

**Argumentation in Linguistic Thought: Reconfiguring the Modern and Contemporary
Arabic Scholarly Paradigm**

Fethi Khechaimia

1 Constantine 1 - Frères Mentouri University (Algeria)

fethi.khechaimia@umc.edu.dz (Constantine 1 - Frères Mentouri University)

Received: 18-02-2026

Accepted: 10-04-2026

Published:05-05-2026

ABSTRACT:

Recent developments in linguistic inquiry have ushered in profound methodological and epistemological reconfigurations, prompting a critical reassessment of several foundational concepts. Within this evolving landscape, argumentation has emerged as a central analytical category, no longer confined to its classical rhetorical framing, but reconceptualized as an intrinsically pragmatic-linguistic mechanism that governs the organization of discourse and the orientation of interpretive processes. From this perspective, argumentation operates not merely as a persuasive technique, but as a constitutive dimension of meaning construction, embedded in the inferential architecture of language and discourse.

In contemporary pragmatic theory, argumentation is understood as a system of discursive operations, involving argumentative operators, connectives, and orientation markers that structure the progression of utterances and guide the addressee toward specific interpretive and evaluative outcomes. In this sense, it constitutes a shared theoretical terrain between Arabic and Western linguistic traditions, particularly in relation to discourse analysis, communicative intentionality, and the dynamics of persuasion.

This paper seeks to examine the manifestations of argumentation within modern and contemporary Arabic linguistic thought, with a view to mapping the conceptual frameworks developed by Arab scholars and assessing the ways in which argumentative processes are theorized and operationalized within Arabic discourse. Methodologically, the study adopts a critical-analytical approach, grounded in a close reading of key Arabic contributions, while engaging with influential Western models—most notably those associated with Perelman’s rhetorical argumentation and Ducrot’s theory of argumentation in language—in order to trace patterns of appropriation, transformation, and conceptual negotiation.

The analysis is guided by a set of interrelated questions: How is argumentation conceptualized within Arabic linguistic scholarship? What are the principal argumentative mechanisms—linguistic, rhetorical, and structural—mobilized in discourse analysis? To what extent has Arabic linguistic thought internalized, reworked, or resisted dominant Western paradigms of argumentation? And crucially, has it succeeded in articulating an epistemologically autonomous framework, or does it remain largely inscribed within the horizon of Western theoretical models?

The study argues that argumentation, in its pragmatic articulation, constitutes a pivotal dimension of contemporary Arabic linguistic thought, marking a shift from ornamental rhetoric

toward a functionally grounded, discourse-oriented paradigm in which meaning, persuasion, and interpretation are dynamically intertwined.

Keywords: Argumentation; Pragmatic Argumentation; Discourse Analysis; Arabic Linguistic Thought; Inferential Structure; Persuasion.

ABSTRACT:

Modern linguistic studies have witnessed qualitative methodological transformations that have contributed to reconsidering many fundamental concepts. Among the most prominent is argumentation, which has transcended its rhetorical aesthetic domain to be considered a pragmatic-linguistic mechanism with an effective role in discourse construction, influencing the addressee and directing him. Argumentation is characterized as one of the fundamental topics in modern and contemporary pragmatic studies and one of its prominent techniques that contribute to persuasion and influence, forming a common ground between Arabic linguistic studies and their Western counterparts in the study of discourse analysis strategies and meaning construction.

This research paper aims to highlight the various argumentative conceptions presented by Arab scholars and to monitor the ways in which argumentation has been employed within Arabic linguistic discourse. It begins from an analytical reading of Arabic linguistic production, while invoking some influential Western contributions in order to reveal aspects of interaction between the two references and to show the extent of their contribution to the development of linguistic studies. Accordingly, what is the concept of argumentation in Arabic linguistic studies? What are the main argumentative mechanisms adopted by Arab scholars in discourse analysis? To what extent has Arabic linguistic thought been influenced by Western theories of argumentation? And have Arab scholars contributed to producing an independent conception of argumentation, or have they remained bound to Western linguistic thought?

Keywords: Linguistics, Argumentation, Pragmatics, Arabic Studies, Persuasion.

1- Introduction:

In the context of the openness of Arabic pragmatic studies to modern linguistic concepts, the term argumentation has emerged as one of the central concepts that attracted researchers' attention. However, its circulation has not been uniform in terms of translation or terminology, due to the multiplicity of theoretical references and the variation of epistemological backgrounds upon which scholars relied in transferring and rooting this concept within Arabic linguistics.

Accordingly, this foreign term appears in Arabic pragmatic studies in various translational forms, although they all belong to the semantic field of the trilateral root (ḥ-j-j). Despite this common root, researchers differed in its derivations: some use (al-ḥijāj), some prefer (taḥāj), some use (taḥājaj), others use (muḥāja), and others (muḥājaja)... and so on in different derivational forms.

From this multiplicity, the importance of examining the conceptions presented by Arab scholars regarding argumentation becomes evident, especially in light of their openness to modern Western theories, whether those associated with Perelman's new rhetoric, or those that consider argumentation as an immanent structure in language as in Ducrot's theory. This interaction contributed to reshaping the concept of argumentation within Arabic linguistic studies, where it is no longer limited to debate and rhetoric, but has become an analytical framework in which linguistic and pragmatic dimensions intersect, and is viewed as a fundamental component in discourse functioning.

Based on this, this research seeks to explore the manifestations of argumentation in modern and contemporary Arabic linguistic thought, through an analytical reading of Arabic production, and by identifying how argumentation is employed within discourse, while uncovering its main mechanisms and the extent of their interaction with different pragmatic contexts. The research also raises questions such as: What is the concept of argumentation in Arabic linguistic studies? What are its main mechanisms in discourse? To what extent has Arabic linguistic thought been influenced by Western theories of argumentation? And have Arab scholars contributed to building an independent conception of this concept, or has Arabic argumentative studies remained bound to Western argumentative theory?

2- Argumentation in Linguistic Thought (Origin and Development):

Argumentation represents an expressive tool that reveals the depth of human awareness of the power of language and its capacity for influence and persuasion. This led peoples since ancient times to organize discourse and persuade the receiver through multiple strategies such as inference, comparison, argumentation, and persuasion. These practices are considered effective tools that embodied the early emergence of argumentation and paved the way for understanding it as a linguistic and intellectual phenomenon that can today be analyzed within pragmatic studies and modern linguistic methodologies, making it a linguistic bridge connecting heritage with the present in understanding and analyzing discourse.

