

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

THE EMBEDDED DELIBERATIVE AND REALIGNMENT OF THE COMPASS DIRECTION OF LINGUAL ORBITAL ARGUMENTS

Dr. lect. Eaktiffaa Mutar Shurbak-Gayim

Ministry of Education / The second Rusafa

fatimalameen77@gmail.com

Dr. lect. Eaktiffaa Mutar Shurbak-Gayim, Embedded Deliberative and Realignment of the Compass Direction of Lingual Orbital Arguments-Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17 (07), 17073-17088. ISSN 1567-214x.

Keywords: Embedded Deliberative, semantic set theory.

ABSTRACT

The embedded deliberative, with its levels and analytical mechanisms, is an integrated and interdisciplinary method; therefore, it could be used in the analysis of many texts of influential and persuasive dimensions, with what gives the deliberative trading dealings richness in terms of fruitful procedures and satisfactory results, especially in the heritage texts that have harmonic conceptualism levels, and those that exist on vast areas of speech classes, another thing that distinguishes this theory is that the embedded deliberative opposes the dependence of the literal meaning alone in clarifying the meaning of the words. Therefore, the statement is fulfilled in stating the meanings contained in these texts. Starting from the literal meaning represented by its significance in the speech towards its interpretation in a manner consistent with the position of the speech, and as it serves her argumentative, especially since the analysis of the sayings in the embedded deliberative is based on a set of linguistic data and rhetorical data. Hence the importance of this research: Because it deals with a theory that does not seem limited to one dimension, but rather it branches off, and is still in the process of trimming and modification.

Introduction

The first generation of the deliberative people, especially (Austin) and (Searle) were preoccupied with the theory of speech acts, and before that (Morris) observed the deliberative nature of the signs, while (Grice), in his study of conversational coercion, paved the way for deliberative openness to different fields of knowledge,

towards: artificial intelligence, language programming, and cognitive psychology, it is an openness that entailed changing the compass of attention from verbal actions and indications to argumentative and reasoning, as evidenced by influential theories in deliberative studies, such as the convenience theory, argumentative theory, embedded deliberative, and semantic group theory (Khitam, 2016, p. 116), embedded deliberative theory will be the focus of our travels in this research.

The embedded deliberation means that critical theory that studies the linguistic and literary phenomena in the guise of the argumentative deliberations, focusing on speech acts, exploring Argumentative indicators and markers, and paying attention to the communicative and verbal context, It is not limited to its deep structure, but rather to search for the existing links between the speaker and the recipient, uncover the hidden intentions, processes of influence and affection, and the search for the subjective elements in the discourse, such as pronouns, temporal and spatial ambiguities, insinuation and statement according to the implications of the saying, as well as the laws that control speech, and the difference between its linguistic connotations in its various deliberative contexts, this requires attention to understanding the relationships between speaker and recipient within a specific context.

Embedded Deliberative:

The linguists' views diverged in the deliberative lesson; it was, like the rest of the human sciences, subjected to experiments by research related to it. So the development that deliberativeness brought about was not a one-track development, rather, this development has attracted multiple directions, it proceeds from foundational properties that are consistent in terms of the source, and are consistent with the vision (Al Swenet, 2013, pp. 205-206), some of them argued that deliberativeness is nothing but an independent level of analysis besides structure, significance and sound, from the perspective of others, it is an integrated level of significance, in contrast to these two perceptions, there is a trend that considers deliberativeness a self-based linguistic trend, which has its own issues and discussions, while others deny this and acknowledge their belonging to the cognitive sciences (Khitam, 2016, p.67). The two researchers (Ann Ripoll) and (Jack Mochler) were alone in stating that deliberation has a close relationship with cognitive science. It is a link that leads to a deeper understanding of the deliberative issues, given the assumptions and concepts they borrow, despite what this suggestion implies of excluding deliberativeness from the field of linguistics and appending it to the cognitive sciences (Khitam, 2016, p.74), the focus of their conversation on deliberativeness was reflected in three directions:

1. The classic deliberative: this description was linked by researchers to the theory of speech acts, presented by (Austin) and reviewed by (Searle), this trend has caused a fundamental change, Judgment on the archives is no longer dependent on the standard of truthfulness and lying, as is the case with logicians, philosophers, and rhetoricians, Rather, its orbit is the effect that the verb of saying has on the one addressed, the act of achievement will be successful if the addressee responds and is

convinced of the speaker's intentions. It may be a failure when the speaker is unable to influence the speaker (Khitam, 2016, pp. 72, 91).

