



## The Deep Pragmatic Level in Abdulrazak Alghaliby's Critical Theory

Lect. Majid Dakhil Hammadi

General Directorate of Education in Thi Qar, Ministry of Education, Iraq

Email: majidalsafi8@gmail.com

Lect. Dr. Ahmed Muhsen Mashkour

General Directorate of Education in Thi Qar, Ministry of Education, Iraq

Email: ahmedmuhsenalshatree@gmail.com

Lect. Hayder Abdulrazak Oudah

College of Education , University of Thi-Qar, Iraq

Email: Haihaiderrazaq457@gmail.com

### ABSTRACT

Life is still moving at an accelerated pace in all social, political and literary fields, and the movement of development does not stop at a certain limit, just as it does not wait for someone to stop, even if it is for a reason or an emergency and the like. Modernity in all aspects of life, and this is what we see in Western Societies and the emergence of several schools of criticism and literature, which is the topic that pertains to our research. The competition of that school, and an example of that, is the emergence of the Structuralism School, Deconstructionism School, and Formalism School, leading to the Arabic Pragmatic Theory, which is the focus of our study. This development will not come only by coincidence, but rather it came as a result of several factors and reasons that led to its occurrence. The language and its sciences had their share of this development. The sciences of rhetoric, as well as criticism and its schools, developed until they reached Postmodernity. Arabic Pragmatic Theory (CPAA) is one of these modern literary and critical schools. In its foundations and rules are based on several important pillars, the most important of which is implicature, significance, and the signified aspect. Although sometimes the significance is absent, but the one who predicts it is the signified aspect, as well as it adopted Discourse in language and Perception that pours into the essence of the Concept, and (CPAA) as a scientific theory that took Ethics as an essential aspect in dealing with the Literary Text, whether poetry or narrative, and its difference from other critical theories is that , its reliance on the linguistic vocabulary and the connotations it carries in order that it may give the text strength and Aesthetics in terms of construction and Displacement, so as to provide the text with its elements affecting the reader and the recipient. Therefore, today it has become a critical theory with a scientific and literary approach in Arabic literature in general, and in the light of the foregoing, this research may be our attempt to study the Arabic Pragmatic Theory in both its theoretical and applied forms. The theoretical Pragmatic study is relying on the writings of the discoverer of the theory, the theorist, Professor Abdulrazak Alghaliby and his important six-volume encyclopedia, through which we got acquainted with the concept of theory, its foundations, and its scientific and literary rules.

**Keywords:** pragmatics. Inspiration, discourse language, polysemy, interpretation, changing, transformation and concept.



## I. INTRODUCTION

After the emergence of the term “New Pragmatics” in America and spread to other countries for the first time in the last quarter of the twentieth century, many linguists and scholars in every language of the world rushed towards this new term shared with all the languages of the world to receive their share of this new linguistic and literary revolution. After this trend has its philosophical path, it became clear in a new direction around the bifurcation of the linguistic signification technique and the work between the visible and uttered semantic meaning (denotation meaning) and the implicit and invisible suggestive meaning Pragmatic connotation (Implicature). Knowledge grants, so they took the communicative, pragmatic, linguistic meaning and studied its linguistic communication, and God enabled the Iraqi critic (Abdulrazak Oudah Al-Ghalaby) with this critical role and work on this term and propose a critical theory of Arabic origin after the departure of the English term (pragmatics) from the language of terminology towards the Arab arena and study its content; The suggestive meaning in which Arabic is superior to other languages, and because the Arab arena is devoid of the Arabic critical approach, (Al-Ghalibi) began to delve into the nature of the Arabic text and its aesthetic and artistic belongings.

In this crowded arena and the conflict between written language, gender, text, naturalization language, criticism, meaning, and the philosophical and linguistic exports spread by modernity. All linguistic and critical knowledge crumbled, and a loose ball rolled onto the surface of literature and criticism with westernized currents, methods, and theories that tried to undermine the Arabic text and twist its neck with Western theories such as Structuralism, Deconstruction, Formalism, and Impressionism. Arabic text became a ball that shot from one foot to the other. God enabled (Abdulrazak Alghalby) to delve into this battlefield and save the authentic Arab that is filled with the metaphor that characterizes our Arabic language and is distinguished in its vast spaces among other languages (A. O. Alghaliby, n.d.)...

