

## Exploring Pragmatics of Criticality as a Methodology in Linguistics and Literature Analysis

Asst. Prof. Dr. Basim Jubair Kadhim  
The Open Educational College- Najaf Ashraf  
[basimjubair1984@gmail.com](mailto:basimjubair1984@gmail.com)

### Abstract:

The current study attempts to unify the concept of criticality (as introduced by Cameron, 2000) as a linguistic tool used within the pragmatics of language interpretation that can be employed as a methodology shared by both linguistic and literary analyses. Both CDA and literary analysts use the same armamentarium when it comes to uncovering the power dynamics and hidden ideologies within a given text and the ideological orientations of the text reducers. However, the concept of criticality is utilized under different terminologies in linguistics pragmatics and literary analyses. In pragmatics, it is referred to as critical analysis of discourse, meaning to comment on the discourse producer's intention within various contextual cues to uncover the hidden meaning and to demonstrate the power dynamics of the discourse. On the other hand, in literary analyses, it is manifested through the use of 'political theory' or 'ideological theory'. The tools, by nature, are different in literature and pragmatics due to the functions of analysis, yet the theorists of all the above-mentioned terms are the same, i.e., Althusser, Foucault, Said, Gramsci, and others. Two examples are taken from linguistic pragmatics analysis and literature to be analyzed according to the same concept of criticality. Both examples yield similar justifications for the use of language in shaping power dynamics and discourse-meaning negotiation as well as uncovering the hidden ideologies of text producers under the multi-layered texts.

**Keywords:** Criticality, Meaning Negotiation, Pragmatics, Critical Pragmatics, Critical Methodology

### استكشاف التداولية النقدية كمنهجية للتحليل في اللسانيات والأدب

أ.م.د. باسم جبار كاظم  
الكلية التربوية المفتوحة - النجف الاشرف

### المخلص:

تحاول هذه الدراسة توحيد مفهوم النقدية (كما قدمه كامرون، ٢٠٠٠) كأداة لسانية تُستخدم في تداولية تفسير اللغة، والتي يمكن توظيفها كمنهجية مشتركة بين التحليل اللساني والأدبي. فكل من تحليل الخطاب النقدي (CDA) والمحللين الأدبيين يستخدمون نفس الأدوات عندما يتعلق الأمر بكشف ديناميكيات القوة والأيدولوجيات الخفية داخل النص، والتوجهات الأيدولوجية لمُنتجي النص. ومع ذلك، يُستخدم مفهوم النقدية تحت مصطلحات مختلفة في التداولية اللسانية والتحليل الأدبي. في التداولية، يُشار إليه بالتحليل النقدي للخطاب، أي التعليق على نية منتج الخطاب ضمن سياقات مختلفة لكشف المعنى الخفي وإبراز ديناميكيات القوة في الخطاب. بينما في التحليل الأدبي، يتجلى ذلك من خلال استخدام "النظرية السياسية" أو "النظرية الأيدولوجية". والأدوات تختلف بطبيعتها بين الأدب والتداولية بسبب وظائف التحليل، إلا أن المنظرين لكل هذه المصطلحات هم نفسهم، أي التوسير

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36317/kja/2026/v1.i67.19871>

Kufa Journal of Arts by University of Kufa is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.  
مجلة آداب الكوفة - جامعة الكوفة مرخصة بموجب ترخيص المشاع الإبداعي ٤.٠ الدولي.



وفوكو وسعيد و غرامشي وغيرهم. تم أخذ مثالين من تحليل التداولية اللسانية والأدب لتحليلهما وفقاً لنفس مفهوم النقدية. وقد أسفر كلا المثالين عن تبريرات متشابهة لاستخدام اللغة في تشكيل ديناميكيات القوة وتفاوض المعنى الخطابى، فضلاً عن كشف الأيديولوجيات الخفية لمنتجى النصوص تحت طبقات النص المتعددة.  
الكلمات المفتاحية: النقدية، التداولية، المعنى، تفاوض المعنى، التداولية النقدية، المنهجية النقدية

## 1. Introduction

Many researchers carry on their studies in linguistics and literature; most of them try to analyze texts for the hidden meanings left by the writers or speakers of those texts. In linguistic analysis, texts' description is made possible through types and genres using pragmatics and CDA strategies and devices. These approaches make texts generate more refined meanings for readers and listeners.

