

Pragmatic Linguistics: Concepts and Origins

Dr. Ben Boufeldja Mohammed El Fateh

Djillali Liabes University, Sidi Bel Abbes, Algeria

Email : benboufeldjamohammed@gmail.com

Received: 10/10 /2025 Accepted: 07/01/2026 Published: 26/04/ 2026

Abstract

Pragmatics represents a novel linguistic approach concerned with the study of language in use. It focuses on investigating the speaker's intentions as a party in discourse who possesses the authority of speech, the addressee as the holder of reception tools, and intentionality as the sphere that brings together the speaker and the listener. This approach has been employed in discourse analysis and in revealing its objectives. This article seeks to elucidate the boundaries of the term in both Arab and Western cultures, in addition to discussing the philosophical and linguistic origins that contributed to the birth of this new field of knowledge.

Keywords: *Pragmatics, Usage, context, analytic philosophy, semiotics.*

Introduction

Pragmatics constitutes a fundamental cornerstone in discourse analysis and stands among the most important topics produced by modern linguistic studies. Pragmatics has concerned itself with the communicative process without neglecting any of its parties; it has attended to the speaker, the addressee, and the situational context (miqam) in which the speech event occurs, and has accorded paramount attention to speakers' intentions. A number of philosophical and linguistic tributaries have contributed to the birth of this new field of knowledge.

Proceeding from this premise, the article aims to define the concept of the term "pragmatics" in both Arab and Western cultures and to investigate the

epistemic roots that contributed to its emergence.

1. The Concept of Pragmatics

1.1 The Linguistic Meaning of Pragmatics

The term pragmatics traces back to the linguistic root (d-w-l). It appears in *Lisān al-‘Arab*: "We circulated (tadāwalnā) the matter, we took it up in turn (bi-l-dawal), and it is said: dawālik, meaning deliberation over the matter. The days turned (dālat), i.e., revolved, and God causes them to circulate (yudāwiluhā) among people, and it was circulated (tudāwulat) by hands, this one taking it once and that one once" (Ibn Manẓūr, n.d.). "And we circulated the matter and the work among ourselves, i.e., we took turns with it, so this one worked at it once and that one once" (Al-Azharī, n.d.). "The dawla is the revolution of time from a state of misery and harm to a state of bliss and joy, and the dawla in war is that one faction prevails over the other; it is said: the dawla was upon them."

Ibn Fāris clarified in his dictionary *Muqāyīs al-Lugha* that the

root (d-w-l) returns to two origins: one indicating the transfer of a thing from one place to another, and the other indicating weakness and laxity. As for the first: "The linguists say: the people moved (indāl) when they moved from one place to another, and from this category is the people's circulation (tadāwul) of a thing among them when it passes from some of them to others. And al-dawla and al-dawla are two dialectal variants; and it is said: rather al-dawla is in wealth and al-dawla is in war, and it was named thus by analogy to the category because it is a matter that they circulate and transfer from this one to that one and from that one to this one."

As for the second origin: "Al-dawīl in vegetation is what withers in its season. Abū Zayd said: the garment dāl (yadūl) when it wears out, and its wadd (edge) dāl, i.e., wears out, and from this category is the sagging of his belly when it becomes flaccid" (Ibn Fāris, 1979).

The root (d-w-l) also appears in the Holy Qur’ān bearing the linguistic meaning of pragmatics. Among the evidences of this usage is the saying of the Almighty: "And so are the days

(good and not so good), We give to men by turns” 140 it means these days We alternate (nudāwiluhā) among the people, meaning "We rotate them among them; We give once to these and once to those" (Al-Qāsimī, 1957, p. 980). And from it is His saying: “So that it will not be a circulation (dūla) among the rich among you” (Al-Hashr: 7); it was read "dūla with the dāl vowelled and opened, and the reading of the majority is with vowelling, and ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and Al-Sulamī read it with opening" (Abū Ḥayyān, 1993, p. 244; ‘Aṭīyya, 1980, p. 53; Al-Qurṭubī, 2006, p. 353; Al-Bannā, 1987, p. 530).

The meaning of "al-dawla and al-dawla" revolves, according to the exegetes, around two meanings (Al-Qurṭubī, 2006, p. 353):

The first meaning: (al-dawla with fatha) triumph in war and otherwise, and it is the verbal noun (maṣḍar).

The second meaning: (al-dawla with ḍamma) the name of the thing that circulates among properties and other things.

That "Isa ibn 'Amr, Yunus, and al-Asma'i did not differentiate between the damma and fatha on the letter dal,

saying, "They are two dialects with the same meaning." (Al-Qurṭubī, 2006, p. 353).

We find the same usage (linguistic and Qur’anic) of the root (d-w-l) in a number of prophetic hadiths and reports, among which is what came in the hadith of the signs of the Hour; in it: "When booty becomes dula." And the meaning of dūlā is what circulates of wealth so that it becomes for some people to the exclusion of others.