## II. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

### Inspiration(connotation) Gap

Through my professional follow-up and the teaching of English language for four decades. I have discovered this fact, and deal with it, during my teaching career in language communication in the classrooms. I realized that *gap* is located in the middle of the meaning on which the process of changing the meaning from semantic to pragmatic is occurred, in addition to this operation, it helps transfer the meaning from the space of ordinary language to the *discourse language* (the intellectual language), or transferring the significance from the outer world to the inner world in which we realize the linguistic operations at the heart of the imaginary pragmatic process in the interior world (*human brain*). This gap, I call, is the (*Inspiration/connotation/Gap*) (Abdulrazak A. Alghalibi, 2017). It is a mental space in the human brain that is responsible for dealing with the *codes* of the meanings and concepts in the process of communication between the outer and the inner worlds. I also realized that this Gap is controlling the movements of the elements of language (sounds) to



form the words, from their resources in the organs of speech, in the mouth cavity, to the brain. It, also, embraces the meaning and organizes its transition from *the normal language* to *discourse one*, after it emerges from the fingers of significance towards the signified meanings. Then it divides the meaning according to the cases of achievement required by the mind within the encrypted messages coming from the speaker towards the addresser. In other words, the *Inspiration Gap* receives the meaning after it completed its semantic or lexical function at the boundaries of logic, which stops at the threshold of logic. *In this spot the Pragmatic will receive the meaning and begin its function to complete the performance of its analytical duty in the arena of discourse language*, i.e. the process of changing of the meaning from semantic to pragmatic takes place between the walls of the inspiration gap after it comes from the speaker to the addresser through the communicative channel. This process of analyzing meaning of language takes place in a very smallest part of the second (A. oudah Alghaliby, 2022).

Critically speaking, the process begins with the understanding the meaning and analyzing it in the inspiration gap, passing through interpretation, polysemy and imagination. The *Critical Pragmatic Arabic Approach (CPAA)* works in an area that is not explicitly related to the vocabulary, but it relies on the cognitive conclusion by suggesting the meaning of the known to produce the unknown meaning. This will exclude the Approach from logic and reality and then enters it into the illogic zone, when the syntactical relation of the suggestive meaning will be in the user's playground. We can call that wide area conventionally (hidden information gap or inspirational gap). This gap works to transfer the linguistic signification among its elements to form the signified meaning and encrypting it. Then it is responsible for receiving all the incomes and interpreting them through the following cognitive components of the inspiration gap:

- **Discourse language**
- **Connotation**
- **Interpretation**
- **Matching**
- **Transformation**
- **Concept**

### **Discourse language:**

It is a second cognitive language that is synonymous with the normal language. It is the language above the sentence level, i.e. ,it is located above the ordinary language, to give pragmatic (*prospective meaningful situations*) symbolic , and imaginative meanings in addition to the semantic meanings ,as needed, in the *Denotation or connotation fields* to determine the type of social phenomena in the slang use through the common achievement of the language. The speaker sometimes produces a regular sentence with polysemic meanings hidden behind the spoken linguistic elements, and not interested in the form of syntax or morphological language system which is an important part of the mental analysis of the language imported to *Wernicke's space* in the human brain .The physiological functions of



Wernicke's space embrace the *denotation or connotation meaning*, which is carried by linguistic elements and analyzing it with the help of matching intentions, in the incoming messages. Then the connotation meaning is studied to be appropriate with that content of the meaning that is determined by the speaker and the listener in the *communication channel*, to give the appropriate interpretation that creates the suitable *matching* between the intentions in the meaning of the speaker and that of the listener or the communicator.