Literary analysis has the same armamentarium of linguistics, especially those of the language levels, applied by its critics and reviewers with the intention of showing what lies beneath the prose or poetry text as functions and implications. Curiously, the same set of linguistic devices as in CDA and pragmatics crops up as identical to that in the textual functions analysis of literary works. By operating on context-specific meaning, pragmatic devices contribute to the process of deciphering and negotiating meaning between the addressee and the addressor and also between the writer and the reader. These are tools that may have ideological and cultural implications, which can either be insinuated intentionally by the producer of the text in the expressions and sentences or not.

Pragmatic devices and cognitive strategies have been implied for carrying out effective critical discourse analysis of the linguistic text. It uncovers the hidden motives, meanings, and ideologies lying beneath language. Indeed, through the employment of pragmatically oriented utterances attuned to linguistic features such as grammatical, morphological, and phonological structures, speakers often proclaim their

particular ideological persuasions. The term critical in CDA has its etymology in the Frankfurt School of Philosophy and is underpinned by Marxist thought. Criticality in this perspective then denotes the interpretive and explicatory aspect of the analysis, which looks at the language together with its circumstantial variables. This kind of analysis tries to uncover in the language the inbuilt ideologies, as put by Mey (2001, p. 219).

These differing emphases underpin the various definitions of CDA according to the respective underpinning paradigm.

For instance, Fairclough (1993, p. 134) points to two significant sets of relationships which CDA attends to: the relation of discursive practices, events, and texts, and, secondly, their relationship to socio-cultural processes, including the causes and determinants of these relations. In the same vein, Van Dijk (1997a, p. 3) sees CDA as a method studying the roots of power, dominance, prejudice, and social inequality, looking into how such relations come into being in concrete social contexts.

Criticality in linguistics often means the ideological propagation of utterances that denote the ideological standpoints of the speaker or of the writer. Literary research approaches being critical shows how language is important and useful in establishing relevance concerning cultural standpoints. Such a perspective examines questions of post-structuralism and deconstruction requiring critical frameworks that carry out the examination of meaning and socio-cultural and cultural implications within the said literature under scrutiny, as Cameron (2000) portrays.

Convergences of the concept of criticality in linguistic and literary research are explored in the present study, even though different labels, tools, and approaches are in practice. In this study, an attempt is made to advance the hypothesis that both strands share analogous methodological frames in uncovering special yet interrelated meanings, especially with regard to the ideological readings of linguistic and literary products. For



this purpose, two representative samples are analyzed in this respect, focusing on the convergences and divergences of these two areas. Other illustrative data are put in a table for space reasons.

The current study can be of value for those who analyze linguistic, pragmatic and literary texts using critical strategies a methodology for collecting data regarding certain ideologies.

## **2.1. CDA: A Brief Account**

CDA has been in constant search for the most accurate meaning, taking this in various fields of knowledge. Wodak and Chilton (2005: XI) review the models of discourse analysis (DA, henceforth) and CDA to introduce an interdisciplinary model in which various methodological aspects used in discourse are interconnected with other disciplines related in one way or another to CDA. Accordingly, they (ibid: XII) remark that discourse becomes an interdisciplinary subfield with different disciplines; chief among them is pragmatics (1992a: 11).

### **2.2.1. Dialectical Approach**

This approach, as initially articulated by Fairclough (1992a: 11), is intrinsically socially-oriented spelling out how discourse relates to the society in that the relation between discourse and society is essentially dialectical. Pressed by the principles of Marxism concerning power, authority, and hegemony, Fairclough established a relation between language and other social practices based on Halliday's (1994: 15) Systemic Functional Grammar and Functionalism in a broader sense. Other thinkers in this respect include Foucault, who focuses on discourse, and Gramsci, who deals with hegemony. Fairclough elaborates his model, wherein he says that "*the relationship between discourse and other elements of social practices is a dialectical relationship*" (1992a: 13). By explanation, language is a social practice that occurs in dialectical relation with other constituent elements, namely sectarianism,

racism, power, and others of that ilk. In this manifestation, language is identified to be considerably affected by the society itself.