2. Embedded deliberative: Search is an independent, deliberative aspects of the structure of language and the significance of the sentence to extract valuable linguistic forms to adjust the terms of deliberative use, that is, it aims to search for the deliberative connotation, not the expert or the descriptive, recorded in the structures of language, and standing at the limits of the conditions for its possible use (Shukri Al-Mabkhout, p. 351), It realizes linguistic actions, and is not a description of the state of things in the universe. This entails that the meaning of the saying is a form of the process of saying, not of the universe (Shukri Al-Mabkhout, p. 354). Her wager is based on the incorporation of deliberative phenomena into the core of the linguistic semantic study, and then the learner must look at the pronouncement, as long as it represents a deliberative given. Being a component that belongs to the system and structure of the language, it is considered a fundamental topic of the deliberative study, and it is not supplemented or superfluous to it (Rashid Al Radi, 2015, p. 36). Its interest is focused on the structures of argumentative, which emanate at the core of the language more than it researches the conditions of veracity of the statements, in addition to its interest in studying the means of persuasion stored in the natural linguistic discourse, It focuses on how a speech is structured, in order to ensure that the addressee shares his opinion, or act according to what he or she desires (Al Swenet, 2013, p. 200), This linguistic project is based on two complementary methodological procedures: They are: review and construction, The first is based on reviewing the linear perspective, by searching for verbal and deliberative data that fall within the language itself, and is reflected in its structural structure, that is, the incorporation of deliberative phenomena into the core of semantic analysis (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, p. 23) and (Khitam, 2016, p. 141), this procedure did not stop at the borders of the uttered only, But surpassed it to the establishment of a deliberative uttered, It refutes the theory of the unity of the speaking self whose orbit is the indirect free mode. As for the second procedure; it is based on constructing the methodological framework for the theory of argumentative in language, this was possible by crystallizing a set of procedural concepts such as discourse laws, and the argumentative stairs, and orbital argumentative (Khitam, 2016, p. 141).

3. Cognitive deliberative: exemplified by the theory of convenience, this was based on an idea whose focus is the concept of productivity or profitability. The human mind seeks to achieve compatibility, which is based on the close connection between the speaker's intentions on the one hand, and the contextual results that the addressee gains after a series of efforts on the other hand (Khitam, 2016, p.73).

Perhaps what interests us here (Embedded deliberative), which dealt with the argumentative deliberative perspective (Tarous, 2005, p.20) and (Ma'an, 2013, p.20), Starting from the tongue in discourse analysis, that is, invoking some of the components of the tongue, by defining its operational functions within it, such as relying on the lexicon and syntax in determining some deliberative characteristics in their structural dimension that each one of them creates in the discourse, especially what is related to the aspects of persuasion and influence in his arguments (Balkhiri Abdul Malik, 2017, p. 119), as the analyzes presented by (Decro) and (Anscomber) of many linguistic phenomena represented an important step towards building the

argumentative basis on a solid deliberative and semantic base, this linguistic project derives its importance from their undertaking to review the relationship between the rhetorical and linguistic components on the one hand, and occupy them with the installation of concepts in this review on the other hand (Khitam, 2016, p. 162), their perception states that most of the uttered ones contain some phenomena whose deliberative value is determined independently of their content, these phenomena are so real that they cannot always be considered marginal. Rather, it relates to signs imprinted in the compositional structure, (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, p. 36), The embeddeddeliberative subject is the connotation drawn from the sentence framed as an abstract unit, It is generated by the linguistic component, taking into account the linguistic rules and the border conditions of the components of the sentence, the significance of the sentence in the framework of this theory is not based on the conditions of truthfulness, the method of imparting what is in it is not based on the principle of composition. Rather, it is based mainly on instructions attached to phrases, not on argumentative or anecdotal evidence. Therefore, the linguistic component had to be supplemented with a rhetorical component that seeks fixed values for the variables that it encapsulates (Al Swenet, 2013, p.199).

The term (embeddeddeliberative) is inspired by the research and writings of the French (Kilioli) who called for the inclusion of deliberativeness in the semantic description, and not just increasing it (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, p. 35). It is deliberative and embedded in connotation, it is concerned with the argumentative properties of the word more than it is in the condition of its validity, and it interacts with levels of discourse and all its components.(Al Swenet, 2013, 212), and if this stabilizes, the embedded deliberative project is only part of the theoretical and applied endeavors in the field of discourse analysis to study its coherence and coherence.(Shukri Al-Mabkhout, p. 360).

In the beginning, this project was not clear-cut. Rather, it was merely scattered works based mostly on capturing some rhetorical evidence indicating that language interacts in one way or another with the deliberative given with its various elements, from the place of communication, its context, the circumstances and conditions of the speakers, then researchers rose to clarify and study it with a degree of expansion and understanding, such as (Benvenist) research on subjectivity in language, the contributions of all other poles of the pronouncements theory, the theory of speech acts, and early studies of (Anscomber) and (Decro) that were part of this preoccupation, It is noted that these works were not united by a unified project and a harmonious perspective, this led to a conflict of visions and confusion in concepts that made their impact remain relatively limited in the linguistic study in the sixties and seventies of the twentieth century. (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, pp. 23-24), and then, in the early eighties, there was a growing focus in the context of embeddeddeliberativeness on those facts that are related to a more personalized deliberative aspect,that is, with a special style of articulation, the matter is related to the facts relating to the argumentative use of language,that is, by a special verbal verb, there is argumentative, the work carried out in the context of this orientation has become, in general, a study of the argumentative aspects of the archives associated with the guidance mechanisms focused on the structure of language. (Rashid Al-Radi,

2015, pp. 41-42), (Al Swenet, 2013, p. 205), because language does not stop only at the limits of description and information's, but rather goes beyond it to bring about the power of influence in the addressee.