David Nunan (Teaching-, 2005) refers to the discourse language as *the study of the relationship between the ordinary language and the linguistic context*. Thus, linguists studies the vocabulary and the sentences through the linguistic context. For example, the rules of using simple past tense, refers, in general without connection, to the context or the linguistic situation in the ordinary speech. But when we study the language in the use, we take care of the words of the person who used past tense, and ask for the reason of his choice to this tense and in this language situation precisely. Thus the situation is completed, when someone addresses another else, saying ( May I ask you a question?) ,we find in this case, the speaker chooses to express the meaning produced by the speaker in order to convey a special meaning expressing special situation (politeness), other than the causal meaning used in the regular, visual or audible syntax. So we conclude that the discourse language observes the meaning which is produced by the speaker and change it to another meaning *suitable to the situation* received by the listener then the meaning is understood by the listener, through the context. Thus, the discourse language is the medium in which users express their feelings which are not showing obviously, when they use the ordinary language for the same purpose. So (George Yule) (Yule, 2020)-defines the discourse language, in his book (Study in English Language): *it is the language that stands behind the sentence to study it*, while the analyzing the study of language takes care of the texts and conversations. For example :when we say: *-I have no foothold here-* I mean, *We have no service or accommodation in this place* – So we say a thing and we mean another (Yule, 2020) (McClarkville, 1958) In this point, he agrees with David Nunan in the definition of discourse language.

Discourse Language is considered the heart of the language that transfers the language from the ordinary state into pragmatic state. It is the state of mind that is responsible for converting the ordinary language into complementary linguistic situations according to the corresponding requests waiting in the inspiration gap after filtering its signifiers and signified multiple meanings (polysemy) and linguistic concepts, then choosing what matches the meaning required by the outer world. I agree with Yule and Nunan (Nunan, 1991) and add my opinion that discourse language is a second cognitive language dwells the human mind that is synonymous with the normal language. It is the language that is hidden between or under the elements of the sentence, ...i.e, it is located in hidden position in the lines of the ordinary language and its understood from context. Its main duty is to give pragmatic meaning in (*prospective meaningful situations*) or symbolic, and imaginative meanings in addition to the semantic meanings, as needed, in the *Denotation or connotation fields* (Mosses, 1990) to determine the type of social phenomena in the



slang use through the common achievement of the language. *So, I define discourse language as the supporting cognitive language which is hidden between or under the spoken or written lines of the speech to give the meaning without declaring the same speech, but another that is the mind perceives it, but it is still beyond the eye or ear reach.* The speaker sometimes produces a regular sentence with polysemic meanings hidden behind the spoken linguistic elements, and not interested in the form of syntax or morphological language system which is an important part of the mental analysis of the language imported to *Wernicke's area* in the human brain. The physiological functions of Wernicke's area embrace the *denotation or connotation meaning*, which is carried by linguistic elements and analyzing it with the help of matching intentions, in the incoming messages. Then the connotation meaning is studied to be appropriate with that content of the meaning that is determined by the speaker and the listener in the *communication channel*, to give the appropriate interpretation that creates the suitable *matching* between the intentions in the meaning of the speaker and that of the listener or the communicator.

Discourse Language was defined many definitions that puts it far from its real meaning and its physiological and biological duty when some researchers tried to pair it with the text, but in fact, it is not a text. It is a complete mental language above the normal language. It has its internal and external physiological processes, and its structural, metaphorical and pragmatic system of meaning. It deals with the connotation meanings, processing to give proper interpretation. *I consider discourse language as the language of Pragmatics.* In the early 1970s, linguists began to take it out of the realm of the human mind as a linguistic process in order to be a modern branch of linguistics, a visible state in the cognitive linguistics. Since then, grammatical lessons - particularly in English - taking its possible inspiration field for the discourse language to describe the elements of the sentence as (McClarkville, 1958) a visible language, side by side with the ordinary language, to express the *elements of the sentence with pragmatic and social language situations such as / greetings farewell, social introduction, suggestions, ability, likelihood and certainty, asking and expressing opinions, obligation, sarcasm, warning, polite request, and the drawing conclusion/.* Thus, the discourse language appears to light as a social language that accompanies the normal language, and occupies its roof, to highlight the meaning which is understood communicatively. *These are the language situations that I used to call "prospective meaningful situations"* which have evolved through the modernization of some open languages such as English, using the vocabulary and terminology borrowed from other languages. *This openness in these languages was called (the languages of purpose). Each branch of knowledge will be given different and appropriate meanings to the same vocabulary with general lexicon and semantic meanings ... e. g the word "current" in geographical sense means / stream of water / the flow of electricity in physics /and paper-money in the economy .... and so on ....* I see that the pragmatic meaning will be dissolve with semantic meaning in one crucible.