To analyze discourse from this point of view, he suggests three levels Fairclough 1989: 26:

- Verbal - oral or written, and resorting to semiotics where necessary.
- Text generation is a social activity; therefore, discourse practice is sensitive to the context in which it has been developed.
- Socio-cultural practice is utilized in revealing the cultural and social norms that are primarily relevant to the use of language.

Formal properties and levels of language-as the approach merits-would, from this point of view, be differentiated into three levels of analysis by Fairclough:

- a. A description would therefore involve linguistic forms and their functions in the text as well as outside it.
- b. Interpretation establishes the relation between the text and other forms of social practices, normally known as ideologies. These social practices have strong bearings on the text (ibid).
- c. Explanation is the relation between language and society; this defines the reason for using language in certain social situations related to particular cultures, such as using a specific level of language in a religious setting to show a sectarian message.

### **2.2.2. Discourse Historical Approach**

Taking as a basis the notions developed by Fairclough (1989) within CDA, Wodak (1997) uses a historical aspect in her framework and states that one of the contextual parameters that CDA takes into consideration is given by the historical manifestations of the particular discourse. The main hypothesis of this approach can be summed up in the diachronic



nature of discourse, making use of the dialectical view of society and discourse expressed by Wodak (2001a: 64). In this approach, some features pertinent to CDA are added to delve into a deep discourse analysis (ibid.). Wodak (2009: 94-96) enumerates ten such features:

- 1 In its inter-disciplinarity, it crosses into other fields;
- 2 Problem-oriented, the discourse always seeks an answer for a specific social problem.
- 3 Discourse relies on many theories in order to cover every aspect of analysis.
- 4 It is hugely related to ethnography about society.
- 5 It moves back and forth between the theoretical accounts and empirical data.
- 6 It tackles many genres, intertextualities, and inter-discourses.
- 7 It incorporates the historical background as an integral part of its analysis.
- 8 There is no rule or principle which is invariable; but both vary with the data.
- 9 Discourse applies a number of foundational theories towards attaining some levels at which slight theories are applied for analysis.
- 10 Its applications on society are of outstanding importance because it shows how language as a social practice has an effect on society.

To analyze discourse, Wodak and Meyer set three dimensions which are represented (2009b: 34) by the topics or contents, i.e., the ideologies used such as racism, sectarianism, ethnicism... and so on; the discursive strategies such as in/out-group strategies; and the linguistic constructions which convey the previous two dimensions such as the syntactic, phonological and semantic conductions (ibid).



Therefore, the Historical aspect is taken as a matter of prime importance in CDA. Since, according to Wodak (2009: 89), it is taken as a constitutive element that is meant to link a text with its background. With everything that is happening or has happened, discourse is closely linked.

### **2.2.3. Socio-cognitive Approach**

This approach is initiated along with other ones that are regarded as complimentary ones by van Dijk (2001: 379) who is one of the pioneers in CDA. The core argument of this approach is that the relationship between language and society is not a dialectical one; it is rather a mediator, i.e., cognition is the mediated link between the two extremes: language and society (ibid: 380).

This is the paramount justification for using the socio-cognitive approach, defining it as socially shared representations, meaning that certain social groups who have common cultural norms (2009: 65) share certain mental processes. Van Dijk (ibid) mentions that social practices are represented in the mind, so the other social practices have their mental representations in the mind.

Such social cognitive enterprise can link the social system to the individual system in that it deals with the social system through the individual representations of the cognitive aspects whose bases are the social ones (Meyer, 2001: 25).

Taking the notions of psychology, van Dijk (1995: 4) classifies the social cognition system into two types of social memory: short-term (words and structures in mind) and long-term memory (related to discourse) which includes episodic among which personal experiences are stored. Although van Dijk (ibid) approaches CDA from different perspectives, the general feature that he focuses on is the classification of discourse into micro and macro discourse. Micro indicates the core branches of linguistics such as phonology, syntax, and semantics, following Wodak

in the topics and contents and whatever is related to the text. On the other hand, macro means all the aspects that are related to societal and cultural properties. The two most significant models are introduced with regards to CDA:

