



The Intersection of Stylistics and Pragmatics in Contemporary Arabic Critical Studies: A Reading in Saber Al-Habasha's Project

Ousama LENSARI

Lecturer (B), Laboratory of Linguistic and Literary Practices in the Algerian Sahara and their Extension in the Sahel Region, University of Tamanghasset, Algeria.

Lensari.ousama@univ-tam.dz

Abstract

Modern Western stylistics, with its various approaches, has had a significant presence in contemporary Arabic linguistic, rhetorical, and critical studies. Arab scholars have engaged with stylistics in diverse ways—ranging from introducing its theoretical foundations and methodological principles to employing its terminological system, either wholly or partially, in the analysis of creative works, whether classical or modern. This engagement has evolved to include comparative approaches that aim to define the nature of the relationship between stylistics and several modern linguistic and rhetorical disciplines, most notably rhetoric, linguistics, literary criticism, functional grammar, and pragmatics. In this context, the present study aims—through description, analysis, comparison, and deduction—to examine the contemporary Arabic critical and linguistic output, shedding light on the comparative dimension between stylistics and some of the emerging linguistic fields, with particular focus on the relationship between stylistics and pragmatics. This is carried out by examining the work of the scholar Saber Mahmoud Al-Habasha, in an effort to answer the central question: What is the nature of the relationship between stylistics and pragmatics in contemporary Arabic studies—and how did Saber Mahmoud Al-Habasha conceptualize it?

Keywords: Stylistics, Stylistic approaches, Pragmatics, Inter-methodological relations, Saber Mahmoud Al-Habasha.

Received: 05 February 2025

Revised: 09 April 2025

Accepted: 02 May 2025

1. Introduction

Linguistics, in its various branches, has significantly contributed to a profound transformation in the course of linguistic studies, prompting numerous researchers—both Arab and non-Arab—to explore the nature of the relationships between the different branches of linguistics and their associated fields of knowledge. Although many of these branches have sought distinction and independence from general linguistics, interaction among them has remained ongoing.

In this context, stylistics—in its various orientations, from expressive stylistics with its founder Charles Bally, to Leo Spitzer, Roman Jakobson, Mikhail Riffaterre, Pierre Guiraud, and others—intersects with the sciences of linguistics, rhetoric, and pragmatics.

The relationship between stylistics and pragmatics has taken multiple forms, ranging from adjacency and overlap—while preserving the distinct identity of each—to calls for integration and assimilation, where one is viewed as a component of the other. This diversity in the modes of relationship between modern stylistics and pragmatics forms the central focus of the present research paper.

Stylistics: Essence and Boundaries

The concepts of *style* and *stylistics* have received notable attention across various research fields, including modern linguistics, literary criticism, and rhetoric. This reflects their prominent presence and intersections with several disciplines within the humanities. While the term *style* is characterized by its broad usage and the diversity of its applications, *stylistics* appears to be more specialized, as it is almost exclusively confined to the domains of literary and linguistic studies. However, this restricted scope of use does not necessarily imply that stylistics is easy to define or clearly delineate. Rather, it reflects its relatively recent emergence as an independent scientific field, especially when compared to the term *style*, which has deep roots in ancient rhetorical and critical practices.

Mundhir Ayashi, the translator of Pierre Guiraud's book *Stylistics*, points to the difficulty of arriving at a precise definition of stylistics. He attributes this to the multiplicity of its fields of inquiry, which range between the study of language and its transformations on the one hand, and its representations within the structure of the literary work on the other:

"Given this, we can understand why it resists codification and systematization, just as rhetoric once did. We can also understand that it captures fleeting moments through a structure fixed forever by writing—moments that cannot be fully grasped through completed works."ⁱ

In his other book *Stylistics and Discourse Analysis*, Mundhir Ayashi offers a definition of stylistics in which he links the field to linguistics, emphasizing its intersection with linguistic sciences and discourse analysis. He states:

"Stylistics is a science that studies language within the system of the speaker, but it is also a science that studies discourse distributed across the principle of genre identity. Hence, the subject matter of this science is multi-leveled, varied in its sources and interests, and diverse in its aims and orientations. Since language is not exclusive to a single communicative field, the subject of stylistics is not limited to one expressive domain either. However, it remains true that stylistics is a science that elevates its subject or transcends it in order to transform it into a scientific study. Without this, stylistics would not have earned this designation, nor would it have developed into various schools and doctrines."ⁱⁱ

Yet, the definition provided by Ayashi is not without a degree of generalization and abstraction, as it revolves around the field of stylistics without articulating a clear and precise concept. This is due to stylistics' intersection with numerous scientific branches and the diversity of its theoretical orientations and epistemological foundations.