Connotation means (Garza-Cuarón, 2013) linguistically that it is a process of containment and inclusion. We are interested in containment and deduction. Two



important terms involve in meaning wherever meaning is mentioned, but the researchers have no interest in them. The first is a static term. It is the semantic or lexical meaning that recognizes the logical meaning. This term refers to the meaning of the word in case of (Eco, 1987) "*denotation*", the case in which the meaning is limited to a static case of logic. It does not get out of the logic whatever the reason is. Its stability is decided on the boundaries of the linguistic concept, because the linguistic concept is the fence that surrounds the prospective signified lexical and static meanings. The second term is "*connotation*". It means that it is related to the dynamic *pragmatic*, imaginary or symbolic meaning (Yahia, 2022). This meaning begins at the limits of the semantic meaning after its invalidity on the boundaries of pragmatic. From this point, the pragmatic meaning starts its dynamic and analytic travel into the *inspiration gap* with imagination and the unlimited symbols. There is no possibility of reaching its real limits. It contains the endless series of (*the prospective meaningful situations*), because it takes the linguistic elements as meaningful situations. These meanings or *meaningful situations* are stored in *The brain* in advance. It is the linguistic *competence (store of meanings)* into the human brain which grows and grows day by day from different cultural sources in the social language use. It is strengthened and reinforced by association and watching through the daily repetitions in social mixing. The connotation works as the keeper of this large linguistic store, and it has all the keys. Nothing comes out of this store without the permission and the agreement of this guard keeper. It is responsible to give the suitable and optional interpretation by the mind that is required by the users of the language.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

#### 1. Interpretation (Polysemy):

The interpretation or polysemy means the search for the required option of the hidden meanings behind the visible meanings in the speech. The real meaning of *Interpretation* in English is mixed with semantic meaning of itself, because this word is supposed to give a series of different signified meanings in a list of vocabulary that are besieged by one concept (A. Alghaliby, 2019). For this reason interpretation will contain a continuous *evasion* between the signifier and the signified meanings in any language. So interpretation of the special meaning is based on semantic or true meaning that expresses reality, but if the interpretation exceeds the truth, to be like polysemy, which is subjected to the balance of lying, tending to be an imaginary or symbolic interpretation that contains an evasion into it, and the meaning into it will not be stable, but it is changeable according to the context to be recognized by the recipient who addresses the language, whether it is of spoken or written text. The interpretation will have the long hands to knock at the gates of symbolism, imagination, literary depth (*pragmatic meaning*), movement and linguistic generosity in giving the infinite meanings within the limits of the individual in the context.

The *Critical Pragmatic Arabic Approach (CPAA)* is of rhetorical reality and a motor that stores the linguistic depth inside it. This Approach grants the sufficient freedom



for the meaning to extend and stretch comfortably above the *pragmatic* land of the *Inspiration Gap*, and the context gives the meaning some flashes of intellectual illuminations, which the human brain ejects from an awareness of the internal language. There is a connection between the sources of speech of the sounds and phonological configurations of the brain and brain regions, which shake the context windows to extract the intended meaning, to produce a suitable output as follows (A. O. Alghaliby, 2021):

□ **If the speech is a product of the tongue:**

The linguistic output means oral speech among the speakers, and this mechanism is imposed by the mind in the area of analysis, through the (connotation); quick signifiers and signified meanings ending with the end of the conversation between the speaker and the listener, based on the logical interpretation.

