# Pragmatics of Dialogue Among Grammarians According to Conversational Implicature Theory

Ali kadhim Abd Ali Yassin[1], Dr. Asaad Khalaf Al-Awadi[2]

## Abstract

*This study deals with one of the most important methods used by the grammarians in their grammatical writings. It is the method of dialogue and its study in a pragmatic study in the light of conversational Implicature theory. This theory, and the most important principles on which it is based in modern linguistic thought, especially with Grace. Then the study presents some applied models of grammatical dialogues in which the concept of conversational Implicature has been manifested. Then, the study ends with a group of conclusions that include the most important findings of the study.*

**Keywords:** *dialogue, grammarians, pragmatics, dialogic imperative.*

## Introduction

Praise be to God, Lord of the worlds, and prayers and peace be upon the one who was sent as a mercy to the worlds, Abu al-Qasim Muhammad, and upon his pure and chaste family.

The phenomenon of dialogical imperative among our ancient grammarians is an approach between two perspectives, ancient and modern, and aims to prove that the study of this phenomenon was more mature than what modern linguistic thought has reached. Through the application of deliberative concepts, especially the concept of dialogical implication, on the ancient Arabic linguistic heritage, as it contributes to the interpretation of its communicative phenomena. Cut off from our grammatical heritage.

The examiner of the writings of ancient grammarians finds that they were not unaware of the importance of the concept of the dialogical imperative in the success of the dialogic process, and proving the existence of this concept in our grammatical heritage confirms its originality and its precedence in relying on everything that achieves the desired benefit of syntax in different contexts, and this early awareness of the importance of the dialogical imperative In the dialogic process, it was clearly manifested in the thought of grammarians, until it became a basic basis that they relied upon to guide the semantics of some sentences, and to reveal the subtle expressive subtleties contained in them.

The research required me to show the concept of dialogical implication, and the most important principles on which it was based in modern linguistic thought, especially in (Grace), then I present some applied models of grammatical dialogues, and the concept of dialogic implication was manifested in them, and I studied that in a study based on reading dialogic texts In the blogs of grammarians and comparing them with theses of modern linguistic theory.

[1] University of Thi-Qar, College of Education for Human Sciences, Iraq, aabwmstfy382@gmail.com
[2] University of Thi-Qar, College of Education for Human Sciences, Iraq, dr.Asaad.Khalaf.Alawadi@utq.edu.iq

The concept of dialogue imperative

The dialogical imperative is one of the most important aspects on which the pragmatic analysis is based, as it is attached to the nature of the research, and it is far from ambiguity in the areas of semantic research (1), as it is considered a basic axis in the pragmatic lesson and one of the patterns of the pragmatic pronouns and the implications of saying, which are the meanings that are performed without being declared. them in the dialogue.

The dialogic imperative can be defined as what the speaker aims at indirectly, making his listener transcend the apparent meaning of his speech to another meaning, or it is the meaning attached to the original significance of the phrase (2).

Knowledge of the dialogic imperative does not depend on knowledge of the rules that make phrases molded and controlled, but rather goes beyond that to knowledge of the circumstances in which they are said, as they change according to the circumstances of the parties to the communicative process (the speaker, the listener, and the position) (3).

And the first to use this term was the American philosopher (Paul Grace), and the origins of the research in it go back to the lectures he gave at Harvard University in 1967 AD when he saw that some words can only be known by their use and the inference of the recipient of them (4), and he presented through these lectures Briefly his perception of this aspect of the lesson, and the methodological foundations on which it is based, and brief parts of it were printed in 1975 AD in his research entitled (Logic and Dialogue), then he expanded it in two researches of his, the first in 1978 AD, and the second in 1981 AD (5).

The starting point for Grace ((is that people in their conversations may say what they mean, and they may mean more than what they say, and they may mean the opposite of what they say, so he made all his concern to clarify the difference between what is said and what is meant))(6).

