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Abstract

This ethnographic study investigates the The study aims via a qualitative discourse analytic method to investigate the pragmatic and rhetorical devices and strategies in the Qur’anic argumentation. In an attempt to contribute to the pragmatic and rhetorical understanding of argumentation in the Glorious Qur’an depending on contemporary models, the study has focused on originating the notion of Hijâj in both Arabic and Western rhetoric in their pragmatic and dialectic spheres. The findings revealed that the most important strategies that are employed in the Glorious Qur’an involve rhetorical questions, speech acts, argumentative structures and persuasive rhetorical moves (logos, pathos and ethos). The paper concludes with the finding that the Qur’an has a highly organized structure of argumentation which is based on a set of dialectic, pragmatic and rhetorical devices and strategies including strategic maneuvers and rhetorical questions.
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Introduction

This paper attempts to present some speculations on how to analyze the Qur’anic argumentation in verses and suras, whether rhetorically or pragmatically in the light of the contemporary theories of strategic maneuvering. To achieve this aim, the current research reviews the basic tenets of the pragmatic theories of strategic maneuvering and argumentation with reference to their roots and similarities in the classical and modern Arabic studies. Then, a selection of some illustrative examples will be presented to formulate our proposed perspective to analyze argumentative moves in the Glorious Qur’an.

A General Outline of Argumentation

Since it is a book for guidance and instruction, The Glorious Qur’an utilizes a variety of styles and devices to achieve the main aim of leading people and saving them from darkness to light and faith. One of these styles is Argumentation or (Al-Hijâj). The Qur’an is full of devices that manipulate syllogism, induction and logical deductions to achieve its objectives and persuade others of its eternal message (The Qur’an, 6: 149). The model used in this paper depends on both classical studies of Arabic rhetoric and modern studies of pragmatics and dialectics in the western world.

In Arabic, Hijâj (argumentation) is said to be derived from the stem ‘hâjja’, ‘hâjja’ or ‘hajja’, meaning discussed, argues, refused, rejected, pretested, terminated, destined. Sometimes, hijâj is correlated with Jídâl (polemics) (Ibn Mandûr, 1994: 779). This means it covers different but interrelated notions and senses. For instance, some scholars indicate that Hijja means ‘evidence or burhân’ (Al-Habîb, 2010:31). On the other hand, the term argumentation in western dictionaries means ‘defending your standpoints against other’s views using evidence and arguments’ (Alexy, 1989: 53). Similarly, according to Cambridge Advanced Learners’ Dictionary (1989: 56), ‘argument’ refers to that evidence which you resort to in order to validate what you believe to be wrong or right. Therefore, all in all, argumentation involves the use of arguments by two or more discussants or disputed speakers to either prove or refute each other’s standpoints (Trûs, 2005: 6).

Argumentation has been dealt from two angles: conversational and textual. The first focuses on the act or process of argumentation as a communicative act between different speakers, while the second means that argumentation is a feature of the text or discourse itself whether
there are two speakers or not (Thābiti, 2006: 286).

According to Islamic teaching of the Qur’an, argumentation is of two kinds: ‘mahmūd’ or preferred, where you use it to persuade others by soft and acceptable tools (The Qur’an, 16: 125), and ‘mathmūm’ or dispreferred, where some people use it without knowledge or proof and to support enemies of Allah (The Qur’an, 22: 8,9; 18: 56) (Ibn Hazm, 1983: 23).

Al-Azzawi (2006:15) argues that argumentation is a pragmatic and dialectical activity or process. Similarly, in Arabic, rhetoric has been evaluated or defined by two ways. First, it is viewed negatively as the manipulation of any maneuver or device to achieve your objective by mistaking the right or correcting the wrong. Of course, this type of rhetoric is closer to ‘fallacy’ where things will be blurred and puzzled, and this is rejected in Islam and cannot be applied neither to Hadith nor Qur’an (Sumūd, 1983: 260). The second definition is that rhetoric refers to the act of persuasion to achieve eloquence and satisfaction for others (Sawla, 2001: 20). This is wholly accepted in the analysis of both the Qur’anic text and Hadith.