What is particularly noteworthy in the context of defining the concept is what the researcher Djamil Hamdaoui presents in his book *Trends in Stylistics*, where he offers a definition of stylistics that reveals his view of its nature and fields of inquiry. He writes:

"Stylistics refers to the scientific study of style in its various linguistic, structural, semiotic, and hermeneutic manifestations. Stylistics is also considered a modern branch of linguistics, alongside poetics, semiotics, and pragmatics. It is concerned with describing style in terms of structure, meaning, and intentionality [...] From this perspective, stylistics is the study of style in its various phonetic, segmental, semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic manifestations. It thus focuses on identifying the characteristics of literary and non-literary styles, inventorying their distinctive features, and determining their individual specificities."ⁱⁱⁱ

This statement clearly reveals the overlap between stylistics and a set of linguistic, critical, and literary fields, particularly its intersection with pragmatic studies, which constitutes the central focus of our current research.

Thank you for the reminder about numbering. I will preserve all in-text citation numbers exactly as you provide them.

Pragmatics: Essence and Boundaries

The term *Pragmatics* in English or *Pragmatique* in French does not differ from other linguistic, literary, and critical terms in terms of how contemporary Arab scholars have received and translated it. Its translations and Arabizations have been numerous and varied, both in singular and plural forms, which has led to a broad spectrum of renderings. Among the most prominent translations found in Arabic research are: *al-tadāwuliyya* (pragmatics), *al-dhiraā'īyya* (instrumentalism), *al-fawā'idīyya* (utilitarianism), *al-tadāwul* (usage), *al-majāl al-tadāwulī* (pragmatic domain), *al-maqāmiyya* (situationality), *al-naḥīyya al-ilmīyya* (scientific utilitarianism), and so on. In contrast, the Arabization of the term has been narrower, with limited alternatives such as *al-barjamatiyya*, *al-barāghmatiyya*, *al-barghamatiyya*, *al-barāghmātiyāt*, among others.

Muḥammad al-Rāḍī selected the term *al-dhiraā'īyya* (instrumentalism) as the objective counterpart for *pragmatique* in his translation of the book *The Great Linguistic Theories: From Comparative Grammar to Pragmatics* by researchers Marie-Anne Paveau and Georges-Élie Raphaël (*Les grandes théories de la linguistique : de la grammaire comparée à la pragmatique/ The Major Theories of Linguistics: From Comparative Grammar to Pragmatics*). The authors dedicate the eleventh and final chapter to pragmatic theories, and the translator consistently adopts the term *al-dhiraā'īyya* or *al-dhira'ī* in singular and *al-dhiraā'īyyāt* or *al-dhira'īyyāt* in plural. For example, in his discussion of Oswald Ducrot, he refers to “integrated pragmatics,” stating:

“If integrated pragmatics (*pragmatique intégrée*) falls, in its own way, within the revival of rhetoric, it nonetheless differs in its assumptions and subjects from Perelman's new rhetoric. Yet, within the French context, it is considered an extension of utterance semantics as developed by Benveniste.”^{iv}

The authors of *The Literary Critic's Guide (Dalīl al-Nāqid al-Adabī)* do not differ from this translation choice either, as they adopt the term *al-dhiraā'īyya* (instrumentalism) and append the qualifier *al-jadīda* (new) to it, rendering *new pragmatism* as *al-dhiraā'īyya al-jadīda*. They argue that the origin of this term goes back “to semiotic theorists such as Charles Morris, Charles Sanders Peirce, and John Dewey in particular. Its meaning varies depending on the field it originates from—philosophy, linguistics, communication—but its dominant feature remains its practical orientation. Due to the overlap of its domain with neighboring fields, it has been translated in Arabic in many ways, including *al-tabāduliyya* (interchange), *al-ittiṣāliyya* (communicativeness), *al-naḥīyya* (utilitarianism), alongside *al-dhiraā'īyya* (instrumentalism) [...] As for describing this school of thought as 'instrumentalist', it is because it extends a known philosophical doctrine by that name, founded by the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce in the 19th century.”^v The beginnings of pragmatics are thus linked to American semiotic research.