Through this saying, it becomes clear to us that Grace cared about what is known as saying and what is known as intent. As for saying, it is what is indicated by the literal structure of the text, i. Its mental interpretation, i.e. ((what the speaker wants the listener to convey in an indirect way, based on the fact that the listener is able to reach the speaker's intent with what is available to him of usage norms and means of inference))(8).

This theory (dialogue imperative) puts a solution to a problem that states: ((How is it possible for the speaker to say one thing and mean another? Then how is it also possible for the interlocutor to hear one thing and understand another?)) (9), and Grace found a solution to this problem. Through a general dialogical principle between the speaker and the interlocutor, which he called (the principle of cooperation) (10), and therefore ((Grace proposes that the phenomenon of the conversational imperative be described based on the principle of cooperation and the rules derived from it, given that the source of the obligation is the intended violation of one of the four rules while respecting the general principle of the principle of cooperation ))(11).

Semantics stands helpless in front of this linguistic theory, as it came to fill a gap in the field of semantics and events. It provided us with a clear explanation of a difficult issue that preoccupied linguists, which is how can we mean more than what we actually say? Semantics cannot provide a complete explanation, for example, for the following dialogue:

Can you visit me tonight?

I have an exam tomorrow.

All that semantics can tell us is that the first sentence is interrogative, in which the speaker asks about the possibility of the addressee visiting him, and the second sentence is informing by the addressee that he has an exam tomorrow.

As for how did the first sentence emerge from the interrogative into the petition? And how was the notification in the second sentence meant the rejection of that request? The literal meaning of the two sentences was not intended, and this is what the semantic theory is unable to do. Therefore, Grace's theory came to fill this gap in the field of semantics and activities (12).

Grace's theory is divided into two parts:

The first section: dealt with the meaning and its types in general, especially what he calls (the unnatural meaning) (13), and the most important in this section is Grace's differentiation between two types of connotation: the positive natural connotation, and the unnatural connotation, and the difference between them is represented in the fact that the words are in the natural connotation It denotes what it was placed for in the origin of the language, that is, it refers to the declared signification without the need for the interpretation of the utterance.

Grace is represented by the natural signifier with the following examples:

1. These spots mean (indicate) measles.

2. These spots meant nothing to me, but to the doctor they meant measles.

3. The last financial budget means (indicates) that we are on the verge of a difficult year.

It is clear that the term (meaning) was used here to refer to the significance or meaning behind which there is no intent, as patches or budgets cannot mean anything, but what is intended is to infer these things about measles and rain (15).

As for the unnatural signification, we notice that the interpretation of utterances does not stop at the limits of the modest linguistic significance of the speech, but rather depends mainly on the speaker's intent and intentions on the one hand, and on the understanding of the addressee of these intentions on the other hand, and on the context of the speech and the evidence of conditions on the third hand. The utterance is not complete without the addressee's attempt to construct an acceptable logical inference (16), and Grace represents the unnatural signification with two examples:

4. Sounding the siren (means there is an air raid).

5. The expression (so-and-so is indispensable for his problems and conflicts) means that so-and-so cannot do without his wife.

Grace shows many differences between the first two groups of sentences (1, 2, 3), and the second (4, 5), which is that we can infer from sentence (4) that someone (i.e. the civil defense official) intended from the warning siren to inform of the presence of a raid, The same applies to sentence (5), as we can assume that there is a person who intends the sentence to have that meaning (17).

On this basis, we find that there is a vast difference between the significance of the uttered, i.e. what was said or declared, and the dialogical imperative, i.e. what was conveyed.

The second section: is his interpretation of the phenomenon of waving, or the dialogical imperative according to the principle of cooperation (18).