Arab scholars classified argumentation into three main types in the light of the domain on which it is based:

1. Rhetorical argumentation: in which, language users utilize rhetorical and eloquent styles and devices such as metaphor, logos and irony to persuade others of his own standpoints and ideas (Midkin, 2005: 173).

2. Philosophical argumentation; which involves he employment of philosophical grounds such as acceptance, rejection, effectivity, power and weakness (Midkin, 2005: 173).

3. Pragmatic argumentation: which invokes the manipulation of pragmatic strategies such as speech acts and politeness to achieve the act of persuasion which is seen here as an instance of perlocutionary speech act (Midkin, 2005: 174).

In the western studies, argumentation has been developed by group of scholars in The Amsterdam School who made attempts to extend the pragma-dialectical theory by reconciling the dialectical perspective with rhetorical insights. For this purpose, they developed the concept of strategic maneuvering, which helps understand the relationship between the arguers’ complying with dialectical obligations and their aiming to achieve rhetorical effectiveness by means of persuasive argumentative moves (van Eemeren, 2010; van Eemeren et al, 2012). According to them, the pragmatic analysis of argumentation should be based on what they call ‘strategic maneuvering’.

Maneuvering comes from the verb “maneuver,” which has performing maneuvers as its first meaning. The noun “maneuver” can refer to a planned movement or a movement to win or do something.

The term strategic is added to maneuvering because the goal aimed for in the maneuvering has to be reached by a skilful planning, doing optimal balance between reasonableness and effectiveness. To Drucker (1974), strategy is purposeful action; to Moore (1959) design for action, in essence, conception preceding action. According to van Eemeren (2010: 41), the tools used in maintaining the balance between effectiveness and reasonableness may be referred to as (argumentative) “techniques”. This means that there is a communicative gap between a dialectical approach and a rhetorical approach to the study of argumentation (cf. Leeman, 1992; Toulmin, 2001). Bridging the gap is by using these pragmatic techniques, and showing that rhetorical and dialectical approaches are, in fact, complementary from the perspective that both aim at persuasion (cf. Krabbe, 2002; Leff, 2002).

The concept of strategic maneuvering can be used to understand how the arguers’ various choices contribute to achieve reasonableness while trying to obtain at the same time an advantageous outcome of the discussion. Reasonableness is truth seeking according to Aristotle. To obtain advantageous outcome of the discussion, arguers tries to be effective. By making use of this concept, the analysis of an arguers’ argumentation does explain both the dialectical interest in maintaining reasonableness and the rhetorical interest in being effective (van Eemeren and Houtlosser, 2001; van Eemeren, 2010). Accordingly, in strategic maneuvering, interactants use rhetoric moves to lead the discussion in the direction that
According to Jacobs (2002: 261), normative pragmatics conceptualizes argumentative effectiveness in a way that integrates notions of rhetorical strategy with dialectical norms. All arguments involve rhetorical strategies and all rhetorical strategies involve language use. And all language use is organized by inferential and strategic principles – the domain of pragmatics. Pragmatically, argumentation is structured as a flow or series of speech acts that construct the whole argumentation process at hand. Therefore, Speech Act Theory provides a suitable instrument for dealing with verbal communication that is directed at resolving a difference of opinion in accordance with the pragma-dialectical principles. Using this theory, the verbal moves made in the various stages of a critical discussion (or argumentation) to resolve a difference of opinion can be described as speech acts (van Eemeren, et al, 2007: 12).

Generally speaking, rhetoric can be involved in the pragmatic study of argumentation when we deal with the act of persuasion as a perlocutionary or illocutionary speech act since rhetoric is defined as the scientific study of persuasion. Rhetorical devices and styles in argumentation vary from metaphor, metonymy, irony and overstatement.

Participants share a common goal and cooperate to achieve it by means of conversation. Cooperation is characterized either by means of a set of imperatives or by imposing constraints on what parties are expected to do in the interaction (Walton & Krabbe, 1995; Matheson et al., 2000). From a rhetorical point of view, it can be said that arguments are effective and thus good (Johnson, 2000: 189). It is the use of signs for communicating effectively in practical discourse (Booth, 2004: xi). They are not only interested in maintaining and getting on with others in mutually cooperative way and aiming at the truth (Misak, 2000: 83).