And from it is the hadith of supplication: "Narrate to me a hadith you heard from the Messenger of God, peace and blessings be upon him, that was not circulated (lam yatadawalahu) between you and him by men." And in the hadith of the delegation of Thaqīf: "We prevail (nudal) over them and they prevail over us"; and al-idala: dominance, it is said: we were enabled (udila) over our enemies, i.e., we were given victory over them, and the dawla was for us, and the dawla: the transition from hardship to ease. And from it is the hadith of Abū Sufyān and Heraclius: "We prevail over him and he prevails over us," and from it also is the saying of Al-Ḥajjaj: "Indeed, the earth will turn

(tadul) against us as we turned against it," i.e., we will be inside it as we were upon its surface (Al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmad, 1989; Ibn Manẓur, n.d.).

After tracing the meanings of the root (d-w-l) and surveying its usages in Lisān al-Arab, in the texts of the Holy Quran, and in the words of the prophetic hadith, we find that they revolve around meanings of succession, transmission, and transfer from one person to another, or from one place to another, or from one state to another. These meanings indicate participation and interaction, which is close to the technical concept of pragmatics that is concerned with the interaction occurring between the speaker and the listener (the receiver), and attends to studying the communicative relationship between them, focusing on all the circumstances and varying conditions that affect this relationship.

Perhaps this meaning is what led the translators of the term (Pragmatics/pragmatique) to prefer using the term (pragmatics/ al-tadawuliyya) over other translations, on the basis that this field of linguistic studies is concerned with the circulation

of language among its users, as will be explained.

1.2 The Technical Meaning of Pragmatics

The vast majority of researchers working in the field of pragmatics agree on the difficulty of formulating a comprehensive and exclusive definition of pragmatics, and this is attributable to several reasons that we summarize in the following three points:

First, the novelty of this science and its non-established emergence, in addition to its overlap with many sciences and the multiplicity of its epistemic tributaries that contributed to shaping it and supplying it with a set of established concepts, such as analytic philosophy in whose bosom pragmatics was born, semantics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and others. Van Dijk affirms this when discussing the characteristics of this science by saying: "This science... has the characteristic of overlapping with several other specializations, and it has been stimulated by the sciences of philosophy, language, and anthropology, indeed psychology and

sociology as well" (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 114).

Second, the diversity of theories that formed within the pragmatic orientation, which made the researcher within one of these theories direct pragmatics toward the theory from which he proceeds (Al-Dukhayl, 2014, p. 19).

Third, the multiplicity of Arabic designations corresponding to the foreign term (*pragmatique*), so in its Arabization it was said: *al-barāghmātiyya*, *al-baraghmatik*, *al-barajimatiyya*, and *al-barajimatik*, and there is no difference between these terms because they are literal transcriptions of the foreign counterpart (Murtaḍ, 2005, pp. 66–67).

We also find many Arabic equivalents translated for the term, such as: *al-tadāwul* (Murtaḍ, 2005, pp. 66–67), *al-tadawuliyya*, *al-tadawuliyyat*, *al-maqamiyya*, *al-dhari-iyya* (Şahrawa, 2005, p. 15), pragmatics, situational, instrumental, instrumental, contextual, communicative, intentional science, Communication Science, Usage science philosophy of work... (Yūnus, 2004, p. 5; Al-Maysāwī, 2013, p. 110);

and among these terms there are differences that do not allow using them as synonyms for the foreign term.

With this brief presentation of some Arabic equivalents for the term (*pragmatique*), we choose "pragmatics" (*al-tadawuliyya*) in our research as an equivalent for the foreign term, because it is the most widespread and circulated among researchers, and the books composed in this field and the university theses and articles bear witness to this, as the vast majority of them use the term pragmatics and make it the mainstay of the study, as if this formulation from researchers represents a near-consensus among them in adopting this term over other equivalents.

The first to use the term "pragmatics" as a counterpart to "*pragmatique*" was the researcher Taha Abdel Rahman, who says — explaining this choice: "We chose since 1970 the term pragmatics (*al-tadawuliyyat*) as an equivalent for the Western term '*pragmatique*' because it fulfills the requirement deservedly, by virtue of its signification of the two meanings 'use' and 'interaction' together, and it has found acceptance since that time among

researchers who have begun to include it in their studies" (Abd al-Raḥman, 2000, p. 28). He was followed in this by Aḥmad Al-Mutawakkil in his works, and Muḥammad Yaḥyātīn described it in his translation of (Introduction to Pragmatics) as light and smooth, saying: "We preferred the term coined by our colleagues in fraternal Morocco, namely pragmatics (al-lisāniyyāt al-tadāwuliyya), for its lightness and smoothness" (Dalash, n.d., p. 1).

After determining the term, we present the most important definitions of pragmatics formulated by Western linguists for this science, followed by mentioning the efforts of Arab linguists and their contributions in formulating a technical definition of pragmatics.