The principle of cooperation and the rules deriving from it:

It is the first principle of the dialogue process. Grace mentioned it for the first time in his lectures on dialogue, which were entitled (Lectures on Communication), then he mentioned it secondly in his famous research (Logic and Communication) (19), ((The

meaning of this principle is that the parties to the dialogue must cooperate in what between them in order to achieve what is required, in the sense that it requires that the speaker and the interlocutor cooperate in achieving the goal of the dialogue in which they entered)) (20), and to explain the phenomenon of the dialogue imperative, Grace believes that the interlocutors cooperate with each other in communicating and understanding their purposes, so they follow this principle and are guided by it, and this principle states that The following: ((Make your dialogue contribution when you make it appropriate to the direction and the intended purpose of the dialogue in which you participate)) (21).

This principle includes four behavioral rules called the rules of conversation, or dialogue, which are (22):

1. The quantitative rule: it is intended that the interlocutors do not increase or decrease the amount of interest required, and in turn it is branched into:

a. Let your benefit be to the addressee as much as he needs.

B. Do not make your statement exceed the required limit.

2. The rule of quality or type: It is intended to prevent false allegations, or to prove falsehood, and it is branched into:

a. Don't say what you think is false.

B. Do not say what you do not have sufficient evidence of its truth.

3. The rule of connection or appropriateness: It serves as an objective limit, the aim of which is to prevent the speaker from slipping into other objectives contrary to those targeted by the speech. This rule says:

(Let your words be related to the topic of the conversation).

4. The rule of method, method, or entity.

It differs from the previous rules in that it is not related to what was said, but rather to what is meant to be said and the manner in which it should be said.

a. Avoid ambiguity of phrase.

B. Avoid confusion.

c. Speak briefly.

D. Let your words be arranged sequentially.

The desired goal of these rules is to ensure a high effectiveness of verbal exchange without eliminating the possibility of talking about other goals, such as the speaker seeking to influence others, or monopolizing their interest (23).

In Grace's view, the phenomenon of dialogic imperative results when one of the four rules is violated while respecting the general principle (the principle of cooperation)(24).

The following example shows how to break these rules:

Professor (A) writes to Professor (B) asking about student (C)'s willingness to pursue his university studies in the Department of Philosophy. Professor (B) replies: The student is an excellent football player.

If we look at this sentence, we find that it denotes two meanings, the first: its literal meaning, which is (that student (c) is one of the excellent soccer players, and the second: the meaning perceived denominally, which is (that student (c) does not have any willingness to pursue his university studies in the Department of Philosophy). Professor (B) constitutes a violation of the rule of relevance or appropriateness, because its literal meaning does not seem to fit the source and topic of Professor (A)'s question, but its dialogical meaning is what represents the appropriate answer, so if Professor (A) does not

assume that Professor (B) is cooperating with him in the conversation When he arrives at the indirect (non-literal) meaning of his answer, and so on with regard to the other rules, the violation of any of the rules enacted by Grace entails a dialogical implication that calls for a meaning other than the literal meaning of the phrase.

Dialogue imperative in grammatical dialogues:

We have tried here to monitor some of the linguistic phenomena that were embodied in the dialogues of grammarians, and to show their connection to the phenomenon of dialogical implication proposed by (Grace). The ability of the speaker to communicate his idea, and the competence of the receiver in understanding the significance of the linguistic phrases intended by the speaker, and this can be demonstrated through the dialogue that took place between Abi Amr bin Al-Alaa (d. Abu Muhammad al-Yazidi narrated that he said: ((Isa bin Omar came to Abu Amr bin Al-Alaa and we were with him, and he said: O Abu Amr, what has reached me that you permit it? He said: And what is it? He said: I was informed that you permit: (There is no perfume but musk) By raising, he said: Abu Amr said to him: You slept, Abu Omar, and the people entered, there is no Hejazi on earth except that he is erected, and there is no Tamimi on earth except that he is raised... He said: So we came to Abu Amr, so we informed him, and he had Jesus bin Omar who did not leave, he said: So he went out Jesus had his ring from his hand, then he said: You have the ring, by this, by God, you have surpassed the people!) (25).