In his translation of George Yule's *Pragmatics*, translator Quṣṣay al-Atabi selects the term *al-tadāwuliyya* (pragmatics) and does not refer to *al-dhiraā'īyya* (instrumentalism). He explains to the reader why he prefers this term over others, saying:

“I would like to point out to the esteemed reader that I have chosen to translate the term *Pragmatics* as *al-tadāwuliyya*—instead of *al-barjamatiyya* or *al-maqāmiyya*—because, in my opinion, *al-tadāwuliyya* is the most suitable equivalent, especially when we consider that *pragmatics* is essentially the study of language from the perspective of its ‘use’ among its

speakers. I should also note that I was, on a few rare occasions, compelled either to keep the English example without translation or replace it with an Arabic model rather than translate it.”^{vi}

It is clear that the translator does not provide solid reasons supporting his choice, even though—in our view—he follows in the footsteps of other translators of the foreign term.

Researcher Maḥmūd Okasha, in his book *The Linguistic Pragmatic Theory: Pragmatics—A Study of Concepts, Origins, and Principles* (*al-Naẓariyya al-Barāghmātiyya al-Lisāniyya: al-Tadāwuliyya—Dirāsa fī al-Mafāhīm wa-l-Nasha’a wa-l-Mabādi’*), explains how the claim of “the death of the author” and its consequences—namely, the focus on the recipient as the reference point for intended meaning—“was the idea that dominated early pragmatists who focused on the use of language in a discursive context and on the recipient’s understanding, without regard to the intention of the one who employed the discourse to express their purpose [...] These theorists were influenced by the philosophy of pragmatism, which lent linguistic pragmatics its name due to its dominance. The latter term is specific to utilitarian or functionalist practical philosophy, while they designated *pragmatics* to refer to linguistic pragmatism or linguistic pragmatics, which became known as *al-tadāwuliyya* (pragmatics), though both words are foreign and originate from the same root.”^{vii} This shows that pragmatism encompasses pragmatics—or that the latter is a branch of the former—yet the Western founders of both fields adopted a single term to denote them.

Okasha rejects the term *al-dhiraā’iyya* (instrumentalism) or *‘ilm al-dharā’i’* (science of means), as well as, earlier, the term *al-tadāwuliyya* (pragmatics)—despite its appearance in his book’s title—in favor of the term *al-barāghmātiyya* (pragmatism), choosing transliteration over translation. He clarifies the reasons for this approach, stating:

“I did not deviate from this original designation (*Pragmatics*) in favor of translating it, because it is more precise in conveying its meaning in its original environment. Yet, some Arab researchers opted for the translation *al-tadāwuliyya*, which concerns the interaction between dialogue participants, while *pragmatism* values the reception process, not the structure of the discourse, its internal formulation, speaker, or intent. The recipient is the reference point for meaning, not the speaker. *Tadāwul* (exchange) does not convey this concept. Others have borrowed traditional Islamic terms like *‘ilm al-maqāṣid* (science of intentions), *al-maqāṣidiyya* (intentionalism), and *‘ilm al-dharā’i’*, which negatively impact the Islamic concept that bears religious and cultural values from the nation’s heritage. These Arabic designations are but Arabized masks covering the flaws of utilitarian pragmatic philosophy in linguistic studies.”^{viii}

From this, we understand that the researcher views his choice as precise and sufficient, offering an alternative to the many unhelpful or vague translations that fill Arab academic studies.

We join Jamīl Ḥamdāwī in his preference for the term *al-tadāwuliyya* (pragmatics). He says:

“The term *Pragmatique* is translated into Arabic in various ways: *al-dhiraā’iyya*, *al-tadāwuliyya*, *al-barāghmātiyya*, *al-waṣṣifiyya* (functionalism), *al-isti’māliyya* (utilitarianism), *al-takhāṭubiyya* (conversationalism), *al-naḥḥiyya* (benefit-oriented), and *al-tabāduliyya* (interchange). But in our view, the best term is *al-tadāwuliyya* because it is widely used among scholars in the field of language and linguistics, and because it refers to interaction, dialogue, communication, and exchange among speaking participants.”^{ix}

He excludes the term *al-dhiraā’iyya* due to its association with utilitarian philosophy and its American pioneers, John Dewey and William James.

