Allusions Between The Ancient Arab Lesson - And Modern Western Theorizing

Dr. Ismail Souigat[1]

[1]Higher School of Teachers - Ouargla (Algeria),

Author Correspondence email: Ismail.souigat@gmail.com

Abstract:

Allusions, which are linguistic signs whose meaning is determined only in the context of the deliberative discourse, because they are devoid of any meaning in themselves, and they play an effective role in directing and controlling the meaning, hence the interest in these hints, so the scientists studied them and pointed to their importance, and the question that the research seeks to answer, are there references to this important topic in the ancient Arab heritage? Is there an intersection between the ancient Arab lesson and the modern Western theorizing in this particular area?

Keywords: deliberative – Allusions – signals – meaning – discourse.

Introduction:

Language does not live only through its vital interaction with life and its references and events and this is what it did not find in the structuralist school, and therefore attention language students calling for a pragmatic view of the language paid attention to the danger of isolating language from the course of life and therefore soon receded linguistic theories that imprisoned texts within the boundaries of the structure

Language is not only a coding system, but it is a structure of a functional nature that has close relations with all aspects of cognitive life, and the interpretation of a sentence is based on deciphering it within non-linguistic knowledge that requires inferential processes that lead from a verbal sentence and based on different knowledge to the interpretation of the audible discourse according to different circumstances, and from here we realize that the production and interpretation of language are two processes that are not based on a system of an exclusively symbolic nature, and with the importance and necessity of placement and the coding system in the language However, the use of language is not limited to the mere process of coding during the production of discourse or deciphering during interpretation, and inferential processes do not always adopt linguistic symbols, but are often based on non-linguistic factors, and therefore language, although it is an independent coding system, its use cannot be separated from human decisions of inference and knowledge, and it certainly does not have any linguistic character at all.

The strategy of the interpreter then lies in going beyond the mere decipherment, which provides only a partial interpretation of the sentences, to the interpretation of these sentences in a complete interpretation that

takes into account the circumstances and contexts in which this or that speech is presented, and according to the common knowledge of the parties to the discourse, and then linguists and those interested in it realized that the production and interpretation of language are not only based on the process of coding and deciphering as we mentioned but is also based on inferential processes based on the strategy of the interpreter and employing capabilities General humanity, which is not specific to language, its production and interpretation, which is what deliberative is concerned with.

Definition of deliberative and its investigations:

The philosopher **Charles Morris** put the term deliberative, and the definition he gave is "that deliberative is the third branch of semiotics after the science of structures and semantics and deliberative is concerned with the study of the relationship between signs and their users"(1).

The most important characteristic of deliberative (2):

1- It is based on the study of linguistic usage.

2- Examine the relationship of language to the context and conditions in which the language is used.

3- Studying how the recipient discovers the intention of the speaker.

4- Dealing with all psychological and social phenomena that appear in the employment of signs (3).

deliberative "is not a purely linguistic science in the traditional sense, a science that only describes and interprets linguistic structures and stops at their limits and apparent forms, but a new science of communication that studies linguistic phenomena in the field of use." (4)

Despite the differences of scholars on deliberative, "most of them acknowledge that the issue of deliberative is to find Macro laws for linguistic use and recognition of human abilities for communication"(4).

Therefore, we find that the shortest definition of deliberative and the closest to acceptance, as most researchers believe, is: "the study of language in use or in communication", (5).This study is based on four important aspects: Signal [indicators]. And the previous assumption, the dialogic imperative, and verbal actions.

Allusions Language and Terminology:

Allusions Language: It came in Lisan al-Arab to Ibn Manzur several meanings of the article (شور): "Referred to him and شور: nodded, that is with the palm, the eye and the eyebrow; And he pointed to him with his hand, which pointed; And in the hadith: He used to point in prayer; nods by hand and head, commands and forbids by a signal; ... The man pointed a signal if he nodded his hands. It is said: I pointed it out tohim with my hand and pointed to him ,:. waved to him and insisted as well. He pointed to him with his hand: and nodded (6).

The Dictionary of language standards mentions that (شَوَرَ, الشّينُ وَالْوَاوُ وَالرَّاءُ) are steady origins, the first of which is to express, show and display something, and the other to take something (7).