The observer in this project notices the extent to which (Decro) has been keen in his various research, whether individually or jointly, to delineate the boundaries of his operation and refine his concepts with a package of procedures, corrections and criticisms, as he refused to accept the foundations from which the communication theory was based, he denied that the intended purpose of a communication activity would be limited to transmitting the news from bath to the recipient. (Khitam, 2016, p. 131), also provided that the linguistic effectiveness in this new perception is not just in the delivery of information, "Rather, it transcends that to embody a pattern of action that contains an intentional content, the achievement of which leads to the establishment of facts in the world, and language and speech are adopted in this achievement." (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, p. 27) thus, it becomes clear that the embedded deliberativeness is the argumentative value of the utterance it is the foundation of speech and not news value.

The research in embedded deliberativeness is mainly based on trying to reduce the excessive resort to deliberative principles, and more reclining on the semantic description of the pronouncements, and the interpretation of some semantic facts (Credibility) as the results for reasons of argumentative. (Jack Mochler & Ann Ripoll, 2010, p. 230), or, as some linguists put it, the incorporation of the syntactic and structural component and the semantic rhetorical component (Jack Mochler and Ann Ripoll, 2010, p. 42) and (Mushtaq Abbas Ma'an, 2013, p. 20); because the bet on the argumentative theory is double, it allows to extract the characteristics of the articulation theory on the one hand, it is dealt with in the context of the embedded deliberative; for argumentative as a whole being argumentative in semantic contents; therefore, the general framework that governs argumentative is the semantic framework, however, what interact inside it is the deliberative elements on verbal terms on the other hand. (Mushtaq Abbas Ma'an, 2013, p. 20, (Bin Issa Azayit, 2010, pp. 2/242), the meanings that are understood from the pronouncements are essentially due to the pronunciation itself, thus, the significance is considered an important investigation in the embedded deliberative. on this, (Decro) and (Anscomber) define the embedded deliberative as: "Semantic theory that focuses on deliberative aspects of meaning" (Bin Issa Azayit, 2010, p. 2/244), (Mushtaq Abbas Ma'an, 2013, p. 20). they see, based on this theory, that deliberative, (That is, the terms of conversational and orthotic use), for the pronouncements are only embedding into the connotation, It is not a final way out, and then reject the classification hierarchy (linear), Which traditional linguistic theories adopt in their approach to the pronouncements, it is divided into successive levels: it begins with the composition, it follows with the connotation and ends with the deliberative, these components are not separate, according to the researchers. every utterance carries, in essence and internally, verbal indications that give it its meaning, and explain its association with this meaning exclusively. each uttered by the expression (Mochler) carries in its image a path to access its connotation, and an evidence for its interpretation. (Patrick Charodu, and Dominic Mangano, 2008, pp. 442-443), (Jacques Mochler and Ann Ripoll, 2010, p.

42), (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, pp. 22-23), (Habasha, 2008, pp. 30-31), and (AbdAl-Latif Adel, 2013, pp. 95-96), for example, when a professor tells his students when he is testing them: «Whoever cheats us is not»(Sahih Muslim, p. 1/99), The embeddeddeliberative acknowledges that this prophetic hadith contains a warning or a prohibition of cheating, without being declared.

The most important central concepts in embedded deliberativeness can be summarized according to a model (Decro) and (Anscomber) with the following (Mohammed Tarous, 2005, pp. 106-107).

A- Most of the linguistic verbs have an argumentative function that appears in the structure of the compositions, and these structures carry indicators that determine their deliberative value, far from the news content.

B- The system of arguments is based on the principle of disparity in degrees of strength and weakness, which makes the argumentative group regular in the argumentative scale.

C- Circulation is incorporated into the semantic description, and works directly on the structural structure, so it is called embedded deliberative.

And in the saying of rhetorical interaction, which is considered one of the most important conceptual data for deliberative and argumentative ones on the one hand, and the embedded deliberative on the other hand, emphasizes embedded deliberative, especially its founder, (Decro). that language is at its origin, was found not only to indicate, but also to guide (Mushtaq Abbas Ma'an, 2013, p. 60) based on that, the basic project of embedded deliberation is building the connotation of an ideal discourse, what is meant by this is: "Formulating the connotation of the discourse on the basis of the linguistic aspects that can be formulated on the basis of the directives and instructions provided by the language structures for the sayer in order for his speech to direct a point."(Shukri Al-Mabkhout, p. 359), As for the fact that this discourse is ideal, it is due to the fact that it is the product of the set of axioms and rules upon which the methods of forming the ideal signification dependwhich is closely related to structuralism, because the connotation is studied on the basis of its independence from reality, the value of the linguistic unit is semantic does not lie in its referral dimension, Rather, in its controversy in the linguistic system, this project can be summarized in the statement of the rules governing the composition of the discourse and its possible interconnections (Al-Mabkhout, p. 360).

Hence the syntactic formulation of the deliberative tasks that are explicitly combined in the phrase:(The structuralism of the ideal discourse), and this requires (Jack Mochelor and Anne Ripoll, 2010, p: 88).

A- The embedded deliberative independence and constructivism as a discipline close to semantics.

B- The manifestation of communication, that is, the discourse, on the level of an abstract structure on the one hand, and at the level of restrictions that govern the succession of units for discourse on the other hand.