Jamīl Ḥamdāwī defines the pragmatic approach based on what Greimas and Courtès presented in their *Semiotic Dictionary of Language Theory* (*Dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage*), stating:

"It is known that the pragmatic approach is the methodology that studies the functional, pragmatic, and contextual aspects of a text or discourse. It examines the overall relationships between speaker and addressee, focusing on the argumentative and persuasive dimension and speech acts within the text. In other words, pragmatics is that 'science which studies meaning, emphasizing the relationship between signs, their users, and context more than focusing on reference, truth, or syntax.'^x

Pragmatics, then, emphasizes reference and deixis—elements overlooked by Saussure when he linked the sign only to the signifier and the signified.

Researcher Messaoud Şahraoui, in discussing the conceptual apparatus of contemporary pragmatic studies, also rejects translating the term *Pragmatics* or *Pragmatique* as *al-dhiraā'iyya* (instrumentalism or means-based theory), a translation adopted by some Arab researchers. Instead, he prefers the term *al-tadāwuliyya* (pragmatics).^{xi}

Şahrāwī begins defining pragmatics through its connections to disciplines that share conceptual and procedural overlaps with it. He argues that:

"Pragmatics is not a purely linguistic science in the traditional sense—a science content with describing and interpreting linguistic structures and stopping at their boundaries and visible forms. Rather, it is a new science of communication, one that studies linguistic phenomena in their use-context and therefore integrates multiple epistemological projects in the study of the phenomenon of 'linguistic communication and its interpretation.' Accordingly, to speak of *pragmatics* and its conceptual network requires referring to its relationships with various fields, as these indicate its belonging to conceptual domains that span intersecting levels: such as linguistic structure, conversational rules, pragmatic inference, and the cognitive processes underlying linguistic production and comprehension..."^{xii}

This same researcher draws on Catherine Kerbrat-Orecchioni to highlight the value of pragmatic studies. Despite differing scholarly perspectives on *pragmatics* and ongoing debates about its scientific value and effectiveness, she notes that:

"Most scholars agree that the issue at the heart of pragmatics is to identify the universal laws of language use and to explore the human capacities for linguistic communication. Thus, *pragmatics* becomes worthy of being called: 'The Science of Language Use.'^{xiii}

Researcher Ahmed Waḍāḥ, in his study *Discourse Pragmatics in the Arab Rhetorical Heritage*, affirms the difficulty of clearly defining the concept of pragmatics or delineating its conceptual boundaries, stating:

"We are not exaggerating when we say that engaging with a discipline that seeks to explore the essence and nature of the pragmatic theory is a challenging and formidable task. This is due to its broad scope within the modern intellectual system, which makes it difficult to arrive at a comprehensive and precise definition that offers a real understanding and accurate delineation of it—especially when we consider its complex and multifaceted character, drawn from diverse philosophical, literary, stylistic, and rhetorical sources."^{xiv}

The previous researchers' references to the intersection of pragmatics with several linguistic, critical, rhetorical, and stylistic fields prompt us to further examine the nature of the relationship between *pragmatics* and *stylistics*. These two domains intersect within the linguistic field and both draw from the wellspring of rhetorical studies. We will investigate this relationship through our analysis of Şaber al-Ḥabbasha's study (*Stylistics and Pragmatics*) to identify points of convergence and divergence.

Saber Mahmoud Habbasha: Stylistics and Pragmatics Between Connection and Disconnection

Stylistics—considered in the plural as "stylistics"—opens up to a variety of linguistic, rhetorical, and critical domains. The nature of its relationship with these linguistic sciences and literary-critical studies varies. Sometimes, stylistics is seen as an heir to rhetoric, and other

times, each is considered an independent discipline. This produces overlapping and adjacent relationships, wherein the connection between them expands or contracts. Heinrich F. Plett says in the preface of his book *Rhetoric and Stylistics*:

"Rhetoric and stylistics have long maintained close ties: sometimes stylistics contracts to the point of being merely a part of the rhetorical communication model, and at other times, it detaches from that model and expands to encompass nearly all of rhetoric, acting as a 'reduced rhetoric.' The same could be said of the relationship between rhetoric and stylistics on the one hand, and poetics on the other."^{xv}

Plett borrows the phrase "reduced rhetoric" from Roland Barthes.