Allusions: idiomatically, means the sign through the language, and any linguistic form used to do this sign is called the term indicative expression ... All of these indicative terms are interpreted by a speaker and listener who share the same context. The word I will put this here is easy to understand for those present, but the absent may need someone to explain it to him and translate it (8). The sign is not limited to language, alone, it may be a tool that the speaker needs to point to the things around him to determine to his addressee during the conversational process, and includes sensory signals, directed towards a specific thing to indicate it (9)." "We can define a sign as an act in which a speaker or writer uses linguistic formulas to enable a listener or reader to identify something (10). It is worth noting in this regard that the context plays an important role in the analysis of the indicative elements of each word on the basis that there are "words and expressions that depend entirely on the context in which they are used and cannot be produced or interpreted in isolation from it."(11)

It is known that Allusions are linguistic signs whose reference is determined only in the context of discourse, because they are devoid of any meaning in themselves..(12).

So they are words and expressions that depend entirely on the context, some of them are found in the mental lexicon of man without being associated with a fixed meaning, so their meaning is only clear through the utterance of the speech in a specific context, such as sign names and some pronouns, for example. They are vague linguistic tools and their ambiguity lies in the fact that they are linguistic signs whose reference is determined only in the context of deliberative discourse because they are devoid of any meaning in themselves Mahmoud Ahmed Nahla says commenting on this example: "They will do this work tomorrow, because they are not here now."

If you read the sentence excerpted from its context, "you find it very vague because it contains a large number of indicative elements whose interpretation depends entirely on the physical context in which it was said and the knowledge of the reference to which it is referred, and these elements are the واو group and the absent pronoun [they] and the name of the sign [this] and the adverbs of time [tomorrow] and [now] and the adverb of place [here] and the meaning of this sentence is not clear unless we know what these elements refer to (13).

This is because indicative expressions have laid the basis for direct communication between people based on orality, and if the reference is absent, or what they refer to, ambiguity prevails and understanding is closed.

Types of Allusions:

some researchers have seen that they reach five types, but we only mention three of them - which concern us in this research - are: personal, temporal, and spatial signals (13).

1 – **Personal references:** represented by pronouns in particular, indicating the speaker, addressee, and absent, singular, dual, or plural.
And hidden pronouns in Arabic grammar are kind of signs that realize the referral to it from the context, and some of them require the presence kind of hiding pronoun [you] after the command and prohibition and here it is worth stopping at two notes mentioned by Muhammad Fahl (13).
First: the third person pronoun does not enter into the references unless it is free, that is, does not know its reference from the linguistic context, if it knows its reference from the linguistic context, it came out of the Allusions.

Second: Philosophers of language add another dimension is the condition of honesty, if a woman says, for example, I am the mother of **Napoleon**, it is not enough that the reference of conscience is that woman, but must be achieved conformity of the reference to reality, that this woman is the mother of **Napoleon** actually, and that the sentence was said in the appropriate historical circumstances if the condition of honesty was not met the sentence was false (13).
2- **Temporal signals:** words that indicate a time determined by the context in which the moment of speaking is the reference, the time of speaking is the center of the temporal signal in speech, and not knowing the moment of speaking leads to confusion and lack of understanding. For example, if a person leaves a paper for his brother while he is in a foreign country with the writing on it: "The afternoon prayer after an hour, and he wakes up and finds it near his head, and the brother does not specify the time of writing the paper, then this act that he did is meaningless and useless, and its existence is like non-existence.
His second example: "To say to someone: "You are invited to a feast on Friday", as Friday does not indicate a specific time, it may be next Friday or the Friday after that. The same is the case with the rest of the circumstances, such as: now - yesterday - tomorrow - year - month.

In addition, knowing the historical period is necessary to remove the ambiguity of some words, such as reading a news item in the newspaper "The Minister of Education stated that this year will be successful," ignorance of knowing the time period that the news talks about makes you ignorant of the minister referred to and the year he is talking about.