□ **If the speech is a written text:**

In that case, it is not enough to the signified meaning to cover what the pragmatic text produce in the stream of the context, because the depth of literature is an industry that reflects the depth of the writer's creativity, his technique and strategy in writing. The language industry is quite different from speaking the ordinary language. Sometimes the signified meaning is incapable of giving the wide meaning in the text, so the concept substitutes the signified meanings in receiving the meaning, sent from the area of perception in the brain towards the basket of interpretation or polysemy, to refer to the meaning, required by the outer world, from the multiple possibilities.

Plato's view of the interpretation of the word in the limitation of (**truth and lying**) in the interpretation (polysemy) of the meaning is based on a metaphorical or pragmatic (AaTaylor & Ricoeur, 2002) consensus. That the problem of truth or the isolated words or names must remain unsettled, because the naming does not exhaust the power or function of speech. And the unity of these two words required law of speech or in need, at least, for a noun or a verb to unite them. This unit will form the first unit to the language and thought. If this unit pretended to claim honesty, the question should remain, in any case, open, and if the question means, we always, must say something. So how can we say for a thing is nothing. And once again, Plato has to conclude that the word is or is not true or false, although the variety of words may mean a thing and indicate for nothing.

## 2. Matching:

The proper meaning is not given in the interpretation stage, unless it matches with the meaning determined by the speaker in the polysemy and the interlocutor, until the final process of change takes place between the ordinary language and the discourse language. The transcripts or readings are transferred into the space of communication outside the mind. The semantic meaning is separated from the pragmatic meaning will be ready to begin its work on the final boundaries of semantic meaning that takes a wider range of unrealistic expression in imagination and symbol as required by the speakers.



### 3. Transformation:

The transformation is a final achievement will happen between the discourse language and ordinary language at the heart of the *pragmatic inspiration gap*. This Operation will occur after the force of the match is done, then that step concludes the process of the final pragmatic analysis. This hypothetic presentation in which I recorded my experience in my real official research in pragmatic language for four decades passed .It is a combination of facts I have lived it in my work life. This discovery has given me real courage and legitimacy with my students to put it before every scientific follower of the critical linguistic process of the Arabs individuals who work in Criticism Field to participate me in what I do for a respectful movement to the benefit of Arabic Literary Text. All the assumptions, I have made are recorded by critical applications of critical studies which raised the respect and appreciation of the most prominent Literary Critics in Egypt and other Arab countries.

### 4. Concept:

Lots of new sciences have emerged into the Literary Criticism Fields, and to the linguistic arena which analyzed the language to the most precise elements. This analysis was reflected in the Critical research process. Concept is the only term that was neglected by the researchers and critics. It seemed to be one of the neglects which I have recovered for its importance of surrounding the meanings with a strong wall in the signification field(Jackendoff, 1989).

*I have realized that the signifier refers to a signified meaning and the signified meaning refers to the concept. So if I exceed the signified meanings towards the concept, I will avoid the constant and continuous evasion between them in the interpretation and polysemy field of meaning. By this way I was able to stop the evasion, among the signifier ,the signified meaning and the concept, and fix the required meaning, demanded by the outer world, at the boarder of the intention. So the transformation of the meaning between semantic and pragmatic meaning will, peacefully, happen. This is what the Critic needs urgently in his analysis(A. Alghaliby, n.d.).* In other words, the signifier refers to meaning, and the meaning refers to a series of meanings, then the final stable reference is the concept. If the concept eventually stabilizes, it means that the final meaning is determined easily by this stability, and then it is fixed at the final limits with Linguistics genes .Finally I prove my attempt to be successful, because I realize the following facts:

**1-The concept is stable and is stood with similar attitude with the signifier 2-Linguistic stops at the boundaries of articulation,**

