



St. Clements University
SUASION IN
PROPHETIC HERITAGE
AND
NEW WORLD TRANSLATION OF THE
HOLY SCRIPTURES: A CONTRASTIVE
TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL OF
ST. CLEMENTS UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF Ph. D. IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND
LINGUISTICS

Submitted by: Hayder Ali Abdulridha ALZUBAIDI

MAY, 2012

Supervised By

Prof. Dr. Chasib ALJOBOURY
Prof. Dr. Hiba ALSADIK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Acknowledgements	I
Abstract	II
Table of Contents	V
Chapter One	1
1-1	Problem
1-2	Hypothesis
1-3	Aims
1-4	Limits
1-5	Procedures
1-6	Value
Chapter Two	Aspects Of Persuasion
2-1	Introduction
2-2	Defining Persuasion
2-2-1	The Origin Of The Term
2-2-2	Persuade, Induce, And Convince
2-2-3	Discussion Of Definitions Of Persuasion
2-2-4	Procedural Definition
2-3	Attitude And Persuasion
2-3-1	The Nature Of Attitude
2-3-1-1	Attitudes And Opinions
2-3-1-2	Attitudes And Values
2-3-1-3	Attitude And Behaviour

- 2-4 Historical Background**
 - 2-4-1 Classical Rhetoric And Persuasive Discourse**
 - 2-4-2 The Three Legs Of Persuasion**
 - 2-4-2-1 The Appeal To Ethos (Character)**
 - 2-4-2-2 The Appeal To Pathos (Emotion)**
 - 2-4-2-3 The Appeal To Reason (Logos)**
- 2-5 Persuasion's Five Parts**
 - 2-5-1 The Introduction**
 - 2-5-2 The Statement Of Fact**
 - 2-5-3 The Refutation**
 - 2-5-4 The Proof**
 - 2-5-5 The Conclusion**
- 2-6 Modern Theories Of Persuasion**
 - 2-6-1 Tension Reduction Theories**
 - 2-6-2 Balance Theory**
 - 2-6-3 Congruity Theory**
 - 2-6-4 Cognitive Dissonance Theory**
 - 2-6-5 Information Processing Theories**
 - 2-6-5-1 Social Judgement Theory**
 - 2-6-5-2 Elaboration Likelihood Model**
- 2-7 The Psychological Bases Of Persuasion**
 - 2-7-1 Psychological Techniques Of Persuasion**
 - 2-7-2 Common Ground**
 - 2-7-3 Repetition**
 - 2-7-4 Scapegoat Technique**
 - 2-7-5 Strategy Of Terror**
 - 2-7-6 Transfer**
- 2-8 The Language Of Persuasion**
 - 2-8-1 Syntactic Markers Of Persuasion**
 - 2-8-1-1 The Denotative Specificity**
 - 2-8-1-2 The Spatial Immediacy**

- 2-8-1-3 The Temporal Immediacy
- 2-8-1-4 Ellipsis
- 2-8-1-5 Asyndeton
- 2-8-2 The Semantic Markers Of Persuasive Style
 - 2-8-2-1 Semantic Ambiguity
 - 2-8-2-2 Semantic Repetition
 - 2-8-2-3 Antithetic Repetition
 - 2-8-2-3-1 Oxymoron
 - 2-8-2-3-2 Enantiosis
- 2-8-3 Phonological Markers Of Persuasive Style
 - 2-8-3-1 Alliteration
 - 2-8-3-2 Euphony
 - 2-8-3-3 Cacophony
- 2-9 Pragmatics And Persuasion
 - 2-9-1 Grice's Theory Of Conversational Implicature
 - 2-9-2 The Cooperative Principle
- 2-10 Rhetorical Clause Relations And Persuasion
 - 2-10-1 Clause Relations

Chapter Three

- Rhetoric And Persuasion In Classical Arabic
 - 3-1 Introduction
 - 3-2 Arabic Rhetoric
 - 3-2-1 The Terms البيان And البلاغة
 - 3-2-2 The Arabic Concept Of The Context Of Situation
 - 3-2-3 The Likening (التشبيه)
 - 3-2-4 المجاز Transcending
 - 3-2-5 الاستعارة The Borrowing

3-2-6 Properties Of Persuasive Speech

Chapter Four Persuasion Elements In The New Testament

4-3	Data analysis	65
4-3-1	English Text 1	65
4-3-1-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	67
4-3-1-2	Rhetorical Level	69
4-3-1-3	Syntactic Level	70
4-3-2	English Text 2	71
4-3-2-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	72
4-3-2-2	Rhetorical Level	73
4-3-2-3	Syntactic Level	73
4-3-2-4	Lexical Level	73
4-3-2-5	Tropes	74
4-3-3	English Text 3	74
4-3-3-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	76
4-3-3-2	Rhetorical Level	76
4-3-3-3	Syntactic Level	78
4-3-3-4	Lexical Level	78
4-3-3-5	Tropes	79
4-3-4	English text 4	79
4-3-4-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	80
4-3-4-2	Rhetorical Level	81
4-3-4-3	Syntactic Level	83
4-3-4-4	Lexical Level	83
4-3-4-5	Tropes	84
4-3-5	English Text 5	84
4-3-5-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	85
4-3-5-2	Rhetorical Level	85
4-3-5-3	Syntactic Level	86
4-3-5-4	Lexical Level	86
4-3-6	English Text 6	87

4-3-6-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	87
4-3-6-2	Rhetorical Level	88
4-3-6-3	Syntactic Level	88
4-3-6-4	Lexical Level	89
4-3-6-5	Tropes	90
4-3-7	English Text 7	90
4-3-7-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	91
4-3-7-2	Rhetorical Level	92
4-3-7-3	Syntactic Level	93
4-3-7-4	Lexical Level	95

4-3-8	English Text 8	96
4-3-8-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	97
4-3-8-2	Rhetorical Level	98
4-3-8-3	Syntactic Level	99
4-3-8-4	Lexical Level	99
4-3-9	English Text 9	100
4-3-9-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	101
4-3-9-2	Rhetorical Level	102
4-3-9-3	Syntactic Level	103
4-3-10	English Text 10	104
4-3-10-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	104
4-3-10-2	Rhetorical Level	105
4-3-10-3	Syntactic Level	106
4-3-10-4	Lexical Level	107
4-3-10-5	Tropes	107
4-3-11	English Text 11	108
4-3-11-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	108
4-3-11-2	Rhetorical Level	109
4-3-11-3	Syntactic Level	109
4-3-11-4	Lexical Level	110
4-3-12	English Text 12	110