This reference to time may take the whole period of time, such as when it is said today, Wednesday, the word of the day takes the whole Wednesday. And the reference to time may take a specific period, such as saying: "We meet on Thursday," that is, at a specific time of it and may expand the extent of some of the indicative elements in time, beyond the time specified for him customarily to a wider time The word today in our saying today's youth or today's girls, for example, include the era in which we live (14)

This breadth may be invested in the investment advertising discourse, as the phrase "seize the opportunity of the discounts now" makes the signal [now] open and may take years by transferring Indicative status to the spatial-temporal framework in which the listener or reader is informed of the text"(15).

3- Spatial signals: If the reference of the temporal signal is the moment of speaking, the spatial signal has its own reference as well, without which the correct understanding is not done by the hearer and this spatial reference should be known to the addressee, words such as: in front of - behind - behind - below - above - this - that - that - there, depends on the direct physical context in which it was said to make it clear what it refers to, the phrase "I like to stand here every day" is shrouded in a kind of lack of clarity because the circumstance [here] It does not refer to a specific one for the listener, and if the addressee was present at the moment of utterance or had a clear perception made by the context, this ambiguity would not exist.

The subject of Allusions according to Al-Qarafi*

We mentioned earlier that Allusions: Are words and expressions that depend entirely on the context in which they are used and no one can interpret them in isolation from it, if the words usually refer to a certain meaning, some of them are found in the mental lexicon of man without being associated with a fixed meaning, so its meaning is only clear through the utterance of the speech in a specific context, such as the names of the sign and some pronouns, for example. They are vague linguistic tools and their ambiguity lies in the fact that they are linguistic signs whose reference is determined only in the context of deliberative discourse because they are devoid of any meaning in themselves (16).

This is because indicative expressions have laid the basis for direct communication between people based on orality, and if the reference is absent, or what they refer to, ambiguity prevails and understanding is closed.

With a closer look, one can realize that the Arabic Language researchers in general and the fundamentalists in particular were fully aware of the importance of signs in determining the meaning and referring to it; have:

1- Implicit:

" The implicit: is the word that needs in its interpretation to a separate word from it if it is absent or a presumption of speech or speech, so we say to the word: as a precaution against the words of the sign, and we say separately from it: to guard against connectors, and we say a presumption of speech or speech to enter the pronoun of the speaker and the addressee.

And the implicit: is taken from the atrophy because it is a few letters abbreviated in relation to the apparent, or from the pronoun because it is a metaphor for what is in the pronoun, which is the apparent name or its name, and it must be interpreted, it may be a separate word from it towards: Zaid I passed by, and this is the original, and then takes its place other things that become known, such as the Almighty's saying**:(We sent him down on the Night of Power)** (17). The Holy Qur'an was not mentioned, but it was known by the advanced dialogues, and as the Almighty says: (Everyone on it is a mortal) (18) He did not come to the ground, but it is known in the context, and as the Almighty says: " **Until she was hidden in the veil**."(19) No mention was made of the sun. Al-Qarafi here defines the implicit as the word that needs in its interpretation a separate word from it if it is absent or a presumption of speech or speech, which is one of the ambiguities that need others to clarify what is meant by them, which is what the Kufics call metonymy.

Al-Qarafi distinguished between a number of other ambiguities, namely sign names and hyphenated nouns.

2- Connectors: The connectors must be connected towards: I passed by the one who did and who did or what he did.

3 - With regard to the names of the signs this, that, these and those... It must be interpreted with it, and its origin must be an act of member or other signals.

Al-Qarafi has distinguished between the three implications: the speaker, the addressee and the absent, and then stated that the need to interpret more with the word apparent but is the pronoun of the third person towards: he and she and they, and the addressee towards: you, and the speaker towards: I and we do not need any of these two sections to know the word apparent, but who said to you: I, I knew him even if you did not know his name, as well as who I told him: You, talk regularly between you even if you do not know his name, but the presumption of speech and speech is sufficient in that.

Al-Qarafi discussed the difference of Researchers in the name of the word "implicit" where it was found, is it partial or total? He stated that the most is that it is partial, and they protested against that in two ways: the first: that the grammarians unanimously agreed that the implicit knowledge and the correct that he knew the knowledge, if it was named in full would have been a denial, the denial was only a denial because its name is totally common to it between individuals infinite does not belong to one of them without the other, and the implicit is not, so it is not a denial, the second: The name of the implicit if it is wholly indicative of what is more general than the specific person, and the mental rule: that the indication of the most general is not indicative in particular, so it is necessary that the implicit does not indicate a special person at all and is not so, but everyone who said: (I) understood him alone, and also if you said to Zaid: You are standing, he only understands himself.

