

**The Linguistic and Communicative Representation of Social Crisis in
Dramatic Discourse:
An Analytical Approach to Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard***

Ismahane Adouane

University of Algiers 2

Ismahane.adouane@univ-alger2.dz

Fattouma Lahmadi

Fattouma.lahmadi@univ-alger2.dz

University of Algiers 2

Received: 09/01/2026 Accepted: 17/03/2026. Published: 29/08/2026

Abstract:

This paper examines the representations of linguistic discourse in relation to the social conflict in (*The Cherry Orchard*) by the Russian playwright Anton Chekhov, viewing the play as a text that reflects the transformations of Russian society at the dawn of the twentieth century. Through an analytical reading that goes beyond surface-level study, the research delves into the deep symbolic meanings embedded in the characters' discourse and the unfolding events, adopting a pragmatic approach that links linguistic structures to social meanings and communicative contexts governing the interaction among the characters in the play. In Chekhov's work, language does not serve a purely functional role; rather, it mirrors profound social changes and conveys the contrasting class perspectives of characters representing the declining nobility and the rising new bourgeoisie. The study also seeks to analyze the implicit, unspoken discourse in the text by uncovering the underlying structure of the social and class conflict, which is veiled in a calm conversational style, whose surface carries an implicit communicative language within the characters' dramatic dialogue.

Keywords: linguistic, représentations, théâtre, communication, social Crisis.

1-INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH PROBLE

Literature is a truthful mirror reflecting the emotions, thoughts, and experiences of nations. It is the product of the interaction between collective sentiment and the cultural and social reality, closely linked to the values and traditions of society, embodying its worldview and stance toward life. Among the branches of literature, art—and particularly theatre—occupies a distinguished place due to its profound influence on shaping collective consciousness, whether towards noble values or otherwise, depending on the writer's perspective and cultural background.

Literature represents a profound manifestation of collective awareness, emerging from a nation's emotions, experiences, and perceptions, and reflecting its system of values, psychology, and culture. It is not merely an artistic expression but a philosophical vision of life rooted in the civilizational environment in which it arises. Art, as a form of human expression, is a powerful tool for guiding societies, shaping their awareness, and determining their

intellectual and behavioral paths. This is clearly evident in theatre, which is considered one of the highest and most influential fine arts in social and political life.

Although Arabic theatre is a relatively recent entrant to the literary scene-emerging from cultural interaction with Western literature-it quickly established a significant presence by addressing contemporary issues and embodying the aspirations and hopes of the Arab individual. It has become a popular means of expression, closely tied to personal and social identity, attracting the attention of writers and creators who contributed to its development and production, drawing inspiration from the experiences of global theatre pioneers, foremost among them the Russian playwright Anton Chekhov, a seminal figure in the history of world theatre.

Chekhov's (*The Cherry Orchard*) stands among the most notable theatrical works portraying the social and economic transformations in Russia at the end of the 19th century. The play provides a precise reflection of the reality faced by the Russian nobility amid sweeping societal changes. It begins with a seemingly simple event—the sale of a cherry orchard, a symbol of aristocratic heritage—yet this event reveals the depth of social transformations and class conflicts hidden beneath the apparent structure of the text. In this context, the critical value of the work emerges through the complexity of its characters and the multiplicity of its discursive levels, where social meanings intersect with symbolic dimensions to expose the human dilemma in the face of change and the inability to adapt to the conditions of that era. The narrative depicts the struggle between an aristocratic class resisting its decline and a rising bourgeois class bringing with it a new language that reflects a different reality. Although these transformations are apparent in the content of the text, their most subtle manifestations lie in the linguistic structure of the dramatic discourse.

In (*The Cherry Orchard*), language is not merely a simple means of communication; it is a fundamental tool for depicting class struggle and social turning points. Through the choice of vocabulary, sentence structures, dialogic styles, and speech acts, the language reflects the characters' stances toward the changing reality. For example, some characters use emotional expressions tied to nostalgia and memory, while others employ direct, pragmatic language shaped by profit-and-loss calculations. Language thus becomes an active tool in constructing communicative discourse among the characters, through linguistic representations that mirror the social and class tensions and reveal the psychological positions of the play's characters.

How are linguistic representations manifested in the discourse of Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* in portraying social issues and societal transformations within Russian society?

From this central question emerge several sub-questions, the most important of which are:

1. What is the relationship between the linguistic structure of dramatic discourse and the social transformations reflected in the play's dialogue?
2. How do linguistic representations contribute to expressing the psychological and social identity of the characters in *The Cherry Orchard*?
3. What role do speech acts and dialogic styles play in shaping the linguistic representations of social issues within the play?