1.2.1 The Concept of Pragmatics in the West

The term pragmatics in its modern sense goes back to the American philosopher Charles Morris, who used it in 1938 to denote a branch of three branches comprising semiotics, and these branches are:

Syntactics: It is concerned with studying the formal relations between signs and one another.

Semantics: It studies the relation of signs to the things they denote or refer to.

Pragmatics: It is concerned with studying the relation of signs to their interpreters (Nakhla, 2002, p. 9).

Thus, pragmatics for Charles Morris is a part of semiotics and one of its basic components; syntactics (grammar) studies the relations between linguistic units, semantics studies the relation of signs to the things they refer to, while pragmatics is a science concerned with studying the relation of signs to their interpreters, so this science is concerned with the communicative aspect that linguists excluded from their studies and focused on syntactics and semantics.

George Yule mentioned this tripartite division, and highlighted through it the importance of pragmatics in studying and analyzing language, saying: "In this tripartite distinction, pragmatics alone allows the inclusion of humans in the analysis process. The process of studying language through

pragmatics is distinguished by enabling us to talk about the meanings intended by people, and about their assumptions and goals, and what they aspire to, and the types of actions they perform while speaking" (Yule, 2010, p. 20).

As for pragmatics according to Van Dijk, it is the science concerned with "analyzing speech acts and functions of linguistic utterances and their features in communication processes in general" (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 114).

What is noticeable in this definition is that it did not focus on the essence of pragmatics and its reality, but rather mentioned some of its procedures in analyzing discourse, namely "speech acts," which constitute the most prominent theory upon which the pragmatic approach was founded.

Elwar defines it as: "A cognitive framework that brings together a set of approaches that share, in their treatment of linguistic issues, an attention to three data that have an effective role in directing verbal exchange, namely: the speakers (the speaker and the addressee), the context (the situation / the miqām), and ordinary uses of

speech: that is, the daily and ordinary use of language in reality" (Al-Ṣabiḥi, 2008, pp. 49–50).

The important element in Elwar's definition is the element of context, which is considered one of the pillars of pragmatics; with its change, the utterance and the concept can change, for the process of understanding and making understood cannot take place in isolation from context, for context is the tangible situation in which purposes related to place, time, the identity of the speakers, etc., are posited and uttered, and everything we need in order to understand and evaluate what is said, and here we realize the extent of the importance of context.

For this reason, Mangueneau linked pragmatics to context, as he sees that "the pragmatic component processes the description of utterances in their contexts" (Mangueneau, 2008, p. 101).

We also find another definition by the authors of the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Pragmatics, where they linked the concept of pragmatics to the linguistic field and defined pragmatics as: "The study of language use as

opposed to the study of the linguistic system which is specifically concerned with by linguistics" (Moeschler & Reboul, 2010, p. 21); that is, pragmatics was concerned with studying speech (language use) that linguistics neglected and focused in its study on language as a system of signs.

Pragmatics, according to Anne-Marie Diller and François Récanati, means: "The study of language in discourse, witnessing its discursive capacity" (Arminco, n.d., p. 8); because pragmatics is concerned with the usage dimension of speech and takes into account the contexts and situational strata within which discourse is performed, and focuses on the social character with which language is characterized, and these elements are brought together by Francis Jacques' definition, which sees that "pragmatics studies language as a discursive, communicative, and social phenomenon at the same time" (Arminco, n.d., p. 8).

Philippe Blanchet also defines it by saying it is: "A set of logical-linguistic researches, and it is also the study concerned with language use, and it is concerned with the issue of the

compatibility between symbolic expressions and referential, situational, event-based, and human contexts" (Blanchet, 2007, p. 18).

What appears from the foregoing is that the definitions of pragmatics are linked to the idea of "use" that recurred in one form or another in all pragmatic concepts, and this was affirmed by Kent Bach, who conducted "a statistical survey of the definitions of pragmatics and their concepts and found that they all revolve around the idea of use that recurred in most definitions" (Balba', 2005, p. 38).

Use indicates the existence of (a speaker, a receiver, and a context), and through these three elements the intended meaning can be reached, and the true reality of meaning cannot be understood except through the convergence of these three elements among themselves, because meaning is not limited to the speaker or the receiver or rooted in words alone, but encompasses the whole.

1.2.2 The Technical Meaning of Pragmatics among the Arabs

Arab researchers have been concerned with the pragmatic approach both theoretically and practically, and serious efforts have appeared attempting to define the term pragmatics, among which — by way of example, not limitation — is what the Moroccan researcher Taha Abd al-Rahman presented, where he divided linguistics into a tripartite division comprising (Abd al-Raḥmān, 2000, p. 252):

1. *Daliyāt* (Signifier studies): They are the studies concerned with describing — and if possible interpreting — the natural signifier in its pronunciation, forms, and relations, and by this the *dāliyāt* are comprehensive of the three well-known divisions: phonetics, morphology, and syntax.