4-3-12-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	111
4-3-12-2	Rhetorical Level	112
4-3-12-1	Syntactic Level	113
4-3-13	English Text 13	113
4-3-13-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	113
4-3-13-2	Rhetorical Level	114
4-3-13-3	Syntactic Level	114
4-3-13-4	Lexical Level	115
4-3-14	English Text 14	115
4-3-14-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	116
4-3-14-2	Rhetorical Level	116
4-3-14-3	Syntactic Level	117
4-3-14-4	Lexical Level	117
4-3-14-5	English Text 15	118
4-3-15-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	118
4-3-15-2	Rhetorical Level	119
4-3-15-3	Lexical Level	120
4-3-15-4	Tropes	121

4-3-16	English Text 16	121
4-3-16-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	122
4-3-16-2	Rhetorical Level	122
4-3-16-3	Syntactic Level	123
4-3-16-4	Lexical Level	123
4-3-17	English Text 17	124
4-3-17-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	124
4-3-17-2	Rhetorical Level	124
4-3-17-3	Syntactic Level	125
4-3-17-4	Lexical Level	125
4-3-18	English Text 18	126
4-3-18-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	126

4-3-18-2	Rhetorical Level	127
4-3-18-3	Syntactic Level	127
4-3-18-4	Tropes	128
4-3-19	English Text 19	128
4-3-19-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	129
4-3-19-2	Rhetorical Level	130
4-3-19-3	Syntactic Level	130
4-3-19-4	Tropes	131
4-3-20	English Text 20	131
4-3-20-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	132
4-3-20-2	Rhetorical Level	133
4-3-20-3	Syntactic Level	133
4-3-20-4	Lexical Level	133

Chapter Five	Persuasion in the Prophetic Traditions	135
5-1	Introduction	135
5-2	Arabic Text 1	135
5-2-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	163
5-2-2	Rhetorical Level	137
5-2-3	Syntactic Level	137
5-2-4	Lexical Level	138
5-3	Arabic Text 2	138
5-3-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	139
5-3-2	Rhetorical Level	141
5-3-3	Syntactic Level	142
5-3-4	Lexical Level	142
5-4	Arabic Text 3	143
5-4-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	144
5-4-2	Rhetorical Level	145
5-4-3	Syntactic Level	146
5-4-4	Tropes	146

5-4-5	Sound Effects	147
5-5	Arabic Text 4	147
5-5-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	147
5-5-2	Rhetorical Level	148
5-5-3	Syntactic Level	148
5-5-4	Tropes	149
5-6	Arabic Text 5	149
5-6-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	150
5-6-2	Rhetorical Level	150
5-7	Arabic Text 6	150
5-7-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	151
5-7-2	Rhetorical Level	151
5-7-3	Syntactic Level	152
5-7-4	Lexical Level	152
5-7-5	Sound effects	152
5-8	Arabic Text 7	153
5-8-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	153
5-8-2	Rhetorical Level	154
5-8-3	Tropes	155
5-9	Arabic Text 8	155
5-9-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	155
5-9-2	Rhetorical Level	156
5-9-3	Syntactic Level	156
5-10	Arabic Text 9	157
5-10-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	157
5-10-2	Rhetorical Level	159
5-10-3	Tropes	160
5-11	Arabic Text 10	160
5-11-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	160
5-11-2	Rhetorical Level	161
5-11-3	Tropes	161
5-12	Arabic Text 11	161

5-12-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	162
5-12-2	Rhetorical Level	162
5-12-3	Lexical Level	163
5-12-4	Tropes	163
5-13	Arabic Text 12	163
5-13-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	164
5-13-2	Rhetorical Level	164
5-13-3	Tropes	164
5-14	Arabic Text 13	165
5-14-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	165
5-14-2	Rhetorical Level	166
5-14-3	Tropes	166
5-15	Arabic Text 14	167
5-15-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	167
5-15-2	Rhetorical Level	167
5-15-3	Tropes	168
5-16	Arabic Text 15	168
5-16-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	168
5-16-2	Rhetorical Level	169
5-17	Arabic Text 16	169
5-17-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	169
5-17-2	Rhetorical Level	170
5-18	Arabic Text 17	170
5-18-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	171
5-18-2	Rhetorical Level	171
5-18-3	Syntactic Level	171
5-19	Arabic Text 18	172
5-19-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	172
5-19-2	Rhetorical Level	173
5-19-3	Syntactic Level	174
5-20	Arabic Text 19	174
5-20-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	175

5-20-2	Rhetorical Level	175
5-20-3	Syntactic Level	167
5-20-4	Tropes	177
5-21	Arabic Text 20	177
5-21-1	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	177
5-21-2	Rhetorical Level	178
5-21-3	Lexical Level	178
5-21-4	Tropes	179

Chapter Six	Contrastive Analysis	
6-1	Introduction	180
6-2	Semantic and Pragmatic Level	186
6-3	Rhetorical Level	187
6-4	Syntactic Level	187
6-5	Lexical Level	188
6-6	Sound Effects	188
6-7	Tropes	188
6-8	Conclusions	189
6-9	Pedagogical Recommendations	190
6-10	Suggestions for Further Research	190
Bibliography		
1-	Arabic References	192
2-	English References	193
	Abstract in Arabic	

ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates the linguistics of suasion in the talk of Moses and Jesus Christ cited in the New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures. Matthew's new testament and the Arabic traditions of the Prophet Muhammad as cited in the collection of true sayings by (Bukhary). The aims are to define the types of linguistic means of persuasion deployed in each language speech first, then to compare them in order to determine whether or not these two linguistically different types of prophetic discourses make use of similar or different linguistic means of suasion.

Three hypotheses have been put forward for empirical verification, which read:

The Traditions of the Prophet Muhammad and the Speeches of the Prophet Jesus Christ:

1. Use of textually identifiable suasive method,
2. These methods are essentially similar in the two types of data, and
3. The similarity of such textual methods reflect a universal tendency in the properties of all highly suasive religious texts.