Abdessalam Al-Massadi challenges the idea of stylistics being a descendant of rhetoric. In his book *Stylistics and Style*, he writes:

"This axis... revolves around defining stylistics in comparison to rhetoric. The premise from which we proceed is that stylistics and linguistics can coexist, but stylistics and rhetoric, as intellectual constructs, represent two repelling and conflicting forces that cannot coexist in a unified foundational thought. The reason lies in the historical emergence of stylistics in the modern era. If we adopt the assumptions of researchers and theorists, we find that they agree stylistics is both an extension and a denial of rhetoric—it is its direct heir..."^{xvi}

Thus, Al-Massadi affirms the separation between the two and the independence of each science, despite their shared features.

The relationship between stylistics and linguistics also varies, having started as a part of linguistics (language science). Stephen Ullmann, in his study *New Directions in Stylistics*, as cited by Youssef Abu Al-Adous, affirms that:

"The relationship between stylistics and linguistics is one of origin and root. According to some scholars, stylistics is considered a branch of linguistics, although it adopts a particular perspective that sets it apart from other branches of linguistic studies. Logically, it is more accurate to consider it a parallel science to linguistics—one that does not concern itself with linguistic elements per se, but rather with their expressive potential. On this basis, stylistics would have the same divisions as linguistics."^{xvii}

Thus, stylistics began as a branch linked to the broader tree of linguistics before gradually becoming more independent.

Mohammed Karim Al-Kawaz also affirms this connection, viewing stylistics as:

"A child of modern linguistic sciences—what we now call linguistics or 'alsuniah'. We have seen that the first seeds of linguistics were planted by de Saussure and that these eventually bore the fruit of stylistics. Stylistic studies continue to intermingle with linguistic research to form diverse stylistics."^{xviii}

These attempts reflect a desire to separate from their original root.

Among the scholars who explored the relationship between stylistics and pragmatics is the researcher Saber Habbasha in his book *Stylistics and Pragmatics: Approaches to Discourse Analysis*, a collection of essays drawing from modern linguistic theories and issues. We will attempt to detail the first section of the book, titled "Stylistic and Pragmatic Topics."

Saber Habbasha divided his book into three sections, beginning with a preface summarizing its content and emphasizing the need to update the Arab perspective and activate critical awareness. He criticizes the entrenched belief among many engaged in linguistic research that Western linguistic sciences and methodologies are interchangeable, saying:

"Many scholars face no difficulty lumping together distant names and dissimilar efforts under one umbrella: like structuralism or pragmatics or other linguistic research methods."^{xix}

He stresses the urgent need for modern Arab scholars to exert significant effort in serving the Arabic language and enriching its serious linguistic research.

In the preface, he notes that the first section, “Stylistic and Pragmatic Topics,” is devoted to studies such as:

- Translating Georges Molinié’s chapter on stylistics.
- Questioning whether stylistic analysis is a methodology or merely a technique.
- Exploring the connection and separation between stylistics and pragmatics.
- Discussing aspects of pragmatics in rhetorical discourse.
- Examining argumentative rhetoric in the Qur’anic text.
- Concluding with a comparison between Al-Jurjani and J.L. Austin in analyzing simile.^{xx}

We will analyze this section, as it addresses the relationship between stylistics and pragmatics—the core of our research—without neglecting a reading of the rest of its topics.

The researcher translates Georges Molinié’s article on “Stylistics” and introduces it by highlighting its importance in contemporary linguistic studies, especially stylistics. He compares it to Georges Mounin’s article on stylistic trends, stating:

“Georges Molinié’s article—currently before us—includes mention of sequential and actantial stylistics, which are among the most modern approaches. Moreover, Molinié’s grasp of the subject matter is stronger, as he is a specialist in stylistics, while Mounin’s interests span the entire linguistic field.”^{xxi}

The article is structured into three sections:

1. Stylistic Theories, divided into three rhetorics: persuasive rhetoric, constructive rhetoric, and normative rhetoric.
2. Subject and Method, covering the literary discourse approach and stylistics’ domain.
3. Challenges, beginning with usage features and ending with sequential and actantial stylistics.