The embedded pragmatism is an alternative theoretical framework to the classic semantic treatment, which argued that the linguistic student is able to interpret the pronunciations of the sentences of the language to which he belongs based on his prior knowledge of these sentences, that is, he is able to summon and evoke this knowledge without the need to study the methods of interpreting the pronouncements, or the speeches in general. Within the framework of classical connotations, the utterance associated with specific denominators "Maqamat", is "Prose literary art" described. the withdrawal of this description on the sentence, this description is an absolute indication of these pronouncements (Rashid Al Radi, 2015, p. 36); therefore, according to (Decro), there was an urgent need to abandon the linear model that is unable to monitor some of the deliberative aspects that appear in the compositional component, such as referrals and links, to try to construct a semantic project for the ideal speech, the first building block of this project was to distinguish between two central components: they are: the linguistic component and the rhetorical component. the latter undertakes the function of searching the verbal context for the necessary elements to fill in the empty layers of the meaning of the sentence, the desired goal is manifested in the ability to define the intended meaning from among a number of the mentioned meanings, depending on the internal structure of the pronouncement, and in harmony with the specific verbal context (Khitam, 2016, p. 135); therefore, (Decro) suggested reviewing the linear perspective that printed previous linguistic analyzes. as the separation is made between a synthetic component that focuses on the rules of sentence structure, and a semantic component that helps to control the relationship of the mark with its reference, and a deliberative component concerned with issues of linguistic use, noting that its significance is determined only by the context of speech, for (Decro) also affirms that the argumentative links transmitted in the multiplication of linguistic use encapsulate multiple deliberative features that cannot be overlooked. By limiting the legal content of the pronouncements, or their inferential structure, (Decro), in his various deliberative analyzes, proved the correlation of the linguistic and deliberative components. (Khitam, 2016, pp. 132-133).

Accordingly; the interpretation of a saying, according to the concept (Decro), includes two successive stages: the first stage of the sentence turns towards the connotation, and the second turns from the connotation to the meaning, the circumstances of the speech are only taken into consideration in the second stage. because the first stage is precisely independent of these circumstances, it is clear to us in this place that the embedded deliberativeness is based on canceling the idea of separating the three levels (language, structure, semantics), it supports the idea of embedding the three components in the analysis of a discourse; therefore, the issue of analysis is assigned to multiple textual levels, according to the embedded deliberative reliance on the linkage between a set of linguistic data that relate to the linguistic component, and a group of non-linguistic data that refer to the rhetorical component (Al-Mabkhout, p. 354), the first (linguistic) component rises by addressing the constraints related to lexical units and (Morphemes), which have a structural character, such as linking, deleting, confirming, etc., and their impact morally and semantically. From a purely linguistic angle, as the wholesale meaning is only derived on the basis of restrictions that are referred to, which are closely related to

the components of the sentence itself. while the relational concerns are between the significance and the "Maqam", and the human elements, are within the circles of cognitive processing of the rhetorical component, so he establishes connections between the sayings and the context in which they were established, taking into account the position, place and time of the conversation in this. (Al-Mabkhout, p. 355).

The basis of the relationship between the linguistic and rhetorical components is the control of the multiplicity of uses in the different by the "Maqam". this is because the function of the linguistic component is its ability to predict the significance of words, and the function of the rhetorical component is its ability to determine the actual meaning of the saying, that is, it is verified as a "Maqamat"(Al-Mabkhout, p. 356), but if there is a conflict between the results of the analysis starting from the linguistic component, and the results of the analysis that the rhetorical component led to, we resort to the laws of discourse, which is a way to deal with the sayings that are implied, and if the implicit saying is one of the implications that emerge mainly in the linguistic component, the side effects of quotes and the possible hint in them according to the denominators should be addressed at the rhetorical level since the allusion is not related to the grammatical meaning of the sayings, but rather is the product the methods in the discourse that require inference and the result of the speaker choosing a statement in specific circumstances, the main feature of the hint is that it is derived from the event of speech, not from its content (Shukri Al-Mabkhout, p. 356), as (Decro) believes that the linguistic description of a language should provide an explanation of the reason why a certain saying in a particular discursive "Maqamat" is subject to different meanings. Informational analysis is unable to describe such the pronouncements, or rather, its interpretation, and the reason is due to the presence of another level that interacts in natural language, which is the deliberative level, this level is connected to the object of speech, the speaker's purposes and purposes, the understanding of the recipient, and the common knowledge between them, these data are necessary for a correct and complete understanding of the pronouncements. And informative logical analysis (syntactic and semantic) by ignoring these facts remains unable to describe and explain the phenomena that are branching from them. (Rashid Al Radi, 2015, p.33) this is what led (Decro) to provide an effective description of what the study of issues such as: the structure of the sayings, links, factors, and hierarchies of argumentation, it is considered an important introduction towards the establishment of a deliberative, embedded in the connotation (Khitam, 2016, p. 134),it takes the discourse as its object rather than the text itself (Al Swenet, 2013, p. 202); so that the deliberative conceptualization comes in all its directions to correct this narrow view; he affirms that language is used naturally, and therefore does not refrain from showing some forms of contradiction in it. Is thanks to a set of tools that the natural language abounds in comprehending this contradiction, to be acceptable, as it raises the contradiction of such uses (Rashid Al Radi, 2015, p.33),the embedded deliberativeness is characterized by taking argumentative paths as a means of interpreting (sayings) and following them, the relationship between them is not deductive. Argument, according to the embedded deliberation, is based on meanings acceptable to the common people (Jack Mochler& Ann Ripoll, 2010, pp. 88-85).