Textual analysis has been carried out with the help of an eclectic model of analysis that explores the available persuasive means at the linguistic levels of semantics, rhetorical relations pragmatics, syntax, lexis, morphology, and figures of speech used in each one text.

Data collection has been conducted selectively on the basis of broadly comparable themes, whenever this measure has been possible, within

a total of 40 speeches. The majority of these speeches are monological ones, but some are dialogical, or interactive.

By comparing the results of the analyses conducted along the main lines above, it has been found that the two types of prophetic speeches use the same linguistic means of persuasion in Arabic and English at all levels of linguistic realization. In addition, every speech concentrates upon the utilization of one or two central means of linguistic persuasion for the purpose of conveying its message to the audience. In other words, all texts contain certain dominant linguistic means of persuasion that is foregrounded by backgrounding all other means. The results above have been found to provide empirical evidence validating the aforementioned hypotheses. The results are also indicative of the fact that all languages resort to certain universal semantico-logical means of reasoning and/or figures of speech to effect a desirable change in the attitude of the target audience.

The study has been organized into six chapters, the first of which presents the problem, aims, hypotheses, limits, procedures and value. The second chapter offers a theoretical survey of aspects of the theory of persuasion in the west, while the third outlines the theory of persuasion as presented by the scholars of Classical Arabic. Chapters four and five are dedicated to data analysis, while the sixth chapter presents the general results and conclusions, and makes certain relevant recommendations for further research in this interesting areas of contrastive discourse analysis.

1.Introduction

1.1 Problem

One of the characteristics of religious texts as exemplified by the speeches of the Prophet Muhammad, Moses and Jesus Christ, is that they are highly persuasive discourses in that the intended message is required to be effective enough to induce the addressees to abide by their illocutionary force. In addition, these speeches are highly revered as manifestation of the Divine Word.

Throughout the long history of Christianity and Islam, the teachings of the two prophets have acquired permanent appeal and sincere adoption and commitment of one generation after another. The question is ‘what are the textual properties of such speeches that have turned them into such highly persuasive discourses over such a vast period of time and to different people?’ Traditions of the Prophet Muhammad and the speeches of the Prophet Moses and Jesus Christ have certain persuasive features in common. Answers to such questions have not got been, to the best of our knowledge, not get been . The study is an attempt to bridge this gap in the relevant literatures.

1.2 Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that the Traditions of the Prophet Muhammad and the Speeches of the Prophet of Moses and Jesus Christ:

1. make use of textually identifiable persuasive techniques,
2. that these techniques are essentially similar in the two types of data,
3. the similarity of such textual techniques reflect a universal tendency in the properties of all highly persuasive religious texts.

1.3 Aims

The study aims at conducting textual analysis of twenty speeches of The Prophet Muhammad and 24 others of Jesus Christ and Moses in order to identify the basic persuasive techniques used in such religious texts, point out their similarities and differences in the use of such techniques on the basis of the results of a contrastive analysis, Assess whether the scope of their similarity allows drawing universal conclusions.

1.4 Limits

This study is limited to the investigation of persuasive techniques used in the selected data. The analysis will be organized to cover the various semantic, pragmatic, rhetorical, syntactic, and lexical levels of each selected text. Sound effects will also be accounted for as well as the use of tropes. Textual aspects that fall outside the limits above will not be investigated.

1.5 Procedures

The study starts with a theoretical survey of the basic tenets and linguistic techniques of the theory of persuasion in the west and Classical Arabic Rhetoric. Data selection and analyses are conducted in Chapters Three and Four, the former dedicated to the analysis of the use of persuasion techniques in the selected English texts, the latter to the Arabic ones.

The results of these analyses are then compared to define their similarities and differences in order to eventually test the validity of the three hypotheses postulated in 1.2 above. On the basis of the outcome of this comparative method, conclusions will finally be drawn.

1.6 Value

It is expected that the results of the textual analysis conducted in this study will shed useful light on the discourse characteristics of the religious texts in the two languages, as well as on the prominent and frequent use of persuasion technique in such register. Finally, the results of the study will be beneficial in the exploration of universal tendencies in the use of persuasive means in such important texts. Thus, the study will be of significance in contrastive discourse analysis between English and Arabic. It is also hoped to be of value to writers of argumentative speeches in all streams of life since it is going to pinpoint for them, the most successful persuasive strategies in the history of the two languages.

2. SUASION

2.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the theory of SUASION, how it works, and what makes it effective or ineffective. After defining the concept, and exploring its functions, the survey will outline the principles of persuasion, its symbols, various theories and applications.

2.2 SUASION

Definitions of suasion are numerous. To formulate an acceptable procedural definition, one has to look into the origin of the term, its dictionary definitions and the ones that have been developed by different scholars throughout time.

2.2.1 The Origin of the Term

The English word ‘suasion’ is borrowed, through Old French, from the Latin term ‘persuadere’, which is a blend from the prefix ‘per’ denoting ‘completion’ (throughout, or thoroughly), plus the base ‘suadere’ meaning to ‘advise’ or ‘urge’ (Sandell:1977:78). In Old English, the term persuade did not mean to ‘convince’, but merely to attempt to convince (Brembeck and Howell, 1976: 24). The antonym of the term persuade is to dissuade (Brembeck and Howell, 1976 : 13).

2.2.2 Suasion, Induce, and Convince

The term *suasion e* can be used synonymously with *induce* and *convince* to imply influencing someone's thoughts or actions. *Persuade* and *induce* (followed by the infinitive) are used today mainly in the meaning of winning over to a certain course of action as shown hereunder:

(1)

- a. It was I who assuasive him to call a doctor.
- b. I induced him to do it.
- c. I assuasive him to go back.

Induce emphasizes only the idea of successful influence, whether achieved by argument or by promise of reward.

(2)

What can I say that will induce you to stay in your job?

Owing to this idea of compensation, *induce* may be used in reference to the influence of factors as well as of persons. Convince means to satisfy the understanding of a person with regard to a truth or a statement

(3)

He convinced them by quoting statistics.

