COGNITIVE THEORY OF ASSETS IN THE MEANING OF ARABIC GRAMMAR LESSON FOR PHILOSOPHICAL A MODEL

Assistant Lecturer Dr. Naaman Amber Huerf Al-Ibrahimi

University of Thi-Qar, College of Education for Human Sciences, Department of Arabic.

Abstract

The study of language was the focus of the attention of scholars from ancient times, and this interest was not a sign of intellectual luxury or unconscious meditation, but was part of the core of trying to understand man's existence.

Despite the differences in the mechanisms of understanding the language among its students, these scholars of all walks of life were trying to probe the depth of words to reach the meaning intended by the speaker, and if the recipient of himself fell on the text when he received that text .The texts were attracted by many visions, and if this was a natural issue in some texts, then it is not the case in other texts, especially those texts related to the human movement towards life, such as religious texts or legal texts.

This research aims to rooting the meaning in studies that were not specialized in the technical sense of the singular, but which cast its shadow clearly in Arabic grammatical studies.

The meaning of the philosophers

Although philosophy is a science that searches for the essences of things entirely based on its view of the universe and existence in the form of reflections originating from the mind, this does not mean that it is not read to many of the particles that constitute existence as a whole, as the philosophical norm denies the true existence of the whole because the whole an extractive concept based on parts.

Perhaps the meaning part was organized in philosophical thought within the overall concept of language, and the philosophical statements in meaning and their relationship to the word are considered a precedent for all studies that went to meaning later, but rather they are truly the first reference to study the meaning and its relationship to the word.

The binary word meaning when philosophers represent a reflection after a knowledge deeper is a bilateral matter and the image that formed an extensive presence in the philosophical thought which also fall within the coverage of my places in the so - called theory of the four ills is an article, image, actor and end , (1) and sees philosophers that need science The natural is for the two elements of the material and the image that ((that every natural body is the subject of the self in two parts, one of which takes the place of wood from the bed and he is told that it is the ole or substance and the other takes the place of the image of the bed from the bed and is called an image. (2)

There is no doubt that this is any relation Balheioly stems from philosophers to perceived things that are before me ,if it was perceived they mean ((the idea of something abstract about it ,purely from it, the University of cases is the picture , (3) ((the more Philosophers claim that he conceived before me , and they called him pure, meaning that he was prior to experience. (4)

The idea of chaos, or the visualization of a material without an image, and that it took a lot of controversy in the philosophical corridor , but it remained in reality the outgrowth of pure assumption led to

it by contemplation and abstraction of concepts ;So the philosophers concede ((the impossibility of a party in the absence of the other, because the previous existence in the potential of power is nothing but a purely philosophical assumption that prepares to accept the idea of the formal impression on matter)) ,[5] but in the abstract concept of science it does not prevent this existence In a superposed form, in which the relationship of the two victories appears to have an external adhesive character.

Perhaps the impossibility of this existence reaches its most clear form when it comes to relationships of meanings with expressions and their familiarity with the production of the text, as it is preceded in the perception of heritage makers that it is not possible for meaning to emerge into actual existence except by verbal, and this emanation may depart from perfection if the congruence between the functions and the connotations is achieved so that it becomes impossible for a mature conception. It depends on these axioms on the one hand, and is rooted in other sources based on awareness of the relationships of integral units in the text based on the meanings of grammar on the other hand.[6]

Sophists are the first to engage in the question of meaning, within the circle of their conversation about language, as they are among the first to draw attention to the study of words, sentences and style, and their view of language is evident through the saying of Rota Görse: ((The human being is the standard of everything, some standard It exists so that it exists, and a standard of what is not present does not exist)) ,[7] an indication of the controversy that took place between the Ilis and the Sophists about the dilemma of meaning, is it in the homogeneous thing that does not undergo change in the belief of the Ilians ?Or that the subject participates with the essence and nature of a thing in producing meaning according to the view of the sophists?[8]

For the sophists, language came to express a subjective vision, and did not search the essence of truth as a supreme end in itself, rather the aim was to prove a certain issue regardless of the individual's conviction in it .[9] The other for the truth ((so they made conjecture, a concept that is very close to interpretation, a basic input to achieve their goal of making the probable a reality, and their persuasive philosophy was activated on this basis, and on this was that activity in making the possible reality by persuasion is an important asset of interpretation)) ,[10] the sophists tried to establish an epistemological paradox between the essentialist and the modern, that is, between the idea and the reality, based on that gap that exists between the words and the things expressed, so the realistic interpretation of language must take into account its semantic duality in language, because language can be a tool of communication but it is in Time itself may be a means of deception.[11]