1-1:Research Objectives:

1-To reveal the linguistic representations in the discourse of *The Cherry Orchard*, focusing on how language is employed to depict social issues and to understand the expression of psychological and social identity through the language of theatre.

2-To analyze the rhetorical and dialogic styles that reflect the class conflict among the play's characters, and to examine the relationship between these linguistic features and the characters' social positions, as well as their interactions within the play through the underlying conflict embedded in the text.

-1-2 :Significance of the Study :

Anton Chekhov's (*The Cherry Orchard*) is one of the classical theatrical texts that holds significant historical and literary value in the context of modern Russian literature. It reflects the profound social transformations that took place in Russian society and stands as an artistic embodiment of critical moments of class conflict—the decline of the nobility and the rise of the bourgeoisie—making it a prominent example of theatre as a medium of social transformation. The significance of the text lies in its ability to position the cherry orchard as a central element in delivering a theatrical discourse that transcends entertainment to occupy a reflective and critical space. Through language, the play presents the social and psychological discourse of its characters, highlighting the tensions between the desire to cling to the past and the confrontation with an ever-changing reality.

Thus, the play serves as fertile ground for pragmatic linguistic studies that aim to understand how language is used to construct social and class meanings. Analyzing) *The Cherry Orchard*)from the perspective of linguistic representations opens a window to a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of dramatic discourse in depicting societal transformations.

-1-3: Methodology:

This study adopts a *pragmatic approach* that focuses on analyzing language within its social and communicative context. This framework allows for an exploration of how meanings are constructed and exchanged among interlocutors within the dramatic discourse. It also enables the examination of speech acts and dialogic patterns that reveal the social and psychological stances of the characters in *The Cherry Orchard*.

-1-4: Research Population and Study Sample

This study focuses on the text of Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* as a primary model for examining linguistic representations in Russian theatrical discourse. The play is considered one of the most significant works reflecting social and class transformations in Russia. It is distinguished by its linguistic richness and its diverse range of characters representing different social strata, which provides a wide scope for analyzing discourse and linguistic interaction.

The research population encompasses all dialogues and linguistic situations in the original text of the play, with particular attention to the language used by both the main and secondary characters. The aim is to understand how social issues are embodied through linguistic representations within the dramatic discourse.

-1-5: Definition of Concepts

1-1: Theatre:

The play is one of the oldest art forms known to humankind, focusing primarily on the event or action. Theatre is a form of art in which actors translate a written text into a performance on stage. With the director's guidance, actors bring to life the characters and situations created by the playwright. A successful theatrical event is one that captivates both the audience and the performers, regardless of where it is staged—be it in a professional theatre, a school setting, or even a temporary space arranged for this purpose. The range of performances can extend from light entertainment, such as musical shows and comedies, to works exploring philosophical themes (Al-Ashmawi,).

According to Marie Elias and Hanan Qassab, the term “theatre” can refer to a form of writing that presents the imagined through words, similar to the novel or short story; it can also refer to a form of spectacle based on the interaction between the performer or actor and the spectator; and it may further denote the physical place where the performance takes place (Fadla,).

-1-2:DramaticDiscourse:

The art of playwriting is among the literary forms most in need of a mature talent, broad experience, focus, and deep understanding of life's and humanity's complexities. This is because it delves into the roots of human truths and reveals them—not only because it allows an artist to embody the emotions of others and step beyond the limits of the self, but also because it presents a social environment in which individuals interact with one another and with life itself.

In this sense, a theatrical work is not complete upon being written; it is truly realized only after being directed, staged, and experienced by an audience. This is why modern literary studies have paid special attention to dramatic discourse—its realization, and the methods through which it transforms from a written text into an audiovisual composition on stage, achieving its full meaning through its relationship with the audience.

-1-3: Social Issues:

An “issue” refers to a matter whose features have become clear, with variables that have emerged and require resolution or judgment. The word “social” is derived from the idea of gathering or bringing together what is separate—uniting and assembling it—such as when a group shares common experiences or hardships (Badawi,).

In general terms, social issues are the problems and difficult circumstances faced by a society that require solutions. Anything that affects society and its members, prompting their reaction and engagement, can be considered a social issue (Souhaila Laghres, p. 257)-

-2: THE IMPORTANCE AND FUNCTION OF THEATRE IN SOCIETY:

The importance of theatre lies in its diverse and multifaceted functions, spanning social, political, economic, entertainment, educational, and pedagogical aspects. As the saying goes — and it is often repeated when discussing the role of theatre in society — *“Give me bread and theatre, and I will give you a great nation.”* This can be followed, with full scientific accuracy, by another statement from the French philosopher and playwright Voltaire, who said: *“In the theatre, the nation comes together, and the mind and taste of its youth are formed... there is no place in it for harmful wisdom... it is a permanent school for learning virtue”* (Mohamed Ramzi,).