- a. The first one consists of six steps used in the process of analysis as classified by Meyer (2001: 26) starting with the analysis of the semantic topics and propositions (macro-propositions); analyzing the indirect/implicit meaning such as implicature, presupposition, allusions, vagueness, omissions, polarizations and so on; the linguistic significant markers; the global and local discourse analysis; analyzing special linguistic realizations and finally analyzing the context which can cover all of the steps.
- b. The second model is called the ideological squares where speakers convey their ideologies through enhancing what is relevant to them and criticizing all that is irrelevant to them. In the same stream, van Dijk (2009: 70) introduces two important terms: 'we' and 'others' representations. The indication of using 'we', 'our', or 'us' is to convey positiveness in discourse in the sense that the speaker adopts one's own ideology. On the other hand, 'otherness', 'youness' or 'yourness' all represents the negative aspects that the speaker is against the ones [negative aspects] who do not belong to his ideology (ibid).

#### **2.2.4. Social Actor Approach**

This approach is introduced by Van Leeuwen (1993a: 30). According to this approach, the social factor (the agent in the formal classification of the sentence is not only taken at the formal level but also at the functional level in society).

A central notion of this approach is recontextualization, following Bernstein's coined term of re-contextualization which is defined as cutting certain pieces of discourse from the main context and putting

them in a different context to serve different implicatures and ideologies (Baker and Ellece, 2011: 136).

Two important properties distinguish this factor; they are the inclusion and/or the exclusion. Elaborating on these two notions, when the social actor is excluded, this means the actor is ideologically attacked and out-grouped. On the contrary, when the actor is included, this means that this entity exists and is in-group. That is to say, it is indirectly similar to what has been introduced by van Dijk's (1995d: 17) ideological squares; the whiteness and otherness terms.

The notion of inclusion is realized through ten strategies as follows, as manifested by Van Leeuwen (2008: 4-16):

- a. Activation/passivization indicates the use of active or passive voice to include ones within certain groups.
- b. Genercization/specification means to generalize or specify ones in favor of the speaker's intended ideology.
- c. Individualization/assimilation asserts the role of speaking of oneself or a group for the sake of inclusion.
- d. Association/disassociation can refer to the group representation as associated within one ideology such as a certain religious or political sect, or the separation within a group as individuals in one sect.
- e. Indetermination/differentiation refers to the uniformity of the social actors or the diversity according to their own ideologies.
- f. Nomination/ categorization means the identifying properties of the social actors or their common properties that can categorize them.
- g. Functionalization/identification can be used according to what social actors do or to what they are.
- h. Personalization/impersonalization can be referred to as the property of having human features or not, a matter that can serve criticality in discourse.

According to these strategies, the participants [social actors] can include themselves as a strategy to critically implicate what they need to convey (Wodak, 2000: 186).

However, for the same aforementioned reason, social actors adopt two strategies to exclude others from the ideology that the social actors want to convey. These are as follows (Van Leeuwen, 2008: 20-4):

- a. Radical suppression indicates the complete exclusion of whatever is related to the social actors in terms of their discourse and actions.
- b. Backgrounding implicates the exclusion of the social actors with certain traces of exclusion. In other words, this is less radical than the one before it.

### **Criticality in Linguistics and Literature: A Method of Analysis .٣**

Although linguistics and literature have been viewed as separate disciplines, a critical view reveals the fact that there is a strong relationship between the two fields. Criticality as a theoretical theory goes beyond the interpretation of a text or a speech and questions the power relations and ideologies and configurations that exist and that govern language and literature. Criticality tackles language as a site of power in two distinct but intertwined domains, the ordinary interaction, which is linguistics, and the literary compositions, which are cultures at large.

#### **3.1. Linguistics and Criticality**

Criticality in language studies is one of the facets that utilize Critical Discourse Analysis that helps analyze the nexus between language and power. Language as Fairclough (2015) argues is not innocent. It has a social structure. CDA seeks to understand the interrelationship between different discourses (in speeches, reporting, casual talk and interactions among people) and ideologies. For example, political leaders speak about members of a certain group in a way that subsequently influences their



understanding of such groups and the stories remain constant without any scrutiny.