When we find Issa bin Omar in his question: O Abu Amr, what has I heard that you permit? has departed from the principle of style; Because Abu Amr ((was the master of the people and taught them Arabic, poetry, and the doctrines of the Arabs))(26), and because he permitted many issues, so Isa was oblivious to the manner of the question; It was to draw Abu Amr's attention and reprimand him at the same time. That he permitted something that is not possible, and his question also carried the meaning of denial and objection, so it was possible for him to say to him: How do you permit the two aspects (not doing and neglecting them)? So Abu Amr's question was: What is it? It carries several meanings, including: Which issue is permissible? Or he wanted to communicate a specific idea, which is, O Jesus, I pass a lot of issues, so which one reached you? Which indicates that Abu Amr knew more than one issue.

Whereas, we find that Abu Amr conveyed an eloquent message to Jesus - after mentioning the issue, which is (there is no perfume but musk), by removing musk - by saying: (You slept, O Abu Omar, and the people entered the world. And he raises), Abu Amr was known for the capacity of narration, and the understanding of many Arab languages, and here he relies on what he has memorized of them in terms of rules and permissible aspects, as he deviated from the principles of quantity and style at the same time, so he responded with two answers: The sentence (slept) and what comes after it, so tell us that this issue is old; Because the Arabs knew about it, and despite that, O Jesus, you are heedless, and its news did not reach you! So Ibn Omar understood what he meant by exposing the answer in detail; So it was possible for him to answer "Yes, that is permissible," but he gave him the reason for its permissibility, and the Bedouins from Bani Tamim and the Hijaz testified to that. There are two issues in this matter:

1. The Arabs relied on the mechanism of exposing them to issues and dealing with them in order to reach the most accurate details. They search and find in order to hit the demand.

2. The scholars are not able to challenge or neglect a dialect or language whose eloquence they hold dear to them, which is not affected by the disease of melody, and the evidence is the conviction of Isa ibn Umar with the answer and his adoption of the permissibility of both matters.

Therefore, Jesus agreed with him by saying: (With this, by God, you have surpassed the people); For the strength of the evidence, which is an acknowledgment by Jesus of the

knowledge of Abi Amr bin Al-Alaa, and he departed from the principle of style; Because he did not explicitly refer to his knowledge, but to praise him for his way of dealing with grammatical issues.

The strange thing is that we find Issa bin Omar - after his testimony - opposing Abu Amr bin Al-Alaa with another issue that he did not answer him with, as the latter met him before, and it is the issue of directing the reading of ▢These are my daughters, they are purer(27), as ((Eesa used to recite: ▢these My daughters are the purest, peace be upon him, and this contradicts what all the grammarians said, and when I read the reading, and Abu Amr Ibn Al-Alaa denied it to him, so he said: How do you say: These are my sons, what? He said: Twenty men, so Abu Amr denied it)) (28) Abu Amr bin Al-Alaa was not satisfied with this reading from Issa bin Omar, and he denied it to him, so he asked him how do you say: These are my sons, what? ; As he did not intend by his question to interrogate, rather he intended to deny the recitation of Isa ibn Omar, and he meant by his question two things: the first: a statement of his denial of the recitation, and the second: he intended to oblige the argument against Isa ibn Omar, and here he departed from the principle of style or how.

As for Jesus' response by saying: Twenty men, it is a departure from the principle of quality, quantity and style, and he had three issues in his answer, the first: he was aware of Abu Amr's intention, so he gave him an answer that proves his insistence on this reading, and the second: his answer was not correct and he answered a wrong answer eh Intended, and the third: It was not clear with his response verbally, except that the meaning was aware of Abu Amr, and Jesus wanted from his method of dialogue to prove the reading, no matter what the matter, is nothing; Because it is only a reading, as it came out on all the principles of cooperation in order to end the dialogue; To realize the weighting of Abi Amr's opinion on his reading.