Theatre is considered a social institution that reflects the issues of society, the circumstances it lives in, and the transformations it witnesses. Among the most prominent issues addressed by theatre during the 1960s, for example, was Egypt's shift from a society structured into three classes — the aristocracy (the ruling class, major landowners), the middle class, and the lower class (workers, wage earners). These social, intellectual, and political transformations inspired playwrights and authors to address related themes in their works, such as agrarian reform and conscious change (Mohamed Zamri).

The importance of theatre lies in its multiple functions: social, political, economic, entertainment, educational, and pedagogical. As mentioned, *"Give me bread and theatre, and I will give you a great nation,"* followed by Voltaire's words: *"In the theatre, the nation comes together, and the mind and taste of its youth are formed... there is no place in it for harmful wisdom... it is a permanent school for learning virtue"* (Mohamed Ramzi,).

-2-1: Psychological Function: This refers to how psychological factors influence characters in a play, how they interact with events and situations, and how theatre can embody these psychological processes for the audience. Theatre also helps individuals overcome psychological issues such as shyness, despair, fear, and introversion (Mohamed Zamri,).

2-2: Cultural Function: Plays are part of the cultural arts, aiming to showcase the culture of a society across different periods. They are thus a means of expressing cultural identity. The cultural function of theatre can be understood as a vital tool for expressing a people's social, cultural, and political changes. Theatre contributes to preserving and protecting a society's culture from decline and disappearance.

-2-3: Educational and Pedagogical Function: Many researchers in this field have highlighted the importance of theatre in contributing to socialization, as it helps individuals acquire the principles, values, and morals of their society. This role involves teaching and guiding individuals in various aspects of life — whether through providing knowledge, reinforcing moral values, or teaching social skills. Theatrical performances also help shape a child's personality and upbringing, awakening the child's awareness of their surroundings, opening horizons to reality, and introducing contemporary issues (Mohamed Zamri,). Theatre is an effective tool in directing society toward positive values such as equality, tolerance, and cooperation through realistic characters and dramatic events that encourage optimism and critical thinking (Al-Hamdani,).

In addition, other sociological theories have examined theatre as a social phenomenon, such as Role Theory, Conflict Theory, and Symbolic Interactionism — all of which fall within the discipline of sociology in general and the sociology of theatre in particular.

-2-4: Social Function: According to(Abdullah Houidi,) *"The truest aspect of a social play is what results from psychological influence born from association and immersion in the depths of life and the tangible realities of the environment in which one lives"* (Mohamed Zamri,).

-2-5: Economic Function: Theatre is also a commercial medium, having become a source of income for social and cultural institutions — both Arab and foreign — helping them fund their reform and cultural programs

-3: PRACTICAL ASPECT:

In this section, we will analyze the linguistic representations of social issues in Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*, focusing on deconstructing theatrical discourse through the study of dialogues between the characters and the communicative contexts that reflect class transformations and the clash of values between the rising bourgeoisie and the old aristocracy. We will also examine the pragmatic dimension of the play's linguistic discourse, as well as its rhetorical and stylistic devices, which serve as linguistic mechanisms embodying the characters' stances and perspectives on social issues within the linguistic structure of the text, and how these align with the play's historical and cultural context.

This section will also highlight how language is used as an artistic and aesthetic tool to depict and interact with reality. Moreover, this chapter allows for an in-depth pragmatic approach to theatrical discourse that takes into account the various contexts governing meaning production and reception.

We begin with the dialogue of Ranevskaya, who represents the voice of the aristocracy and lives in a state of nostalgia and absolute refusal to sell the orchard — which, in her view, embodies the family's collective memory — summarizing her stance in the phrase: *"I cannot sell the orchard."* This statement clearly indicates that Ranevskaya is attached to the orchard, which represents her past and heritage, using the negative particle "cannot" to prevent the subject from taking that action. Here, there is a hint that selling the orchard means abandoning family identity and memory, Ismail Sayed Omar defines it as that diverse and inherited cultural reservoir passed down from fathers and forefathers, encompassing religions, historical, civilizational, and popular values, including customs and traditions, whether these values are documented in heritage books, embedded between their lines, or transmitted and acquired over time (Emara, 1999).