In the first section of his book, the researcher poses the central issue: *Is stylistic analysis a method or a technique?* He begins by emphasizing the intersection of stylistics with numerous linguistic and literary disciplines:

“Stylistics opens up to many specialties: literary theory, history and criticism, narratology, poetics, grammar, semantics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, text linguistics, etc. Some consider it literary linguistics, since it is—according to this view—not sufficiently precise. Others describe it as a hybrid discipline on the borders of other disciplines, lacking full legitimacy.”^{xxii} He then addresses stylistics as both method and technique, as well as the stylistic analysis of texts.

Arriving at the focus of our study—*Stylistics and Pragmatics: Adjacency and Intertwining*—Saber Habbasha opens by highlighting the relationship between stylistics and textual criticism methodology, examining their convergence and divergence. He notes:

“Stylistics analyzes texts, particularly literary ones, describing their literariness and identifying the artistic features of verbal aesthetics. Thus, it stops at technical and artistic description without passing judgment on the work (as literary criticism does), nor does it explore the speaker’s contextual intentions or the rhetorical strategy of the text as an utterance (as pragmatics does).”^{xxiii}

This illustrates one of the key differences between stylistics and pragmatics through delineating their boundaries.

The researcher refers to Molinié’s establishment of a “strong communication” between stylistics and pragmatics, suggesting that the former directs the latter, not the reverse as one might expect. In his book *Stylistics*, Molinié asserts that pragmatics studies speech act theory as developed by Austin and Searle. It examines utterances through three levels of speech act: the locutionary act, the illocutionary act, and the perlocutionary act.^{xxiv}

Molinié builds on this view of pragmatic value, showing how substitution and transformation in language make writing literary and artistic.

This convergence of stylistics and pragmatics, Molinié believes, helps stylistics escape the dead-end of “effect stylistics,” and suggests that their meeting point depends on a unified understanding of meaning theory. If pragmatists focus solely on contextual meaning and stylisticians on literal/figurative meaning (as he terms it), their fundamentally different views of meaning prevent convergence. Only if both adjust their perspectives on this central issue can their methodologies align.^{xxv}

Although the researcher affirms that stylistics is, in essence, a plurality of stylistics, and the same applies to pragmatics—which is understood as encompassing various forms of pragmatics—their relationship to rhetoric reveals strong ties of proximity between them. He begins with Molinié’s division of rhetoric into three categories: the first being persuasive rhetoric, the second creative rhetoric, and the last typological rhetoric. He observes that “contemporary stylistics has drawn upon both persuasive and creative rhetoric. More than that, their fields of inquiry—according to Molinié—form an integral part of stylistics. Persuasive rhetoric is what analyzes second-degree macrostructures of metaphors, which are logical discursive models aimed at enriching argumentative strategies (...) This orientation (...) aligns with current research in pragmatics, whether in the attempt to explore argumentative and effective styles stemming from fictional utterances within a given literary universe, or in the attempt to measure the cultural import of literary productions considered as specific speech acts”.^{xxvi}

The relationship of stylistics—or stylistics in the plural—with rhetoric on one hand, and through it with pragmatics on the other, makes each of them “a reservoir from which stylistics draws whatever it deems suitable to enrich its approach to the text. The stylistic view of these two fields appears to us to be fragmentary, in the sense that it neglects the philosophy of each discipline and its epistemological foundations, and considers it raw material to be exploited within the epistemic framework of stylistics. This is not the case to the same extent with rhetoric or with pragmatics”.^{xxvii} Rhetoric seeks independence from stylistics in order to achieve its analytical specificity, and pragmatics presents itself as a method for discourse analysis with constantly renewed and modern tools, distinguishing itself from stylistics in that it focuses on non-linguistic values, whereas stylistics emphasizes the literary dimension in its analysis of discourses.

The convergence between stylistics and pragmatics occurs while each discipline maintains its specific features and independence: “Stylistics and pragmatics are both methods of discourse analysis, and they intersect at certain points in their concern with the linguistic entity in which the utterance is manifested. However, each one is characterized by a specific approach: if stylistics stops at the aesthetic limits of the utterance, pragmatics considers the value of the utterance beyond the linguistic world, that is, it looks at the practical dimension of the utterance”.^{xxviii} This raises questions about the validity of attempts to merge one into the other—whether by making pragmatics a branch of stylistics, or by making stylistics a subset of pragmatics.