Among the anecdotes of the dialogues was the dialogue that took place between Sibawayh and Yunus on the issue of (the severance of dependency). Al-Mazni narrated that he said: Al-Akhfash said: I was with Yunus, and he was told: Sibawayh had approached, and he said: I seek refuge in God from him. He said: So he came and asked him, and he said: How do you say I passed by the poor, and he said: It is possible for me to pay him for the allowance of a distraction. He said: It is a mistake, so it made me sad, he said: So I passed it to the poor, and he said: It is permissible, so he said: On what thing is it erected? So what did your friend say about him, meaning the boyfriend?' Sibawayh said: He told me that it is set for mercy, so he said: How good is this?(29).

To begin with, we find that Yunus' mention of seeking refuge with Allah is an indication that Sibawayh is a scholar and not a student. As for Sibawayh's question: (How do you say: The poor, the poor, the poor?) Yunus about a single question with all its grammatical aspects, the nominative, the accusative and the prepositional, and he did not intend to interrogate anything. It is unknown to him, but rather the intention of the dialogue, and the evidence is his knowledge of grading these aspects on the opinion of both Al-Khalil and Yunus himself, and here he has deviated from the principle of style. There are two aspects to his response, the first: challenging the opinion only with the evidence of Al-Akhfash's saying (so that overwhelmed me), and the second: opposing him by saying something that cannot be proven and interpreted by ijtihad. On the validity of his opinion without the second, and Sibawayh mentioned the opinion of Yunus in this dialogue in his book in ((Chapter: What happens from insults in the course of glorification or something similar)) (30), as for Sibawayh's saying: (Didn't you tell me that the situation is not with the thousand and the lam), It is a denial question, with which it departs from the principle of style or method. If Sibawayh should have said (you do not allow that), then he gave his answer in the form of the question, so that Yunus would understand that he himself was the one who prevented that, so how could he allow it?! . And in Yunus' response to Al-Khalil's opinion about the monument: How good is this! A departure from the quantitative principle, as it was possible for him to answer by saying: True. As for the

method of exclamation, it includes Yunus' approval of Al-Khalil's opinion while expressing his admiration for the opinion.

Among the conundrums that the grammarians exploited in the way they asked questions, so their questions were a departure from the principle of cooperation, which made them include a dialogue imperative in every formulation, and this is what characterized the dialogue between the radiator and the glass in the issue (the syntax of the exclamation form: what I do, and its meaning), as Abu Ishaq al-Zajaj said So I entered him (al-Mubarrad), and when I sat down, I said to him: How do you say: What is better than Zayd? He said: What is better than Zayd? The subject, and increase the object of it, and the meaning is the meaning of exclamation, so I went to skip the question, and he said to me: On your messenger, this answer convinced you? Rather, it is a complete noun in the sentence, such as: what you do, do, or in the interrogative form, like: what did you do, man? And what do you have? It is a beginning and what comes after it is its news, so how is it possible for it to be in other than these two places a noun without connection? And if you said: I saw Or I liked what it was not words until you say: I saw what you made, or I liked what you have, and the likes of what is related to what I did not have an answer to this, so he said: The answer to the question is to say: It is only valid for what is in the interrogative to be a noun without Link ; because if it arrived it would work, and the questioner is only asked about what he is ignorant of, as you say: Who is your father? If you say: Who is your father in the house? You were informing about what you knew and not informing about what you were ignorant of. Because there is a vague rumor that says: What I rode, I rode, and that is a reality for every ride, and as you say: Whoever comes to me will come, this is a reality for all people. To be vague and not specific, as you say: something brought you, that is, nothing but something brought you, and also: (evil with a fang), which means nothing but evil, and similar to it: I am from what I do such-and-such, he wants from the command to do such-and-such Likewise, when the matter was unknown, what was in her thumb was irrelevant...))(31).