Whatever the matter of the sophists and what they suggested in their view of language, the philosophers of language admit that the true birth of the philosophical interest in language is evident through the famous Cratel dialogue, that dialogue in which the discussion centered around the issue of the origin of language and the nature of names, and Cratel was discussing Hermogen on these issues in Socrates.[12]

The Cratel dialogue showed two opposing theories on the issue of the significance of the word on the natural theoretical meaning represented by Cratil, who acknowledged the existence of a natural relationship between the word and its meaning, and the other was the idiomatic theory represented by Hermogen, who believes that language arises from humility and convention.[13]

The form of Cratel's position represented in the fact that names did not exist according to the way we saw them, but rather in line with their pure nature basically Socrates' response, which he explained with the following question ((Can the picture painted by the painter accurately express the subject that he paints?)) What must be paid attention to is that The general character of this essence will become known in the

drawing, and the imprecision of some details does not hinder people from realizing the meaning of the name.[14]

As for Plato, he went on to say an intermediate reference to the language, as he saw that the name reflects the name and sometimes stems from its nature, and the letters and syllables that people use differed from one language to another.

This means that the signifier has the ability to simulate and express the meaning, so the relationship between names and things is an organic relationship, so letters and syllables express the image of things[15] but this does not mean that some names are not subject to usage and convention[16] which seems to be Plato's vision. It was a reflection of the relationship of form to the content for him. Perhaps saying the issue of the abstract form suspended in the world of proverb is what prompted him to say the natural relationship between word and meaning.

Plato's ideas were the subject of criticism by Aristotle, who believes that there is no significant relationship between the word and what it indicates except the convention, and this opinion is the basis for what was later known as the lineage of the relationship between the signifier and the signified.

Aristotle considered speech a representation of the changes of the soul, just as writing is a picture of the changes of the voice.[17]

Then it is determined that the meanings in the soul, unlike the letters and words, are examples or images of the objects))) and by defining this difference between words and meanings that are in the soul) confirms in an almost spontaneous way, that words and letters are without doubt and above all mimic any signs ... to the meanings in Nafs ,[18] (and speech for him are representations of the primary meaning that falls under the category of the ten categories or essences that are images of external sensations.[19]

The disagreement between Plato and Aristotle over the relationship of words with their meanings cast a shadow over the later philosophical research, and the debate intensified between the nominative and realist philosophers on this issue ,as the realists who derived their ideas from Plato see that words have a natural relationship to things. Through its significance on the meaning .[20] As for the Assamese who were influenced by Aristotle, they see that abstract concepts and faculties do not have a real existence except in the minds of people ,and these names express extractive things whose focus is the part, and that ideas have no real existence except in the minds of people, just as words are not things whose pronouncement matches their essence. The convention and modesty are what drives the relationship of verbal and meaning, and accordingly, the network of linguistic convention is the reference in defining and directing the words.[21]

The movement of thought is necessarily a communicative movement. Therefore, Aristotle's views did not stop at the Nesmen, but rather formed a starting point for the Stoics who established their theory of meaning on the basis of thought. In their view, man speaks because he thinks, and thinks because he speaks, and it is one of the first attempts to link language with thought, and what distinguishes their philosophy Associated with language is the individual characteristic that depends on the substance and the actual event, based on their theory of knowledge based on sense and experiment.[22]

So they stripped the science of meaning from the psychological formula ;Meaning , because in their view is the result of a system emerges from the ideal segmentation of mental cultural and autism, which is not a mental image nor the idea nor the impression.[23]

When they talk about the significance, they refer to something clear in a direct form that leads to the conclusion of something clear, so the sign can be memorial, that is, it arises from a combination of two events

confirmed by experience, just as experience confirms that if there is smoke, then that means the presence of fire.[24]

Talking about the meaning of the philosophers necessarily calls for standing on the vision of Islamic thought, which formed a vision of existence, which does not derive its legitimacy from the Greek hallway alone. Rather, the Islamic visions had a great impact on it, as the study of the history of philosophy always mentions that there is a religious activation behind every change that occurs to The pattern of philosophy, not because religion represents the movement of fateful connection with a set of values and beliefs, but rather an experiment of representations of thought within the circle of concepts and visions in which understanding the meanings based on it requires a phenomenal fusion drawn through the horizon of the outward appearance of language, and its interior involves the act of guessing and waiting ,[25] which is a field It interferes with philosophy after it, prompting the act of imagination at the level of understanding, and the act of interpretation at the level of language.[26]