The methodology and practical procedures of each stand as obstacles to the plausibility of such integration or inclusion. Pragmatics specializes, with its logical tools, in approaching ordinary and artificial utterances, while stylistics approaches literary discourses. To the extent that stylistics is close to pragmatics through rhetorical research, they diverge in practical application, reinforcing their distinctiveness and separation.

The researcher Saber Al-Habbasha concludes with findings that answer the nature of the relationship between stylistics and pragmatics, pointing out that they “run parallel to each other in a manner resembling the historical parallelism in rhetoric between its two main branches: persuasive/rhetorical rhetoric and creative/aesthetic rhetoric. The juxtaposition between them has been revived in our era between pragmatics (as the heir to the first type of rhetoric) and

stylistics (as the heir to the second)".^{xxix} He explains this relationship of adjacency and intersection through the field of text typologies (*textes typologie*).

Conclusion:

Following our descriptive and analytical reading of the relationship between stylistics and pragmatics, based on the work of the Tunisian researcher Saber Al-Habbasha, we conclude by affirming the interconnections and convergences between linguistic, rhetorical, and critical studies on the one hand, and between these studies and their counterparts in psychological, social, and historical research on the other. This is because disciplines draw from one another without one absorbing or replacing another—as in the idea of subsuming stylistics within pragmatics or vice versa—or acting as its substitute, as some scholars have claimed by asserting that stylistics is the heir to rhetoric.

Stylistics and pragmatics coexist under the umbrella of linguistics, drawing from its same source. This coexistence negates containment, establishing instead independence and preserving the particularity of each field. As a result, stylistics intersects with pragmatics through its link with rhetoric, yet diverges from it due to differences in their analytical procedures and in their respective aims when analyzing literary versus ordinary linguistic discourses.

References:

- 'Ayyashi, M. (2015). *Stylistics and discourse analysis* (1st ed.). Ninawa Publishing and Distribution.
- 'Okasha, M. (2013). *The linguistic pragmatic theory: Pragmatics – A study of concepts, origins, and principles* (1st ed.). Al-Adab Library.
- Abu Al-Adous, Y. (2007). *Stylistics: Vision and application* (1st ed.). Al-Maseera Publishing and Distribution.
- Al-Habbasha, S. M. (2011). *Stylistics and pragmatics: Approaches to discourse analysis* (1st ed.). Modern Books World.
- Al-Kawaz, M. K. (2005 [1426 AH]). *Stylistics: Concepts and applications* (1st ed.). Publications of the Seventh of April University.
- Al-Massadi, 'A. (n.d.). *Stylistics and style* (3rd ed.). Arab Book House.
- Al-Radhi, M. (2012). *Major linguistic theories: From comparative grammar to pragmatics* (1st ed.). Arab Organization for Translation, Center for Arab Unity Studies.
- Al-Ruwaili, M., & Al-Bazai, S. (2002). *The literary critic's guide: An overview of over seventy contemporary critical trends and terms* (3rd ed.). Arab Cultural Center.
- Benveniste, É. (1971). *Problems in general linguistics* (M. E. Meek, Trans.). University of Miami Press. (Original work published 1966)
- Guiraud, P. (1994). *Stylistics* (M. 'Ayyashi, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Center for Civilizational Development. (Original work published in French)
- Hamdaoui, D. (2015). *Pragmatics and discourse analysis* [Electronic version]. Al-Muthaqaf Library.
- Hamdaoui, D. (2015). *Trends in stylistics* [Electronic version]. Al-Muthaqaf Library.
- Plett, H. (1990). *Rhetoric and stylistics: Towards a semiotic model for text analysis* (M. el-Amri, Trans.; 1st ed.). Africa Orient.
- Sahraoui, M. (2005). *Pragmatics among Arab scholars: A pragmatic study of the phenomenon of speech acts in the Arabic linguistic heritage* (1st ed.). Dar Al-Tali'a Publishing and Distribution.
- Wadah, A. (2011/2012). *Pragmatic discourse in the Arab rhetorical heritage (from the 3rd to the 7th Hijri century)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Department of Arabic Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters, Languages and Arts, University of Oran.