As far as it is pertinent to pragma-dialectics, rhetoric is the potential effectiveness of argumentative discourse in convincing or persuading an audience in actual argumentative practice. This means that argumentative moves are considered as speech acts and they have to be agreed with language use rules. And as Henley (1988: 8) states that “many people might think that if one simply has an opinion, one can argue it effectively and might be surprised when others don’t agree with them”. In this regard, some of the Qur’anic argumentative moves such as ‘rhetorical questions’ will be analyzed as a set of pragmatic speech acts such as blaming, threats and the like. This will constitute our proposed pragmatic rhetorical model of argumentation.

All in all, theories of argumentation have stressed the underlying reasonableness of moves made in conversational exchanges designed to resolve a conflict of opinions or move toward uncovering the truth of the matter being discussed. The concept of strategic maneuvering arises because participants not only pursue the goal of the discussion, which is the resolution of difference of opinion, but also try to achieve their own goals.

Some argumentation theorists, dialecticians, view argumentation as descriptive claims which are deemed to fulfill reasons from recognized truths or justified beliefs (Biro & Siegel 1992: 99). Some argumentation scholars taking a rhetorical approach favor action claims, thus they exclude descriptive and evaluative standpoints (Kock, 2007: cited in Eemeren, 2010: 2). Rhetorical discourses tend to prefer effectiveness over reasonableness, and vice versa in dialectical practices.

Methodology

The current paper adopts a qualitative method of analysis in which pragmatic and rhetorical discourse analysis is conducted in the light of van Eemeren’s (2010) model of strategic maneuvering sketched above as well as the rhetorical aspects developed by Boone and Kurtz (1999) and Walton (2007) as indicated below.

Results and Discussion

Rhetorical Aspects

In the related literature, there are three aspects of rhetoric: logos, ethos and pathos introduced respectively below:

Logos

The term logos represents persuasion through reasoning. In other words, it refers to the use of logic through arguments. Thus, appealing to reason is a prerequisite to verify rational discussion. Reasoning fulfils the clarity of the
claim, the logic of its reason and the effectiveness of its confirming proof (Walton, 2007: 18). This strategy can be clearly found in the following verse:


[No son did Allah beget, nor is there any god along with Him: (if there were many gods), behold, each god would have taken away what he had created, and some would have lorded it over others! Glory to Allah. (He is free) from the (sort of) things they attribute to Him!] (Qur’an, 23: 91)

It is noted that this verse utilizes logical reasoning where it is impossible to have two ‘Gods’ since each one, like kings and lords in our life, will take his own world aside and his creatures alone. Glorious Qur’an motivates the human mind’s mentality and thinking through the use of ‘logos’ represented by principles of logicality.

Ethos

Ethos refers to the credibility or ability of the person as being truthful, reliable. Hence, they are speaker’s traits to carry out an argument. The capacity to persuade is affected by the reliability of the document. Boone and Kurtz (1999: 41) describe reliability as the "degree to which a statement, a person, and/or a company is perceived to be ethical, trustworthy, and sincere". It is significantly connected to the observation of the audience how "believable a speaker" is (Boone and Kurtz, 1999: 41). This rhetorical device is apparently proved in the following verse:


[Say: "O People of the Book! come to common terms as between us and you: That we worship none but Allah. That we associate no partners with him; that we erect not, from among ourselves, Lords and patrons other than Allah.”]

If then they turn back, say ye: "Bear witness that we (at least) are Muslims (bowing to Allah’s Will).] (Qur’an, 3: 64)

In this verse, the Qur’an uses proved and reliable document which is found in all Abrahamic religions: to worship one God only. This strategy is highly used in other verses such:


[But when Our Clear Signs are rehearsed unto them, those who rest not their hope on their meeting with Us, Say: "Bring us a Reading other than this, or change this," Say: "It is not for me, of my own accord, to change it: I follow naught but what is revealed unto me: if I were to disobey my Lord, I should myself fear the penalty of a Great Day (to come)."] (Qur’an, 10:15)


And remember, Jesus, the son of Mary, said: "O Children of Israel! I am the messenger of Allah (sent) to you, confirming the Law (which came) before me, and giving Glad Tidings of a Messenger to come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad." But when he came to them with Clear Signs, they said, "this is evident sorcery!"] (Qur’an, 61: 6)

One can see in the first verse in (3) that Prophet Mohammad (A.S.W) has reported and asserted that he is not free to change or modify Allah’s words from his own. Similarly, the second verse in (4) presents a document by Jesus (Al-Maseeh) (A.S.) which originated in the Gospel and the New Testament that the coming messenger is ‘Ahmed’.