Deviating from the quantitative principle, the debate, from its inception, relied on extravagance and elaboration in explaining the issue. If the answer was not as much as the question, the question of al-Zajjaj (I told him: How do you say what is better than Zayda?), and al-Muradabi answered the first time, and then proceeded to detail, not only that, but the al-Muradabi went on to raise problems on his explanation to enter another aspect of the issue, and that By posing the same problem on the glass, which makes him seek to know it, the matter that was put on the glass like his problem on his first answer, the glass said: (So I went to skip the question, and he said to me: Could this answer convince you? I said: You did not leave anything in it...), and with this he departed from The principle of style when it began to raise ambiguity and skepticism, so it was not brief in the hadeeth, but rather mentioned it in the most accurate details of what went far in its explanation. The method is by mentioning what constitutes issues and contradicts them at times And he proves the validity of the other on a third occasion, as in al-Zajjaj's saying: (And I approved of what I heard, so he said to me: Did this convince you?...), This exodus brought the dialogue to the point of persuasion and achieving the goal:

1. Al-Mubarrad wanted Al-Zajjaj to feel that he was more knowledgeable than he thought in the branches of language.

2. To show him his school's method of discussion and argument.

Rather, he reaped more than what he wanted, which is the gain of the glass from the Kufic school to the visual school (32), by saying the glass, addressing himself: (This is the truth, and anything else is false).

Among the dialogues that included a dialogic implication was the hypothetical dialogue that Al-Sirafi mentioned in the form of objection and response in the matter of (or) that is ambiguous or doubtful. He says: ((And among the ambiguities in the news is his saying: Saying it Glory be to Him: ((And We sent him to a hundred thousand or more))(34), and

the Almighty said: ((They are like stones or more hard))(35), if someone says: How does this ambiguity occur? What you mentioned is from God Almighty to His creation, as it was only intended By addressing them with clarification and understanding to establish the argument against them with what was revealed, and he did not make it ambiguous?It was said to him: They were addressed according to the extent of what is happening in their speech in terms of understanding each other, perhaps it obscured them in informing them because of their inability to reach the facts of things and that they reach an approximation from them, and the speaker may confuse them for the lack of Interest in detail))(36).

In this text, we find Al-Serafi has issued a deliberative version, as he, in his assumption of the objection of the objector, has acknowledged the principle upon which the communicative process is based. This, which Al-Serafy approved, is close to the saying on which Grace built the principle of cooperation, which states the following: ((Let your contribution to the dialogue be as much as the context of the dialogue requires, and in accordance with the recognized purpose, or the direction in which that dialogue takes place))(37), so Grace In this saying, the speaker is directed with a directive that guarantees the addressee clarification, understanding, and not falling into confusion during the speech.

In Al-Sirafi's response to the objection of the objector, he establishes the theory of dialogical implication according to Grace, by saying: "They were addressed according to the extent of what is happening in their speech in terms of understanding one another." According to Grace, the violation of the rule (the direction of the news) that stipulates clarity in speech is based on the circulation of these linguistic communities for this violated or vague linguistic use, and the Qur'anic discourse came in accordance with this circulation and use, so Al-Sirafi's inference on the legitimacy of this breach represented in (the thumb), is based on On the basis of the common use of language, and this treatment approximates Grace's treatment of the phenomenon of dialogic imperative that occurs when the speaker violates one of the rules stipulated in the principle of cooperation. The speaker intends one of them, and this is exactly what al-Sirafi did by examining the intentional possibilities that the Qur'anic discourse may have intended, which are as follows:

Perhaps the Quranic discourse obscures people because of their inability to reach the truth.

Or to get from this vagueness to something close to the truth.

Or he obscured the Qur'anic discourse due to lack of interest in detailing.