It is noteworthy that modern pragmatic studies were preceded by many early indications that refer to attempts to organize discourse and persuade the addressee, whether through poetic rhetoric or prophetic and oratorical speeches, so that argumentation became a shared field between Arabic studies and their Western counterparts, which makes its study necessary to understand the mechanisms of interaction between text and receiver and to identify the linguistic and pragmatic dimensions in discourse.

In general, if we examine the historical context in which argumentation entered linguistic thought, we do not find it as an originally established discipline in a direct form. It gradually developed through successive stages linked to the evolution of linguistic studies and their methodological transformations. In its early stages, it remained linked to traditional rhetoric and logic, as they constituted the basic foundation for persuasion and debate, before undergoing a qualitative shift with the emergence of modern linguistics, which reconsidered the nature and

functions of language. With this transformation, argumentation began to acquire new dimensions, moving beyond formal aspects toward being understood as a linguistic and pragmatic mechanism emerging from discourse itself, giving speech acts an argumentative dimension connected to the pragmatic situation.

This orientation was reinforced with the emergence of modern linguistic theories, particularly within pragmatics, where argumentation was reconnected to communicative context and the relationship between speaker and addressee, becoming an active element in meaning construction and orientation. Thus, argumentation shifted from being merely a rhetorical technique or logical tool to a comprehensive analytical approach aimed at explaining how language operates in persuasion and influence, making it one of the central axes of contemporary linguistic studies.

Argumentation is also characterized as one of the essential topics in pragmatics and one of its prominent linguistic techniques, where it appears as a discursive strategy that goes beyond informative function to an affective and persuasive dimension. This made argumentation a common field between Arabic and Western studies, despite differences in methodological foundations and historical conditions of emergence.

In Western tradition, discussion of argumentation began in antiquity with the Sophists, then Plato and Aristotle, where emphasis was placed on dialectics, logic, and rhetoric as foundations of persuasion. Later, in the twentieth century, argumentation developed into a linguistic theory through the Belgian and French schools, represented by prominent scholars such as Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca in *The New Rhetoric* and *Treatise on Argumentation* (1958), Michel Meyer, and Oswald Ducrot (1973). These scholars contributed to reformulating argumentation as an integrated pragmatic-linguistic theory capable of analyzing discourse in multiple contexts.

In Arabic linguistic heritage, argumentation received attention from major scholars such as Al-Jahiz, Ishaq ibn Wahb, Abu Hilal al-Askari, Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani, Al-Sakkaki, and Hazin al-Qartajanni, who laid early foundations of argumentation within theology, rhetoric, and discourse.

Argumentation, therefore, extends across multiple interdisciplinary fields, including philosophy, logic, law, linguistics, psychology, and discourse studies, making it a complex and multifaceted concept with diverse meanings and uses.

3- Importance of Argumentation in Pragmatic Linguistics:

In modern pragmatics, argumentation (Argumentation) is an important tool in discourse analysis due to its relation to speech acts and conversational implicature. It is a linguistic and logical mechanism through which the speaker uses argumentative tools, linguistic indicators, and logical connectors to persuade the receiver, taking into account context, situation, and presuppositions.

Argumentation plays a central role in interaction between speaker and receiver, helping to resolve communicative obstacles and ensuring discourse acceptance, thereby enabling effective communication.

4- The Reality of Translating the Term Argumentation:

Returning to the methodology of translating the foreign term (Argumentation) into Arabic, we find that Arabic linguistic studies have produced a problematic situation characterized by multiplicity and dispersion. Researchers faced major difficulties reflected in the diversity of translations and terminological variation.

Arabic equivalents include: al-ḥijāj, taḥājaj, taḥāj, muḥāja, muḥājaja, etc., reflecting the absence of a unified terminological strategy. However, many researchers adopted *al-ḥijāj* as the most appropriate equivalent, which made it widely used in Arabic linguistic studies.

Sabir Al-Habbasha is among the scholars who adopted the term *al-ḥijāj* in his book *Pragmatics and Argumentation*, where he highlighted terminological confusion in Arabic research, noting that the terminological system suffers from ambiguity and inconsistency due to individual scholarly efforts and translation limitations.

5- Manifestations of Argumentation in Modern and Contemporary Arabic Linguistic Studies:

5.1 Linguistic Argumentation in Abu Bakr Al-Azzawi:

Abu Bakr Al-Azzawi is among the most prominent Arab scholars who contributed to consolidating argumentative studies in Arabic linguistics. He worked on reconstructing the concept of argumentation within the Arabic context, drawing on modern linguistic achievements.

His work is characterized by linking argumentation to linguistic analysis and making it a central tool for understanding discourse mechanisms and persuasion. He engaged with Western linguistic theories while preserving Arabic specificity, producing a balanced theoretical vision.

His works include: *Language and Argumentation* (2006), *Discourse and Argumentation* (2007), *Dialogue on Argumentation* (2010), *From Logic to Argumentation* (2016), *Argumentation between Theory and Practice* (2020), as well as his translation of Oswald Ducrot's *Argumentative Scales* (2020).

He also addressed argumentation in several articles such as: *Towards an Argumentative Approach to Metaphor* (1991), *Argumentation and Poetry* (1992), and *Argumentation and Argumentative Meaning* (2006).

His works aim at establishing argumentative studies within Arabic linguistics by moving beyond mere translation toward conceptual reconstruction within Arabic intellectual context.

5.1.1 The Theory of Linguistic Argumentation in Al-Azzawi and Oswald Ducrot:

Perhaps the most prominent feature of Abou Bakr Al-Azzawi's approach to argumentation is his clear reliance on the theoretical conceptions developed by Oswald Ducrot, which he adopts as a starting point for rebuilding the concept of argumentation within Arabic linguistic studies. This is particularly evident in his adoption of Ducrot's distinction between argumentation and inference, specifically in his famous statement: « Both inference and argumentation belong to two completely different systems; a system we usually call: "logic", and a system we call: "discourse" »(1). In this view, the former is considered a discursive activity linked to the context of communication and its objectives, while the latter remains within the framework of formal logical system. This orientation enabled Al-Azzawi to move beyond the traditional understanding of argumentation, shifting it toward a pragmatic horizon that makes language an effective tool for influence and persuasion.

Al-Azzawi starts from the conviction that language is a space where intentions and effects intersect, where meanings are formed according to precise argumentative paths. Hence, his works aim to explore these paths within the structure of language itself, drawing on the modern linguistic conceptions of his teacher Oswald Ducrot, while carefully reformulating them in a way that aligns with the nature of Arabic linguistic studies. Thus, in his project, argumentation transforms from a theoretical concept into an analytical tool capable of penetrating the depth of discourse and revealing its mechanisms of persuasion and influence.