Ranevskaya thus embodies the declining aristocratic class, feeling both defeat and nostalgia. Culture is composed of values, beliefs, norms, mental interpretations, symbols, ideologies, and similar intellectual products. Another perspective views culture as referring to the overall pattern of a people's way of life, the interpersonal relationships among its members, as well as their orientations (Al-Sawi, 1997). Accordingly, culture is capable of dissemination, spread, and transmission from one generation to another despite its particularity and its association with a specific society that distinguishes it from others, due to the differing circumstances that give rise to it.

In the play, we notice that Ranevskaya employs repetition to reinforce her words to the audience, emphasizing that the orchard is not merely a plot of land with various trees, but a metaphorical symbol of family memory, heritage, and places carrying historical and emotional value. This symbol reflects the struggle between holding on to the past and embracing change. The orchard thus symbolizes the life of refinement and aristocratic identity, which she describes in a language filled with sorrow and nostalgia — as in her statement: *"The orchard is dying with us."* This adds a personal and psychological dimension to the metaphor. Here, language is not only a means of communication but also a tool for expressing social and class identity.

In contrast, Lopakhin views the orchard as an economic opportunity for investment and change, describing it in more pragmatic terms: *"The land is waiting to be cultivated."* This is what the philosopher John Dewey pointed to in a more pragmatic language and in its technical

sense, whereby the term *pragmatism* means nothing more than the principle of referring all thinking and all reflective considerations to their consequences (Al-Hadidi, 2004).

here This reflects the perspective of the rising bourgeoisie, who regard the land as a source of profit, investment, and progress. ere, the philosophical concept of pragmatism becomes clear, as it holds that the mind achieves its purpose only when it leads its possessor to successful action. Thus, a true idea is a successful idea—that is, an idea validated by experience—and the truth of a proposition is measured solely by its practical outcomes (Jamil, 1982).

For Lopakhin, change and economic exploitation are necessary, highlighting a clear materialistic and utilitarian outlook. Notably, Lopakhin uses short, decisive sentences, indicating his firm stance on the matter and his desire to make an immediate and urgent decision, suggesting that clinging to the past leads to economic and social decline.

Within this theatrical discourse, the pragmatic dimension is apparent in the use of metaphor as a persuasive tool for influencing other characters and supporting social and political positions. The metaphor is not merely a linguistic ornament; it reflects deep social conflicts between the two classes and reveals the social and political dimensions of the text, as well as the linguistic strategies employed to express various social issues in the play,

In another statement by Ranevskaya— “*It’s the orchard, I cannot leave the orchard, I cannot*”—this phrase carries a deep emotional significance toward the orchard. She perceives the orchard not merely as material property of the family, but as the family’s heritage, encompassing both past and present. In this theatrical text, the repetition of the word “orchard” is evident, serving to emphasize and reinforce the emotional attachment and nostalgia for the past. This reflects the conflict between preserving identity and the necessity of relinquishing it due to inevitable economic and social circumstances. Here, language is employed to express her internal resistance to confronting the new social reality.

The spatial order represents the collective identity of peoples and nations as a political necessity. Nations strive to shape their collective identity within contemporary societies as a fundamental element for building national unity, stability, and development. Every nation seeks to form a shared collective identity that reflects the culture of its society, conveys its social and political history, and expresses its hopes, aspirations, and future objectives, distinguishing its sovereignty and unique character from other nations. It also facilitates the integration of individuals into that identity, thereby preserving national cohesion and stability. Alex Michelli defines it as a system of material, spiritual, and social data, encompassing a framework of cognitive integration processes. However, such a system cannot exist without an element that provides it with unity and meaning, which is represented by the inner spirit that carries the sense and awareness of identity (Michelli, 1993).

In this passage, there is an implicit cultural framework emphasizing the significance of historical spaces, which are not merely geographical areas to be measured but entities imbued with the imprints of history and shaped by events over time. Understanding a place requires linking it to its past and the historical context that influenced and formed it. Space is the memory of peoples, the embodiment and spirit of the text, around which human existence revolves. The place communicates with humans, revealing its stories and the events it has witnessed

In contrast, Lopakhin *emphasizes cultivating the land*, stating, “*The land wants to be cultivated; the time is not for nostalgia but for work*,” asserting that the land is not an inheritance to mourn but a means for revival, labor, and economic profit. This discourse embodies a silent revolution and a decisive rejection of the old aristocracy. It advocates action and service to the land, reflecting the new bourgeois perspective on social reality, which views transformation as inevitable and necessary. Nostalgia and attachment to the past are seen as obstacles to development and progress. Here, language is employed to promote change and persuasion, urging abandonment of the illusions of the aristocratic class. Land should be viewed from a utilitarian perspective, which aligns with John Dewey’s definition of pragmatism as an operational process. He considers thinking to be a tool and a means for solving and addressing people’s social and personal problems, through which certain desired outcomes are achieved (Al-Ahwani.).