2.2.3 Definitions of suasion

The above-mentioned dictionary definition of persuasion does not encompass all the aspects of this term. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss some technical definitions that have been developed by those scholars who have studied persuasion from

the semiotic and psychological points of view.

Roloff and Miller (1980: 15) argue that the phrase ‘being persuaded’ applies to situations where behaviour has been modified by symbolic transactions (messages) which are sometimes, but not always, linked with coercive force (indirectly coercive), and which appeal to the reason and emotions of the person(s) being persuaded. Accordingly, this definition stipulates that a certain modification in behaviour has to be affected so that one can assume that the act of persuasion has actually taken place. In other words, persuasion seeks change, not mere information gain.

Some scholars of persuasion do not require a change in behaviour to take place so that one can consider that an act of persuasion has been affected. These scholars regard persuasion to be that kind of verbal activity geared to bring about some change in belief or attitude. As for the realization of such required change, this is another matter. Thus, Petty and Cacioppo (1987: 4) hold that the term **persuasion** refers to any instance in which an active attempt is made to change some person’s mind. Similarly, Cooper and Nothstine (1992: 2) define persuasion as the process by which language and symbolic actions influence choice-making by others.

Other scholars see in persuasion as both the attempt and the changing of beliefs, attitudes and behaviour. In this respect, Reardon (1982: 25) believes that persuasion is, in all cases, the

activity of demonstrating and attempting to change the behaviour of at least one person through symbolic interaction. In contrast with persuasion, coercion involves a conscious activity that occurs (a) when a threat to at least one person's goals is observed, and (b) when the source and degree of this threat are both sufficiently important to warrant the expenditure of effort involved in persuasion.

In similar vein, Cegala (1987:13), Bettinghus and Cody (1994:6), and Burgoon et al. (1994: 177) see in persuasion that transmitted symbolic act intended to form, modify, or strengthen the beliefs, opinions, values, attitudes, and/or behaviours of oneself or others. Likewise, Johnstone (1994: 7) agrees in regarding persuasion a transactional process among two or more persons whereby the management of symbolic meaning reconstructs reality, resulting in a voluntary change in beliefs, attitudes, and /or behaviours.

On the basis of the foregoing discussion, it has become obvious that the process of persuasion is a kind of communication (Brembeck and Howell, 1976: 19). As in all communication, there is a source (a persuader), a message delivered through symbols, a media of communication, and the target audience. The source has an aim, and is trying to affect an audience (target). He manipulates the symbols and the medium.

2.2.3.1 Procedural Definition

The previous discussion of the concept of persuasion can be summarized in the following main points:

1-Persuasion is communicative transaction in which verbal and nonverbal messages are sent. Sources use messages to affect change, not guns.

2-As a communicative transaction, it involves an addresser plus an addressee. However, these two sides of the transaction may become one and the same on these occasions where one 'persuades' oneself.

3-The aim of the message to influence the receiving person's construction of meanings in ways that may lead to change as desired by the addresser.

4-The change always targets the addressees' beliefs, attitudes, and behaviour.

In view of the above factors, a procedural definition can be formulated in the following terms:

Persuasion can be defined as a communication transaction in which the addresser constructs and sends designed the addressees constructions meanings in ways that can lead to affect the desired change in the addressees beliefs, attitudes, and/or behaviour.

2.3 Attitude and Persuasion

In many ways, persuasion is the most natural and civilized way of changing the world since all people are consumers of persuasive attempts to change their attitudes (Hart, 1999: 1). This shows that attitudes and persuasion are always related processes since persuasion is primarily concerned with producing attitudinal change. Such a change is brought about either by influencing, altering, strengthening, or destroying existing opinions and values (Brembeck and Howell, 1976: 127). In other words, given that persuasion is concerned with the modification of the existing attitudes, creating new ones, or influencing behaviour linked with attitudes, then the nature of attitudes and their relations to opinions and values require to be considered first.

2.3.1 The Nature of Attitude

Attitude is a highly abstract concept and a complex psychological phenomenon that acquires a great significance in the study of persuasion. One widely accepted definition of attitude is offered by Allport (1935: 120) who sees it as a mental and an actual state of readiness, organized through experience, that exerts a direct or dynamic influence upon an individual's responses to all aspects or situations with which it is related. An attitude is an established predisposition in one's response to a situation. In other words, attitudes are emotionally based beliefs

that affect the actions of human beings. Thus, if one believes that authority is bad, then he would act in an anti-authoritative way. In addition, it is a learned phenomenon that is related to one's own experience or the experience of others. Here is an example:

(4)

Grown up adults learn not to touch the stove when it is on because of their past experience of burn when they were young.

The building block for persuasive messages is the existence of attitudes in each person (Larson 1979: 727). However, these attitudes may or may not exert a certain force on behaviour as will be seen in 2.3.2

2.3.1.1 Attitudes and Opinions

Attitudes are only part of a set of influences on behaviour. Probably the most easily changed factor of human beings is opinion (Larson 1979: 72). For example, we have an attitude toward smoking composed of many opinions that hold it to be a costly, unhealthy, and a dirty habit. Opinions are verbal statements of part of the attitude (ibid.). Hoveland, Janis, and Kelly(1953: 6) state that an opinion "involves some type of expectation or prediction – not merely a preference – and that it can be verbalized". Opinions expressed in public do not necessarily correspond precisely with one's real attitude. Gordon (1952: 50) that the public expression of opinion is likely

to represent "a compromise between the person's true attitude and what he believes to be the prevailing attitude(s) of the group in which he finds himself".

2.3.1.2 Attitudes and Values

When attitudes become organized into larger, more general classes of things, and when these vital attitudinal patterns come to play the enduring roles among individuals in society, values or value systems emerge. As Newcomb, Turner, and Converse (1952: 50) point out, "The term value is used by some social psychologists to refer to the common objects of such inclusive attitude". The term 'value' is a specific kind of belief that represents a normal judgment of right and wrong. Values give us judgments on how we 'ought' to act, such as the belief that killing someone is wrong.

2.3.1.3 Attitude and Behaviour

The notion that there is a direct relationship between attitude and behaviour is controversial. However, it is generally accepted that there is often little direct association between attitude and behaviour in most real-life situations. The probability of acting in accord with one's attitude is dependent on the presence or absence of several limiting and facilitating factors, such as social pressures and constraints.