2. *Dalaliyāt* (Semantic studies): They are the studies concerned with describing — and if possible interpreting — the relations that bind the natural signifiers (*al-dawalī*) to the signifieds (*al-madlūlāt*), whether they are considered conceptions in the mind

or concrete entities in the external world.

3. *Tadawuliyyāt* (Pragmatic studies): They are the studies concerned with describing — and if possible interpreting — the relations that bind the natural signifiers to their "signifieds" and to the "signifiers" by them.

As for Aḥmad Al-Mutawakkil, he made pragmatics in its general sense equivalent to the functional approach (Al-Mutawakkil, 1985, p. 8).

Meanwhile, Masud Ṣaḥrawi sees that pragmatics "is not a purely linguistic science... but it is a new science of communication that studies linguistic phenomena in the field of use, and thus merges multiple epistemic projects in the study of the phenomenon of linguistic communication and its interpretation" (Ṣaḥrawi, 2005, p. 16).

Some give it a general concept by saying: "Pragmatics is the newest branch of the linguistic sciences, and it is the one concerned with analyzing speech and writing processes, and describing the functions of linguistic utterances and their characteristics

during communication procedures in general" (Faḍl, 1992, p. 8).

We also find that Muḥammad Yaḥyātīn equated pragmatics with dialogic linguistics, and defined it by saying it is: "A linguistic specialization that studies how people use linguistic evidence within their conversations and discourses, and it is also concerned, from another angle, with how they interpret those discourses and conversations... We can also say that pragmatics is nothing but dialogic linguistics or the communicative faculty" (Dalash, n.d., p. 1).

The researcher Maḥmūd Aḥmad Nakhla preferred the definition stipulating that pragmatics is: "The study of language in use or in communication," explaining his choice of this definition by saying that it indicates that meaning is not something rooted in words alone, nor is it linked to the speaker alone or the listener alone; rather, the making of meaning consists in the circulation of language between the speaker and the listener in a specific context, in order to arrive at the meaning latent in a given speech (Nakhla, 2002, p. 14).

2. The Philosophical and Linguistic Origins of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a new name for an old method in thought and practice; it is not the product of today, nor can it be said that the principles and foundations brought by Austin, Searle, and others are based on observations unprecedented by others. Rather, the first foreshadowings of pragmatics go back to Greek philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle, Augustine, and others who conceived of pragmatism as an activity or action or practice relying on experience and practical application to reach results.

The sources of pragmatic research are numerous and varied, and excavation and research into the origins of pragmatics lead us to the existence of more than one source, and these sources collectively contributed to the emergence of pragmatics and the crystallization of its major concepts. However, there are direct causes that led to the appearance of pragmatics in the West that can be attributed to two basic origins: a philosophical origin and a linguistic origin.

2.1 The Philosophical Origins of Pragmatics

Philosophy has a prominent role in the emergence and development of pragmatics, for Western linguistic research was born in the bosom of theoretical philosophy and remained linked to it until the modern era. Perhaps the most prominent philosophical current that helped the emergence of pragmatics is the current of "analytic philosophy," which is considered the basic source from which pragmatics sprang. "It is the main direction in the philosophy of language, or the predominant current in contemporary philosophy that focused on the subject of language, and attempted to change the task, subject, and practice of philosophy itself, by adopting a new method in analyzing philosophical language instead of criticizing philosophical systems or structures, and its appearance was linked to the idea that philosophical problems stem from language and from the bad use of language, and that natural language is the source of error and misunderstanding, and therefore work

must be done to replace it..." (Bighūra, 2005, p. 202).

This philosophical direction was founded in the second decade of the twentieth century by the German philosopher Gottlob Frege in his book "The Foundations of Arithmetic," in which he conducted some linguistic analyses on expressions and propositions, and among the most important of those analyses was his distinction between two linguistic categories that differ conceptually and functionally, namely: the proper name (ism al-'ilm) and the predicate (ism al-mahmūl), and they are the pillars of the categorical proposition. By the proper name is meant that which points to a specific individual, while the predicate performs the function of conception, i.e., attributing a set of descriptive and functional characteristics to the proper name, and the predicate is that upon which the words of generalization enter to convey a new meaning, while the proper name does not have the words of generalization entering upon it, such as: (all, some...).

Frege also linked two important pragmatic concepts: reference and

presupposition, and distinguished between meaning and reference, and between scientific language and communication language, thus establishing an epistemic rupture between ancient and modern logic (‘Ukāsha, 2013, pp. 44–45; Bouguerra, 2012, p. 78).

Frege was followed by the Austrian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein, who was concerned with studying ordinary language instead of artificial language, and pointed out that ordinary language is the standard by which we judge the validity or invalidity of what we say of expressions. Wittgenstein also shifted from an interest in the syntactic and semantic aspect of propositions to an interest in the actual functions of language and how it is used, and saw that it is not necessary to invent an ideal language in order to depict reality, but it suffices only to know the way in which each word indicates, and this is undoubtedly a landmark in the general line of analytic philosophy in general and in Wittgenstein's philosophy in particular (Bighūra, 2005, p. 101; ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, 1993, p. 34; Ḥammūd, n.d., p. 15).