Pathos

The term ‘Pathos’ refers to emotional appeals, which are intended to provoke the feelings of the
adresses to be angry, compassionate, afraid, distasteful, conceited, deferential and shameful, or the like. Thus, the appeal to pathetic is oriented towards eliciting the emotions of the audience. In many situations, emotion constitutes the salient, powerful persuasive factor. As logical arguments fail, emotions most often have the ability to instigate people to comply with (Boone and Kurtz, 1999: 42).

This rhetorical device can be illustrated by the following aya:

(5) Fāmā Bakat ʿAlayhimu As-Samāʾu Wa Al-ʿArdu Wa Mā Kānū Munẓārīna. [And neither heaven nor earth shed a tear over them; nor were they given a respite (again).] (Qurʾan, 44: 29)

In this verse, we notice the utilization of emotional motif which is concerned with those people who rejected to believe in Allah. They did not receive or deserve His mercy and the weeping of heaven. This strategy is also combined with ‘metaphor’ since heaven does not cry or weep for people, but it means that heaven and ground in which and above which we worship God will long for us after our death, and seem to weep for us. All these aspects are viewed as instances of the employment of emotive and passionate to achieve persuasion on the part of the Glorious Qurʾan.

Rhetorical Questions

The Qurʾan seems to employ various types of rhetorical questions that have been utilized to achieve persuasion via different functions and for different goals. Let us take the following Aya:

(6) ʿAfālā Yataḍabbārūnā Al-Qurʾāna ʿAm ʿAlā Qulūbin ʿAqfāluhā. [Do they not then earnestly seek to understand the Qurʾan, or are their hearts locked up by them?] (Qurʾan, 47: 24)

(7) Qul Ḥal Yastawī Al-Ladhīnā Yaʿlamūnā Wa Al-Ladhīnā Lā Yaʿlamūnā ʿInnāmā Yatadhakkaru ʿūlū Al-ʿAlbābī. [Is one who worships devoutly during the hour of the night prostrating himself or standing (in adoration), who takes heed of the Hereafter, and who places his hope in the Mercy of his Lord - (like one who does not)? Say: "Are those equal, those who know and those who do not know? It is those who are endued with understanding that receive admonition."] (Qurʾan, 39: 9)

Here, the rhetorical question functions as an assertive which implies negation, or more accurately as a motivational assertion. It seeks no answer. Or one can pragmatically analyze these verses as instances of indirect speech acts of ‘blaming’. Allah blames people who do not think deeper in Qurʾan, do not respect those who know better than others (Ulamā), and do not return good deed by good reactions.

Moreover, this question is used as an establishment for the standpoint or a motivation for the whole sura. Van Eemeren et al. (1993: 26) state that series of questions will heaten the argumentative situation. Such questions have more strategic merits over direct statements. Here, indirectness is not a matter of politeness, but it relates the more persuasive effect on the listeners’ cognition. Such questions have also been called ‘critical questions’ since they enhance the critical situation of the given discussion or speech (van Eemeren, 2010: 23). These persuasive questions have been studied in detail under the term ‘premise-elicting questions’ (Taraman, 2010: 1). Besides, Taraman (2010: 4) affirms that there are three indications which make this particularly clear: rhetorical questions “can be followed by responses of agreement or disagreement”, they “can function as valid answers to genuine questions” and those rhetorical questions that are “functioning as answers can often be interpreted as argumentative”. It is the first criterion that makes the question in this example ‘rhetorically’ functioning as assertion since it opens domains of agreement and disagreement in audience. Another instance of the Qurʾanic rhetorical questions is illustrated in:

(8) Ḥal Jazāʾu Al-ʿĪlānī ʿIllā Al-ʿĪlānū [Is there any Reward for Good - other than Good?] (Qurʾan, 55: 60)