In another dialogue between (Shamilin) and Yasha, the servants, Yasha states, “*The orchard is our hope*, but it is going to perish.” This phrase is a symbolic metaphor representing life and hope, highlighting the contrast between “hope” and “perish,” which underscores the characters’ internal conflict in facing imposed social transformations—the tension between clinging to the present and fearing destruction if adaptation does not occur. This dialogue reflects the lower class’s awareness of social changes, where language functions as a tool for discussion and reflection on everyone’s fate, representing the reality of servants and laborers amid the collapse of the old system.

Shamilin responds, “*We must adapt to reality, or we will remain slaves to the past*.” This statement carries an explicit call for liberation from the psychological and intellectual constraints imposed by nostalgia or blind attachment to traditions and memories. It conveys a critical stance against stagnation, illustrating how clinging to the past can immobilize individuals or society, preventing engagement with the future and adaptation to social change. Adaptation here does not imply submission but represents a flexible consciousness capable of understanding present circumstances and utilizing them to serve humanity and achieve a peaceful life. In contrast, clinging to the past denotes temporal and mental stasis, trapping individuals in a closed loop disconnected from the external world, lacking foresight and control over the present. This statement advocates adopting new values and interacting with them positively, reflecting the necessity of responding to social, political, and economic transformations; otherwise, individuals remain prisoners of the past, incapable of shaping themselves in a constantly changing world. Language here is not only expressive but also argumentative and pragmatic, conveying a profound existential stance that psychologically impacts the audience, prompting serious reflection on the consequences of nostalgia. In this context, language functions as a tool of critique and motivation, designed to break inertia and awaken consciousness toward change and liberation.

In another instance, (Ranevskaya) says, “*The orchard is part of me... how can I leave it?*” This discourse reveals a deep emotional bond between the character and the place, transcending mere material ownership to an experiential and symbolic fusion.

Place is a geographical extension of each nation, encompassing all its spiritual values as well as its material and human resources. This constitutes a fundamental condition for self-protection

and for confronting the enemy, whatever its form—colonial, class-based, economic, political, social, ideological, intellectual, or cultural (Hamdawi, 2020).

The orchard is not simply a tract of land that can be sold or abandoned; it embodies the memories of the aristocracy, childhood experiences, and family relationships formed within its grounds. From this perspective, the orchard represents Ranevskaya's identity and serves as a symbol of her aristocratic class, which clings to the past and refuses to yield. The phrase employs precise, emotionally charged language, particularly in "*part of me*," a powerful metaphor suggesting that losing the orchard is akin to losing a part of herself, not merely material property. It is a direct refusal to sell the orchard to cover debts and a concentrated expression of identity and existential crisis.

Language here conveys Ranevskaya's internal turmoil and fragmentation despite pressing material needs. The pragmatic dimension of the discourse becomes evident as it manifests her attachment to heritage and identity, reflecting the aristocratic class's resistance to losing possessions amid enforced economic changes. This highlights the tension between the old and the new in Russian society during this period. The statement carries a communicative function between self and audience, employing repetition to emphasize total refusal to sell. It is a characteristic of both the human being and society—of the individual and the collective—through which a person comes to know the self and the relationship with the other. It is also founded on freedom: the freedom of the self that transcends geographical, ethnic, linguistic, and cultural boundaries, because it arises from the self, from the essence rather than from external attributes. This is identity, in which humanity becomes a single identity, with no distinction among races, languages, cultures, or homelands (Hassan Hanafi, 2022, p. 33).

Lopakhin's statement, "*If we do not cultivate the land, it will become desolate*," embodies a direct linguistic structure with a pragmatic dimension. The conditional sentence links two actions—the failure to cultivate and the inevitable result of desolation—demonstrating the use of language pragmatically to persuade and influence. It implicitly urges characters and the audience to take immediate practical action regarding the social and economic challenges depicted in the play. This phrase reflects the actual economic reality, advocating effective resource utilization, in contrast to the aristocratic nostalgia that calls for clinging to the past. It underscores the potential for loss and destruction if no tangible action is taken and criticizes the nobility's attachment to the past, which causes economic and social decline. The tension between the emerging working class, valuing labor and production, and the old aristocracy, preserving symbols, heritage, and place, is thus expressed. Linguistic and communicative dimensions intertwine, making this a pivotal rhetorical moment that summarizes the struggle between old and new, stagnation and renewal, eloquently conveying the logic of a transforming world, the backdrop of *The Cherry Orchard*.