On this scenario, it becomes clear that the embedded deliberative proposal is based on two matters:(Jack Mochler& Ann Ripoll, 2010, p. 35).

A- The task of language is not limited to informing only, as it is not intended to describe things and represent reality only, but rather to achieve linguistic actions. Such as ordering, prohibiting, wishful thinking, influence, persuasion and direction that is, it has an achievement power, defining positions and defining states and intentions, which means that the language internally includes a set of special procedures that allow the establishment of a great diversity in human relations, then, language cannot have a single function, which is to transmit information.

B- The deliberative facts are revealed from the reflexive thesis of language,or the self-referral that the meaning of saying what is the image of its delivery, that is, the saying cannot be understood without understanding the reasons for giving it, so the meaning is represented in the pattern that was carried out to achieve, so describing the meaning of a saying is a description of the type of action that that saying is supposed to accomplish.

On the other hand, the revision proposed by (Decro) has given rise to the traditional connotation,and for the relationship of the discursive component to the linguistic component, to reconsider the analysis of the pronouncements from a new perspective that draws on its hypotheses from the concept of polyphony, or (phonetics) crystallized by (Bakhtin),as all the active forces have the opportunity to express themselves, regardless of their social status and cultural level (Khitam, 2016, p. 137). (Decro) has distinguished between three levels:

A- The speaking subject versus the listener, i.e. the individual who utters his utterance.

B- The speaker versus the person addressed, that is, the individual who distributes the roles in the discourse.

C- The enunciator versus the addressee, and “it could be the transmitter, or a third person as well”(Saber Al-Habasha, 2010, p. 29) and (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, pp. 168-175).

And embodying (Decro) calls to propose a model in which the linguistic data (the linguistic component) interact with the non-linguistic data (the discursive and deliberative component), and in harmony with this new perspective on the relationship of the linguistic component to the rhetorical component, the deliberative (Decro) agreed to invest the pronouncement instead of the sentence. because it is a procedural and practical product, linguistically and socially, as for the sentence, it belongs to an abstract and independent theoretical structure, out of use, but verifiable when used in specific contexts (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, pp. 38, 41) and (Ma'an, 2013, p. 21), the sentence is defined as an abstract unit generated by the linguistic component, the connotation of the sentence is derived only from the grammatical rules, starting with the instructions related to the components of the sentence. The significance of the sentence in the context of embedded deliberativeness is not based on truthfulness terms.The method of calculation in it is not necessarily based on the principle of composition, as it is based on instructions associated with expressions (Argumentative and anecdotal evidence),some of these clues which are of an didactic

nature refer to the process of giving speech. Therefore, the linguistic component had to be supplemented with a rhetorical component whose task was to assign the value of any constant to the variables included in the semantic of the sentence. (Jack Mochler& Ann Ripoll, 2010, p. 90), it is a construction hidden from the lexical, semantic, syntactic and phonemic restrictions of language. Subject to grammatical description. The pronouncement is an effective, coherent, and realistic achievement related to the activity that arises from it, and attests to it at the same time, this product bears the marks of its production, which include various regenerative combinations in every linguistic or verbal experiment, therefore, it is merely independent, it is synonymous with what the speaker produced when he enters into the sentence, that is, what he achieves and accomplishes in his pronunciation or verbal communication (Khitam, 2016, p. 136),(Decro) has stated two conditions that define the utterance: Harmony and independence, as each utterance requires harmony and distance from disharmony in its units (Khatam, 2016, p.137).

The sentence, in addition to the connotation consistent with it, is not of concrete meaning and is capable of description and observation. Rather, it is the product of a theoretical construction constructed by the linguist according to specific data and controls. As for what can be observed and examined, it is the meaning associated with the utterance, and if the utterance is the outcome of its delivery, it does not, however, represent a tangible statement that is more stable than the sentence. Therefore, the embedded deliberativeness assumes that each speaker is able to present hypotheses about saying something, which is termed (Decro) by external hypotheses. Because the meaning inspired by the uttered even when giving the word the meaning of its narrower concept derived from grammar, It cannot be described without reference to some of the aims of the pronouncement (Al Swenet, 2013, p. 199), according to this view, it is impossible to isolate any part of the meaning that the verbal function has not characterized (Al-Habasha, 2008, p. 26) and (Al Swenet, 2013, p. 199), In the words of (Decro): “The saying is recorded in the saying.” (Habasha, 2008, p. 26), accordingly, the pronouncement will contain elements alluding to the pronouncement, in other words, the pronouncements that we produce in our linguistic activity are adapted to the nature of the linguistic action from which these pronouncements are generated. (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, pp. 29-30), this distinction entails the recognition of the difference in connotation from deliberative. The former examines the sentence, while the latter studies the meanings of the pronouncements within specific contexts (Khitam, 2016, p. 166).

Based on this, the task of linguistic deliberations or semantics is to start from the pronouncements to study the facts that are accomplished through speech, to achieve this, according to (Decro), it is imperative to make an orderly description of the various verbal images that are achieved by means of pronouncements, which made (Anscomber) declare that the general purpose of the project he created with (Decro) was to build a theory on the interpretation of archives. (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, p. 30).

