world resulting from taking two different and disparate worlds constituted from common words and meanings from the side of reality and from the side of composition and from the side of existence and from the side of concept and from the side of realization of the existing and perceived things rationally or by convention.

So the transition from a supposed world (the speaker's world) to a supposed world (the receiver's world) through the space of the

language and its words and its agreed conventions to a new world (conceived or realized) is a causative indication for the success of the communication process or rather it is an indicative sign on the success of the linguistic or literary production, and that it has brought out from the old conception process and the supposed abstraction to a new effectiveness realized actually or conceived presupposed in a new environment and which gives according to a new receiving process in a level from the levels of reading a fixed cognitive value existentially or variable notionally, according to the mental or rational or conventional relations accompanying the production process or the emergent reproduction process on the words of the language.

The perception process that happens according to the obtained conception in the mind for the intended meaning to be read and interpreted made the meanings resulting from it in their ends and the purpose from using it a beginning for a new production according to a new interpretation built on a set of new mental conceptions through which it was possible to gather between the speaker's worlds and the receiver's worlds according to new cognitive templates opposite to them was placed a new image for this production, and the truth is that the new relation between the first production and the new production according to the conception and the supposed presupposition is also a supposed relation that allows according to the multiplicity of presuppositions to multiplicity of readings and interpretations, so it is not possible to control the presuppositions nor predict them but rather it is merely a presupposition built on an obtained conception opposite to a linguistic world recognized.

What we presented according to this conception on the presupposition between the two parties requires in our view a prior and considered presupposition in determining the relation between the world of the old text (the original speech of the speaker) and the world of the interpreted text resulting from the receiver's conceptions or the readings resulting from different receivers so determining that relation is determining for the worlds and conceptions of

both parties and determining the worlds of both parties is describing them or their nature describing entering into the reality of their constitution entering that enables us to understand the subsequent interpretations; and which are in their constitution new texts according to new conceptions; which opens the field for an infinite and undefined textual production, since in the nature of the subsequent production which is the sum of the new interpretations is conceived readings that may be considered and specified and intended or may not be so since in the reality of receiving it is an approach to that intended and considered meaning an approach that allows hovering around the text without perceiving the true meaning or what is intended from it because perceiving it in a definitive way is killing for the text's meaning in itself and in its meaning; and perceiving the meaning in its reality is constituting for a new meaning equal to the original meaning according to a supposed non-realized relation between the significations of the first production, and the subsequent production not realized notionally so it is a descent for supposed meanings with originally realized meanings a non-considered descent which makes the subsequent meaning a meaning equal to the original meaning and this is not permissible for the difference of the worlds and difference of the knowledges and way of perceiving it.

Receiving the text according to a new specific interpretation according to a specific supposed relation does not cancel the relation between the text and its interpretation since that is established according to a real considered world at its second producer by virtue of the rational perception of the real world in the view of the speaker and in the self of the text that realized that, and by virtue of the rational perception of the self of the text and its relations to its supposed or realized worlds makes from the relation between it and the interpretation a justified relation in the view of the interpreter, based on his new worlds or based on what he presupposed previously in the self of the speaker.

The presupposition of the receivers despite their difference between them and even if they resemble so it produces different multiple texts having their different and new worlds according to their conceptions and conceptions of their conventions and their realized or possible or supposed worlds; so presupposing the mind in the receiver from the speaker's side or his presupposition from the receiver's side in the speaker is a condition from the conditions of entering into a real communicative process and a completing condition for the interpretation process so this latter does not stop at the mind alone but there are things that the mind (individual) may not perceive for its shortcoming but the collective mind (the language) in its actual realization and used especially in new supposed and real worlds that the one community agreed on the possibility of accepting it and not rejecting it basically so it is necessary to enter other elements that the interpretation process or the receiving process leans on, because neglecting it completely is neglecting for the perception process and the total or partial conception process for the meanings or the images that the words indicated in its general placement or its subsequent circulated used placement or its real or metaphorical placement so in addition to the mind the habits and conventions and beliefs may be specific to it so they cooperate with each other forming a fixed and acceptable and considered whole.

2- Principle of Belief:

The condition of belief added to the condition of the mind allows it also to reshape the reality informed about by the language starting from reshaping the meaning in what matches the concept of the belief which is "a decisive mental judgment that accepts doubting or it is a decisive mental judgment or preponderant" (Al-Tahhanawi, n.d., vol.1, p. 230)" allows rebuilding the text and receiving it in what matches the preponderant reality at the receiver and does not accept doubting in it absolutely based on what he preponderated in his mind and his reality, and this rebuilding at the receiving process admits two states in the mind