Wittgenstein focused in his study of natural languages on three basic concepts (Dalash, n.d., p. 18):

1. Meaning (Al-dalāla): Wittgenstein distinguished in this concept between the achieved meaning linked to speech, and the estimated meaning linked to the sentence, and the sentence in this sense is less extensive than the utterance, and its meaning cannot be determined through the system under which it falls and the context in which it occurs, but its true meaning is determined through daily practice, and the speaker in all of that follows a rule and relies upon it, which is nothing more — in Wittgenstein's view — than a language game like the other practices.

2. Rule (Al-qa-ida): Wittgenstein sees that the rule must be viewed from a grammatical, substitutional, and social perspective, and the latter is based on convention and agreement, for the rule in his view is a language game, and the participant in this game must be acquainted with the basic rules (social conventions) without neglecting the non-basic rules (individual conventions).

3. Language games: Wittgenstein dedicated his work "Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus (1921)" to treating a set of philosophical researches, at the head of which is the concept of "language play" (al-talaub bi-l-kalam), which later became one of the pillars of the emergence of pragmatics, and this concept constitutes Wittgenstein's basic idea and is inseparable from the two preceding concepts (meaning and rule), and his concept at Wittgenstein is limited within the framework of the tangible relation between speakers and expressions (Achar, 1996, pp. 96–97), or it is, in other words: "A term by which is meant the institutional coloring of language during use, for when we speak we have subjected our speech to a set of implicit laws that make us distinguish between sound and unsound speech, just as is the case with the rules of a tennis match or a game of chess, which explains what some have come to term discourse strategies, for each of the parties of discourse has his own style in confronting the other party in speech" (Belkhair, 2013, p. 47).

The concept of "analytic philosophy" can be summarized in a set

of demands and concerns that are condensed in the following points (Şahrawi, 2005, p. 21):

- The necessity of abandoning the old philosophical research method, especially in its metaphysical aspect.
- Changing the focus of philosophical interest from the subject of "epistemology" to the subject of "linguistic analysis."
- Renewing and deepening some linguistic researches, especially the research of "semantics" and the linguistic phenomena branching from it.

It is also possible to distinguish within analytic philosophy between a set of intellectual directions, the most prominent of which are:

1. Logical Positivism: Led by Rudolf Carnap, who called for revising old linguistic ideas in philosophy, and analyzing language logically, and criticized previous philosophical studies, and saw that metaphysical philosophy is not suitable in linguistic analysis. Carnap also addressed the fields of the three branches of semiotics established by Morris, and clarified that in the field of linguistic research, if we explicitly point to the speaker or the user

of language, then we are working within the field of pragmatics, and if we analyze expressions and what they refer to, then we move to the field of semantics, and if we move away from what expressions refer to and analyze the relations between expressions, then we enter the circle of sentence syntax (‘Ukāsha, 2013, pp. 57–58).

2. Linguistic Phenomenology: Led by Edmund Husserl, who investigated an important principle that later became one of the most important principles of pragmatics, namely the principle of "intentionality" (al-qaṣdiyya), which Husserl received from Brentano, and which Austin invested in studying the phenomenon of speech acts, and his student Searle did the same when he took it as a basic criterion for classifying the forces contained in speech (Busniski, 1992, p. 187; Ṣaḥrawi, 2005, p. 23).

3. Ordinary Language Philosophy: This direction is led by Wittgenstein, who was concerned with studying and analyzing language and saw — as previously mentioned — that all problems are solved by language, and that the disagreements and

contradictions widespread among philosophers have as their basic cause their misunderstanding of language or their neglect of it. He was also concerned with the usage aspect of language and focused on its importance, saying: "What gives life to the sign? It lives through use" (Arminco, n.d., p. 22). And he also says: "Do not ask about meaning, ask about use" (Ṣadq, 2005, p. 130).

This "methodological convergence that occurred between linguistics and the philosophy of language... produced a new epistemic research: pragmatics" (Grandin, 2007, p. 9). These philosophers succeeded in laying a solid foundation for linguistic study, and their researches are among the most important supports that helped the emergence of pragmatics, as they also influenced the most prominent figures of the pragmatic approach, at the head of whom are Austin and Searle.

2.2 The Linguistic Origins of Pragmatics

Among the most prominent linguistic factors contributing to the emergence of pragmatics, we find

"pragmatic semiotics" (al-simiya' al-tadawuliyya) established by the American philosopher Charles Peirce and developed by his student Morris; the first features of the pragmatic approach appeared in Peirce's philosophical and semiotic works, specifically with the appearance of his article "How to Make Our Ideas Clear?" which is considered an extension of the article "The Fixation of Belief," and he proceeded in it from an important question meaning: When does an idea have meaning? (Bouguerra, 2009, p. 98; Bouguerra, 2010, p. 98; Abu al-Ḥusayn, 2010, p. 7).