On this basis, Abou Bakr Al-Azzawi's view of argumentation relies on the theoretical foundations established by the French linguist Oswald Ducrot, especially those related to reconsidering the nature of language and its function within discourse. Argumentation, in this framework, is understood as an intrinsic component embedded in its structure. From this perspective, Al-Azzawi draws on Ducrot's conception, within which the argumentative theory revolves, where he says: « This theory, whose foundations were laid by the French linguist Oswald Ducrot (O. Ducrot) since 1973, is a linguistic theory concerned with linguistic means and the possibilities of natural languages available to the speaker, in order to orient his discourse in a certain direction, enabling him to achieve certain argumentative goals. It also starts from the common idea that: "we generally speak in order to influence". This theory seeks to show that language inherently and essentially (intrinsically) carries an argumentative function. In other words, there are many indicators of this function within the structure of utterances themselves »(2).

This conception highlights a qualitative shift in the understanding of argumentation, such that it becomes an inherent property of language itself, manifested in the simplest forms of expression. According to this view, utterances do not merely transmit meanings; rather, they guide the receiver, seek to persuade them, and push them to engage and participate in the communicative process, shaping their interpretative paths through precise linguistic indicators. Thus, argumentation becomes an integral part of discourse structure, and a fundamental element

in explaining how language operates to achieve influence and persuasion within various communicative contexts.

The concept of argumentation in Abou Bakr Al-Azzawi's work falls within a conscious attempt to redefine its conceptual boundaries, by distinguishing it from adjacent concepts that may overlap with it, particularly demonstration and logical inference. For him, understanding argumentation can only be achieved by highlighting its specificity within natural discourse, and revealing its nature, which goes beyond logical rigor toward a pragmatic communicative horizon. This is evident in his statement: « in order to have a clear idea about the concept of "argumentation" (Argumentation), it should be compared to the concept of demonstration (Démonstration) or logical inference. Natural discourse is not a demonstrative discourse in the strict sense of the term; it does not provide proofs and logical evidence, nor does it rely on the principles of logical reasoning. The term "argumentation" does not mean proving the truth of a statement or demonstrating the validity (Valide) of a reasoning from a logical point of view »(3).

This conception reveals a fundamental shift in the understanding of argumentation, moving it beyond its logical and inferential dimension toward a discursive practice based on persuasion and influence within a specific communicative context. Argumentation, in this sense, does not aim at certainty as much as it seeks to guide the receiver and construct their convictions through various linguistic means, which reinforces its pragmatic nature and confirms its independence from the formal logical system.

Abou Bakr Al-Azzawi does not treat linguistic argumentation as a simple extension of known forms of argumentation; rather, he places it in a distinguished position that makes it more complex and expansive, due to its direct connection with the structure of natural language at its various levels. From this perspective, his conception expands the scope of argumentation to include almost all linguistic phenomena. For him, linguistic argumentation is far more difficult than other types of argumentation, and more precise and detailed: « it is more difficult than rhetorical argumentation of Chaim Perelman, logical argumentation of Jean Blézy Grize or other logicians, or the pragmatic dialectical argumentation of Van Eemeren. Linguistic argumentation is linked to natural language and is found in all linguistic phenomena: morphological, lexical, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic phenomena; it is found in semantic and logical relations; it is found in particles, adverbs, tools, connectors, expressions and forms; it is found in rhetorical and figurative phenomena such as metaphor, metonymy, exemplification, comparison, and analogy; it is found in utterances, sentences, texts, and discourses of all kinds; it is found in ordinary speech and everyday language. In short, it is found in everything. It is broader and more comprehensive than rhetorical argumentation, logical argumentation, and pragmatic dialectical argumentation. Rhetorical argumentation is only a partial field, whereas linguistic argumentation »(4).

There is no doubt that this reflects Al-Azzawi's deep understanding of the concept of argumentation, which led him to present a comprehensive conception of linguistic argumentation. Thus, he reinforces the idea that linguistic argumentation is broader than other types of argumentation, because it stems from language itself and accompanies it in all its uses, making it a fundamental entry point for understanding how meaning is formed and directed within discourse, as a multifaceted concept shared by several fields. Moreover, Al-Azzawi was able to develop a comprehensive conception of linguistic argumentation by comparing it with various contexts in which argumentation appears, where he says: « The theory of argumentation in language is in opposition to many classical argumentative theories and conceptions that consider argumentation as belonging to classical rhetoric (Aristotle) or modern rhetoric (Perelman, Olbrechts-Tyteca, Michel Meyer...) or to natural logic (Jean-Blaise Grize...) »(5).

It also seems that Abou Bakr Al-Azzawi's ideas intersect with Oswald Ducrot's theses in several other positions, especially in the call to reconsider traditional rhetoric and transcend its classical limits. However, this intersection does not amount to a complete rupture, as Al-Azzawi adopts a more balanced position, since he does not seek to abolish rhetorical heritage but rather to reread it in light of modern argumentative conceptions. He thus moves toward constructing a reconciliatory vision that connects linguistic argumentative theory with rhetorical and critical issues in the Arabic tradition, allowing this heritage to be integrated into a new pragmatic horizon without losing its specificity. This orientation reveals a methodological awareness seeking to achieve a form of epistemological continuity between the old and the modern, rather than adopting a logic of rupture, which gives his argumentative project a distinctive character combining foundation and openness at once.

5-1-2- Pragmatic argumentation in Al-Azzawi:

Pragmatic argumentation in Abou Bakr Al-Azzawi is based on a conception that makes language a communicative space where intentions and contexts intersect, where discourse cannot be understood independently of its conditions of production and reception. Argumentation thus becomes a pragmatic practice embedded in a specific communicative context, through which the speaker seeks to guide the receiver, influence their attitudes, and construct their convictions. Therefore, Al-Azzawi, like other researchers, emphasizes « the importance of argumentation in contemporary pragmatic theories, and its role in the logical and linguistic analysis of discourse, as well as the interrelation between grammar, rhetoric, and pragmatics, considering that the modern cognitive revolution in linguistic sciences has eliminated the traditional boundaries between these fields, so that grammar has acquired a pragmatic dimension, while semantic studies have expanded, and linguistic and logical fields have become deeply intertwined »(6).