This rhetorical question does not seek an answer.
Thus, it violates the regular felicity conditions of the speech act of questions: Preparatory (S does not know ‘the answer’) or Sincerity S wants this information (Taraman, 2010: 3). Here, the Qur’an does not want information. Therefore, the question is an indirect speech act of blaming again. This means that by asking a critical question the speaker lets the listener “know that the preparatory condition is not fulfilled and he has not yet accepted the argumentation. Therefore, the question functions as a request to provide further justification, by virtue of the sincerity condition for the complex speech act of argumentation” (Van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004: 150). However, this rhetorical question may also be seen as functioning as an indirect warning. The Qur’an warns people to be aware of Allah’s justice which will give good and bad humans what they deserve.

**Let’s see another example from the Qur’an:**

(10) Yā Ma’shara Al-Jinni Wa Al-’Insi ‘Alam Ya’tikum Rusulun Minkum Yaqūṣṣina ʿAlaykum ‘Āyā Tī Wa Yundhirūnakum Liqāʾa Yawmikum Ḥādhā Qālū Shahidnā ʿAlaa ‘Anfusinā Wa Gharrat/hum Al-Ḥayā Atu Ad-Dunyā Wa Shahidū ʿAlaa ‘Anfusihim ʿAnnahum Kānū Kāfīrīna. [“O ye assembly of Jinn and men! came there not unto you messengers from amongst you, setting forth unto you My signs, and warning you of the meeting of this Day of yours?” They will say: “We bear witness against ourselves.” It was the life of this.”] (Qur’an, 6: 130)

This rhetorical question can be understood as indirect blame. The Qur’an uses question to blame those who did not believe in Allah (God) and His messengers (A.S.). The question neither seeks ‘yes’ nor ‘no’ as a reply. Anderson (2007: 34) pragmatically argues that rhetorical questions violate the quality maxim of Grice for a variety of functions such as blame. Thus, the felicity conditions of questions are modified into blaming felicity rules. Additionally, this question can also be seen as an instance of argumentative motivating speech act. That is, the indirect speech act of blame will have an additional indirect speech act of ‘give justification’ or a command (see Rohde, 2006: 143).

Another function for rhetorical questions in the Qur’an can be seen in the following verse:

(11) Qul Man Ḥarrama Zīnāta Allāhi Allāhī ‘Akhrajā Li’ibādīhi Wa Aṭ-Ṭayyibātī Mina Ar-Rizqi Qul Hiya Lilladhīna ʿĀmanū Fī Al-Ḥayāati Ad-Dunyā Khāliṣatān Yawma Al-Qiyāmati Kadhāliku Nafaṣṣīlu Al-ʿĀyāti Liqawmin Ya’lamūna.

[Say: Who hath forbidden the beautiful (gifts) of Allah, which He hath produced for His servants, and the things, clean and pure, (which He hath provided) for sustenance? Say: They are, in the life of this world, for those who believe, (and) purely for them on the Day of Judgment. Thus do We explain the signs in detail for those who understand.] (Qur’an, 7: 32)

This question has different persuasive and dialectical functions:

a. As a rhetorical trope, it functions as an assertion. Allah did not prevent you of having delicious food, meant and other decorations of life. In these cases, the Qur’an seeks no answer. It does not mean that there are no answers, but it provokes that the answers are not significant in themselves or they are common sense. Here, shared or common knowledge has an important role in such an interpretation (see Brown and Yule, 1983: Ch. 2). However, in the same Āya, Allah, then, reports that it is for believers in this life and only for them after the Judgements’ Day.

b. The dialectic function is that it represents a conclusion for the ideal argumentation (here the speaker asks and answers at the same time.) (see van Eemeren, 2010).