of the receiver; the first the acceptance without doubting and the second the doubting with certainty of non-acceptance, after it was in its first production from the speaker's side a set of correct propositions at the moment of his speaking (and likewise the case with regard to the wrong propositions) or which he seeks assenting them as they are" (Al-Habasha, 2008, p. 18); so the correct propositions at the moment of speaking may have been built on facts and conceptions and assents that do not accept doubting in the view of the speaker as they are correct or true conceptions and assents and facts, likewise with regard to the wrong propositions that were built on a belief indicating that the error occurring in them is built on a mental conceptual or assenting or factual basis where at the moment of speaking or before it that it is a wrong principle that does not accept discussion in his view and it is in the same state seeking assenting them as they are, and the production process or the discourse in the state of the belief that does not accept doubting or in the state of the decisive preponderance is a process of transferring this conception with different assents to the mind of the receiver and asks him to assent it based on what established his conception and assent in the mind of the receiver; and the receiver has to accept or to reject, and this process of acceptance or rejection is built also on the belief opposite to the previous belief (the speaker's belief) and it is also a process that relies on the property of certainty and the property of doubting in what is transferred which allows a new production process according to a new belief, especially if we realize that the world of belief of every addressee can be likened to a miniature opinion specific to every addressee, "so the discursive or dialogic sequence is determined through this world; which the addressee should make for himself or reject it; producing in turn an opposing contrary world of belief radically different from the world" (Al-Habasha, 2008, p. 18)

Refusing the general meaning of the text from the receiver's side contributes directly in the dialogic process or the continuation of the

addressed sequence between the text's producer and its receiver; because the acceptance process is an adoption process for the meaning that the text produced and this adoption process is an adoption process for the belief and entering into the text's world as the speaker believed it or close to it or may produce a contrary opposing belief to the speaker's world based on his belief in a radically different and rootly non-homogeneous way necessarily with the world of the belief conceived in the speaker's mind.

The belief not susceptible to doubt is a decisive belief that contributes actively in the process of building the general meaning of the text and presenting it to the receiver especially if it is presupposed that he has a belief different from what is in the speaker's mind he presents according to argumentative frameworks that allow the process of influencing in the receiver's mind and if employing these frameworks fails in the presentation process it makes the world of belief a foggy world not clear in features or not clear in conceptions and necessarily not clear in facts which makes the process of attracting these frameworks a failed process, therefore it is obligatory on the speaker to employ them correctly that allows him to influence the receiver and enter with him into his own world of belief, and in contrast the receiver when receiving these frameworks that the speaker tried to assent his belief by them faces them with implicit argumentative frameworks that repel from him the process of being affected which makes us before two beliefs each one of them tries to overcome the other according to what was available to him from argumentative frameworks in the interpretation process employed in the counter interpretation process which is a second production process for the original text.

Employing these argumentative frameworks in their different patterns happens through the language because we are before a linguistic text or linguistic discourse its material the language addresses the previously presupposed mind so both parties try to influence each other through it in the world of belief and what are the argumentative

frameworks employed in the production process or re-production except representation for the efficiency of the speaker and the receiver so it is a production that allows the speaker to enter into a discursive process that tries to influence in an opposing world that believes in its error and non-reality or non-realization actually or supposed that allows assenting it basically or adopting it truly, and in contrast the receiver or the interpreter repels from himself this influence process with argumentative frameworks that represent the argumentative efficiency that the production process or the receiving process was built upon; which allows him according to it to build a counter influence specific to him that he tries by it to refute the first belief.

Building the meanings of texts according to argumentative frameworks that support a preponderant belief not doubted and directed towards the other presupposed in them the non-preponderant belief doubted in reality "fixed argumentative polarities in the utterance not added to it but registered in the language as basis of every meaning and basis of the meaning and basis of its interpretation in the discourse" (Al-Habasha, 2008, p. 18); and according to this basis the discursive process is built on the basis of the preponderant belief and the preponderant belief is built on the basis of the argumentative process that supports it so the informing process becomes by this a secondary process built on a basic process which is the argumentation process" (Al-Habasha, 2008, p. 18)

The principle of belief is reinforced according to what we presented by the principle of the convincing and argumentative power that the utterance contains and it is a power whose nature is to refute the opposing belief; and here it must be available a presupposition from the speaker for the strength of the listener's belief and the strength of his arguments and proofs that he may employ to confront the speaker's belief otherwise he may fail in the influence process, and this influence process or the function of influence is a basic principle that starts at every speaker or every producer of intended speech its meaning "that we speak generally with the

intention of influencing" (Al-Azzawi, 2006, p. 14)

And the influence that we want in the receiver must be built in general on the conditions of influence and it conditions built also on the presupposition of the speaker for who he directs his speech to in addition to considering the semantic compositions carrying the arguments and proofs intended through them the influence in the receiver and from these principles that make the influence in the end possible actually, practices through them an intellectual and behavioral influence on the receiver of the message using explanation and different arguments to attract him (Buqra, n.d., p. 177)

And the attraction process that the speaker seeks to and it his intention from delivering the discourse and directing or producing the text imposes on him implicit knowledge for the type of the receiver in states of assenting the sayings and adopting their true meanings because the futures of the texts differ in assenting the sayings to the limit of Ibn Rushd's expression "that the natures of people are different in assenting, so among them who assents by proof and among them who assents by dialectical sayings like the assenting of the owner of proof by proof, since there is not in his nature more than that and among them who assents by rhetorical sayings like the assenting of the owner of proof by the demonstrative sayings" (Ibn Rushd, n.d., p. 31)

The speaker's perception of the states of his discourse's receiver and knowing what type he is and what nature on him in the assenting process perhaps he knows how to influence him, and perhaps he knows the natures of people collectively so he employed in his text arguments and proofs and inferences that match all natures so he would have reached the highest degrees of proof and argumentation so his speech would have reached the utmost degrees of textuality and his words and meanings would have reached the utmost degrees of influence in their meanings.