This led him to consider argumentation as « based on the structure of linguistic utterances, their sequencing and functioning within discourse »(7). From this perspective, Al-Azzawi links argumentation to speech act theory, which focuses on the speaker, the addressee, and the

surrounding contextual conditions, where these elements combine to produce a directed meaning capable of influencing the receiver, as essential determinants for understanding how argumentative mechanisms operate. This conception also highlights his interest in the relationships between utterances within discourse, where meanings are formed through an organized argumentative sequence in which linguistic connectors and pragmatic indicators contribute to guiding interpretation. Thus, pragmatic argumentation in Al-Azzawi becomes an effective tool for discourse analysis, revealing the interplay between linguistic and pragmatic dimensions, and showing how language becomes a means of persuasion and influence within various communicative contexts.

In another context, he says: « The theory of argumentation in language emerged from within the theory of speech acts founded by Austin and Searle. Ducrot particularly developed Austin's ideas and proposed, in this framework, the addition of two speech acts: the act of presupposition and the act of argumentation. Since Austin and Searle's speech act theory faced many difficulties (such as the insufficiency of proposed classifications of speech acts), Ducrot redefined the concept of illocution while maintaining the conventional nature of language. He defines it as a speech act aimed at producing transformations of a legal nature, i.e., a set of rights and obligations. The argumentative act imposes on the addressee a certain type of outcome as the only possible direction the dialogue can take. The argumentative value of an utterance is a kind of constraint concerning how discourse should proceed and develop »(8).

Based on Al-Azzawi's view, argumentative theory emerges from the roots of Austin and Searle's speech act theory, but Ducrot significantly developed these ideas by adding two new acts: the presupposition act and the argumentative act. This expansion allows pragmatic linguistic theory to study argumentation within language more clearly and flexibly, on the basis that argumentation is a linguistic phenomenon emerging from these acts and organizing discourse progression. For Al-Azzawi, argumentation is nothing but the presentation of arguments and evidence leading to a specific conclusion. It « consists in performing inferential sequences within discourse. In other words, argumentation consists in producing sequences of utterances, some of which function as linguistic arguments, while others function as conclusions derived from them. The fact that language has an argumentative function means that discursive sequences are also and essentially determined by the structure of these utterances themselves and by the linguistic material employed »(9).

Thus, Al-Azzawi presents a coherent conception of pragmatic argumentation, where it is seen as an organized linguistic mechanism that produces influence and persuasion within discourse, and confirms the close relationship between linguistic structure and argumentative sequencing of utterances.

Based on the above, it can be said that the theory of argumentation through the works of Abou Bakr Al-Azzawi has gained significant value and will remain an important reference for all those interested in linguistic argumentation. Ducrot's argumentative theory also represents

another stage in the development of speech act theory, and in pragmatic studies in general. This theory deserves further discussion and research to understand the qualitative leap achieved by researchers through the study of linguistic argumentation from a pragmatic linguistic perspective.

The argumentative structure within poetic text, and its relation to its persuasive and pragmatic functions.

5-2- Argumentative structure in Arabic poetry and its persuasive and pragmatic functions according to Samia Dredidi:

The presence of argumentation in contemporary Arabic linguistic studies is evident through the contributions of Samia Dredidi, particularly in her study entitled: (Argumentation in Arabic Poetry, its Structure and Methods), where she sought to explore the argumentative structure within poetic text and link it to its persuasive and pragmatic functions. She focused in her approach on two main issues closely related to the receiver and their role in the argumentative process.

The first issue concerns the nature and characteristics of argumentation, where she highlighted dialogicity as a fundamental feature of argumentative text. Argumentation is essentially an implicit or explicit dialogue with the receiver, based on an interactive relationship between the text producer and its recipient, « a relationship that undoubtedly takes many forms revealed by discourse itself, which often aims to convince the largest possible number of receivers, and may even aspire to convince what is called the universal receiver »(10).

The second issue concerns the relationship between the speaker and the receiver within argumentative discourse, where she argues that this discourse, while presenting ideas and constructing arguments, may sometimes be precise and rigorous and sometimes lack such qualities. However, its goal remains the same: to influence the receiver and direct them, whether through rational persuasion or through attraction and seduction, and even to the point of compelling them to submit. The effectiveness of argumentative discourse lies in its ability to penetrate the receiver's horizon and change their attitudes and representations, meaning that it « lies in its ability to penetrate and transform the world of the receiver »(11).

Dredidi's approach is characterized by shifting argumentation from its traditional domain to poetic discourse, by revealing its dialogic dimensions and persuasive strategies within the text, which confirms that poetry is also an argumentative space based on complex linguistic and pragmatic interaction. It also highlights the importance of speech acts in this context, as tools contributing to influence and revealing the argumentative dimension embedded in poetic discourse structure.

5-3- Pragmatic mechanisms of argumentative analysis in speeches according to Bassem Khairy Khudair:

Bassem Khayri Khudair is among the researchers who focused on defining the concept of argumentation and regulating its theoretical dimensions, while taking into account its philosophical, rhetorical, and pragmatic backgrounds. Through his study: (Argumentation and Discourse Orientation: Its Concept, Fields, and Applications in the Sermons of Ibn Nabata), he sought to define the concept of argumentation from its various aspects and to identify its philosophical, rhetorical, and pragmatic mechanisms. Khayri Khudair made pragmatic argumentation a fundamental element in his research and dedicated a full applied chapter to it entitled: (The Pragmatic Mechanisms of Argumentative Analysis in the Sermons of Ibn Nabata). He concluded that the roles of pragmatic argumentative mechanisms varied in Ibn Nabata's sermons, « so that speech acts had a clear role in directing discourse, especially in the implied meaning of utterances which corresponded with the explicit meaning to orient discourse toward influencing the receiver. Conversational implicature also played a major role, especially in the shift from literal meanings to other implied meanings derived from the analysis of the contextual situation of different speeches »(12).

The researcher concluded that argumentation in these sermons is realized only through a diversity of pragmatic means that contribute to directing meaning and producing effect on the receiver. His findings show that speech acts play a prominent role in guiding discourse, especially in what goes beyond the explicit utterance to the implicit meaning, allowing for the intensification and direction of meaning toward persuasion. Conversational implicature also appears in transferring meanings from their literal level to implicit significations derived from context, which reinforces the argumentative dimension of discourse. Thus, Khudair confirms that the effectiveness of pragmatic argumentation lies in its ability to activate both contextual and linguistic elements together, thereby achieving the desired influence on the receiver and revealing the dynamism of discourse.