A traditional case is the mentioning of collateral damage rather than civilian deaths or auhtorships of errors: mistakes were made rather than I made a mistake (Van Dijk, 2008). Such language can, however, be examined closely and politicians and other leaders of a society's thoughts will be inquisitively conveyed. This is in conforming to idea espoused by Bourdieu (1991) of symbolic power, 'Language is a capital' that can preserve certain interactional patterns.

### **3.2. Critical Pragmatics**

Pragma-dialectical scholars view the goal of critical pragmatics: May (2002), Perry (2011, 2013), and very recently Jubair (2023), maintain that critical pragmatics systematically combines critical discourse analysis with pragmatic insights in order to solve the ideological stance that the author or speaker assumes since it is reconstituted by utterances in such a way that the hidden or masked implications become salient in this discourse. Critical pragmatics, therefore, tries to disclose the camouflaged ideology in communicative acts by applying CDA tools and offers, simultaneously, a framework for less ambiguous interpretation of discourses.

This model expands the horizon of CDA by including pragmatic fields that deal with the writer's or speaker's intention in certain contexts where ideologies might be deliberately obscured. As Jubair (2022), in his article on critical pragmatics, writes: "Placing pragmatics in the middle of CDA allows for a far deeper analysis for latent meanings that are hidden". It claims to lead to pragmatic solutions for the social problems originating from these latent ideologies.

Critical pragmatics follows the linguistic and non-linguistic strategies in CDA but extends its scope by recommending remedying strategies for such ideological manipulations. Jubair's model presents a three-stage framework for carrying out an utterance analysis by means of critical



pragmatics. In its last stage, it outdoes the purpose of CDA with presentation strategies that can help both the addressor and addressee get through discourse with no ideological bias.

### **3.2. Literature and Criticality**

Criticality may be defined as the legitimate examination, the discursive interrogation or contestation of literature, which, according to J O D Haas (1998), A W McMurray (1999) and A Hannah (2008), was present long before its proper theoretical articulation in postcolonial, feminist, and Marxist critiques.

To begin, it is important to note that, just as language, literature is produced in certain socio-political circumstances. Most literary works produced engage or are manipulated by and even shape the power of societies at large. This in turn allows a middle-level perspective where literature is not merely analyzed in terms of plot or characterization, but is offered to a range of society studies.

A few notable figures in this area include Said (1978) and Spivak (1988) who utilized criticality to look at literary works that purport to represent the West and demonstrate how they dominantly other elements outside of the Western zones of their power. Furthermore, they employ the very language of literature to uphold and undermine colonial communities. exceptional literature provides a fair basis for the oppression to estranged dominations allowing attacks on its regimes and the shaping of cultures.

## **4. The Contexts of Linguistics and Literature**

There are evident connections between linguistics and literature, but this becomes clearer when both are analyzed from a critical perspective. Similarly, critical pragmatics or CDA also focus on interpreting how meaning is constituted rather than presupposed. As a case in point, politeness strategies in dialogues can bring to the surface the existing



order, or struggle for it, in literary characters. Nevertheless, a critical pragmatic approach would take account of the underlying contexts and interrogate why certain people are privileged with politeness and others are not, for instance, class, race, or gender. Thus, in this dual portrayal of linguistics and literature, the former also assists in understanding the literary dialogue in its socio-political narrative. Politeness, like any other communicative act, has artistic application in literature with respectable social norms and realities being critiqued in literary works.

Furthermore, literature also tries to reflect the norms of language or practices in order to challenge or reinforce societal norms. For example, in Zora Neale Hurston's *Their Eyes Were Watching God* (1937), African American Vernacular English (AAVE) becomes a way of defying racial language oppression. It is here that Hurston speaks in AAVE may become resistive in literature to the dominant linguistic norms, as in such works as Zora Neale Hurston's *Their Eyes Were Watching God* (1937). Here, Hurston uses AAVE to undermine such socio-political structures that position standard English in a privileged position. This positions her work within critical linguistic practices that question the issue of power and control over language and meaning (Morgan, 2002).