The speaker's presupposition of the principle of the listener's belief and the nature of

his receiving for the arguments and proofs and presupposing how to influence in this opposing belief relies basically on the strength of the argumentative words;

so the influence process in the other through employing arguments and proofs that serve the belief and refute the opposing belief always referring to how to employ them and use them since knowing the usage and circulation of meanings plays a big role in building texts and discourses in a way that makes it suitable for the context in which it communicates and the suitability of a discourse or text in a certain context is not necessarily suitable in another context.

So for controlling this change and controlling it and knowing when to employ this saying in this context it is necessary to know that every speech pattern has a dialogic principle, through which it is possible to achieve what the speech act aspires to in itself.

Knowing the patterns and sequence of discourses and employing them is what governs the succession of sayings and their sequence in an inferential way inside the discourse and how not to be the case when a large number of words may reach its ratio to 80% or more we do not know its meaning but we know well how we use it and how we employ it in our discourses and dialogues for influencing the other" (Al-Azzawi, 2006, p. 133)

So the possibility of influence determines the ratio of the idea's occurrence and acceptance and determines the ratio of possibility of its matching to reality, and determines in the end the ratio of the other party's acceptance of this idea and determines to what extent the speaker's belief prevailed and adopting his ideas and the extent of the receiver's inclination to this belief and the influence in it.

The belief in the speaker's mind is the literal meaning that he conceives truly and does not accept refutation ever so it becomes by that the belief what corresponded to the meaning so that even if the receiver perceives it becomes in his mind a new image according to new interpretations and new givens that may affect

him according to the strength of the evidence, and the strength of the argument that the speaker brought in his text or his speech, and may not affect him according to the strength of the belief and the strength of the evidence that supports this belief and becomes based on that merely interpretations close or far that may assent to the speaker's intention or not assent, and by this it becomes obligatory on the speaker to presuppose the possible interpretations probabilities in the receiver's mind so that he does not distance from the correct interpretation or the close one in a form or another if he really wants to influence him and attract him from his belief and "pushing him to adopt a certain opinion or respond to a specific request or take a certain position from issues or to change his opinions and positions in general" (Al-Azzawi, 2006, p. 133)

Conclusion

All what we presented around the belief and its presupposition in both parties of the communicative process as a prior process that enables its continuation and enables the ideas adoption or rejection becomes clear to us evidently that the belief is the mental image of the word or the mental image of the meaning that the word carries truly and that the process of receiving it at the other party is a new interpretation process so the belief in an opposing form is an interpretation by mental presupposition whether this presupposition was a conception or an assent.

References:

1. Al-‘Azzāwī, A. B. (2006). *Language and argumentation*. Casablanca: Al-‘Umda for Printing.
2. Al-Ḥabbāsha, Ş. (2008). *Pragmatics and argumentation: Approaches and texts*. Damascus: Şafḥāt for Studies and Publishing.
3. Al-Jurjānī, A. M. al-S. (n.d.). *Dictionary of definitions* (M. Ş. Al-Manshāwī, Ed.). Cairo: Dār al-Faḍīla for Publishing, Distribution, and Export.
4. Al-Qarāfī, A. b. I. A. (1995). *Nafā’is al-uşūl fī sharḥ al-maḥşūl* (‘Ā. A. ‘Abd al-

- Mawjūd & ‘A. M. Mu‘awwad, Eds.). Mecca: Maktabat Nizār Muṣṭafā al-Bāz.
5. Al-Qarāfī, A. b. I. A. (2004). *Sharḥ tanqīḥ al-fuṣūl fī ikhtisār al-maḥşūl fī al-uşūl*. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution.
6. Bouqra, N. (2012). *Discourse linguistics: Issues of foundation and procedure*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya.
7. Ibn Rushd, A. W. (n.d.). *Faṣl al-maqāl fīmā bayna al-ḥikma wa al-sharī‘a min al-ittiṣāl* (M. ‘Imāra, Ed.). Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif.
8. Tahanawī, M. ‘A. (1996). *Encyclopedia of the terminology of arts and sciences* (‘A. Daḥrūj, Ed.). Beirut: Maktabat Lubnān Nāshirūn.
9. Yule, G. (2010). *Pragmatics* (Q. Al-‘Attābī, Trans.). Beirut: Arab Scientific Publishers.