5-4- Pragmatic argumentation in Abd al-Hadi Ben Dhafari:

Abd al-Hadi Ben Dhafari follows the path of Arab scholars in defining the concept of argumentation and placing it within the pragmatic approach that situates it at the heart of the communicative process. It has thus come to be seen as the primary mechanism employed by the sender within language to achieve specific purposes, thereby embodying various strategies aimed at influencing the receiver and directing their positions. This is because the pragmatic purpose of argumentation is « to achieve persuasion; therefore, the definition provided by Perelman and his collaborator appears more comprehensive, as it combines both the form of argumentation and its goal. They claim that the adherence of minds to what the speaker presents, or increasing such adherence, is the goal of all argumentation; the most effective argument is the one that succeeds in strengthening the degree of adherence in the listener in a way that pushes them to act, either by undertaking an action or refraining from it »(13). In other words, the effective argument is that which strengthens acceptance and leads the receiver to take a practical position, whether by acting or refraining.

Ben Dhafari does not stop at this point in his study; he goes further to establish regulatory principles governing pragmatic argumentation, ensuring the effectiveness and continuity of discourse within the communicative context. Among the most prominent of these principles are (14):

1- Argumentation must take place within the framework of constants such as religious and customary values, as not everything is open to debate or argumentation; many axioms must be respected.

2- The meaning of words must be clearly defined, and the referent of discourse must be specified, in order to avoid problems of interpretation in terms such as: democracy, transparency, and ambiguity.

3- The sender must not fall into contradiction in speech or action, such as claiming to be a member of a human rights committee while using weak arguments, or disrespecting the addressee; otherwise, he contradicts himself in the very act of speaking.

4- The argumentation must conform to what reason accepts; otherwise, the discourse appears false and the argument weak.

5- The presence of shared knowledge between the two parties of discourse, which enables the receiver to accept or discuss or refute the sender's arguments; otherwise, communication and persuasion break down, as in discourse between a patient and a doctor.

These principles defined by Abd al-Hadi Ben Dhafari are necessary because they form a methodological framework that regulates the argumentative process, ensuring the effectiveness of pragmatic argumentative discourse and achieving effective communication between sender and receiver. They facilitate understanding and strengthen persuasion, making argumentation an effective tool for constructing a coherent discourse capable of influencing the receiver across different contexts.

5-6- The persuasive function of argumentation in Ayman Abu Mustafa and Abdullah Barim:

The persuasive dimension occupies a central position in contemporary argumentative studies. Argumentation is now seen as a pragmatic linguistic activity aimed primarily at influencing the receiver and directing their attitudes through a range of rhetorical means. Several Arab researchers have focused on highlighting this function, emphasizing that argumentation is an effective tool for bringing about change in patterns of thought and behavior. In this context, Ayman Abu Mustafa and Abdullah Barim stand out as scholars who stressed the centrality of persuasion in the argumentative process, seeking to uncover the linguistic and pragmatic mechanisms that make discourse capable of persuading the receiver and favoring one position over another within dialogue and interaction.

Ayman Abu Mustafa uses the term argumentation to mean persuasion, because the goal of argumentation is persuasion. Hence, persuasion becomes the field of argumentative inquiry... The most important argumentative function, after preparing acceptance of the thesis or hypothesis, is the encouragement toward action, « a step that requires a precise awareness of the means and mechanisms capable of moving those concerned with speech toward action and change, in accordance with the context and the aims of the text and the aspirations of the speaker (whether thinker, speaker, or writer) as someone who holds a specific vision that he seeks to establish or make prevail over other opposing arguments »(15).

In general, Dr. Ayman Abu Mustafa offers a clear and precise conception through which he seeks to define the intended goal of argumentation, focusing on its scientific dimension of persuasion. He sees the speaker as primarily a thinker who holds a specific vision that he attempts to establish and convince the receiver of. He also emphasizes the importance of a set of means and mechanisms capable of stimulating action in the receiver and influencing them in accordance with context and the speaker's intentions. Persuasion, in this sense, is a dynamic communicative act aimed at producing real change in reality through language, enabling the speaker to establish his ideas and vision.

Thus, argumentation, in this view, is based on the construction of rhetorical strategies in which linguistic, contextual, and intentional elements are integrated, allowing for the achievement of the desired effect and making persuasion a fundamental goal that determines the value and effectiveness of discourse within communicative practice.

In contrast, anyone who reads Abdullah Barim's book (Pragmatics and Poetry: A Reading of Praise Poetry in the Abbasid Era) clearly notices the presence of the term argumentation as a central concept in his analysis, where he views it as a pragmatic mechanism based on achieving persuasion and influence within poetic discourse. He defines it by saying: « argumentation is the exertion of effort for the purpose of persuasion; it is a set of discourse techniques aimed at attracting receivers to the issues presented to them or increasing the degree of that attraction. It is also based on interaction and disagreement of opinion, and remains open to discussion and evaluation, and appears in all types of discourse that tend toward influence without certainty or obligation »(16).

This statement confirms an understanding of argumentation as a discursive practice based on interaction and dialogue on the one hand, and aimed at achieving influence on the other, without claiming logical certainty or strict obligation. This confirms its close connection to the pragmatic domain, which takes context into account and gives the receiver a fundamental role in constructing meaning and directing the course of discourse to achieve persuasive effect.

5-7- Conversational argumentation in Muhammad Yattawi:

Conversational argumentation has received increasing attention in contemporary Arabic linguistics due to its potential in analyzing discourse and understanding mechanisms of

influence and interaction between participants in communication. Muhammad Yattawi is among the researchers who paid special attention to this orientation, considering argumentation as « one of the most prominent linguistic and discursive topics that attract the attention of Arab researchers and students in the present era, especially those concerned with the pragmatic and conversational dimensions of language »(17).

According to Muhammad Yattawi, argumentation is simply a conversational process through which a set of arguments is exchanged between speaker and receiver with the aim of persuading each other, within a framework of pragmatic mechanisms that facilitate understanding and persuasion.

It is clear that argumentation can only be a conversational process based on interaction and exchange of arguments between speaker and receiver, aiming at persuasion or modification of attitudes within a specific communicative context. Argumentation, in this sense, cannot occur independently of various pragmatic mechanisms that organize discourse and facilitate its understanding, allowing meaning to be directed and its persuasive effect to be constructed in the receiver's mind. This confirms the dialogical nature of argumentation and its connection to communicative action based on exchange and response.