The form of the word pair of meaning is under discussion by Arab philosophers, trying to recover that relationship between existence and existence that philosophers talked about in the past, and the attempt to address the philosophical origins of linguistic knowledge requires standing before the efforts of the second teacher Abu Nasr Muhammad al-Farabi, whose contributions to addressing the linguistic issue had a clear effect , and it is evident. This is evident by writing the letters.[27]

In his discussion of the relationship between language and the world, Al-Farabi believes that language is an indicative device that expresses the contents of this world, and language transfers it to a set of mental concepts .[28] Pointing to the limitations of terms compared to meanings , the meanings in his view are)) As for them not originally denoted by a word, but only in terms of reasonable ones, and if they are denoted by words, then they should be taken as meaning by the words of any nation agreed, and they are preserved when uttering them, And the illusion about it is that it is the meanings of its objects in the number, and that it is colluding with it in its words.[29] (

Reasonable meanings not denoted by a word mean that the meaning is prior to pronouncement in its existence, since the arrangement of meanings in the soul is a reason for arranging the words on the tongue ,[30] and that this intelligibility in the meaning is based on the reference of the mind that extracts from the partial images other meanings that can be generated Including new meanings.[31]

However, the meanings entrusted to the mind are nothing but mental perceptions embodied by the image and bring it into existence, and this does not mean a disregard for the meaning, but rather an acknowledgment of its impossibility, a content that can only be controlled in its formal properties, and that the application of philosophy articles to the chaotic and the image does not mean a dilution of meanings, but rather Its presence in the language confirms an unparalleled presence of words.[32]

These ideas presented by Al-Farabi are considered a reference for many who came to find, for Ibn Sina's ideas were based on the epistemic dimensions of what Al-Farabi said, but what Ibn Sina added to the issue of meaning is to determine the ranks of the existence of meaning, it became clear to him that the meaning has two existence, the first It is the presence in the notables, and the second is its presence in the minds.[33]

But the boundaries of the two entities may overlap, making it difficult to differentiate between them, and therefore Avicenna tended to define the meaning by the discriminatory boundary, not the essence, saying: ((The difference between the perception of the image and the perception of the meaning ,that the image is the thing that the subconscious and the apparent sense perceive together, but the apparent sense perceives it first, and performs it. To the subconscious sense, such as the sheep's perception of the image of a

wolf, I mean its shape, appearance and color, for the subconscious sense of the sheep perceives it, but the apparent sense perceives it first .[34] ((...

Tried to Ibn Sina to retrieve the question of significance word on the meaning, and because the meaning and its relationship to verbal lies in the realization that the vocalized entity and that the uttered by a form makes his being volatile image and why the language Taatoby on stability sports and extends after the explanatory can not Tsaejeh wall arithmetic denies reaction time in which [35] Avicenna tried to study the intentionality of language according to the concept of the pledge between the speaker and the recipient ((Since the verb, according to Avicenna, does not have any kind of possibility indicative of its own meaning, and from here , the connotation of the word does not precede the will of the speaker, because In its precedent that is a complete negation of the speaker's ability to act in the verb [36]) .So we see him say: ((And that is that the expression himself does not indicate at all; otherwise, every right of the meaning would not override it, but rather indicate the will of the pronouncer, just as the pronouncement pronounces it is indicative of Meaning, like an eye on a spring of water, so that would be its significance, then it would be a sign of another meaning, such as an eye on a dinar, so that would be its significance. [37] (

In his article, Avicenna tries to abstract the meaning from the semantic system, as it is an arrangement of the formulas of the occurrence of meaning within the concepts of intentionality, regionalism and compositional connotation, and here the significance is involved in the subjective reference of places of meaning, that is, returning to what is in the minds, and there is no doubt that this retrieval makes the word a path To return, because the verb of semantic emission is an act specific to its temporal and it contains a paradox of the substance of the presence of meaning in the mind, which is the substance that becomes clear after the syntax of the expression in the semantic form, then the meaning of the expression is not a sign of pre-articulation, that is, in the modern linguistic expression an effect confined between the verb and the verb Understanding .[38] The ranks of the existence of meaning in its mental and physical dimensions met with a wide echo in the philosophical lesson, so Al-Razi later tried to prove its validity according to a logical pattern of inference, saying: ((For words are indications of what is in the minds and not of what is in the notables for this reason it is said: Words indicate On the meanings, because the meanings are what the ani meant, and they are mental matters and the evidence for what we have mentioned in two ways: The first is that if we see a body from the distance and think it is a rock, we say that it is a rock, then if we approach it and see its movement and think it is a bird, we say: It is a bird, and if the proximity increases and we know He is a human being. We said: He is a human being, so the difference in names when different mental perceptions indicates that the meaning of the words is the mental image and not the external object. [39]