Other functions of questions in the argumentative structure of the Qur’an can be viewed in what Al-Zarkashi (2005: 347-8) indicates that we should differentiate between the speech act of reprimanding (Al-Tabkīt) as in (12), reproaching (Al-Laum Al-Shadīd) as in (13), gentle or soft blaming (A-Itāb) as in (14), and rebuking (Al-Tawbīkh) as in (15) below:

[And behold! Allah will say: "O Jesus the son of Mary! Didst thou say unto men, worship me and my mother as gods in derogation of Allah?" He will say: "Glory to Thee! never could I say what I had no right (to say). Had I said such a thing, thou wouldst indeed have known it. Thou knowest what is in my heart, Thou I know not what is in Thine. For Thou knowest in full all that is hidden." (Qur’an, 5: 116)

(13) Qālū ‘Alam Takun ‘Ardu Allāhī Wāsī‘atan Fatuhājirū Fihā Fa‘ulā‘ika Ma‘wāhum Jannahamu Wa Sā‘at Maṣrrāān. [They say: "Was not the earth of Allah spacious enough for you to move yourselves away (From evil)?" Such men will find their abode in Hell,- What an evil refuge!] (Qur’an, 4: 97)

(14) ‘Afā Allāhū ‘Anka Limā ‘Adhinta Lahum Hattāā Yatabayyana Laka Al-Ladhīnā Șadaqū Wa Ta’lamā Al-Kādhibīnā. [Allah give thee grace! why didst thou grant them until those who told the truth were seen by thee in a clear light, and thou hadst proved the liars?] (Qur’an, 9: 43)

(15) ‘Afaghayra Dīnī Allāhī Yabghīnūa Wa Lahu ‘Aslāma Man Fi As-Samāwātī Wa Al-’Ardī Șaw‘ān Wa Karhān Wa Ilayyīr Yurjā‘ūnā. [Do they seek for other than the Religion of Allah.- while all creatures in the heavens and on earth have, willing or unwilling, bowed to His Will (Accepted Islam), and to Him shall they all be brought back.] (Qur’an, 3: 83)

A very important note must be also highlighted here: rhetorical questions in the Qur’an can be manipulated to express blaming or complaint in a clearly civil, polite, and friendly way. This gentle discourse is employed to make the blamed person avoid doing bad things or behavior (see Al-Husseini, 2007: 101):

(16) ‘Alam Ya‘ni Lilladhīnā ‘Āmanū ‘An Takhshā‘a Qulūbuhum Lidhidkri Allāhī Wa Mā Nazala Mina Al-Haqqī Wa Lā Yakūnū Kālladhīnā ȘUtū Al-Kītābā Min Qablū Faṭājā ‘Alayhīmu Al-’Amadu Faqasat Qulūbuhum Wa Kathirun Minhum Fāsiqūnā. [Has not the time arrived for the Believers that their hearts in all humility should engage in the remembrance of Allah and of the Truth which has been revealed (to them), and that they should not become like those to whom was given Revelation aforetime, but long ages passed over them and their hearts grew hard? For many among them are rebellious transgressors.] (Qur’an, 57: 16)

Finally, rhetorical questions can be used as indirect speech acts of ‘threat’ (Al-Tahhid or Al-Wa‘īd). This can be found in the following verses:

(17) ‘Alam Nuhlik Al-’Awwalīnā. [Did We not destroy the men of old (for their evil)?] (Qur’an, 77:16)

(18) ‘Alam Taraā ‘Ilā Al-Ladhīnā Baddalū Ni’matata Allāhī Kufrrān Wa ‘Aḥallū Qawmahum Dārā Al-Bawārī. Jannahama Yashiwnahā Wa Bi’sa Al-Qarārū. [Hast thou not turned thy vision to those who have changed the favour of Allah. Into blasphemy and caused their people to descend to the House of Perdition? Into Hell? They will burn therein,- an evil place to stay in!] (Qur’an, 14: 28-29)

Again, these questions do not seek answers; rather, they motivate a speech act of ‘threat’ where Allah mentions such stories to threat those disbelievers who do not take message from their ancestors and other tribes and people who rejected the message of Allah (see Al-Khalifa, 2007:428).

Argumentation in Qur’anic Stories

The Glorious Qur’an is characterized by a unique employment of stories. Its stories are not only historical in nature but they have specific and distinguished styles and tools to achieve some intended mission and lesson for all humanity. We will take some examples from the sura of Yousuf’ (Josep) and look at the argumentative strategies in which they are used. The Qur’an utilized stories for different aims and objectives, for instance, to comfort the Prophet’s heart (Qur’an, 12:3), to send mission and message (Qur’an, 6: 11), to tell people some rules and advice for their lives and religion (Qur’an, 5: 45). One can notice that stories in Qur’an are described as ‘ahsana al-qasas’ ‘the best stories’. As such, the story is one of the rhetorical and dialectical tools of argumentation. It
is full of persuasive strategies that aim to convince others of its message and goals with highly elevated language and rhetoric (Al-Khatīb, 1975: 8).