With regard to the connotation and the meaning, the connotation is the semantic value that the sentence expresses, and it results from analyzing the sentence according to what its linguistic data provide in terms of composition and dictionary, It is the sum

of the logical features carried by a lexical unit or a group of units, It is also a set of laws that allow calculating the meaning of the spoken word. as for meaning, it is the semantic value in a specific verbal context that results from analyzing the saying according to its "Maqamat" data. (Saber al-Habasha, 2010, pp. 27-28), it is the sum of verbal verbs that the speaker believes accomplished in his articulation, this does not mean that each utterance expresses one meaning. because it is possible that the readings will be multiple, and then the meanings will multiply according to the contexts of speech for example, if the meaning is an order, a solicitation, or an interrogation (Shukri Al-Mabkhout, p. 357) and (Khitam, 2016, P.137), hence, it proves that it is not possible to explain the meaning of the text without referring to the discourse. Embedded deliberativeness rejects the traditional contrast between the literal meaning (the meaning of the sentence) and the non-literal meaning (the meaning of saying a saying or the meaning of the speaker) (Jack Mochler& Ann Ripoll, 2010, p.83), it is not satisfied with stating the connotation of expressions by mentioning the literal or descriptive meaning of them. In order to demonstrate the possibility of this coupling between the meaning of the sentence and the meaning of the saying, it is assumed that the saying is instructions and directions provided by the linguistic components of the interpreter, In order for him to be able to access the information necessary to show how to reconstruct the meaning that the speaker wanted, The scientific method for making the linguistic connotation in relation to discourse analysis capable of enriching interpretation is a method that is artificially constructed (Shukri Al-Mabkhout, p. 358), The ultimate goal of semantic analysis in embedded deliberativeness is to find methods, any set of formal rules and laws that have the ability to assign a connotation to each saying, the basis for building these mechanisms is the distinction between sentence and utterance on the one hand, and significance and meaning on the other hand (Al-Mabkhout, p. 357).

The main thing in the concept of embedded deliberativeness, then, is the distinction between sentence and utterance on the one hand, significance and meaning on the other hand, this linguistic proposition, which does not separate the pragmatic dimension and the semantic dimension in the discourse, made (Decro) confirm that the meaning of any utterance, even in the case in which the word presented a more narrow concept, that is, the most grammatical one, it cannot be described without invoking specific intentions of its articulation. (Abd al-Latif Adel, 2013, p.96), The meaning of the uttered can be traced back to the intentions of the speaker that were the cause of the utterance, the matter expressed by (Decro) is that understanding the utterance entails discovering the result that the speaker intended, (Al Swenet, 2013, p. 198) Accordingly, the barrier opens between semantic and deliberative. because the meaning is necessarily related to a specific uttering context and to specific speech functions, accordingly, the embedded deliberative theory represents the semantic theory that gives importance to deliberative data in the context of meaning. (Abd al-Latif Adel, 2013, p.96).

And this separation suggested by (Decro), between some concepts, so that those concepts do not remain confused and used in one sense, from the parable of the sentence and vocalized dualism as opposed to binary significance and meaning (Khitam, 2016, p.136), the embedded deliberative process is of great importance in

the process of enunciating and giving speech on the part of the originator of the discourse, and pronouncement according to (Decro), it is "the historical fact that arises through the appearance of the uttered." (Saber al-Habasha, 2010, p. 26).

This step taken by (Decro) and (Anscomber) does not represent a transcendence of the traditional semantic theory, or a cognitive break with it, but rather it was a bold attempt at assimilation, integration and transcendence, and a modification in building internal and external hypotheses, according to the scientific stakes of the embedded deliberative, these adjustments can be identified as follows (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, pp. 58-60) and (Bin IssaAzayit, 2010, pp. 2/245) (Al Swenet, 2013, p.208).

A- The external hypothesis (monitoring the construction): this hypothesis is summarized in the manner in which the interpretation of the pronouncements is carried out in different usage situations, that is, the subject of the embedded deliberativeness does not consist of an utterance, but rather it consists of the meaning associated with that pronounced.

B- The internal hypothesis (observation of orientation): This hypothesis seeks to establish general rules that control the interpretation of sentences, that is, it does not stop at assigning a connotation to each partial and isolated semantic sentence, but rather an explanation of how the process of passing into significance and overall rules takes place. that is, the embedded deliberative subject consists of the methods of the argumentative approach directed to the argumentative indicators, negatively or positively.

It is clear that the words (Decro) and (Anscomber) mean that they reject the meaning of the sentence to be part of the meaning, but rather the whole of the instructions included in this sentence, Instructions are signs offered to those seeking a specific vocalized interpretation, It pushes them to research the status of the discourse that has some benefit in reconstructing the intended meaning of the speaker. (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, pp. 61-62), and these instructions are classified into two types (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, pp. 66-67).

1. Verbal Instructions: This category is related to verbal signs, or it is to provide directions and signs that hint at the meaning of the sentence and the meaning of the sentence are the outcome of these instructions, and its mission is to integrate the pronunciation into the meaning of the uttered one.

2. Dialectical Instructions: This type of instruction reflects the argumentative function of language, as a number of signs lead to the acquisition of the texts when they are completed, instructions that direct our interpretation of these words to an argumentative interpretation, and allow the speaker to direct the addressee to the way that he should speak and speak with the pronouncement. It abounds with those signs, such as argumentative factors, ties and hierarchies, and mandatory relationships.