In his article, Al-Razi tries to create an imitation bias between essence and reality, that is, between the principle of interdependence and modernity, for the essence remains independent from the accidental and the concrete [40] to clarify by this the role of the self in producing the meaning that is based here (((on a divergent connotation and a rotational intentionality). The ontological structure in which a specific meaning resides in it works - without immediate retrieval of the synonymous intentions - to preponderate the significance in terms of a momentary difference in the common mental image in some degree of closeness, so when we deal with the signifier and the signified, the language does not contain neither ideas nor sounds that are already in the system Semantic, but there are conceptual discrepancies and technical disparities resulting from this system, so the final image of the meaning is a momentary shorthand for different and divergent connotations)). [41]

In another part of his talk about the mental existence of meaning, Al-Razi distinguishes between a thing in its mental image and the reference, which is the rooting of what was known in the modern era with the semantic triangle depending on this on the verbal dimension, and he sees ((If the word indicates the external existence, it would have been if a person said the world is old and said The last incident required the

Dr. Naaman Amber Huerf Al-Ibrahimi COGNITIVE THEORY OF ASSETS IN THE MEANING OF ARABIC GRAMMAR LESSON FOR PHILOSOPHICAL A MODEL

fact that the ancient world was an accident together, which is impossible, but if we say: It is a sign of mental meanings, these two sayings are indicative of the occurrence of these two judgments from these two human beings and that does not contradict)). [42]

Al-Razi tried to give the meaning an inner intensity and give the pain a pull inward through the sign , so all that we recall is the manifestation of our own phenomena. [43]

And if Al-Razi was able to liberate the language from its references or at least dismantle the necessary and logical association of the reference's belonging to the circle of meaning, then he could liberate it from the bond of verbal affiliation to the world opened by the language, then in his theory of meaning he adopted a fundamental concept in defining the central concepts of this theory, which is a concept. The annihilation, it submits all the linguistic concepts to the cognitive pair (annihilation / survival) to examine after that the existential foundations of these concepts and then their ability to move the language towards understanding, and to localize that understanding in the language . [44] According to al-Razi, the concept of fana 'means that the semantic signs and the indicative and affective functions are regulated by the characteristic of the annihilation, so the air of the hubs expires to present the sound, the sound is annihilated to present the letters, the letters are consumed to advance the word, the words are consumed to advance the phrase, and the phrase is annihilated to advance the meaning. [45]

This understanding sought by Al-Razi approximates what was seen by Abu Hayyan al-Tawhidi by saying: ((Rather, the difference between the word and the meaning is that the word is natural and the meaning is mental, and this is why the word has become obsolete over time, because time stands for the effect of nature with another effect of nature. The meaning is constant over time, because the final meaning is a mind , and the mind is divine, and the substance of the word is clay, and every clay is crumblin. [46]

The transformation from the world to the text carries with it the separation between the understanding and the world as an object , which is also transformed with the transfer of the text to the self, into a distance between the text and its reader, and accordingly the hermeneutic decodes the text and opens its world to the self, and in this way the real world is read multiple times The regions , [47] therefore, the concept of meaning remained in the philosophical thought, which is attracted by many visions, subject to the trial of a higher order being the philosophical thought throughout its long history, through which it was forced to divide a supposed division requiring the disassociation of the word with its meaning, according to the perceptions in the minds of the heritage makers, with their admission that this The disjointed perception of the two metaphysical elements implies an external formal impression on a substance present by force that forms according to this impression, to give its existence according to the specificity of the imprinted image. [48]

Thus, the idea of meaning dominated in its philosophical dimension until the modern philosophical lesson appeared, which was based on a rich body of knowledge. Modern philosophy tried to probe its depths and reproduce it in a new way. As a result of the transformation of the philosophical structures into schools of thought, social and political sometimes, modern philosophers of the language have taken different positions that reflect their doctrines and their intellectual references. A vision of the universe and existence and the relationship of language with them, and how is language a cognitive system that is established through knowledge of existence as a whole ?These ideas, which were put forward in modern philosophy, subsequently established the emergence of a new vision through which, along with other sciences ,what is known as modern linguistics emerged.