Peirce's efforts constitute a decisive turning point in the development of the pragmatic approach, where he constructed a general theory of signs and made the sign the basis of semiotic activity. This theory is based on the idea of semiosis, by which is meant "the process leading to the production of meaning and its circulation" (Al-Aḥmar, 2010, p. 193; 'Alawi, 2014, p. 19), and the concept of semiosis is linked to the principle of the connection of signs to one another, which in turn produces new signs

determined by the cultural context and human social convention, and determined by the human habit that has become accustomed to specific interpretations and accepted them, and opens them also to other human habits that contribute to reviving and developing them" (Al-Aḥmar, 2010, p. 197).

It is noticeable that Peirce links the understanding of language to the state of communication and couples meaning with context, and sees that the linguistic sign has a relation to the conditions of its use and the milieu in which it was produced.

Peirce's efforts contributing to the emergence of pragmatics can be summarized in the following points (Boujadi, 2012, p. 45):

- Distinguishing between the expression as a pattern and what corresponds to it during use.
- Distinguishing between the sign, the symbol, the index, and the icon.
- He provided ample explanations on the concept of the index, where it is based on the principle of interpretation and varies according to its relation; the

icon corresponds to the subject pictorially and the index (al-amara) is based on the relation of cause to effect.

- He distinguished between semantics as the study of interpretations, and pragmatics which is concerned with studying the residues of these interpreters and their sediments.

- He treated the concept of speech acts in seven articles entitled "Lectures on Pragmatism" and linked in them between pragmatism and concrete existential phenomena (‘Ukāsha, 2013, p. 28).

The efforts of Peirce and his semiotic works constituted a point of departure for the American philosopher Charles Morris, who continued the semiotic research and contributed to founding pragmatics until he was counted among its most prominent founders, and pragmatics appeared in his division of semiotics (the science of signs) into three branches (Nakhla, 2002, p. 9):

- Syntactics: It is concerned with studying the formal relations between signs and one another.

- Semantics: It studies the relation of signs to the things they denote or refer to.

- Pragmatics: It is concerned with studying the relation of signs to their interpreters.

Morris makes pragmatics one of the bases upon which semiotics rests; La Traverse says: "The sum of the proposals, definitions, and hypotheses presented by Morris in all fields seeks to distinguish two objectives: the first relates to defining these fields and determining the number of probabilities and characteristics that can represent ready-made ideas, and on the other hand merging the fields and encompassing them and then defining their structure in relation to the totality of semiotics, and pragmatics undertakes its work within the foundations of the answers to these two objectives" (La Traverse, n.d., p. 74, cited in Boujadi, 2012, p. 47).

Morris sees that pragmatics does not study spoken language alone, but also studies the relation between the symbols or signs used and what they refer to, and the relation of signs to one another, and the relation between the interpreted signs and their users or the

field of use, and pragmatics is considered the most important addition in Morris's efforts (Ukasha, 2013, p. 30).

In addition to the linguistic origins contributing to the emergence of pragmatics are the efforts of the luminaries of the Prague School, as well as what was presented by the London Systemic School, which looked at language as a comprehensive human phenomenon, and these called for not neglecting the cultural, social, and psychological dimensions of language, and developed in this field the concept of "context of situation" (*siyaq al-ḥal*), which studies language in its material and moral context because it is a semiotic and social phenomenon, and it must be interpreted on the basis of these principles (Boujadi, 2012, p. 31).

These philosophical and linguistic origins contributed to establishing a new field of knowledge called pragmatics, which became an independent science and a field to be reckoned with in contemporary linguistic study, and the actual establishment of this science was at the hands of three philosophers of

language: Austin, Searle, and Grice; and they were all interested in the way of conveying the meaning of human natural language through the communication of a sender of a message to a receiver who interprets it, and their work in this was at the heart of pragmatic research. Then the pragmatic research developed after that with the appearance of the theory of speech acts by Austin, which in turn was developed by Searle; and then a set of concepts and theories appeared such as (conversational implicature, and the theory of argumentation and indexicals...) and others from the theories that together formed what is called "pragmatics" (*al-lisāniyyāt al-tadāwuliyya*).

References

- Abd al-Raḥmān, T. (2000). *Fī uṣūl al-ḥiwar wa-tajdid ‘ilm al-kalam* [On the foundations of dialogue and the renewal of theology] (2nd ed.). Arab Cultural Center. Morocco
- Abu al-Husayn, M. M. S. (2010). *Al-dars al-tadawulī fī juw ‘ilm al-lughā al-ḥadīth* [The pragmatic approach in light of modern