Finally, Charmia states, "*We live on memories, but memories do not pay the bills*." This discourse carries rich linguistic significance. It employs contrast between emotion and reality through two clauses connected by a coordinating conjunction, producing pragmatic tension. The pronoun "*we*" implies collective experience, reflecting the speaker's belonging to a group living in nostalgia, while "*memories*" as an inanimate subject cannot act to pay bills. This paradox highlights the tension between emotional attachment and the demands of reality,

implicitly warning the audience against retreating into the past. It reflects a rejection of social and intellectual stagnation, representing the middle-class discourse that seeks a balance between spiritual values and material needs, making it a rational voice advocating adaptation and responsiveness to change

In the dialogue between Yasha and Shamilin:

- Yasha: "*The orchard is our place, but it is being sold to others.*"
- Shamilin: "*And we must depart with the wind.*"

This exchange encapsulates both symbolic meaning and semantic tension between clinging to the past and surrendering to reality. When Yasha states, "*The orchard is our place,*" he emphasizes belonging, the preservation of identity, and rootedness in time and space. The orchard is not merely a location but a spirit embodying existence itself. In contrast, Shamilin responds, "*And we must depart with the wind,*" a pragmatically loaded sentence expressing the inevitability of departure and the loss of control over the orchard. The wind symbolizes aimless movement and dislocation, reflecting a state of homelessness and deprivation. Pragmatically, this dialogue represents the dialectic between a generation attached to the past, its identity, and history, and another that submits to the imposed social transformations. The use of the wind metaphor conveys loss indirectly, emphasizing that resisting change is futile when it is as unstoppable as the wind, while also reflecting the collapse of the aristocracy and the rise of the bourgeoisie, imposing a new social reality. This dialogue also demonstrates the working class's awareness of their tragic situation amid economic and social transformations, highlighting the depth of class conflict and radical changes in the social structure.

Lopakhin states, "*It is not the time to cry, but to work and plan.*" This assertion embodies a decisive pragmatic stance, moving beyond emotionality toward rational and practical action. It reveals a transformation in the worldview within *The Cherry Orchard*, as Lopakhin employs negation and affirmation ("not... but") to juxtapose two opposing behaviours: crying, symbolizing helplessness, submission, and nostalgia for the past, versus work and planning as acts oriented toward the future. Lopakhin addresses other characters, particularly the aristocracy, from a relatively authoritative position, urging them to leave the world of memories and engage with the new economic and social reality. In doing so, he consolidates the view that work and planning are tools for liberation from a stagnant past.

Charmia's statement, "*Past dreams neither fill nor feed the hungry,*" employs a simple folk proverb rich in social meaning, emphasizing the necessity of confronting reality and rejecting illusions, while addressing material necessities. This discourse reflects awareness of unavoidable economic and social conditions. The simplicity of the phrase mirrors popular consciousness, while also highlighting the contrast between dreams and reality. It reflects the middle-class position, attempting to balance ambition with pragmatic needs, adding a socially realistic dimension to the text.

Ranevskaya's line, "*Everything passes, even our beautiful dreams,*" encapsulates the philosophy of nostalgia and resignation to time, reflecting the inevitability of change and its psychological impact on the aristocratic class. It conveys the tragic psychological dimension of her character, who realizes that the past can no longer be sustained. The statement is syntactically simple yet semantically powerful: the generalization "everything" implies total

loss, and “passes” signals that all that is beautiful is transient. Pragmatically, this conveys her profound psychological distress as she bids farewell to the orchard; nostalgia and recognition of helplessness are all that remain. Her words not only express her own feelings but also those of the entire aristocratic family, which has lost its dreams and social position, leaving behind merely a beautiful memory that fades with time.

Yasha the servant’s statement, “*These nobles live in a world far from reality*,” the descriptive sentence carries a figurative dimension highlighting the aristocracy’s detachment, as depicted in *The Cherry Orchard*, from the social and economic transformations unfolding around them. It also indicates class disparity and the social awareness of the servants, as well as their critique of the nobility, who remain entrenched in the past, oblivious to ongoing changes. The statement represents a direct social critique from the lower-class perspective, reflecting the growing consciousness of subordinate groups regarding societal transformations and intensifying class conflict, as conveyed through the theatrical discourse. The nobles are portrayed as disconnected from daily life and the shifting economic realities. The underlying moral emphasizes the gap between an idealized, antiquated world clinging to remnants of the past and a real, changing world around them, which ultimately leads to their downfall and the loss of the orchard—a symbol of their status and heritage.