While attitudes are 'invisible' constructs, overt behaviour

is 'visible', and is subject to scrutiny by others. This poses a set of social pressures upon the individual requiring that attitude and behaviour toward the same topic not to be inconsistent. In other words, one can believe one way and act in another. There are also non-social constraints that can keep individuals from acting out their attitudes such as the personal difficulties (inconvenience, loss, risk), or the physical difficulty of the behaviour to be performed, or the lack of competence to engage in the behaviour or argue with (The International Bible Encyclopedia).

2.4 Historical Background

In ancient Greek, persuasion was the main means of achieving power, and the study of persuasion was central in the education of all Greek male citizens. Aristotle, who was one of the first to study rhetoric in depth, said that it was "the faculty of observing in a given case the agreeable means of persuasion" (Aristotle, 1924: 1355). To him, a persuader may use a man's reputation or credibility or ethos. Persuasion also includes the use of logical argument or logos, and emotional appeal, which he called pathos, to stir the audience. Further discussion of these terms is given in the following sections.

2.4.1 Classical Rhetoric and Persuasive Discourse

A discourse can be defined as a linearized structure of semantically related statements by a source speaker and conveyed to an audience hearer in order to achieve a specific communicative intention or goal.

Classical rhetoric was primarily concerned with spoken and written persuasive discourse (Wales, 1989: 405; Crystal 1987: 70). In addition, rhetoric was directly linked with the ability to persuade. Aristotle, for instance, defines rhetoric as the art or faculty of discovering the best possible means of persuasion in respect to the presentation of any argument, whatsoever (Winterowd, 1968: 14). This is why Aristotle's book *The Art of Rhetoric* is essentially a theoretical treatment of the ways by which man can effectively persuade (ibid.).

Aristotle argues that Rhetoric is useful because truth and justice are naturally stronger than their opposites. If truth and justice are worsted, then this situation is worth correction and that is why rhetoric is corrective. Next, it is instructive in offering a popular vehicle of persuasion for persons who could not be reached by way of the severe methods of strict logic. Then it is suggestive in that when a person pleads a cause of which he has sincere convictions, the art of rhetoric can suggest to this person what may be urged on the opposite side, and this will give this person a stronger grasp of the whole situation. Lastly, Rhetoric is defensive in that it involves mental effort,

which is more distinctive than physical effort, and being mentally defenceless is as reproachable as one's inability of physical self-defense.

As for the possibility of abusing the art of rhetoric, Aristotle's answer is that all good things, except virtue, can be abused. Men can abuse strength, health, wealth, and generalship (Wales,1989:405).

2.4.2 The Three Legs of Persuasion

One of the most notable concepts developed by Aristotle was the notion of *pisteis*, or the proofs that are necessary to convince the audience of one's arguments. He believed that there were three means in which persuasion could be accomplished in public address. *Pisteis* is divided into three sections: ethos, pathos, and logos (Kennedy, 1985:24).

2.4.2.1 The Appeal to Ethos (Character)

Ethos is the term used by Aristotle for what modern students of communication refer to as credibility. The ability to persuade is directly affected by the credibility of the document. Credibility is the degree to which a statement, a person, and/or a company is perceived to be ethical, trustworthy, and sincere. Credibility is strongly related to the audiences's perception of how believable a speaker is. It is an attitude that exists not in the speaker, but in the mind of the audience. The two major factors

influencing a speaker's credibility are competence and character. A speaker's credibility can vary from audience to audience and from topic to topic. Three types of credibility influence the success or failure of messages (Boone and Kurtz, 1994: 271). Initial credibility is the credibility of the speaker before she or he starts to speak. Derived credibility is the credibility of the speaker himself as produced during the speech itself. Finally, terminal credibility is the credibility of the speaker at the end of the speech (ibid.40).

2.4.2.2 The Appeal to Pathos (Emotion)

Aristotle used the term Pathos for what modern students of communication refer to as emotional appeal. Emotional appeals are intended to make listeners feel afraid, compassionate, proud, angry, shameful and reverent, or the like. So, the appeal to pathos is directed towards the emotions of the audience. Although people are rational creatures who appreciate a reasonable argument, they are also emotional creatures. In many situations, emotion remains the most powerful persuasive factor. Where logical arguments sometimes fail, emotions often have the power to motivate people to respond and act (Boone and Kurtz 1994:42).

There are three methods a speaker can use to generate emotional appeal when speaking to persuade. One way is to use emotion-laden words. Yet, one should avoid packing too many

emotionally charged words into one part of the speech. This can call too much attention to the language itself and undermine its desired impact.

Another way to generate emotional appeal is to develop vivid, richly textured examples that personalize one's ideas and help pull listeners into the speech emotionally. Yet another way to generate emotional appeal is to speak with sincerity and conviction. This is because the strongest source of emotional power is the conviction and sincerity of the speaker (ibid.42).

2.4.2.3 The Appeal to Logos (Reason)

The appeals to reason that an orator might use do not violate the principles of strict logic; they are merely adaptations of logic. So, whereas 'the syllogism and induction' are the forms that reasoning takes in logic, 'the enthymeme and the example 'are the forms that reasoning takes in rhetoric' (Corbett, 1990: 39).

Aristotle, who was the first to analyze an argument in a logical order, first introduced the theory of syllogism. He did this by using enthymemes and syllogisms. His description of syllogism was that it is a 'deductive argument consisting of a major premise, a minor premise, and a conclusion (Ivan, 1989: 319). The essential structure of syllogism can be seen in the following formula:

A = B

C = A

C = B

The third statement, or conclusion, necessarily follows from the first two statements in that C equals B because both are equal to A, and B is equal to both A and C (Connolly, 1959: 447). In concrete terms the structure above can be exemplified as follows:

(5)

Major (general) premise: All men (A) are mortal (B).

Minor (particular) premise: John (C) is a man (A).

Conclusion: Therefore, John (C) is mortal.

A syllogism, when used in a rhetorical context, was called an enthymeme. An enthymeme, then is an abridged syllogism like this one:

(6)

Since John is a man, he is going to die.

Brumbaugh (1981: 187) states that ‘an enthymeme is like a syllogism, except that its result is not new knowledge, but action’.