- linguistics]. Dar al-Fikr al-‘Arabi. Cairo
- Abu Ḥayyan al-Andalusi, M. b. Y. (1993). *Tafsir al-Baḥr al-Muḥit* (Vol. 8). A. A. ‘Abd al-Mawjūd & ‘A. M. Mu‘awwad (Eds.). Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya. Beirut
- Achar, P. (1996). *Sociologie du langage* (A. W. Tazou, Trans.). ‘Uwaydat Publications. Lebanon
- Al-Aḥmar, F. (2010). *Mujam al-simiya’iyyāt* [Dictionary of semiotics]. Arab Scientific Publishers, Beirut, Lebanon, and Al-Ikhtilaf Publications, Algeria, 1st edition,
- Al-Azharī, A. M. M. b. M. (n.d.). *Tahdhīb al-lugha*. Y. ‘Abd al-Nabī & M. A. al-Najjar (Eds.). The Egyptian House for Authorship and Translation, Cairo.
- Al-Banna, A. b. M. (1987). *Iṭḥaf faḍala’ al-bashar bi-l-qira’at al-arba’a ‘ashar* (Vol. 2). Sh. M. Ismail (Ed.). Dar Alam Al-Kutub, 1st edition, Beirut.
- Al-Dukhayl, M. b. S. (2014). *Manzilat maani al-kalam fi al-naẓariyya al-naḥwiyya al-‘arabiyya: Muqaraba tadawuliyya* [The status of speech meanings in Arabic grammatical theory: A pragmatic approach]. Al-Qassim Literary Club, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and Dar Al-Tanweer for Printing and Publishing, 1st edition, Tunisia.
- Al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmad al-Farahidī. (1989). *Al-Ayn* (2nd ed., Vol. 8). M. al-Makhzūmī & I. al-Samarra’ī (Eds.). Dar Al-Hijrah, 2nd edition, Iran.
- Al-Maysuwī, Kh. (2013). *Al-muṣṭalaḥ al-lisani wa-ta’sis al-mafhum* [The linguistic term and the establishment of the concept Dar Al-Aman, Rabat, and Ikhtilaf Publications, 1st edition, Algeria.
- Al-Mutawakkil, A. (1985). *Al-waḍa’if al-tadāwuliyya fi al-lugha al-‘arabiyya* [Pragmatic functions in the Arabic language]. Dar Al-Thaqafa, 1st edition Casablanca.
- Al-Qasimī, M. J. D. (1957). *Maḥāsini al-ta’wīl* (Vol. 4). M. F. ‘Abd al-Baqī (Ed.) Dar Ihya Al-Kutub Al-Arabiya, 1st edition.
- Al-Qurṭubī, A. ‘A. M. b. A. (2006). *Al-Jami’ li-Aḥkam al-Qur’an wa-al-Mubayyin lima Tadamanahu min al-Sunnah wa-Ayat al-Furqan*, edited by Abdullah ibn Abdul-Muhsin al-Turki and others, Al-Risalah Foundation, 1st edition, Beirut.
- Al-Ṣabiḥi, M. al-Akḍar. (2008). *Madkhal ila ‘ilm al-naṣ wa-majālāt tatbīqātihi* [Introduction to text science and its application fields]. Manshūrāt al-Ikhtilāf & Dar al-‘Ulūm al-‘Arabiyya. Algeria

- Arminco, F. (n.d.). Al-muqāraba al-tadāwuliyya [The pragmatic approach] (S. ‘Allūsh, Trans.). [Unpublished translation].
- Balba‘, (2005). Al-tadāwuliyya: Al-ba‘d al-thālith fī siyūūṭiqā Mōrris [Pragmatics: The third dimension in Morris's semiotics]. Fuṣūl, 66, 38.
- Belkhair, ‘. (2013). Maqālāt fī al-tadāwuliyya wa-l-khiṭāb [Articles in pragmatics and discourse]. Dār al-Amal.
- Bighura, al-Zawawī. (2005). Al-falsafa wa-l-lugha: Naqd al-man‘aṭaf al-lughawī fī al-falsafa al-mu‘āṣira [Philosophy and language: Critique of the linguistic turn in contemporary philosophy]. Dar al-Ṭalī‘a.
- Blanchet, P. (2007). La pragmatique: De Austin à Goffman (S. al-Ḥabbāsha, Trans.). Dār al-Ḥiwar.
- Boujadi, Kh. (2012). Fī al-lisaniyyāt al-tadāwuliyya ma‘ muḥawala ta’šīliyya fī al-dars al-‘arabī al-qadīm [In pragmatics with an attempt at rooting in the old Arab approach] (2nd ed.). [Algeria].
- Bouguerra, N. (2009). Al-madaris al-lisāniyya al-mu‘āṣira [Contemporary linguistic schools]. Maktabat al-Ādab.
- Bouguerra, N. (2010). Al-muṣṭalaḥāt al-asāsiyya fī lisāniyyāt al-naṣ wa-taḥlīl al-khiṭāb: Dirāsa mu‘jamiyya [Basic terms in text linguistics and discourse analysis: A lexicographical study]. Dar ‘Ālam al-Kutub al-Ḥadīth & Dar Jidara.
- Bouguerra, N. (2012). Al-khiṭāb al-adabī wa-rahamat al-ta’wīl: Qira’at naṣiyya tadawuliyya ḥijajiyya [Literary discourse and the stakes of interpretation: Textual pragmatic-argumentative readings]. Dar ‘Ālam al-Kutub al-Ḥadīth.
- Bušnīskī. (1992). Al-falsafa al-mu‘āṣira fī Uruba (‘I. Qarnī, Trans.). ‘Ālam al-Ma‘rifa.
- Dalash, al-Jilali. (n.d.). Madkhal ila al-lisaniyyāt al-tadawuliyya [Introduction to pragmatics] (M. Yaḥyatin, Trans.). Diwan al-Maṭbu‘at al-Jami‘iyya.
- Faḍl, Ṣ. (1992). Balaghat al-khiṭāb wa-‘ilm al-naṣ [The rhetoric of discourse and text science]. ‘Ālam al-Ma‘rifa.
- Grandin, J. (2007). Le tournant herméneutique de la phénoménologie (‘U. Mahīl, Trans.). Dar al-‘Ulūm al-‘Arabiyya & Manshurat al-Ikhtilaf.
- Ḥammūd, J. (n.d.). Falsafat al-lugha ‘inda Ludfikh Fityghinshtayn [The philosophy of language in Ludwig Wittgenstein]. Dār al-‘Ulūm al-‘Arabiyya & Manshurat al-Ikhtilaf.