It is evident from the foregoing the interest of (Decro and Anscomber) in investing the tremendous contemporary achievements, and the sign of that is the employment of the modeling method and the internal and external hypotheses, that prompted them to formulate the concept of verbal instructions and argumentative instructions, and this would not have happened had it not been for the exclusion of credible logic, the

theory of connotation and the classical meaning, towards researching the internal laws of language, and studying the argumentative facts according to the embedded deliberative model (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, pp. 42-43).

The keenness of the two researchers (Decro and Anscomber) to refine and refine their concepts was not sufficient to prevent the emergence of some methodological problems that hindered the inclusion of deliberativeness in the core of semantic research (Khitam, 2016, p. 162), these difficulties led (Decro) to abandon the position theory and replace it with another methodological and theoretical framework, and (Decro's) students had a great impact in re-correcting the compass of the linguistic argumentative direction to its correct path, that is, the interest in studying linguistic argumentative, which excludes all conclusions that fall outside the language, and that with the research that they have done, either with (Decro) or alone, these problems paved the way for the researcher (Marion Carrell) to put forward a methodical proposition in which she defended some of the perceptions that came to represent the new path of what is known in the linguistic literature as (The Theory of Semantic Groups), as it simplified its concepts and hypotheses towards a new modeling of argumentative theory of language (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, pp. 51, 234-235), (Khitam, 2016, pp. 164-165), And then reconsidering each of (Decro) and (Anscomber's) perception of the relationship between circulation and significance. (Khitam, 2016, p. 162), this trend gave impetus to reviews of the essential ideas in this theory. and make adjustments to many of the basic tenets; in order for this theory to remain of a distinct scientific character, which prompted (Decro) to retreat later on the blind dependency, as he put it to the theory of speech acts, Let us start talking about an idea that: that the pronouncement includes elements that describe the pronouncement in more depth, it goes far beyond those elements that are associated with the achievement of verbal action to the point that the latter becomes a mere branching off of it, the matter relates to that representational image that can be glimpsed starting from the concept of phonology, which will become an alternative to the speaking act within the framework of linguistic argumentative (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, p. 29).

We will briefly introduce this theory. To find out the extent of its benefit from the embedded deliberativeness and its emergence from it.

Semantic set theory

This theory is considered an extended and corrective study of argument theory of language at (Decro), as it is a new approach that departs from formal mathematical rules of meaning. It establishes new concepts with the linguistic whitt argument, and also developed the analytical concepts presented by (Decro) in the theory of (phonology). It draws from two tributaries; they are: the argument theory of language and the phonemic theory (Khitam, 2016, p. 165).

The essence of this theory is that the meanings of linguistic expressions are not formed through the realistic characteristics of the references to which they are referred. Not by beliefs and knowledge, but through the discourse itself, in this way, it does not represent a departure from the language of the argument. Rather, it is a reorientation, reorientation of its course, and enrichment of its descriptive and

analytical capabilities of the discourse, that remained confined to the narrow relationship of argument. (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, pp. 235-236).

The semantic group theory combines between significance and deliberation at the same time, It searches for what is expressed; that is why (Karel) paid great attention to the connotation of words and expressions. assuming that the latter does not fulfill the function of representing the world; Therefore, do not submit to the standard of truthfulness and lying, but at the same time you acknowledge that what is expressed is not isolated from the various verbal contexts, in other words, the utterance is pronouncements a rhetorical phenomenon, you should not be confused by the speaker's impressions of the content of the uttered; that is why it can be said that (Carel's) approach came in line with (Decro)'s endeavor to build a deliberative and integral signification that carries on itself the analysis of the semantic and argumentative phenomena emanating in the archives and accompanying their production, the principle on which this theory was based is the recognition that the argument are, in essence, based on the combination of two vocalizations or two sentences with a standard or non-standard link, likewise the recognition that every word raises in the minds a set of connotations attached to it, as well as emphasizing the existence of a close semantic relationship between the parts of the uttered (argument and result) in (Decro) (Khitam, 2016, pp. 166-168).

This theory had a prominent effect in moving the study of argument from the external approach based on the theory of positions, to an internal approach that deals with lexical units or pronunciations, the semantic block theory gained its fertility and flexibility due to its ability to provide a semantic description of both individual lexical units and archives, Contrary to previous perspectives that paid great attention to describing speeches in general, this fertility and linguistic flexibility necessitated (Decro) abandoning his perception calling for the distinction between the orbital interconnection between the argument and the result, and taking the perspective of his student (Karel) aiming at building semantic and deliberative arguments at the same time (Khitam, 2016, p. 172).

This theory helped expand the hermeneutical base that was adopted in determining the significance of the units (the pronouncements), that is, the rule upon which the argumentative compositions stand, and it included the link between the units of the argumentative series, this expansion will make the theory of semantic groups less restrictive than previous versions of the theory of (argumentative in linguistics), Including topical version, as long as this theory is new, it opens up horizons for discursive composition more than what the narrow argumentative relationship allows in its traditional form, and then you put in our hands achievement tools, to complete the structural description of the speech (Rashid Al-Radi, 2015, p. 237).