And if we contemplate Seraph's treatment of the indication (or) of doubt and ambiguity, we find that he was concerned with the elements that were concerned with the deliberative treatment, which are: (the speaker in the case of doubt and ambiguity, the position of the addressee, the intention of the speaker in both cases, and the use and its abundance in the indication (or) of doubt and the speaker's neutrality from doubt to ambiguity through use as well), and this means that Al-Serafi approached the approach of pragmatists in terms of their care also for these elements in the analysis of linguistic structures, and Al-Serafi is keen on the principle of cooperation between the speaker and the interlocutor, so the speaker in a state of doubt has respected this principle and did not violate any A rule of its four rules, so the indication of doubt reached the addressee, according to the intention of the speaker, but in the case of ambiguity, the speaker violated (the rule of appropriateness), creating a dialogue implication intended to be communicated to the addressee, which is the ambiguity of the matter that the speaker knew and ambiguous to his interlocutor, and in that Al-Sirafi says: (( Know that (or) its reality is that something is isolated from something... and in that it refers to the principle for which it was placed... So from that is your saying: Zaid or Amr came to me, so the principle in it is that one of them came to you, and the most in using that is that the

speaker is doubtful and not He knows which of them is coming, so it appears from the speech that the listener makes him doubt the speaker, and it may be that the speaker was not suspicious, except that he obscured him in case he intended it in that, as the saying says: I spoke to one of the two men (and) I chose one of the two things and he knew it with his eyes and he did not tell about it ))(38).

The dialogical imperative represented a part of Ibn Yaish's grammatical analyzes based on the supposed dialogue, in the two chapters of affirmation and instead of inclusion. It is first to emphasize the whole and the whole, and it is only in what follows or fragments, because their meaning is encompassing and comprehensive, as he says: ((And you say: The people came to me all together. Thus, it is useful to fulfill the number of the people, and if I said: Zaid came to me all or all of it, it is not permissible, because Zayd is not something that can be divided or divided, so if you wanted that he came intact in the parts and parts, that is permissible))(39).

The dialogue impliment occurred in (Zayd came to me as a whole) when the speaker contradicted the original situation of the meaning of affirmation with all and all, so it was not appropriate to the natural meaning, but what is meant is that Zayd came unharmed from disabilities or the like, and from the second, which is instead of inclusion, towards your saying: Zaid liked his knowledge, Its interpretation according to Ibn Yaish is a deliberative interpretation, as he says: ((And that is because when you said: Zaid liked me, it was understood that the admirer is not Zaid in terms of his being flesh and blood, but that is a meaning in him, and the lesson of inclusion is that the phrase is correct in his wording about that thing, so it is permissible to say: robbed Zaid, and you want his clothes, and I liked Zaid, and you want his knowledge and manners, and similar meanings)) (40).

The semantic transgression in the aforementioned examples results from a breach of the rule of adequacy with the principle of Grassroots cooperation. So when you say: I liked Zaid, you mean by informing that Zaid's knowledge and literature have settled in him and became imprinted in him, which is explained by his saying: (but that is a meaning in it), and also your saying: (Zaid was robbed) you mean. The ugliness of the stolen property, and other meanings required by the context.

## Conclusion:

The search resulted in a set of results, which can be summarized in the following points:

1. The dialogical imperative is one of the most important aspects on which the pragmatic analysis is based, as it is considered a basic axis in the pragmatic lesson and one of the patterns of the pragmatic pronouns and the implications of the saying, which are the meanings that are performed without being declared in the dialogue, and the first to use this term is the American philosopher ( Paul Grace).

2. The phenomenon of the dialogic imperative is based on the principle of cooperation, which is branched into a set of rules. According to Grace, the phenomenon of the dialogic imperative is produced when one of the four rules is violated while respecting the general principle (the principle of cooperation).

3. The grammarians were not unaware of the importance of the concept of the dialogical imperative in the success of the conversational process, and proving the existence of this concept in our grammatical heritage confirms its originality and precedence in relying on everything that achieves the desired benefit from sentence construction in different contexts, and this early awareness of the importance of the dialogical imperative in the process Dialogue has clearly manifested itself in the thought of grammarians until it has become a basic foundation that they rely on in guiding the semantics of some sentences, and revealing the subtle expressive subtleties contained in them.

## References

1. Discourse Strategies: A Pragmatic Linguistic Approach, Abd al-Hadi bin Dhafer al-Shehri, Dar al-Jadeed al-Muttahidah, 1st edition, 2004.