As for Al-Qarafi, he believes that the correct contrary to this doctrine, which is confirmed by its validity, which is that its name is total, and the evidence for it: that if it was partially named, it would not have been ratified on another person except by placing another such as flags, it would not have been partially named and not ratified on other than those who put him except in a second place, if he said: (I) If the word is subject to its own in terms of it, and its specificity is not present in others, then it must not be ratified on others except in another situation, and if It was the subject of the concept of the speaker, which is a common fate between him and others and the common is total, so the word (I) is a fact in everyone who said I, because he spoke it, which is the name of the word, so this applies to reality, and as for their saying in both faces: the answer to it is the same, which is that the indication of the word on the designated person has two reasons: One: putting the word in front of it, so the person then understands the situation in front of the particular, and this is like noun, and the second: That the word is placed in front of a general meaning and the fact indicates that the name of the word is confined to a specific person, so the word indicates it, because its name is confined to it, not for the situation towards it, and from that implicits, the Arabs put the word I, for example, for the concept of the speaker, if he said: (I) understood it, because the reality is that he did not say this word now except him, we understood it because of the limitation of the name in it, not for the situation towards it, as well as the rest of the implicits, and this is as you say: I saw the judge of Mecca or Medina, so the The taker understands at that time for this city, because the reality is that he is the taker, and at another time the taker understands the other according to what limits the named reality to a specific person, so are the implicits, even if we impose a group that said: (I) at the same time and similar voices so that the reality does not distinguish one of them from one of them did not understand one, and also if you say to a group in your hands: You are addressing, and your ratio in the speech with them and your confrontation with them and your reference, none of them understood himself about it, but understands it if the reality addressed is limited to it, so what was often the limitation of reality called the word in a specific person understands.

Therefore, grammarians said that it is knowledge, the understanding of the partial is hardly separated from it, and the rule says that the subject of the word for a more general meaning does not indicate what is more specific than it, the significance did not come in the word, but came from the point of limitation of the reality named

in that particular. It is noticeable that the Qarafi and the public of grammarians looked at the use of these ambiguities in reality acquired partial and definition, while the violators looked at the word out of use. It is also noticeable that Al-Qarafi was aware of temporal references and this appeared when he linked the use of the pronoun to the time of uttering by saying: If the one who says: (I) understands him, because the reality is that he did not say this word now except him, we understood it because of the limitation of the name in it, not for the situation towards it, as well as the rest of the implications. Reality and the time of assumption, as well as in all fields.

The speaker's implications are: I and we and me and us and you and we have honored me and honored us and my work and I have the concept of the speaker whoever he was and the name of the pronouns of the addressee, namely: you the concept of the addressee whoever he was, and the name of the absent implications, namely: he and she and the like the concept of the absent whoever he was.

If you say, do you say that the word "absent" and the word "meaning" are synonymous with backbiting, so they are synonymous, or do you say that they have two meanings and they are different?

I said: Rather, I say that they have two meanings and that they are different, because the word absent is the subject of a known described by the absence, and the special implications are placed for a known described by the absence under the constraint of brevity and brevity in its expression, and with this restriction the name of the implicit has become more special than the name of the word absent, they are different, not synonymous, and therefore it is permissible to use the word absent starting without the mind with its name feeling, and it is not permissible in the absent until the mind has a sense of the progress of a word, context or other." (20).

Conclusion:

Through the above, we can conclude the following conclusions:

- Al-Qarafi was exposed in talking about the implications (ambiguities) to make signals, which is one of the pragmatic investigations that can only be identified within the context in which they are mentioned. Al-Qarafi has defined the implicit as the word that needs in its interpretation to a separate word from it if it is absent or a presumption of speech or speech, that is, it is one of the ambiguities that need others to clarify what is meant by them. Then Alqarafi distinguished between a number of ambiguities, namely the pronoun and the names of the sign and the names of the connected, and has seen his sense of deliberative that the name of the ambiguities total not partial, although they are knowledge and not denials other than what most grammarians say that the name is partial because these ambiguities in terms of pronunciation do not indicate a certain itself, and do not have a definition and partial only during use.