Many scholars believe that the contributions of David Hume in the field of language had a clear impact on the philosophical lesson regarding his epistemology, and by referring to his dealings with the

linguistic research, as Hume looks at the formation of knowledge through its individual and partial foundations, the concept of the word that is made In the mind about the expression of a human being - for example - it cannot be achieved by accumulating images of all people in the mind. Rather, the term human being is in fact a product of the images of people through whom the perception is formed, and by mentioning the word human, an image of a person will be drawn in the mind that represents the rest of humanity. [49]

Linguistic research for Hume is based on the issue of meaning, for language is essentially meaning, but this meaning must be related to the issue of rational inference that is based on the discovery of relationships, which is either relationships between ideas based on the non-contradiction of thought with itself , or relationships in The reality where things are related to each other, when it is not possible to determine their truth or falsehood except by referring to the experience, and this is done by doing a breakdown of the faculties that we want to examine in order to ascertain by means of a series of undoubted conclusions, for example the idea that I have in my mind about the word orange composed From a group of parts consisting of color, shape, taste and smell. [50]

This means that the meaning has built on the total Paljzia relationship, supported the experiment on the launch of (the bumper of s) to define the concept.

As for Edmund Husserl, the nature of his approach to the subject of language confirms that we must reverse our natural trend of thinking in order to go back to the preconceived ideas and philosophical positions that obscure us from the vision, so that we return by that to an earlier field of which is the ((pure biological stream)) the home of experience to see what it contains That field with direct intuitive vision. [51]

The meaning for Husserl is related to two things: the first is the thing in itself, and the second is the intention that is given to this thing, especially when the process of filling with transcendent intentional consciousness corresponds to all the sensory impurities. Identity of the content in the form of the form, in other words mention the content of the feeling. [52]

Husserl believes that intentionality is the basic idea in the language, so that the property every feeling has to be a sense of something, and this Almthabth can be described directly) , P) feeling something is Altzaiv continued between the actions of intent in a broader sense and the intended subject, the feeling in Its original nature is transparent and permanently full, given its distinction of intentionality associated with transparency, and therefore the essence of intent is based on the perception of what the definition gives. [53] ()

Intentionism is dominated by three persons, which are its components according to Husser , which is not sometimes called intentionality , for there is the chaotic which consists of the tangible contents, and the noises or the act of thought, which is the image in the Aristotelian sense - and it is he who produces the images of the ani for the data of the sense, and the intentional character of the lived experience is complete with its intention always and according to what it is. to the subject is Alnuelma, or the subject of thought in issuing rulings on the convict. [54]

Husserl's ideas were an intellectual derivation of Martin Heidegger's views, so when he wrote his book, Existence and Time, he bore it as a dedication to Husserl. [55]

Heidegger has deliberately referred the language back to the time of the Greek language, this is what shows his love for returning words to their original meaning, and this appeared in his philosophical writings in which he used terms dating back to the time of Greece, such as the name of truth (Thethia) which means in the Greek language Non-concealment or non-concealment. [56]

Based on that, Heidegger set out to study many other Greek words, not because he believed that God speaks for himself in these words.

He deliberately studied the German language in the same way, because he believed that it shares the Greek language in terms of the possibilities it provides for thought, and in his belief that they are the strongest and most spiritual languages. [57]

In his study of the nature of language, Heidegger pointed out the gap that exists between words and things, because language is subject to deviation from its true function, and it has the possibility of that. For this reason, Heidegger prefers to return to the sources, and to confront the way things are found, not the way they are said to exist. [58]

So Heidegger chose to pay attention to the linguistic derivations and the original meanings of the word, saying: ((If I am allowed to speak here about play, then I say: It is not we who play with words, but the language being that plays with us, not only today, but always and from a long time ago. [59]) (

This Heideggerian view of language included his idea that language is existence, and thought exists in it, and his philosophical treatment of the subject of language has been reduced to his saying: ((All means of thought are locked up in language, and that whoever never thinks about language has never thought. [60] ( ) (