2. The Conversational Implication between Arabic Rhetoric and Modern Pragmatics, Ahmed Al-Mutawakel, within the Pragmatics book, the science of using language, formatted and presented by: Hafez Ismaili Alawi, The Modern Book World for Publishing and Distribution, Irbid - Jordan, 2nd edition, 2014 AD.

3. The dialogue imperative in linguistic circulation from awareness of the specificities of the phenomenon to the development of laws that control it, Al-Ayashi Adwari, Al-Ikhtif publications, Dar Al-Aman _ Rabat, 1st edition, 1432 AH - 2011 AD.

4. New Horizons in Contemporary Linguistic Research, Dr. Mahmoud Ahmed Nahla, University Knowledge House, (Dr. I), 2002 AD.

5. Circularity: Its Origins and Directions, Jawad Khitam, Dar Treasures of Knowledge for Publishing and Distribution, 1st edition, 1437 AH - 2016 AD.

6. Explanation of the detailed, Ibn Yaish (d. 643 AH), Department of pulpit printing, (Dr. I), (Dr. T).

7. Explanation of Sibawayh's book, Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi (d. 368 AH), investigation: Ahmed Hassan Mahdali and Ali Sayed Ali, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah, Beirut - Lebanon, 3rd Edition, (Dr. T).

8. Layers of grammarians and linguists, Abu Bakr Muhammad ibn al-Hasan al-Zubaidi al-Andalusi (d. 379 AH), investigation: Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim, Dar al-Ma'arif - Egypt, 2nd edition, (Dr. T).

9. The book (Kitab Sibawayh), Abu Bishr Amr bin Othman bin Qanbar (d. 180 AH), investigation and explanation: Abd al-Salam Muhammad Haroun, Al-Khanji Library - Cairo, 3rd edition, 1408 AH - 1988 AD.

10. Tongue and Balance or Mental Propagation, Dr. Taha Abdel Rahman, Arab Cultural Center, 1st edition, 1998 AD.

11. Functional Linguistics: A Theoretical Approach, Dr. Ahmed Al-Mutawakil, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Jadeed Al-Mutahidah, 2nd edition, 2010 AD.

12. Councils of Scholars, Abu al-Qasim al-Zajaji (d. 340 AH), investigation: Abd al-Salam Muhammad Harun, al-Khanji Library - Cairo, (Dr. I), (Dr. T).

13. Ranks of Grammarians, Abu al-Tayyib Abd al-Wahed bin Ali al-Lughi al-Halabi (d. 351 AH), verified and commented on by: Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim, Nahdat Misr Library and Printing Press, Faggala - Cairo, (Dr. I), (Dr. T).

14. Lexicon of Writers, Irshad Al-Areeb to Know the Writer, Yaqut Al-Hamwi Al-Roumi (d. 626 AH), investigation: Dr. Ihsan Abbas, Dar Al-Gharb Al-Islami, Beirut - Lebanon, 1st edition, 1993 AD.

15. Syntax and Morphology in Scholars' Debates and Dialogues Until the End of the Fifth Century AH, Presentation and Criticism, Muhammad Adam Al-Zaki, PhD thesis, Saudi Arabia - Umm Al-Qura University - College of Arabic Language - Department of Postgraduate Studies - Linguistic Branch, Supervision: Dr. Ahmed Makki Al-Ansari 1404-1405 AH 1984-1985 AD.

16. The theory of dialogic waving between modern linguistics and linguistic investigations in the Arab and Islamic heritage, Hisham Abdullah Al-Khalifa, Library of Lebanon Publishers, Egyptian International Publishing Company, Longman, 1st edition, 2013 AD. The theory of speech act between modern linguistics and linguistic investigations in the Arab and Islamic heritage, Hisham Abdullah Al-Khalifa, Lebanon Library Publishers, the Egyptian International Publishing Company, Longman, 1st edition, 2007.