in Ranevskaya’s statement, “The orchard is not merely land; it is the soul of the family,” the metaphorical dimension is clearly evident, transforming the orchard from mere material property into a spiritual entity representing memory and identity. By turning the orchard into the family’s soul, it acquires a profoundly personal and emotional significance, making its sale tantamount to the loss of self and existence. The phrase highlights attachment to heritage and the collective memory of the aristocratic class, emphasizing the conflict between spiritual and cultural values on one hand and economic pressures on the other. It carries a deep symbolic meaning that reflects the emotional bonds connecting family members to the orchard. From a semiotic perspective, the orchard is not merely a physical space but a symbol of belonging, roots, and generational family identity. This attachment transforms the place into a living spiritual entity representing collective memory. Therefore, in this context, the orchard is more than property; it embodies the connection between humans and their past, identity, and social being.

The orchard represents their cultural identity, and the meaning here refers to the concept of identity from a psychological perspective, as it is associated with displacement and oscillation between the self and its emotions, and reality with its various manifestations, thereby forming an independent and distinctive entity of psychological identity. This identity emerges “to the extent that the individual achieves self-awareness, uniqueness, and independence, and perceives the self as an entity distinct from others, as well as attaining a sense of inner integration, continuity over time, and adherence to the ideals and values prevailing in one’s culture” (Bouaicha, 2014).

another statement, (Ranevskaya) says, “*I feel the past choking in my chest*.” This phrase represents a powerful corporeal metaphor, portraying the past as a tangible entity exerting real pressure on the self. The notion of being “choked” intensifies the feeling of psychological distress and absence, rendering the past a painful burden that cannot be easily discarded. The

statement reflects the deep internal struggle of the aristocratic class, who find it difficult to confront the loss of their identity and heritage, and it reveals the psychological dimensions of the social transformations affecting society.

Charmia asserts, “*We cannot build a future on the ruins of the past.*” Here, the speaker employs the metaphor of construction and demolition to emphasize the necessity of overcoming the past and beginning anew. The contrast between past and future reinforces the central idea of radical change, and the statement functions as a call to the middle class to embrace social transformations while moving away from attachment to outdated values that have failed to meet the demands of the modern era.

In contrast, Lopakhin states, “*Money is the force that drives the world.*” This statement expresses a clear materialistic conviction, portraying money as an active, controlling power shaping events. The sentence is simple and direct, reflecting the firmness of Lopakhin’s position and symbolizing the shift in sources of authority from lineage and inheritance to economic power. It underscores the rapid rise of the bourgeoisie amid social and economic transformations. Material culture consists of all the objects that human beings have made or use to adapt to the environment. These objects range from the pottery vessels used by primitive humans to spacecraft in the most technologically advanced countries (Omar Hamada, 2007).

Conclusion:

This study set out to examine *The Cherry Orchard* by Anton Chekhov from a pragmatic-linguistic perspective, with the aim of uncovering the linguistic and communicative representations that shape the discourse of its characters, and the social and cultural dimensions they carry. These dimensions express a period of profound transformation in the class structure of Russian society at the end of the nineteenth century. The analysis revealed that language in the play is not merely a superficial means of communication, but rather a vehicle for anxiety and disillusionment. The text of the play engages in a form of rhetorical indirection, revealing more than it explicitly states, and embodying the characters’ inability to engage effectively with the radical social and economic changes sweeping Russian society.

The pragmatic dimension of the text emerged clearly in the use of verb forms and in the dialogic tone, which oscillates between humor and seriousness, nostalgia for the past and fear of the future—reflecting the depth of the human crisis experienced by the characters.

The study also concluded that the discourse of this play cannot be analyzed in isolation from its cultural and social context, for every utterance, pause, and dialogic stance points to a meaning that extends beyond its surface expression. Each is indicative of an ideological position, a mental construct, or an inner fracture. Thus, the analysis of linguistic representations from a pragmatic perspective restores the value of theatrical language as a cognitive and semiotic vessel that translates the deeper dynamics of society.

The findings of this research demonstrate the interweaving of linguistic structure with social and symbolic content. Here, language does not perform a merely communicative function; it actively participates in shaping the consciousness of the characters, embodying their psychological instability, class positions, and existential outlooks. The pragmatic analysis of the selected excerpts revealed a deliberate use of speech acts, silence, and repetition—strategies

that reflect the faltering of action, the collapse of meaning, and the widening gap between words and reality.

Accordingly, *The Cherry Orchard* affirms that a pragmatic approach is an effective tool for deconstructing the structures of theatrical discourse and uncovering the linguistic strategies it employs to influence, guide, and conceal. In doing so, it contributes to fostering critical awareness of the multiple dimensions of discourse, and underscores the need for further studies that move beyond surface linguistic analysis toward a pragmatic interpretation grounded in context, intention, and the impact of speech on the structure of reception.