Within the movement of philosophical thought towards language, the ideas of Ludwig Fengstein are an important tributary of the linguistic lesson, especially when he determined that the main problem in philosophy lies in the language, so he sees that if we are able to decipher the symbols of language, define linguistic issues based on meaning, and put forward what is meaningless We were able to understand the universe and existence, but he (((he went further) in his rejection of philosophy as a theory, trying to return it to a logical procedure for analyzing the language in which he did not see it as the source of every philosophical error, but also the source of the philosophical problems itself , and the occurrence of philosophy in The mistake, in his opinion, is due to the misuse of language, as it often happens in everyday language that one word finds itself having two meanings, and therefore it relates to two different symbols, or we find two words for each of them with a different connotation from the other. [61] ((

Fengstein tended to differentiate between the meaning of the word) saense) And reference(Reference (Which expresses what the word refers to in terms of things, since the meaning of the word does not always equate to its reference, so the reference can be one, and the meaning is different. [62]

Although some scholars believe that the analysis of Venjstein does not add to new knowledge because it is just a way to clarify what we are saying in order to prove his money the meaning of words and meaningless by eating language, what he wrote Venjstein in his letter ((logical message philosophical)) a impact Z lesson in the philosophical analysis of the philosophical schools later. [63]

The Fina group showed an exceptional interest in building a logical language, relying on the method of constructing logical arithmetic , [64] to record a fundamental difference between logical mathematical facts and empirical facts, from which the language is prepared, and that there are only two types of true sayings. [65]

-1Tribal sayings that are known prior to experience and are analytical.

-2Dimensional sayings that are known through experience, and they are synthetic.

This group relied on the principle of verification or the possibility of verification in distinguishing between meaningful and meaningless issues, and Schlick was the first to formulate this principle in the Fina

Group, saying: ((That in order to understand an issue we must be able to point accurately To the individual cases that make the case truthful, as well as the cases that make it false, and these cases are the facts of experience, because experience is what determines the truthfulness and falsehood of cases. [66] ((

Perhaps the most important achievement of the school of Vienna in the science of meaning is the emergence of the theory of patterns, and Carnap defines the semantic system by saying: ((It is a system of rules that is formulated in the superscript language(meta language (Which indicates the language of the subject language object So that these rules determine the condition for the veracity of each sentence in the language of the subject, meaning that it specifies the sufficient and necessary condition for its validity((. [67]

Based on this definition, the rules are what interpret the sentences, that is, make them understandable because understanding a sentence, or knowing what is proven by it is the same as knowing under what condition the sentence is true, in other words that the rules determine the value of the truthfulness of the sentences and determine the meaning or significance of the sentences. [68]

Carnap believes that all the efforts of logic since Aristotle were directed to formulating the rules of inference, after which they are formal rules, that is, they refer to the image of the sentences only, so he sees that logic has nothing to do with meaning except in a narrow limit, that is, to the extent that is called for us to clarify the meaning, and the relationship of meaning is formal. [69]

As for the Oxford philosophers, the main point that they agree upon is that meaning is known only within the limits of linguistic usage , [70] and they presented the definition of meaning within the limits of usage as a methodological rule, and then the question is how to use (x) or in which contexts is it used in a similar way. Significance is a trick or a method, as Rayle puts it. [71]

This is to say alert to the fact that the words (mean) in different ways and, secondly , that the meaning of any word is always associated with the context in which you use it, so one sees philosophers: the idea that the meaning is manifested through the use of one Leahy of one of the greatest feats of contemporary philosophy. [72]

In light of the theory of usage and its effect on revealing the meaning, Weizmann believes that speaking about meaning as being associated with words is misleading, because it appears as if the meaning is a kind of magical being, and it unites with the word the union of the soul with the body, provided that the meaning is not a soul in the body of the word, but What we call the meaning reveals itself in the use of the word. [73]

The use of meaning theory has had important consequences, as this theory leads to a special understanding of language, which in turn leads to the standardization of meaning, as each type of case has a special kind of meaning . [74] This necessitates an amendment to the logical distinction between analytical and compositional issues ,and they have sought to define the meaning according to the occasion of the saying, as it constitutes a strict reference in revealing the meaning , and therefore we must disregard the (thing) that the expression refers to, and pay attention to the occasion that bestows on it. Its usage meaning. [75]

These ancient and modern philosophical sayings constituted an important lesson that threw his perceptions on language, and even if some philosophical schools had made their ideas after Dossuser, they kept abreast of linguistic awareness and affected it, whether in the Western linguistic lesson or what was transferred from this thought to the Arabic language.