2.5 Parts of Persuasion

New rhetoric has to cater for different language varieties since persuasion is only one among the aims of discourse

(Richards, 1936: 24). In particular, the two main features of persuasive discourse are the use of examples to prove a point, and the use of enthymemes (van Dijk, 1985: 120). Kane and Peters (1980: 22-26) state that persuasive discourse attempts to change the convictions and frequently the activities of the receivers.

Persuasion is a form of speaking or writing that aims to induce the audience to take action. There are five parts to a persuasive discourse. These are the introduction, the statement of fact or circumstance, the proof or confirmation, the refutation of counter argument(s), and the conclusion. These elements of persuasive discourse are discussed in the following subsections.

2.5.1 The Introduction

The introduction is the most important part of a persuasive discourse. The introduction must do two things simultaneously: establish a relationship between the audience and the addresser, and a relationship between the audience and the subject. In other words, to find a topic that you feel strongly about it.

However, if the writer feels that the audience will be indifferent or hostile, it may be necessary to create sympathy or dispel a negative prejudice with the help of one of the following techniques:

- 1- The creation of a relationship by showing that the subject is relevant to the audience in a compelling, immediate,

and personal way.

2- Educating the reader by supplying background information, and giving definitions of key terms.

3- Narration, by telling some interesting, relevant story that entertains the reader.

4- Indirect introduction of the topic at hand.

2.5.2 The Statement of Fact

The statement of fact must establish the addresser's opinion and position on the issue. It means a call to some action or attitude through the presentation of a certain proposition that requires such an action or attitude. The concept 'proposition' is taken from the fields of philosophy and logic and is used in a general sense in discourse studies, namely, to denote the minimal unit of meaning. A proposition has a verb –the predicate– as its nucleus, and one or more arguments, which relate to the nucleus (Renkema, 1992: 54).

2.5.3 The Proof

Argument starts from a proposition or a statement about a topic that the addresser intends to prove. In order to prove a proposition, the addresser must 'adduce either facts or the opinion of authorities' (Connolly, 1959: 445). Unless they are common knowledge to the addressees, facts must be verified. Thus, an accurate factual base is one presupposition of

persuasion. However, many propositions are supported by opinions rather than by facts.

By authority is not meant any person, but that trustful person or text which represents the collective wisdom of the human race or the people as embodied in the traditions of prophets, philosophers, scientists, free and objective thinkers, or in proverbs, epigrams, and quotations (ibid. 446).

2.5.4 The Refutation

The refutation will come before the proof if the audience is hostile to the case that the speaker is establishing. The refutation must contain the following elements:

- 1- a clear transitional expression,
- 2- a clear statement of antithesis,
- 3- an explanation or defence of the antithesis,
- 4- a refutation of the antithesis.

2.5.5 The Conclusion

The conclusion is required to be drawn from the previous arguments, clarifications, examples, etc. In other words, it should be organically related to the whole of the previous discourse. Being the result of the message, it is frequently marked by an explicit summary. It has to be short and must not present new information or raise new questions.

2.6 Modern Theories of Persuasion

Theories of persuasion are based on what is known to work in attempts to persuade others. Like other theories, they make use of research—work aiming at providing persuaders with some ideas about what they should do in order to be successful under certain circumstances. While brief, this introduction to the theories of persuasion is designed to provide an evidence of some of the major theories that underlie the persuasive messages that are encountered everyday.

Persuasion is strategic, and it should be approached with at least some understanding of what motivates people to act or not to act, as well as some basic knowledge of the researchers' theories of persuasion. Accordingly, the following selection discusses some of the major modern theories of persuasion.

2.6.1 Tension Reduction Theories

In recent years there has been considerable concern with the theory that man desires to have logically consistent attitudes in reference to various life situations. An approach that has commanded the efforts of a number of social psychologists for over a decade is known as consistency theory. This is the theory that 'a person strives to have consistent beliefs and behavior, and that when he is aware of some discrepancy he strives to rectify the inconsistency by making some change in his beliefs, his behavior, or perhaps both' (Brembeck and Howell 1976: 68).

The approaches surveyed below can be said to represent the variants of the Consistency Theory: (1) Balance Theory, (2) Congruity Theory, and (3) Cognitive Dissonance Theory. which theory holds that balance, congruity, and consonance affect relatively stable and hard-to-change behaviour; while imbalance, incongruity, and dissonance produce tension and alter behaviour.

2.6.2 Balance Theory

Heider (1946, 1958) is credited with pioneering research in the area of consistency theory with his balance theory and model. He contends that people strive for balance, i.e. for harmonious relations between their attitudes and their behaviour, and that they sense frustration or become psychologically upset when such a balance is not present. His theory makes use of essentially two types of relations between people and between people and the event (i) sentiment relations such as admiration, approbation, or love; and (ii) unit relations which result in a unity of persons or persons and related events such as proximity, similarity, causality, or ownership (ibid. 1958: 107-12).

Balance theory states that when tensions arise inside or between people, these people attempt to reduce these tensions through self – persuasion or trying to persuade others.

The interpretation of Balance theory is that individuals

have certain attitudes which can be represented by a plus sign (like) or a minus sign (dislike) (Griffin, 2000:107). Every individual has his own opinions, and people do not always agree on the same things. This state of affairs creates a feeling of discomfort or imbalance; but when people feel the same about an idea, they have a feeling of comfort or balance (ibid. 2000:107).

2.6.3 Congruity Theory

The congruity theory of attitude-change developed by Osgood and Tannenbaum (1955:42) grew out of their work on the measurement of meaning using their semantic differential scales. This theory predicts that if there are two contradicting people, sets of information, or concepts on which a judgment must be made by a single observer, the observer will experience pressure to change his or her judgement on one of the sides. However, if the two sets of information are similar or congruent, “then there will be no problem, and the observer will not experience pressure of any form” (Griffin, 2000:62).

2.6.4 Cognitive Dissonance Theory

The theory of cognitive dissonance was advanced by Leon Festinger (1957) and has generated no small amount of experimentation and criticism. This theory, though closely related to other consistency theories, stresses the after-effects

that may follow a decision that produces a discrepancy or an inconsistency between the decision-maker's belief and his action (Brembeck and Howell, 1976: 69). To put it differently, this theory stresses what happens to individuals when experiences do not coincide with what they had previously believed.