Discussion of Results

The analysis of Anton Chekhov's play *The Cherry Orchard* revealed that the text constitutes a rich site of linguistic and communicative representations, reflecting the social and cultural structure of late nineteenth-century Russian society. Pragmatic analysis indicated that language in the play functions beyond mere overt communication; it conveys anxiety, disillusionment, and the characters' inability to respond effectively to profound socio-economic transformations.

The study further identified the use of *subtle rhetorical strategies*, where the play's discourse expresses more than it explicitly states, highlighting the characters' difficulties in articulating their positions and engaging with the evolving social reality. The pragmatic dimension is particularly evident in verb constructions and in the dialogical tone, which fluctuates between humor and seriousness, as well as nostalgia and apprehension about the future, reflecting the depth of the characters' existential and social crises.

Results also demonstrated that theatrical discourse cannot be understood in isolation from its *cultural and social context*; each utterance, pause, and dialogical stance conveys broader meanings associated with ideological orientations, mental representations, and internal conflicts. Pragmatic analysis positions theatrical language as a cognitive and semiotic vehicle that captures the underlying dynamics of society.

Moreover, the study showed a clear *interconnection between linguistic structures and socio-symbolic content*: language contributes to shaping characters' consciousness, expressing their psychological instability, social positioning, and existential perceptions. The analysis of selected examples highlighted the deliberate use of speech acts, silence, and repetition, which reflect action failure, meaning collapse, and the widening gap between discourse and reality.

Overall, the results confirm that a *pragmatic approach is an effective tool* for uncovering discourse patterns and linguistic strategies in theatrical texts, revealing mechanisms of influence, guidance, and subtle obfuscation. The findings underscore the need for future studies to move beyond surface-level linguistic analysis towards contextually grounded pragmatic interpretation that considers speaker intent and the effect of language on audience reception.

References :

1. Al-Ahwani, A. F. (1959). *John Dewey: The luminaries of Western thought* (3rd ed.). Cairo, Egypt: Dar Al-Ma'arif.p29.
2. Al-Asmawi, M. Z. (n.d.). *Studies in theatrical criticism and comparative literature*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya for Printing and Publishing.p29.

3. Al-Hamadhani, A. A. (2010). *Chekhov's plays* (2nd ed.). Amman, Jordan: Dar Al-Maseera for Publishing and Distribution.
4. Amara, M. (1999). *The dangers of globalization on cultural identity*. Egypt: Dar Al-Nahda for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution.p06.
5. Badawi, A. R. (n.d.). *Encyclopedia of philosophical terms*. Beirut, Lebanon: Arab Institution for Research and Publishing.p307.
6. Bouaicha, A. (2014). *Quality of life and its relation to psychological identity among victims of terrorism*. Mohamed Khider University, Biskra, Algeria.p114.
7. Elias, M., & Kassab Hassan, H. (2006). *Theatrical dictionary: Terms and concepts – Theatre and performing arts (Arabic–English–French)* (2nd ed.). Lebanon: Librairie du Liban Publishers.p
8. Fadlaa, M. T. (2000). *Theatre: History and struggle*. Algeria: Ministry of Culture – National Fund for the Promotion of Arts and Literature.p39.
9. Hamada, M. O. (2007). *Anthropology: An introduction to the study of society and culture*. Alexandria, Egypt: Dar Al-Ma'arifa Al-Jamia.11.
10. Hamdawi, J. (2020). *Ritual, ceremonial, or anthropological theatre: An ethnosociological approach*. Tetouan, Morocco: Dar Al-Rif for Electronic Publishing.p146.
11. Lagrass, S. (n.d.). *Theatre and its relationship with social reality*. *Al-Tamoun Journal*, 6(13).
12. Michels, L. (1993). *Identity* (A. Wutfu, Trans.). Damascus, Syria: Dar Al-Waseem for Printing Services.p129.
13. Saliba, J. (1982). *Philosophical dictionary*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Kitab Al-Lubnani.203.
14. Zahr, Z. M. (n.d.). *Sociology of theatre: Theoretical, methodological, and practical techniques*.
15. Zummar, Z. M. (n.d.). *Sociology in theatre: Methodological scientific techniques*. Libya: Cultural Council.
16. Mahmoud, H. (2005). *Culture and intellectuals*. Al-Hiwar, Al-Mutamaddin, 1984.pp11
17. Al-Jadidi, M. (2004). *Philosophy of experience: John Dewey as a model*. Majd University Institution for Studies, Publishing, and Distribution,p18