5-8- Communicative argumentation in Muhammad Salih Nahi Al-Ghamdi:

Communicative argumentation is based on viewing argumentation as a linguistic activity that goes beyond the mere presentation of arguments to become a complete communicative pragmatic process through which meanings are exchanged and influence is constructed between discourse participants. In this context, Muhammad Salih Nahi Al-Ghamdi is among the researchers who emphasized the link between argumentation and communicative action, as is clearly evident in his introduction to Philippe Breton's and Gilles Gauthier's book (History of Argumentation Theories), which he translated into Arabic, where he states: « argumentation is a very ancient science linked to many fields, made possible by its nature; it has been associated with logic, rhetoric, and dialectic »(18).

In another passage, Al-Ghamdi emphasizes that interest in argumentation develops only within a broader framework, which is communication: « where interest in argument emerges from interest in the message, its transmission, delivery, and exchange. Argument has always been considered a content or form of communicative content, whether explicitly stated or not »(19).

Al-Ghamdi presents argumentation as a communicative concept concerned with transmitting and exchanging messages, ideas, and experiences between discourse participants in order to convey a specific meaning. It is thus a non-isolated discursive technique based on a communicative process concerned with how messages, ideas, and experiences are transmitted and exchanged, enabling both understanding and influence, with focus placed on the argument that governs and manages communication, whether explicit or implicit in dialogue between speaker and addressee.

5-9- Argumentation as collective participation and pragmatic debate in Ahmed Abdel Hamid:

For Ahmed Abdel Hamid, argumentation is not merely an individual practice, « but a social participation in a communicative process between individuals or groups exchanging ideas in order to resolve differences of opinion »(20), so that they may introduce the social dimension into pragmatic argumentative inquiry by distinguishing between the different roles played by participants during interaction within argumentative exchange of views. « This is also achieved by considering speech acts performed in this exchange as parts of a dialogue (even if sometimes implicit), and the roles performed in dialogue are linked to the positions each party has adopted regarding disagreement in the communicative process. Both participants are expected to commit to their speech acts and their propositional content »(21).

Ahmed Abdel Hamid emphasizes that argumentation requires more than one party for successful communication, whether between individuals or groups. The exchange of arguments facilitates reaching agreement and resolving disputes that hinder communication. Argumentation also includes social dimensions through which participants commit to their speech acts and their content in accordance with the context in which events occur.

In another context, he explains that benefiting from pragmatics in the research program of pragmatic debate is not limited to identifying speech acts used in the ideal model of critical discussion, « but extends to conceiving argumentation itself as a complex speech act belonging to the category of assertive acts, even if it is expressed in a textual scope exceeding a single sentence, which explains its complexity. Certain conditions of satisfaction must be met for the speaker to achieve his illocutionary (communicative) and perlocutionary (interactive) goals »(22).

This perspective offers a new understanding of argumentation through pragmatics, where emphasis is not only on the illocutionary and perlocutionary aspects of speech acts in debate, but also on considering arguments as complex speech acts composed of argumentative acts that allow the receiver to evaluate the strength of the argument based on the type of speech act and its effect.

5-10- Argumentative interpretation in Muhammad Walid Salem Al-Amin:

Some contemporary Arab scholars tend to expand the scope of argumentation beyond direct discourse to include interpretive processes that contribute to the production and orientation of meaning within texts, especially those characterized by ambiguity and semantic openness. In this context, Muhammad Walid Salem Al-Amin is among the researchers who sought to link argumentation and interpretation, based on the awareness that understanding a text cannot be separated from the mechanisms of persuasion that govern meaning construction and the weighting of its interpretations. This is evident in his statement: « since "argumentation" is the most important contemporary rhetorical concept, we have sought to study one of its

manifestations through another concept, namely "interpretation", given that some scholars exclude the argumentative aspects of interpretation, symbolism, and metaphor »(23), and because « argumentation only occurs in matters that raise doubt and require intellectual effort to clarify and uncover ambiguity »(24).

From this perspective, interpretation becomes a field in which the effectiveness of argumentation is manifested, where cognitive and inferential efforts intersect to interpret the semantic possibilities of the text, highlighting the role played by argumentative strategies in guiding understanding and supporting reading. In this view, interpretation becomes an argumentative practice based on a set of clues and mechanisms that help remove ambiguity and prioritize one meaning over another within the discursive context.

5-11- Argumentation and integrated pragmatics in Shukri Mabkhout:

The concept of integrated pragmatics is considered one of the most prominent approaches that contributed to reconsidering the relationship between language and argumentation, as it made argumentation an internal component deeply rooted in its semantic structure. In this context, Shukri Mabkhout stands out among scholars who sought to highlight the linguistic nature of argumentation by linking it to linguistic structure itself, in a way that makes utterances directed from the moment of their production toward achieving a specific argumentative goal. He says in his article entitled *Argumentation Theories in Language*, published in Hammadi Samoud's book (*The Most Important Argumentation Theories in Western Tradition from Aristotle to Today*): « The subject of argumentation in language is to show what the utterance contains of argumentative force that represents an essential component inseparable from its meaning, making the speaker, at the moment of speaking, direct his utterance toward a certain argumentative orientation »(25).

Shukri Mabkhout also provides applied examples related to the position of argumentation within integrated pragmatics, saying: « Argumentation is when the speaker presents an utterance (p1) (or a set of utterances) directed toward making the addressee accept another utterance (p2) (or a set of other utterances), whether (p2) is explicit or implicit. This compelling of acceptance of (p2) as a result of argument (p1) is called the act of arguing. Argumentation is therefore a semantic relation linking utterances in discourse, resulting from the act of arguing; but this act is governed by linguistic constraints, so certain conditions must be fulfilled in the argument (p1) for it to lead to (p2). Therefore, argumentation is inscribed in the structure of language itself and is not related to the informational content of utterances nor to rhetorical or contextual data; discourse is both the means and the end of argumentation »

Shukri Mabkhout thus presents another concept of argumentation focusing on the relationship linking utterances within discourse, making argumentation a communicative act and a powerful analytical tool that helps the speaker persuade the addressee and lead them to accept an idea, by supporting one argument with another. He emphasizes that argumentation cannot be merely informational content or rhetoric dependent on context; rather, it is inscribed in the very

structure of language itself. Language is the means of argumentation, possessing the components and tools to present convincing arguments and ensure communication. Argumentation thus begins in language and ends in it.

There is no doubt that argumentation plays a major role in the analysis of literary discourse, through a set of mechanisms it provides that greatly assist in understanding and uncovering implicit meanings in narratives. It also intervenes in constructing dialogue between characters and binding each character to the rules of this dialogue, as well as using implicature techniques to create new meanings and direct sense. For argumentative orientation to succeed, utterances must be used intentionally to guide the reader toward the conclusions and purposes the arguer seeks to achieve. Argumentation thus has great importance in revealing how utterances are employed to influence the receiver and thereby convince him of the speaker's viewpoint and intentions.