## **5. Examples and Analysis Based on the Pragmatics of Criticality**

### **Example 1: Linguistics – Political Speech**

In linguistics, political speeches often serve as rich data for analyzing power dynamics. Consider the following excerpt from a political leader's speech:

*"We will not allow foreign influences to dictate the future of our nation. The power to make decisions lies solely in the hands of the people."*

### Analysis:

From the pragmatic-critical perspective, this claim uses language instrumentally in developing an "us versus them" framework wherein "foreign influences" are juxtaposed against the nation as its enemy. The speaker appeals to the sense of nationalism and unity in the audience members, drawing upon the wealth of presupposition concerning foreign elements that are fundamentally hostile to the interests of the nation. The phrase "the power to make decisions lies only with the people" is also a very traditional use of ideological discourse in the way it reinforces the speaker's authority via superficial democratization of power.

This supports Fairclough's 2015 description of language as a power mechanism reinforcing ideological convictions. Consequently, opposition to the speaker's political message becomes other than just a point of difference, as such opposition is supposedly undermining national sovereignty and hence a powerful rhetorical tool positioning dissolvers as some sort of "other." Some pragmatics of criticality make clear the political motive of what at first seemed like an appeal for inclusiveness and accounts for the power relationship which the discourse seeks to establish.

### Example 2: Literature – Toni Morrison's *Beloved*

In literary studies, the pragmatics of criticality can be applied to the study of the relations between characters, which enables deeper ideological meanings. Thus, in *Beloved*, the main character, Sethe, explains her decision to kill her daughter rather than let her be taken away and returned to slavery:

*"I stopped him," Sethe said. "I took and put my babies where they'd be safe."*

**Analysis:**

On one level, the utterance by Sethe functions on many levels. Pragmatically, the speech by Sethe is not just a constative one stating a fact but also a performative one attempting to justify a morally ambivalent decision. From a critical perspective, this speech can be interrogated for power relations and institutional violence. The irony in Sethe's use of the word "safe" was the violent act she did, symbolizing her reclamation of agency in a system that was dehumanizing her and her children.

Drawing on Butler's 1997 theory of performativity, the language here used by Sethe is an act of resistance. Describing her act as one of protection, she resists the narrative of the dominant culture which would define her act as illegal. This is the pragmatics of criticality, bringing into view how the language expresses personal trauma and resistance to the sociopolitical structures oppressing Sethe. This is where Morrison's work utilizes the pragmatic application of critical inquiry into aspects of race, power relations, and identity, placing language at the very site of struggle for regained dignities.

**Table: The Remaining Examples Analyzed**

	Field	Example	Analysis	Source
1	Linguistic Data	"They come here, take our jobs, and change our culture."	"they" vs. "we"	Wodak, R. (2015)
2		"You people always want special treatment."	enforcing racial bias.	Billig, M. (1991)
3		"The market will correct itself."	Economic determinism concealing human agency.	Fairclough, N
4		"I'm not racist, but..."	denial	van Dijk, T. A.



	Field	Example	Analysis	Source
				(1992)
5		"Thoughts and prayers."	Performative sympathy.	Ahmed, S. (2014).
6		"We were forced to intervene for humanitarian reasons."	Justifying intervention while masking geopolitical motives.	Chilton, P. (2004).
7		"Gender is assigned at birth."	Uncovers hidden power in labeling.	Butler, J. (1993)
8		"Don't be so emotional."	Preventing emotion as illegitimate.	Cameron, D. (2007).
9		"Illegal alien."	Dehumanizing migrants and naturalizing exclusion.	Santa Ana, O. (2002)
10		"She was asking for it."	naturalizing victim-blaming in culture of rape.	Lazar, M. M. (2005)
11	Literary Data	"War is peace. Freedom is slavery. Ignorance is strength." – 1984	paradoxes manipulating logic.	Orwell, G. (1949)
12		"Blessed be the fruit." – <i>The Handmaid's Tale</i>	Ritual language representing ideological enforcement.	Atwood, M. (1985)
13		"No matter how prosperous a man was... he was not really a man." – <i>Things Fall Apart</i>	encoded norms as social truth.	Achebe, C. (1958)
14		"The conquest of the earth... means taking it away..." – <i>Heart of Darkness</i>	racial ideology of colonizers.	Conrad, J. (1899)