**3-The semantic meaning stops at the boundaries of the signified meanings and it does not exceed it to the concept.**

As long as the Concept was the final cache for meaning and it was ready and aware by the mind in advance, for it passed all cognitive processes to become known to all brain tools; components or cells , it became a reservoir and a wall surrounding the meaning .It is now the deep target that the Critic tended to penetrate as the final aim in his analysis to the depth in literature more than in linguistics . *So I decided to move behind the signified meanings to adopt the analysis by the concept*



*metaphorically* .I left the analysis through the signifier and signified meanings for the evasion they have, because (as I think) the analysis of linguistics worked with verbal meanings, whereas the concept is working with literature in a lighter way in the utility at which the word pragmatism was accused by .

The new linguistic pragmatism was the most important analytical linguistic , communicative and rhetoric science that was interested in analyzing the prospective, imaginative and symbolic meanings in the literary depth. This was a very strong evidence of the greatness of the Arabic language and its place among other languages. The Western philosophers revealed linguistic pragmatics in the early seventies of the last century, and it was formed the foundations of Structuralism and Generative Theory in its theoretical beginning , which might address the phenomena of language and analyze them. It participated to stand in the face of problems and resolve them. It derived its resources from various sources to access into different ways of communication.

#### IV. CONCLUSION:

Critical Pragmatic Arabic Approach (CPAA) was the perfect solution, because it is an applied Arab Critical Vision based on scientific frameworks and entrances for everything that is mentioned through it. It does not allow perforation for empty and blind construction, and is not based on solid critical rules, as it is burdened with psychological and philosophical theories that help the recipient and the critic enter into any text in a pragmatic way scientifically, with cognitive dependence and conscious of the deep analysis of the elements of a well-done literary work, in a precise and thoughtful manner drawn from an Arabic-origin approach referred to as deliberation. The CPAA helps the critic dive into the components of the Arabic text with deep respect and professionalism, and this Vision does not destroy the outer aesthetic shell of the literary work, as do the rest of the Foreign Critical Theories. The CPAA is concerned with the form and the content of the Arabic Text in a parallel manner and with varying critical respect and balance. It does not work like materialistic critical theories, which do not look at any text with integrity, even if it is in a holy book.

#### References

1. AaTaylor, C., & Ricoeur, P. (2002). Discussion: Ricoeur on narrative. In *On Paul Ricoeur* (pp. 174–201). Routledge.
2. Alghaliby, A. (n.d.). *Pragmatics in Action - first edition*. 3, 371.
3. Alghaliby, A. (2019). Pragmatics between the Philosophical and Linguistic Perspective-The First Volume of the Pragmatic and Philosophical Encyclopedia. *Book, 1*, 437.
4. Alghaliby, A. O. (n.d.). Pragmatics and the Soverienity of The Arabic Geners.



- Book*, 2, 311.
5. Alghaliby, A. O. (2021). Pragmatics and the Human Mind. *Book*, 4, 363.
  6. Alghaliby, A. oudah. (2022). Pragmatics and the Critical Scientific Analysis. *Abulrazak Oudah Alghaliby*, 5, 344.
  7. Eco, U. (1987). Meaning and denotation. *Synthese*, 549–568.
  8. Garza-Cuarón, B. (2013). Connotation and meaning. In *Connotation and Meaning*. De Gruyter Mouton.
  9. Jackendoff, R. (1989). What is a concept, that a person may grasp it? 1. *Mind & Language*, 4(1-2), 68–102.
  10. McClarkville, A. (1958). *Spoken English: an idiomatic grammar for foreign students*. Oliver and Boyd.
  11. Mosses, P. D. (1990). Denotational semantics. In *Formal Models and Semantics* (pp. 575–631). Elsevier.
  12. Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology* (Vol. 192). New York: prentice hall.
  13. Teaching-, P. E. L. (2005). *Practical English language teaching: speaking*.
  14. Yahia, A. K. to A. A. (2022). Contemporary Arab Feminist Literature in Pragmatic Perspective. *Book*, 1, 144.
  15. Yule, G. (2020). *The study of language*. Cambridge university press.