The dissonance theory says that human beings often have beliefs that conflict with the actions they take, or with other beliefs they have. This dissonance creates a tension, and tension reduction is automatically sought by changing one's evaluations by some degree (Cragan and Shields, 1995: 178). Cognitive Dissonance occurs when one is confronted with two good choices that he has to make a decision about, so he finds himself unsure or in doubt about the choice that he has made. In such a case, he might have to downplay the other choice in order to reassure himself.

Generally speaking, people have preference for consistency among their beliefs / attitudes and their behaviour. When people experience an inconsistency between their beliefs and or attitudes and their behaviour, they become motivated to reduce or eliminate the inconsistency in some way. For example, someone who knows that smoking is harmful but continues to smoke would be experiencing cognitive dissonance. Festinger (1957: 39) sees that cognitive elements as 'knowledges' about facts, objects, behaviours, circumstances,

etc.

It would appear that Festinger includes beliefs, opinions, and attitudes in one general category. He holds that people tend to resolve or reduce any inconsistencies between their attitudes and their behaviours. Thus any two cognitions may be either relevant or irrelevant to each other. Likewise, relevant relationships 'may be of two types: consonant or dissonant' (Brembek and Howell, 1976: 130). Cognitive dissonance is a tension state that varies in accordance with the significance or centrality of the elements involved, and the degree of conflict present. The state of tension resulting from the dissonance provides the motivational power to seek the elimination or reduction of the dissonance.

When a persuader seeks to change an attitudes, create a new one, or change overt behaviour in any way, he could demonstrate to his receiver that 'the suggested attitude or behavioral change (decision) will not result in some dissonance or inconsistency between the receiver's cognitive elements' (Brembech and Howell, 1979:137).

2.6.5 Information Processing Theories

Information processing theories focus on how receivers evaluate and interpret/process messages. Social Judgement Theory suggests that ego - involvement with topic will influence how one processes messages. Elaboration-Likelihood Theory

posits that we process persuasive messages in two ways: centrally – where we think about and weigh the information according to the already existing knowledge – and peripherally, which involves little thinking, more impressions, and feelings. The primary determinant in routing is the significance of topic to us, which involves both our motivations to think about the topic and our ability to do so.

2.6.5.1 Social Judgement Theory

This theory as proposed by Sherif, Sherif, and Hovland(1961:445), states that one's acceptance or regret over one's statement or message is based upon one's cognitive map (Anderson & Ross, 1998: 126). One accepts or rejects a message based on one's own ego-involvement, and whether or not this message falls within one's attitude of acceptance (ibid.).

The interpretation of this theory is that when people receive messages (verbal or nonverbal), they immediately judge 'where the message should be placed on a scale in their mind through comparing this message with their currently held views' (Cragan and Shields, 1995: 12).

Social judgement theory proposes the idea that persuasion is a two-step process. The first step involves the individual's hearing or reading a message, and immediately 'evaluating where the message falls within their own position'. The second step involves individuals as they adjust their particular attitude

either towards or away from the message they heard.

Individuals have three zones in which they accept or reject specific messages or attitudes. The latitude of acceptance zone is where the individuals place the attitude that they consider acceptable. The latitude of rejection zone is where the individuals place attitudes which they consider unacceptable or objectionable. The latitude of non-commitment is where people place the attitude that they find neither acceptable nor rejectable (Griffin, 2000: 9).

2.6.5.2 Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM)

This theory was advanced by Boxtor (1988). ELM is a theory of persuasion which proposes that the influence exerted by various communication elements will depend upon the elaboration that occurs during processing. The word elaboration means the amount of integration between new information and existing knowledge stored in memory (ibid. 257).

There are two routes to persuasion – the central route and the peripheral route. The central route uses message-elaboration, and can produce a major positive, attentive change. It focuses on strong arguments and information, involves making cognitive effort, and requires high elaboration (Cragan & Shields, 1998: 13).

The peripheral route uses irrelevant cues derived from some other different messages to illicit a quick response with a

minor shift in attitude (Boxter, 1988: 258). Peripheral route focuses on background cues, and involves little cognitive effort and low elaboration (Cragan & Shields, 1995: 13).

2.7 The Psychological Bases of Persuasion

Brembek and Howell (1976: 17) argue that the process of persuasion involves five basic psychological steps or stages. These psychological steps are summarized hereunder.

- Attention gain and attention maintenance: without attention persuasion cannot take place. Attention must be maintained until the communication situation ceases.
- Compression: provide visual and or auditory symbols to facilitate the predicable perception of the materials within message.
- Acceptance: create useful desires by indicating motivations that are helpful to your purposes. The persuasive motivations must arouse those desires, which propel and persuade the addressees towards the goal being sought.
- Retention: get people to remember. Demonstrate how these desires can best be satisfied by the addressees' acceptance of the persuader's desires. If the desires are required to supply the impelling power to persuasion, the persuader must be able to demonstrate that what he proposes can satisfy those desires.

- Action: urge people to do what you want.

2.7.1 Psychological Techniques of Persuasion

After establishing the target and the appropriate strategy, persuaders can resort to a variety of techniques in conveying their messages. The most prominent of these techniques are offered by Brown (1963:1974), and Holiest (1974), which can be summarized in the following points:

2.7.1.1 Common Ground

This technique requires appealing to certain individual aspects that we all share. This can be shown in the following example

(8)

You are the light of the world. A city on a hill cannot be hidden. Neither do people light a lamp and put it under a bowl. Instead they put it on its stand, and it gives light to every one in the house. In the same way, let your light shine before men, that they may see your good deeds and praise your father in heaven.

(Matthews 5: 14-6)

2.7.1.2 Repetition

This technique requires the persuader to repeat the same idea over and over. The persuader is confident that, if he repeats a statement often enough, it will in time come to be accepted by

his audience. This can be shown in the following example:

(7)

Woe to those who plot evil, who lie in bed, planning mischief!

(Micah 2:19)

2.7.1.3 Scapegoat Technique

This technique involves blaming others for the irreconcilable problems in which they had no involvement, usually to escape one's own fault as shown in the following example:

(10)

Then he is to take the two goats and present them before the lord at the entrance to the tent of meeting. He is to cast for two goats-one lot for the lord and the other for the scapegoat.