	Field	Example	Analysis	Source
15		"There is simply no blasted God." – <i>A Raisin in the Sun</i>	Radical assertion of secularism.	Hansberry, L. (1959)
16		"I ought to be thy Adam..." – <i>Frankenstein</i>	Metaphor representing marginalization	Shelley, M. (1818)
17		"John laughs at me, of course..." – <i>The Yellow Wallpaper</i>	normalizing gender oppression.	Gilman, C. P. (1892)
18		"You taught me language..." – <i>The Tempest</i>	Language as colonial imposition	Shakespeare, W. (1611)
19		"I am no bird; and no net ensnares me..." – <i>Jane Eyre</i>	Declaration of female freedom.	Brontë, C. (1847)
20		"...if her eyes... were different..." – <i>The Bluest Eye</i>	showing internalized racism and beauty ideology.	Morrison, T. (1970)

## 6. Discussions

While in linguistics, pragmatics has to do with how context is utilized in the making of meaning in communication, pragmatics combined with criticality goes beyond questions on context and shapes itself into a methodological approach by which normative assumptions about language and literature could be questioned and challenged. In this regard, the pragmatics of criticality acts as an approach when the very use of language is put into question, which would also include power relations, ideologies, and socio-political contexts in which communicative acts are performed, both in linguistic and literary contexts.

Put linguistically, the pragmatics of criticality allows an expansiveness toward the engaging of various diverse structural positions of power in shaping language usage. The pragmatics of criticality is a critical analysis of discourse-meaning negotiated by speech acts, implicatures, and presuppositions that go mostly toward the reaffirmation or challenging of the socio-political power structure. According to Fairclough (2015), this may be CDA emanating from pragmatic theory whereby one can unmask submerged power relationships beneath superficially innocuous linguistic interactions. This also befits Bourdieu's concept of "symbolic power" (1991), whereby language is not simply used as a means of communication but rather as a device by which power relations are maintained and reproduced.

Pragmatics of criticality prescribes the theoretical outlook wherein texts engage with sociocultural issues in literature. Most times, literary works reflect a greater deal of social contexts wherein they are born, and such an approach in pragmatism helps dissemble them for exploring their essential ideologies. Through pragmatics in literary critical analysis, the researcher identifies how the characters of a novel establish dominance, resist subjugation, or position themselves in their identity. The underlying rationale here is that literature is an arena for ideological debates wherein different voices contest supremacy (Eagleton, 1996). For example, pragmatics allows an examination, in postcolonial literature, of how the colonized subjects navigate through the colonizers' power-saturated language to retrieve agency (Said, 1978).

The pragmatics behind criticality underlines the performative features of language in either everyday or literary contexts. Drawing on Butler's 1997 theory of performativity, language operates not descriptively but rather as the formational grammatical of reality-what provides a bottom for action and change. It is from this view that one realizes the critical uses of language can create resistances and changes, most notably in groups whose voices have been oppressed throughout history. Assuming



even broader social and political implications, this approach will go far beyond a regular linguistic analysis in order to turn it into a valuable tool within linguistic and literary scholarship.

The bottom line is that pragmatics of criticality as a methodology provides an elaborate framework underpinning the proper understanding of the use of language in both linguistic and literary milieus, by indicating the role of power, ideology, and social structure in shaping communication and providing instruments that will enable critical analysis of texts and discourses. Also, with this aspect of methodology, embracing researchers may come closer to disclosing integral relations between language, power, and society, therefore making it an indispensable tool in both domains.

## 7. Conclusions

The current study has come up with the following concluding remarks:

1. It underlines the interdependence of linguistics and literature by proving that the two disciplines are in line with each other in their critical examination of power relations, ideologies, and social structures as put into play through language and textual form.
2. This study positions criticality as a theoretical paradigm that moves beyond the conventional understandings of language and literature, emphasizing the analysis of power dynamics and ideological structures.
3. CDA is an integral part in maintaining the prevailing norms within society. Therefore, it offers insights on how discourses reinforce existing power structures or critique them, as observed in political or literary discourses.
4. Critical pragmatics reveals the hidden ideologies in communicative acts and brings forth solutions to cut down on ambiguity in interpretation and social problems.