- Yule, G. (2010). *Pragmatics* (Q. al-'Itabi, Trans.; 1st ed.). Arab Scientific Publishers / Dar Al-Aman.

-
- ⁱ Pierre Guiraud, *Stylistics*, trans. Mundhir 'Ayyashi, Center for Civilizational Development, Aleppo, 2nd ed., 1994, p. 6.
- ⁱⁱ Mondhir 'Ayashi, *Stylistics and Discourse Analysis*, Ninawa Publishing and Distribution, Damascus, Syria, 1st ed., 2015, p. 25.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Djamil Hamdaoui, *Trends in Stylistics* (Electronic Version), Al-Muthaqaf Library, 1st ed., 2015, p. 8.
- ^{iv} Mohammed al-Radhi, *Major Linguistic Theories: From Comparative Grammar to Pragmatics*, Arab Organization for Translation, Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st ed., 2012, pp. 373–374.
- ^v Muajan al-Ruwaili & Saad al-Bazai, *The Literary Critic's Guide (An Overview of Over Seventy Contemporary Critical Trends and Terms)*, Arab Cultural Center, Casablanca, Morocco, 3rd ed., 2002, pp. 167–168.
- ^{vi} George Yule, *Pragmatics*, trans. Qusay al-'Itabi, Arab Scientific Publishers, Beirut / Dar Al-Aman, Rabat, 1st ed., 2010, p. 15.
- ^{vii} Mahmoud 'Okasha, *The Linguistic Pragmatic Theory: Pragmatics – A Study of Concepts, Origins, and Principles*, Al-Adab Library, Cairo, 1st ed., 2013, p. 5.
- ^{viii} Ibid., pp. 5–6.
- ^{ix} Djamil Hamdaoui, *Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis* (Electronic Version), Al-Muthaqaf Library, 1st ed., 2015, p. 6.
- ^x Ibid., p. 9.
- ^{xi} Messaoud Sahraoui, *Pragmatics among Arab Scholars (A Pragmatic Study of the Phenomenon of Speech Acts in the Arabic Linguistic Heritage)*, Dar Al-Tali'a Publishing and Distribution, Beirut, 1st ed., 2005, p. 15.
- ^{xii} Ibid., p. 16.
- ^{xiii} Ibid., pp. 16–17.
- ^{xiv} Ahmed Wadah, *Pragmatic Discourse in the Arab Rhetorical Heritage (from the 3rd to the 7th Hijri Century)*, unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Arabic Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters, Languages and Arts, University of Oran, 2011/2012, p. 92.
- ^{xv} Heinrich Plett, *Rhetoric and Stylistics (Towards a Semiotic Model for Text Analysis)*, trans. Mohammad el-Amri, Africa Orient, Casablanca, Morocco, 1st ed., 1990, p. 19.
- ^{xvi} 'Abdessalam al-Massadi, *Stylistics and Style*, Arab Book House, Tripoli, Libya – Tunis, 3rd ed., n.d., pp. 51–52.
- ^{xvii} Youcef Abu Al-Adous, *Stylistics: Vision and Application*, Al-Maseera Publishing and Distribution, Amman, Jordan, 1st ed., 2007, p. 40.
- ^{xviii} Mohammed Karim Al-Kawaz, *Stylistics: Concepts and Applications*, Publications of the Seventh of April University, Benghazi, Libya, 1st ed., 1426 AH, p. 77.
- ^{xix} Saber Mahmoud Al-Habbasha, *Stylistics and Pragmatics: Approaches to Discourse Analysis*, Modern Books World, Irbid, Jordan, 1st ed., 2011, p. 1.
- ^{xx} Ibid., p. 2.
- ^{xxi} Ibid., p. 6.
- ^{xxii} Ibid., p. 30.
- ^{xxiii} Ibid., p. 39.
- ^{xxiv} Ibid., p. 40.
- ^{xxv} Ibid., pp. 41–42.
- ^{xxvi} Ibid., pp. 43–44.
- ^{xxvii} Ibid., p. 44.
- ^{xxviii} Ibid., pp. 44–45.
- ^{xxix} Ibid., p. 46.