5-12- Argumentation and pragmatic competence in Rafea Bint Muwafaq Al-Dosari:

Contemporary pragmatic research tends to highlight the close relationship between argumentation and pragmatic competence, as both are complementary elements in constructing discourse and achieving communicative effectiveness. Argumentation is linked to the speaker's ability to employ language according to contextual requirements and to take into account the characteristics of the receiver, ensuring the orientation of discourse toward its persuasive goals. This issue is addressed by researcher Rafea Bint Muwafaq Al-Dosari in her study entitled (*Argumentation in King Faisal's Political Speeches: A Pragmatic Approach*), where she examined argumentation in relation to pragmatic competence through the analysis of political discourse as a fertile field where strategies of influence and persuasion are manifested. In this regard, she says: « Our study of political discourse is based on considering it a symbolic communicative means with argumentative functions aiming to achieve a goal ensured by the speaker's speech, relying on his conception of the issue, his understanding of the receiver, and his awareness of contextual requirements. The real value of studying argumentation in political discourse in this research goes beyond reading political discourse through modern theories to decoding its complexities, exploring its depths, revealing its contents, and identifying its main issues that constitute the core of argumentation »(26).

The researcher starts from the idea that political discourse is a communicative practice based on employing linguistic resources to achieve specific argumentative goals, where contextual elements, speaker intentions, and receiver representations interact to form a discursive structure capable of producing persuasive effect. Thus, pragmatic competence becomes a decisive factor in the success of argumentative activity, as it ensures control over the relationship between discourse participants and guides meaning in accordance with contextual demands.

In general, argumentation in her view is associated with pragmatic competence, such that « pragmatic competence remains the guarantor of the success of the argumentative process; the effectiveness of discourse does not lie in the structure of the text alone, but in the force that

contributed to its formation, as discourse participants share in producing and receiving argumentation through their respective competencies »(27).

At the end of her study, the researcher concluded that political discourse—despite its multiple sources and structures—remains a discourse that, in its entirety, is governed by argumentative duality standards represented in internal and external levels of discourse, which are responsible for revealing argumentative effectiveness, « which enables discourse to enter the mind of the receiver »(28).

5-13- Pragmatic and rhetorical stylistics of argumentation in the work of Muthanna Kazem Sadiq:

Pragmatic and rhetorical stylistics of argumentation is considered one of the important approaches for understanding how language operates within discourse and how it influences the receiver. Muthanna Kazem Sadiq addressed this issue in a detailed study entitled (*Pragmatic and Rhetorical Stylistics of Argumentation – Theory and Application on Meccan Surahs*), in which he provided a comprehensive summary of pragmatic argumentative structures in texts and explained their mechanisms within discourse. He says: « This chapter deals with pragmatic argumentation that presents linguistic concepts revolving around the pragmatic structure of text, especially in a corpus rich in argumentative styles that are interrelated argumentatively. Through the relationships of these stylistic structures and their functions in their context, the chapter focuses on argumentative links and the meanings they carry within pragmatics, as they connect premises with conclusions according to the context. It also includes argumentative factors that link pragmatic argumentation to the structure of a single utterance, giving it its assumed argumentative identity and revealing it through its role in discourse coherence. As for argumentative scales, they start from weak to strong arguments to reach a conclusion, provided that the arguments belong to a single argumentative category and are hierarchically related. The chapter also addresses speech acts, which reveal the depth of the relationship between discourse participants within the context of situation and show how psychological or behavioral effects are produced in the receiver, since speech is closely related to action. It concludes with repetition, not as a phonetic phenomenon, but as a pragmatic argumentative phenomenon due to its role in drawing the receiver’s attention to the meaning or idea conveyed, in order to achieve persuasion and ultimately influence and conviction »(29).

It appears that Muthanna Kazem Sadiq, in his attempt to understand pragmatic argumentation from its various dimensions, establishes fundamental pragmatic conceptions that are intrinsic to argumentative text, embodied in the following elements: (argumentative connectors, argumentative scales, speech acts, repetition), all of which aim to achieve influence and persuasion. These elements attempt to answer the question concerning the sender’s knowledge of the receiver and the impact of discourse on him, through the use of argumentative techniques that constitute the core concepts of pragmatics. These techniques, according to argumentative theory, deal with presenting a controversial issue on which disagreement exists, which the

sender tries to convince the receiver of. What the sender seeks to convince the receiver of represents a point of view on a given topic; thus, sentence structure is determined and shaped in relation to context and situation and their relationship to users, as well as the performative capacity of sentences in communication and interaction.

6- Conclusion:

This study concludes that argumentation in modern and contemporary Arabic linguistic thought has shifted from a rhetorical tool to an integrated linguistic and pragmatic mechanism that plays a fundamental role in constructing discourse and achieving persuasion and influence on the receiver. The results show that this development resulted from openness to Western theories while maintaining the specificity of the Arabic context, which enabled researchers to formulate an independent conception of argumentation combining theoretical grounding and practical application.

The results can be summarized as follows:

- The concept of argumentation evolved from dialectics and rhetoric to become in modern linguistics a linguistic and pragmatic analytical tool.
- Openness to Western contributions helped Arab scholars benefit from the works of Perelman and Ducrot in developing an integrated Arab argumentative theory.
- The importance of pragmatic argumentation lies in linking linguistic structure to communicative context to guide meaning and produce effect.
- The diversity of Arab studies and their focus on the applied dimension contributed to extending argumentation to poetry, sermons, and various texts, through the use of speech acts and conversational implicature.
- Arab studies contributed, to some extent, to the independence of argumentative theory and the construction of an Arab argumentative vision combining grounding and openness to Western experiences.

Footnotes

- 1• Al-Habasha, S. (2008). *Pragmatics and argumentation: Approaches and texts*. Damascus, Syria: Safahat for Studies and Publishing, p. 46.
- 2• Tarous, M. (2005). *The argumentative theory through rhetorical, logical, and linguistic studies*. Casablanca: Dar Al-Thaqafa Publishing and Distribution, p. 06.
- 3• Al-Habasha, S. (2008). *Pragmatics and argumentation: Approaches and texts*, p. 46.
- 4• Ducrot, O. (2020). *Argumentative gradations*. Trans. A. B. Al-Azzawi. Fes: Waraka Bilal Press, p. 25.
- 5• Ibid., p. 9.
- 6• Al-Azzawi, A. B. (2006). Argumentation and argumentative meaning. In H. Al-Naqari (Ed.), *Argumentation: Its nature, fields, and functions* (Vol. 1). Rabat: Faculty of Arts and Humanities Publications, p. 55.
- 7• Al-Azzawi, A. B. (2006). Argumentation and argumentative meaning, p. 55.