5. Criticality of pragmatics, as represented by certain politeness strategies, serves as a mechanism to illustrate how underrepresented voices employ linguistic techniques in the prevailing narratives and assert their autonomy, with performative elements of language being instrumental in this process of narrating.
  6. This methodological approach is known to be a comprehensive system that interlinks linguistic and literary analysis. It focuses on the role of language in both reproducing and challenging societal ideologies, thus making it a vital tool for understanding the interrelationship between language, power, and society.
- 
- 

### Acknowledgements

I would like to deeply thank all the people who have spared no efforts in assisting, commenting, and reviewing the current review.

- 1- Data Availability Statement: (The manuscript includes all the data used in the study.)**
- 2- Conflict of Interest Statement: (The authors confirm that there are no conflicts of interest that could affect the content of this research.)**
- 3- Funding Statement: This research was fully funded by the authors without any financial support from other entities.**

## References

- Achebe, C. (1958). *Things Fall Apart*. Heinemann.
- Atwood, M. (1985). *The Handmaid's Tale*. McClelland and Stewart.
- Baker, P., & Ellece, S. (2011). *Key terms in discourse analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control, and identity: Theory, research, critique* (Rev. ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Billig, M. (1991). *Ideological Dilemmas*. SAGE.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.
- Brontë, C. (1847). *Jane Eyre*. Smith, Elder & Co.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies That Matter*. Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. Routledge.
- Cameron, D. (2000). *Good to talk? Living and working in a communication culture*. Sage Publications.
- Cameron, D. (2007). *The Myth of Mars and Venus*. Oxford University Press.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse*. Routledge.
- Common in U.S. political responses to shootings; see Ahmed, S. (2014). *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*.
- Conrad, J. (1899). *Heart of Darkness*. Blackwood's Magazine.
- Eagleton, T. (1996). *Literary theory: An introduction* (2nd ed.). University of Minnesota Press.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 133–168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002002>

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. Pantheon Books.

Gilman, C. P. (1892). The Yellow Wallpaper. The New England Magazine.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. International Publishers.

Haas, J. O. D. (1998). *Critical discourse analysis and language education*. Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Arnold.

Hannah, A. (2008). *Discourse and power in literature*. Cambridge University Press.

Hansberry, L. (1959). *A Raisin in the Sun*. Random House.

Jubair, B. K. (2022). *European Journal of Language and Culture Studies*. The Centrality of Pragmatics in Ideological Representation of Muslim Religious Speeches. Vol. 1, No. 4, 2022.



Jubair, B. K. (2023). *International Education Studies and Sustainability. Toward a Comprehensive Model of the Pragmatization of Lexical Uniqueness with Reference to Iraqi Arabic*. Vol. 3, No. 1, 2023.

Lazar, M. M. (2005). *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis*. Palgrave.

May, J. (2002). *Language, social structure, and critical theory*. Blackwell Publishing.

McMurray, A. W. (1999). *Critical perspectives in postcolonial studies*. *Postcolonial Studies Journal*, 12(4), 45–67.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

Morgan, M. (2002). *Language, discourse and power in African American culture*. Cambridge University Press.

Morrison, T. (1970). *The Bluest Eye*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston  
Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Secker & Warburg.

Perry, E. (2011). *Ideological stances in language use: A pragmatics perspective*. Sage Publications.

Perry, E. (2013). *Pragmatics and ideology: Methods in critical pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.

Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown Tide Rising*. University of Texas Press.  
Shakespeare, W. (1611). *The Tempest*.

Shelley, M. (1818). *Frankenstein*. Lackington, Hughes, Harding, Mavor & Jones.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Macmillan.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1992). *Discourse and the Denial of Racism*. Discourse & Society.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner & A. L. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and peace* (pp. 17–33). Dartmouth Publishing.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as structure and process*. Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95–120). Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 62–86). Sage Publications.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1993). Genre and field in critical discourse analysis: A synopsis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 193–223.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R. (1997). *Gender and discourse*. Sage Publications.

Wodak, R. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage Publications.

**Exploring Pragmatics of Criticality as a Methodology ..... (481)**

Wodak, R. (2015). *The Politics of Fear*. SAGE.

Wodak, R., & Chilton, P. (2005). *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods for critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Zora Neale Hurston. (1937). *Their eyes were watching God*. J. B. Lippincott.