- What Al-Qarafi mentioned, completely intersects and even coincides with what modern science has brought to Western Scientists.

- The issues raised by the pragmatics, many aspects of which were of interest to the ancients, and the ancient Arab heritage contained many of its investigations, but these issues did not receive sufficient attention from contemporary Arab researchers, and instead of establishing sciences derived from our heritage and the depth of our thinking in various fields of knowledge, we went to take from the West directly, thus cutting off from our knowledge.

- Paying attention to heritage does not mean cutting off from the world and rejecting everything that comes from it under the pretext that we have a great heritage, but the shame is all the fault to leave this heritage altogether, and resort to the heritage of others as if we do not have anything in this world of people in this area.

Therefore, we should emphasize that many of the deliberative issues have been addressed in depth beyond in some aspects what Western thinking has reached to today, many of the pragmatic visions we find in the books of language, interpretation, vocabulary, hadith, jurisprudence and other sciences because these

scholars dealt with the text in the light of contextual and did not limit the meaning to the literal significance of the words as they did not overlook the basic purposes and purposes of speech because the proper understanding of the Holy Quran and the hadith of the Prophet is based mainly to evoke all the linguistic and contextual components of discourse in the process of interpretation, and for this, they stipulated conditions in the interpreter that are rarely available to very few people.

List of sources and references:

1-Mahmoud Ahmed Nahle, New Horizons in Contemporary Linguistic Research, Alexandria, Egypt: Dar Al-Maarifa Al-Jamia, 1st Edition, 2002, p. 09.

2- Mahmoud Ahmed Nahle, New Horizons in Contemporary Linguistic Research, Alexandria, Egypt: Dar Al-Maarifa Al-Jamia, 1st Edition, 2002, p. 12

3- Ali Mahmoud Hajji.(2010) Accomplished Verbs in the Contemporary Arabic Language, Cairo, Egypt: Library of Arts, p. 4

4-Sahraoui, Massoud. (2005) Pragmatics among Arab Scholars, Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Tali'a for Printing, p. 16

5-Nahle, Mahmoud Ahmed, New Horizons in Contemporary Linguistic Research, previous reference, p. 14

6- Lisan Al Arab, Ibn Manzur, Dar Sader Beirut, 1st Edition, 1997, Material شور , vol. 3, p. 431.

7- Ibn Faris - Dictionary of Language Standards - investigated by/ AbdulSalam Muhammad Haroun - Dar Al-Fikr, Beirut, d.I, D .T, 3/262.Material

8-George Yule, Pragmatics, translated by Qusay Al-Atabi, The Arab House of Science, Beirut, 1st edition, 2010 AD, p. 27.

9-Muhammad Abd al-Salam, The Horizons of Deliberativeness in Complete Prose Texts (The Works of Ali Al-Jarim as a Model), Dar Al-Nabigha for Publishing and Distribution, Egypt,
2015, p. 125

10-George Yule, Pragmatics, translated by Qusai Al-Atabi, The Arab House of Science, Beirut, 1st edition, 2010 AD, p. 17.

11-Nahla, Mahmoud Ahmed, New Horizons in Contemporary Linguistic Research, previous reference, p:15.

12-Deif Abdel Moneim Al-Ferjani, The Pragmatics of Sign in Nizar Qabbani, Journal of Arab Studies, Faculty of Dar Al-Ulum, Minia University, Volume 38, Issue 1, July 2018, Page 133-154.

13-Mahmoud Ahmed Nahla, New Horizons in Contemporary Linguistic Research, p.:16

14-Mahmoud Ahmad Nahla, New Horizons in Contemporary Linguistic Research, p. 20

15-Abd al-Hadi al-Shehri, The Strategy of Discourse, Dar al-Kitab al-Jadeed al-Muttahidah, 1st edition, 2004, p. 83.

16-Mahmoud Ahmed Nahla, New Horizons in Research, p. 16.

17-elquader 1

18-elrahmane

19-Surah ص. 32

20-Al-Qarafi, Explanation of the Revision of the Chapters, Dar Al-Fikr, Beirut, Dr. I, Vol. 2004, p.: 36