- Ibn Fāris, A. al-Ḥ. A. b. Z. (1979). Muqayis al-lugha. ‘A. S. Hārūn (Ed.). Dār al-Fikr.
- Ibn Manzūr, A. al-F. J. D. M. b. M. (n.d.). Lisān al-‘Arab. Dar Ṣādir.
- La Traverse, F. (n.d.). La pragmatique (p. 74). [Cited in Boujadi, 2012, p. 47].
- Mangueneau, D. (2008). Les termes-clés de l'analyse du discours (M. Yaḥyātīn, Trans.). Manshūrāt al-Ikhtilāf & Dār al-‘Ulum al-‘Arabiyya.
- Moeschler, J., & Reboul, A. (2010). Dictionnaire encyclopédique de pragmatique (Collective trans., ‘I. al-Majdhūb, Ed.). Dār Sinātra & National Center for Translation.
- Murtād, ‘A. M. (2005). Tadawuliyat al-lugha bayna al-dalaliyya wa-l-siyāq [Language pragmatics between semantics and context]. Majallat al-Lisāniyyāt, 10, 66–67.
- Nakhla, M. A. (2002). Āfaq jadīda fī al-baḥth al-lughawī al-mu‘āṣir [New horizons in contemporary linguistic research]. Dār al-Ma‘rifa al-Jāmi‘iyya.
- ‘Alawī, ‘A. S. I. (2014). Mā al-tadawuliyāt? [What is pragmatics?]. In H. I. ‘Alawī (Ed.), Al-tadawuliyāt: ‘Ālam isti‘māl al-lugha [Pragmatics: The world of language use] (2nd ed.). Dar ‘Ālam al-Kutub al-Ḥadīth & Dār Jidārā.
- ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq, Ṣ. I. (1993). Al-taḥlil al-lughawī ‘inda madrasat Uksfurd [Linguistic analysis at the Oxford school]. Dār al-Tanwīr.
- ‘Aṭiyya, M. S. (1980). Tatimmat aḍwā’ al-bayān fī iḍāḥ al-Qur’ān bi-l-Qur’ān li-l-Shanqīṭī (Vol. 8). Dār ‘Ālam al-Fawā’id.
- ‘Ukasha, M. (2013). Al-naḥariyya al-barajumatiyya al-lisaniyya (al-tadawuliyya): Dirasa al-mafahim wa-l-nash’a wa-l-mabad’ [The pragmatic linguistic theory: A study of concepts, emergence, and principles]. Maktabat al-Ādāb.
- Ṣaḥrawī, M. (2005). Al-tadawuliyya ‘inda al-‘ulama’ al-‘arab: Dirāsa tadawuliyya li-ḍḥāhirat al-af‘āl al-kalāmiyya fī al-turāth al-lisānī al-‘arabī [Pragmatics among Arab scholars: A pragmatic study of the phenomenon of speech acts in Arab linguistic heritage]. Dār al-Ṭalī‘a.
- Ṣadq, Ḥ. (2005). Al-naḥariyya al-naqdiyya al-tawaṣuliyya: Yūrghan Hābirmās wa-madrasat Frankfurt [The critical communicative theory: Jürgen Habermas and the Frankfurt school]. Arab Cultural Center.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). ‘Ilm al-naṣ: Madkhal mutadākhil al-ikhtiṣāṣāt [Text science: An introduction to

interdisciplinarity] (S. H. Baḥrī,
Trans.). Dār al-Qahira. Cairo.

Yule, G. (2010). Pragmatics (Q. al-
‘Aṭabi, Trans.). Dar al-‘Uloom al-
‘Arabiyya & Dar al-
Amān. Morocco