The basic argumentative structure of the sura of Joseph is the standpoint: when you are patient, *Allah will be with you even after years of sorrow, loss, nostalgia and poverty.*

19) Qâlû `a’înnaka la’anta Yûsufu qâla ‘anâ yûsufu wa hdhâ `akhī qad manna allâhu `alaynâ ‘innahu man yattaqi wa yasbîr fâ’înna Allâha lâ yudî `u ’ajra al-muhsinînâ.
[Behold, he that is righteous and patient,- never will Allah suffer the reward to be lost, of those who do right.] (Qur’an, 12: 90)

The dialectic logical structure of this verse is as follows:

*Introduction:* You are patient and righteous;
*Result:* Allah surely aids him and rewards him with good fate.

Now, we can start with the use of metaphor. Metaphor is one of the main devices of Arabic rhetoric that are deployed in argumentation, and it is generally regarded by scholars that indirect ways of meaning (Talmîh) are more effective than direct ones (Taṣrîh) (Al-Jirjâni, 1991: 26). In this vein, it is believed that metaphorical and metonymical phrases and clauses indicate both affirmation or assertion and negation; thus, they have an argumentative function.

(20) Aqtûlû yûsufa `awi aṭrâhîhu `ardâân yakhlû lakum wajhu `abîkum wa takûnû min ba’dîhi qawmâan sâlihînâ
[Slay ye Joseph or cast him out to some (unknown) land, that so the favour of your father may be given to you alone: (there will be time enough) for you to be righteous after that!] (Qur’an, 12:9)

Here, the verse utilizes two devices: dialectic or logical and rhetorical (metaphor):

*Introduction:* You kill Joseph;
*Result:* You will be the only sons of your father.

The metaphor here is represented by (yakhlû lakum wajhu `abîkum), meaning: the favour of your father may be given to you alone. Thus, his face metaphorically stands for his care and love for them since a human comes with love to others with his happy and pretty face. This âya is strongly related to the previous one in which Joseph’s brothers report the main conflict between them and him that is his father’s love for him more than his love for them:

(21) `Idh qâlû layûsufu wa `akhûhu `âhâbbu `îlaâ `abînâ minnâ wa nânhu `uṣbattûn `înna `abânâ lafî dalâlîn mubînîn.
[They said: "Truly Joseph and his brother are loved more by our father than we: But we are a goodly body! really our father is obviously wandering (in his mind)!] (Qur’an, 12:8)

This relation creates pragmatic and argumentative coherence in the sura where the first verse represents a ground on which the second one is established. Such type of argumentation is illustrated in:

(22) Qâlû yâ `abânâ mâ laka lâ ta’mannâ `alaâ yûsufa wa `înna lahu lanâṣîhînâ.
[They said: "O our father! why dost thou not trust us with Joseph,- seeing we are indeed his sincere wellwishers?] (Qur’an, 12:11)

Here, they attempt to persuade or convince their father to let the take Joseph by pretending that they love their brother. We are advisors for Joseph is a metonymy or metaphor that stands for their extensive love for their brother since advice represents the peak of love.

**Conclusion**

It can be concluded that the Qur’an employs a variety of pragmatic and rhetorical devices and strategies to achieve argumentation. We originated the notion of Hijâj in the Arabic rhetoric in comparison to western literature. The most important strategies that are deployed and implemented in the Glorious Qur’an involve rhetorical questions, speech acts, argumentative structures and persuasive rhetorical aspects or moves (logos, pathos and ethos). It is assured that the Qur’an has a highly organized structure of argumentation which is based on a set of dialectic, pragmatic and rhetorical devices and strategies including strategic maneuvers, metaphors as in the Qur’anic stories, logical justifications and rhetorical questions. The Qur’an employs rhetoric and pragmatics to achieve persuasion in argumentation. It is recommended in the light of the findings of the study that further research could make more
detailed studies on the pragmatics and strategic maneuvering of argumentation in specific Qur’anic suras with some quantitative methods and correlations.
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