- 8• Ducrot, O. (2020). *Argumentative gradations*, trans. A. B. Al-Azzawi, p. 35.
- 9• Al-Azzawi, A. B. (2006). Argumentation and argumentative meaning, p. 55.
- 10• Al-Habasha, S. (2008). *Pragmatics and argumentation: Approaches and texts*, p. 34.
- 11• Al-Azzawi, A. B. (2006). Argumentation and argumentative meaning, p. 57.
- 12• Ibid., p. 56.
- 13• Al-Azzawi, A. B. (2006). Argumentation and argumentative meaning, p. 57.
- 14• Al-Dardi, S. (2011). *Argumentation in Arabic poetry: Its structure and methods*. Irbid, Jordan: Alam Al-Kutub Al-Hadith, p. 28.
- 15• Ibid., p. 31.
- 16• Khudair, B. K. (n.d.). *Argumentation and discourse direction: Its concept, fields, and applications in Ibn Nabata's sermons*. Amman: Al-Safaa Publishing and Distribution, pp. 188–189.
- 17• Al-Shahri, A. B. D. (2004). *Discourse strategies: A pragmatic linguistic approach*. Beirut: Al-Kitab Al-Jadid Al-Muttahida, p. 453.
- 18• Ibid., pp. 465–466.
- 19• Abu Mustafa, A. A. (n.d.). *Argumentation and its rhetorical means in ancient Arabic prose*. Alexandria: Al-Nabigha Publishing and Distribution, pp. 10–11.
- 20• Brem, A. (2014). *Pragmatics and poetry: Reading praise poetry in the Abbasid era*. Amman: Majdalawi Publishing and Distribution, p. 166.
- 21• Yatawi, M. (2018). The origins of argumentative theory among Arabs between practice and theory. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Languages and Literature*, (21), May, p. 133.
- 22• Breton, P., & Gauthier, G. (2011). *History of argumentation theories*. Jeddah: King Abdulaziz University Scientific Publishing Center, p. 09.
- 23• Ibid., p. 13.
- 24• Abd Al-Hamid, A. A. A. (2020). Study of argumentative discourse from a pragmatic dialectical perspective. *Alam Al-Fikr Journal*, (182), April–June, p. 40.
- 25• Abd Al-Hamid, A. A. A. (2020). Study of argumentative discourse..., p. 40.
- 26• Ibid., p. 43.
- 27• Ould Salem Al-Amin, M. (2004). The argumentative nature of interpretation in contemporary rhetoric. *Fadassat Series*, (8), Tripoli: Global Center for Studies and Research of the Green Book, pp. 12–13.
- 28• Ibid., pp. 17–18.
- 30• Amoud, H. (n.d.). *The most important theories of argumentation in Western traditions from Aristotle to today*. Tunis: Faculty of Arts, Manouba, p. 352.

7- References:

- Al-Azzawi, A. B. (2006). Argumentation and argumentative meaning. In H. Al-Naqari (Ed.), *Argumentation: Its nature, fields, and functions* (Vol. 1). Faculty of Arts and Humanities Publications, Rabat: Al-Najah Al-Jadida Press.
- Al-Dardi, S. (2011). *Argumentation in Arabic poetry: Its structure and methods* (2nd ed.). Irbid, Jordan: Alam Al-Kutub Al-Hadith.

- Al-Dosari, R. B. M. (2020). *Argumentation in King Faisal's political speeches: A pragmatic approach*. Riyadh: Prince Saud Al-Faisal Institute for Diplomatic Studies.
- Al-Ghamdi, M. S. N. (Trans.). (2011). *History of argumentation theories*. By P. Breton & G. Gauthier. Jeddah: Scientific Publishing Center, King Abdulaziz University.
- Al-Habasha, S. (2008). *Pragmatics and argumentation: Approaches and texts* (1st ed.). Damascus, Syria: Safahat for Studies and Publishing.
- Al-Shahri, A. B. D. (2004). *Discourse strategies: A pragmatic linguistic approach* (1st ed.). Beirut: Al-Kitab Al-Jadid Al-Muttahida.
- Al-Tarous, M. (2005). *The argumentative theory through rhetorical, logical, and linguistic studies* (1st ed.). Casablanca: Dar Al-Thaqafa Publishing and Distribution.
- Al-Yatawi, M. (2018). The origins of argumentative theory among Arabs between practice and theory. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Languages and Literature*, (21), May.
- Bin Khudair, B. K. (n.d.). *Argumentation and discourse direction: Its concept, fields, and applications in Ibn Nabata's sermons* (1st ed.). Amman: Al-Safaa Publishing and Distribution.
- Ducrot, O. (2020). *Argumentative gradations*. Trans. A. B. Al-Azzawi. Fes: Waraka Bilal Press.
- Ibn Abd Al-Hamid, A. A. A. (2020). Study of argumentative discourse from a pragmatic dialectical perspective. *Alam Al-Fikr Journal*, (182), April.
- Mabkhout, S. (2006). Argumentation in language. In H. Al-Naqari (Ed.), *Argumentation: Its nature, fields, and functions* (Vol. 1). Casablanca: Al-Najah Al-Jadida Press.
- Ould Salem Al-Amin, M. (2004). The argumentative nature of interpretation in contemporary rhetoric. *Fadassat Series*, (8). Tripoli: Global Center for Studies and Research of the Green Book.
- Sadiq, M. K. (2013). *Stylistics of pragmatic and rhetorical argumentation: Theory and application on Meccan surahs* (1st ed.). Cairo: National Translation Center.
- Samoud, H. (n.d.). *The most important theories of argumentation in Western traditions from Aristotle to today*. Manouba, Tunisia: Faculty of Arts.
- Brem, A. (2014). *Pragmatics and poetry: Reading praise poetry in the Abbasid era* (1st ed.). Amman, Jordan: Majdalawi Publishing and Distribution.
- Abu Mustafa, A. A. (n.d.). *Argumentation and its rhetorical means in ancient Arabic prose*. Alexandria: Al-Nabigha Publishing and Distribution.
- Breton, P., & Gauthier, G. (2011). *History of argumentation theories*. Jeddah: Scientific Publishing Center, King Abdulaziz University.