Conclusion

.1For philosophers, the duality of expression and meaning is a reflection of a deeper philosophical and epistemological dimension represented by the duality of matter and image, which had a wide presence in the philosophical lesson.

.2Sophists were the first to engage in the issue of meaning, as they were the first to call attention to the study of words, sentences and style.

.3Some philosophers have argued that the signifier has the ability to simulate and express the signified. The relationship between names and things is an organic relationship .Letters and syllables express the image of things, and the first person to say this is Plato.

.4Later on, Islamic thought had worthy opinions about the theory of meaning. One group of them, headed by Abu Nasr Al-Farabi, said that language is an indicative device that expresses the contents of this world.

.5The most of what modern scholars of philosophy said derives its existence and legitimacy from what the ancient philosophers said, whether Islamic or non-Islamic, and their uniqueness was based on reformulating these ideas in the form of systematic and more mature categories by virtue of chronological development .

Margins

(1) Pronunciation and Meaning in Critical and Rhetorical Thinking among the Arabs, Al-Akhdar Collective: 28.

(2) Same source.28 :

(3) Stylistic and style, d .Abd al-Salam al-Sadi: 133.

(4) See: Same source.133 :

(5) Pronunciation and meaning in critical and rhetorical thinking among the Arabs: 28.

(6) Same source: 30.

(7) Philosophy and language issues: a reading in perception and analysis, Bashir Khleifi: 35.

(8) The Epistemological Foundations of Receptivity Theory, Nazem Odeh Khudair: 21.

(9) See: Philosophy and Language Issues: 34-35

(10) Knowledge assets receive: 23 theory. 24

(11) See: Martin Heidegger's Anthology of Language: 72.

(12) Consider: philosophy and language issues 35. 36

(13) Same source: 36.

(14) See :Same source. 36 :

(15th) See: Martin Heidegger's Anthology of Language: 28.

(16) Seen: the same source

(17) See: Philosophy and Language Issues: 37, See: Sign Theory of the Vinnacarnab Group as an example: 223.

(18) Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language: 73.

(19) See: The Qur'anic Meaning between Interpretation and Interpretation, Abbas Amir: 67.

(20) See: Martin Heidegger's Anthology of Language 29.

(21) See : Philosophy and Language Issues: 41.

(22) See: Same source: 38.

(23) See: Semiotics and Philosophy of Language: 73.

(24) Same source: 79

(25) Language and Interpretation, Nasir Building: 79.

(26) Same source. 79 :

(27) Philosophy and Language Issues: 44.

(28) Studies in the science of logic among the Arabs, Farhan Muhammad Jaloub: 61.

(29) Letters: 159.

(30) See: Expressions used in logic: 100.

(31) See: clear notepad in a philosophy, Abdo sweet 108. 109

(32) See: Pronunciation and Meaning in Critical and Rhetorical Thinking of the Arabs: 72.

(33) Healing: the soul: 33.

(34) Healing: The Soul. 35 :

(35) See: Literature and Criticism Discourse, Abd al-Salam al-Masadi: 71.

(36) The Qur'anic Meaning between Interpretation and Interpretation: 61.

(37) Al-Shifa: Reasoning: 25.

(38) See: Language and Interpretation: 134.

(39) Keys to the Unseen: 1/325, and see: Al-Mizhar as-Suyuti: 1/42, and the Opposites in the Language by Abu Hilal Al-Askari: 60.

(40) See: Martin Heidegger's Anthology of Language: 51.

(41) Language and Interpretation: 134.

(42) Unseen Keys: 1/31.

(43) See: Language and Interpretation: 135.

(44) See: Same source. 135 :

(45) See: Same source: 136.

(46) Pleasure and sociability: 1/115.

(47) See: Language and Interpretation30-29 :

(48) Consider: pronunciation and meaning in critical thinking and rhetorical Arabs 29. 30

(49) Seen: Davidhium, Dr .Mahmoud Zaki Naguib: 47.

(50) See: Same source.47 :

(51) Seen: Philosophy and Language Issues: 47.

(52) Consider: The same source: 47. 48

(53) Antlogia language when Martin Heidegger 51. 52

(54) See: Same source: 52.

(55) See: The reference in philosophical thought, Nawal Al-Sayegh Al-Sarraf: 245.

(56) See: Martin Heidegger's Anthology of Language: 74.

(57) See: Same source.74 :

(58) See :Same source. 74 :

(59) Philosophical Approaches, and Aziz Al-Taher: 72.