It is clear from the aforementioned that the argument theory of language, the theory of semantic groups centered on their preoccupation with diphthong deliberative issues into the core of semantic research, focusing on the study of the internal structure of language, the indications generated by the use of this structure vary according to the verbal context (Khitam, 2016, p. 173), the semantic group theory opened a new horizon for the argument theory of language, trying to overcome some

of the problems that surround it, and it represented a new scientific framework that opens the door to linguistic arguments to be in the ranks of distinguished scientific theories.

We conclude from this that the embedded deliberative theory does not seem to be limited to a dimension. Rather, it is a branched branch, and its owner has always developed it, and modifies some of its elements, within the framework of self-criticism, the tradition of developing knowledge, and enriching experiences (Al-Habasha, 2008, p. 24).

As this theory assumes that "the information useful for understanding statements when communicating is argumentative rather than informative." (Jack Mochler& Ann Ripoll, 2010, p.92), that is, the informational value of the saying is secondary to its argumentative value, which is considered primary and basic (Jack Mochler and Ann Ripoll, 2010, p. 92), and (Habasha, 2008, p. 23), Moreover, this demarcation called by (Decro) in embedded deliberation, and if not always explicitly acknowledged, However, it is a framework for most of the work in current use, It is embedded in many concepts, as we find a manifestation of it in verbal actions, and the implications of saying, discourse laws, and indicative work, the same applies to the study of argumentative, especially the contrast between the argument variable and its value in context, with rhetorical faces of all kinds (Al-Habasha, 2008, p. : 33), and (Al-Sweent, 2013, p. 203).

Conclusion

- The embedded deliberative method is an integrated and overlapping procedure; therefore, it can be used in the analysis of many texts of influential and persuasive dimensions, with what gives the embedded deliberative trading dealings richness on the level of fruitful procedures, and the satisfactory results, especially in the heritage texts that have levels of contextual "Mqamah".
- Whereas the embedded deliberative opposes the use of the literal meaning alone in clarifying the meaning of the pronouncements; the statement is fulfilled in stating the meanings contained in these texts. Starting from the literal meaning represented by its significance in the discourse towards its interpretation in a manner consistent with the position of the discourse, and in a way that serves its argumentative.
- The embedded deliberativeness is not confined to one of the dimensions, rather it is forked branches out, and is still in the process of trimming and modification. And by benefiting from constructive criticism and serious research in this field.
- Emphasis should be placed on the rhetorical aspects of textual analysis, counting them as part of the important means of arriving at the desired meaning.
- The scarcity of studies that adopt embedded deliberative as an approach in Arab studies, for lack of translated references on the one hand, on the other hand, the researchers are not encouraged to go into the field of these studies, on the contrary, we observe a reluctance to accept research that has been conducted into related embedded deliberative.

Margins and sources

- The most important theories of Argument in Western traditions from Aristotle to today: Ashraf, Hammadi Samoud, Research Team on Rhetoric and Argument, Tunisia, D.T.
- Phonological performance of Qur'anic coins: An embedded deliberative approach in the light of Maqamat art semantics, Dr. Mushtaq Abbas Maan, Dar of Al-Farahidi for Publishing and Distribution, 1st Edition, Baghdad, 2013 AD.
- Rhetoric of persuasion in the debate: Dr. Abdel-Latif Adel, Defaf Publications, Beirut - Lebanon / Al-Difaf Publications, Algeria, 1st Edition, 2013 AD.
- The deliberative dimension in the linguistic Argument: The Compact deliberative investment (research), Bin Issa Azayit, within the book Argument, its concept and fields, theoretical and practical studies in the new rhetoric: Prepared and presented by: Hafez Ismaili Alawi, Modern Book World: Jordan, 2010.
- Embedded deliberative: a study of the concept (research), Dr. Muayyad Al Sweinet, Regular linguistic knowledge, Arab Science Publishers, Baghdad, First Edition, 1434 AH - 2013 AD.
- The deliberative origins and trends: Jawad Khitam, Dar of Treasures of Knowledge, 1st Edition, Amman, 1437 A.H. 2016 A.D.
- Embedded and argumentative, Entries and Texts: Saber Al-Habasha, 1st Edition, Syria - Damascus, 2008 AD.
- Encyclopedic Dictionary of Deliberative: Jacques Mochler and Anne Ripoll, translated by: A Group of Researchers, Dar Sinatra, Tunis, 2010.
- The Linguistic Aspects of Argument, Introduction to Linguistic Argument: Rachid Al Radi, Arab Cultural Center, 1st Edition, Morocco, 2015 AD.
- The argumentative theory through rhetorical, logical and linguistic studies: Dr. Mohammed Tarous, House of Culture, Casablanca, first edition, 1426 AH - 2005 AD.
- Linguistics of discourse: stylistics, pronunciation and deliberative, Saber Habasha, 1st ed., Dar Al-Hiwar for Publishing and Distribution, Syria - Latakia, 2010 AD:
- The Dictionary of Discourse Analysis: Supervised by: Patrick Charodu and Dominic Mengno, translated by: Abdelkader Al Muhairi and Hammadi Samoud, Revision by: Salah El Din Sharif, National Center for Translation, Tunis, 2008 AD.
- Embedded deliberative: Approaches to methodology and theory (research), Belkhiri Abdel-Malik, Journal of the History of Science, Issue Eight, Part 1, June, 2017.