(60) See: Same source. 77 :

(61) Sees: Logical Philosophical Message: Ludwig Fenchtein: 91.

(62) Fengstein: Dr .Azmi Islam: 89.

(63) See: the signs of the group in us: 29.

(64) See: Same source.29 :

(65) See: Same source.29 :

(66) See: Same source.29 :

(67) See :Same source. 245 :

(68) See: Same source: 246.

(69) See: The Signs Theory of the Vienna Group: 346.

(70) See: Linguistic Analysis of the Oxford Philosophers: 297.

(71) See: Same source.297 :

(72) Consider: The same source 297. 298

(73) See :Same source. 298 :

(74) Seen: Same source: 304.

 (75) See: Same source: 304 .

<div align="center">References</div>

1. Literature and disappointment with criticism, d .Abdul Salam Al-Masdi, The New United Book House, Beirut, 1st Edition, 2004 AD.
2. Stylistic and style, d .Abdul Salam Al-Masdi, The New United Book House, Beirut, 5th Edition, p. 2006 AD.
3. The Epistemological Foundations of Receptivity Theory, Nazem Odeh Khudair, Dar Al-Shorouk for Publishing and Distribution, Amman No. 1.
4. Contradictions in the language by Abu Hatim al-Sijistani, edited by: Muhammad Abd al-Qadir Ahmad, The Egyptian Renaissance Library, Cairo, 1991 AD.
5. Expressions used in logic, Abu Nasr al-Farabi, edited by: Mohsen Mahdi, Dar Al-Shorouk, Catholic Press, Beirut, d.
6. Al-Imtama'a and Al-Mu'tana, Abu Hayyan al-Tawhidi.
7. The Anthology of Language for Martin Heidegger, Ibrahim Ahmed, Arab Science House, Publishers, Beirut, i, 2008 AD.
8. Linguistic Analysis of the Oxford Group, Salah Ismail Abdel Haq, Dar Al-Tanweer for Printing and Publishing, Beirut, 1st Edition, 1993 AD.
9. David Hume, Dr .Mahmoud Zaki Naguib, Dar Al Ma'arif, Egypt, 1958.
10. Studies in the science of logic among the Arabs, Farhan Muhammad Jaloub, Bassam Library Publications, Mosul, 1978 AD.
11. A logical and philosophical message by Dvig Fengenstein, d .Azmi Salam, Dar Al Ma'aref, Egypt, 1958 AD.
12. Al-Shifa, Avicenna, review: Dr .Ibrahim Madkour, The Amiri Press, Cairo, 1952 AD.
13. The letters, Abu Nasr Al-Farabi, edited by: Mohsen Mahdi, Dar Al-Shorouk, Beirut, d.
14. Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language, Umberto Eco, translated by: Dr .Ahmed Al-Sama'i, The Arab Organization for Translation, Beirut, 1st Edition, 2005 AD.
15. Signs for the Fina Karnatep Group as an example, Muhammad Abd al-Rahman Jabri, House of the New Book United.
16. Philosophy and Language Issues: Reading in Perception and Analysis, Bashir Khleifi, Arab Science House, Publishers, Beirut, 1st Edition, 2010 AD.
17. Language and Interpretation, Approaches to Western Hermeneutics and Arab-Islamic Interpretation, Nasser Building, Arab Science House, Publishers, Beirut, 1st Edition, 2007 AD.
18. Pronunciation and Meaning in Critical and Rhetorical Thinking of the Arabs, Al-Akhdar Jami`, Publications of the Union of Arab Writers, Damascus, 2001 AD.
19. The reference in philosophical thought, Nawal Al-Sayegh, Arab Thought House, Cairo, 1983 AD.
20. Al-Mizhar in the Sciences of Language and its Types, Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti, edited by: Jawad al-Mawla and others, Dar al-Turath Library, d.

21. The Qur'anic Meaning between Interpretation and Interpretation, An Analytical Cognitive Study in the Qur'an Text, Abbas Amir, The Foundation for Arab Expansion, Beirut, 1st Edition, 2008 AD.
22. Keys to the Unseen, Tafsir Fakhr al-Din al-Razi, Dar al-Maarif, Egypt, d.
23. The Clear Thinker in Philosophy, Abdo El-Helou, Beirut, D.T.
24. Curriculum thousand for descriptive, Tahir Aziz, Press the Arab Cultural Center, Casablanca, i 1, 1990.