(Leviticus 7:10)

2.7.1.4 Strategy of Terror

Terror or fear can be used to get a certain desirable response or an action as shown in the following example:

(8)

If you set yourselves against me, and dwell not to me, I will heap plagues on you in sevenfold punishment for your sins.

(Leviticus, 26: 21- 22)

2.7.1.5 Transfer

Transfer makes use of the concept that using a certain product, or adopting a certain position endorsed by a desirable spokesman, will transfer to the persuadee some qualities of the spokesman – ostensibly gained by him through the use of the same product.

(9)

The lord is my light and my salvation ---whom shall I fear? The lord is the stronghold of my life --- of whom shall I be afraid?

(Psalms 27:1)

The addressee's message here is that given everyone is doing it, so why aren't you? Hereunder is one example for the use of this technique:

(10)

Come to me, all you who are weary and burdened and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn from me, for I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for your soul.

(Matthews 11:23.30)

2.8 The Language of Persuasion

Ostman (1987:91) maintains that there is no such a thing as a language of persuasion and that, across specifiable contexts, persuasive language in itself is a register or style of speech. One

of the first researchers who attempted to investigate the style of persuasion was Sandell (1977). He showed that there are many different stylistic markers of persuasive style that can occur at all the levels of expression: syntax, morphology, phonology and semantics. Hereunder is a brief survey of the levels at which persuasion can be clearly manifested.

2.8.1 Syntactic Markers of Persuasive Style

Syntactic devices that lend themselves to persuasion fall into four classes:

- 1-The denotative specificity
- 2-The spatial immediacy
- 3-The temporal immediacy
- 4-Ellipsis

2.8.1.1 The Denotative Specificity

Increasing the denotative specificity of a text is one way of making it more persuasive. The denotative specificity can be increased by stating the agent, object, and action explicitly.

2.8.1.2 The Spatial Immediacy

The spatial immediacy is another way of making discourse more persuasive. The spatial immediacy can be increased by using demonstratives that are “close” for instance: this, these, here, rather than that, those and there.

2.8.1.3 The Temporal Immediacy

The temporal immediacy can be acquired by using the present tense in reference to present events. Stupid happened I don't know why people waste their breath on these things literally. We used to call them "cancer sticks" I know that you think that smoking is a messy habit, right? It stinks, it is bad, and it costs bucks.

2.8.1.4 Ellipsis

Ellipsis refers to that feature used in the grammatical analysis of the sentence where, for reasons of style, a part of the structure has been omitted, but is recoverable from a scrutiny of the context. The relatively heavier use of ellipses in persuasive texts is another feature of persuasion (Sandell, 1977: 130).

Ellipsis can involve different sentential elements, especially subject nouns and qualifiers. The omission of the subject noun or pronoun is fairly common in persuasive texts in general. This may be quite natural in texts where no doubt may exist about the identity.

Another way to increase the degree of persuasiveness is by eliminating all the qualifiers that express uncertainty, such as perhaps, may be or possibly.

Indeterminacy finds its place in those structures where some item of information is left out and the speaker is able to take advantage of its absence. In the active voice, the presence

of a grammatical subject is obligatory, in the passive, the corresponding noun phrase with **by may** be omitted (Bologna, 1968: 270).

(11)

Joe accuses Smith of bad faith, Smith is accused of bad faith (by Joe).

2.8.1.5 Asyndeton

Asyndeton involves the omission of conjunctions as shown in the following example:

(12)

You shall not kill, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not steal, you shall not bear false witness against your neighbour.

(Exodus, 20: 6-9)

2.8.2 The Semantic Markers of Persuasive Style

The semanticist tries to answer the question “what do the words mean in this message?” This axis focuses attention on why certain words are used instead of others. Osgood, et al (1957:62) suggest that semantic meaning for any word or concept can be located by charting it in semantic space using the semantic differential, a total whereby receivers respond to a word, phrase, or concept a long several polar scales. Each end of a scale represents an adjectival description, for example, “good

– bad” or “heavy – light”. As far as persuasive style is concerned, the major components of the semantic axis are the following: semantic ambiguity and semantic repetition.

2.8.2.1 Semantic Ambiguity

There are several ways by which persuaders can create persuasive ambiguity. One way is related to semantics in which the persuader carefully “chooses words that can be interpreted in many ways, often in contradictory ways depending on the receivers” (Larson, 1979: 43). The term “black power” which emerged in the late 1960s, as part of the civil rights movement, relied on semantic ambiguity. The key word there was “power”, but what kind of power? Economic? Political? Social ? Many interpretations of what power is meant by here are possible (ibid.). The term was also striking in its time in the use of the word “black”, a term that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People had been fighting for years.

2.8.2.2 Semantic Repetition

As generally known to stylisticians, (e.g., Jakobson, 1960), the constructive principle of all poetic texts is patterned repetition or parallelism. Such repetition on the expression level of phonological, lexical, and morpho-syntactic features can create formal equivalence between the corresponding text segments. The repetition and the recurrence of semantically

parallel forms produce a special type of balance. This sort of balance occurs either through contrast of ideas or by carrying semantic equivalence (Gordon and Kreiswirth, 1997:9). One of these semantic relations is that of repetition.

(13)

Praise God in His sanctuary, praise Him in His Mighty Heavens.

(psalm 150:1-5)

2.8.2.3 Antithetic Repetition

The assignment of significance to repetition rests upon a certain connection between two or more elements. These elements are signaled out as being parallel. Antithetic repetition is present when the second element denies or contrasts the first. Accordingly, it is usual in the theory of classical rhetoric to define such antithetic repetitions in terms of : Oxymoron and Enantiosis.

2.8.2.3.1 Oxymoron

Two juxtaposed concepts, which apparently contradict each other, are used to lend force to an expression. Such type of repetition is seen in the following example:

(14)

Jesus said, “For Judgment I have come into this world, so that the blind will see and those who see will become blind”.

(John 9:39-41)

2.8.2.3.2 Enantiosis

According to this technique, the juxtaposition of opposites is used to mutually set off or enhance each other as shown hereunder:

(15)

There is a time for everything and a season for every activity under heaven: a time to be born and a time to die, a time to plant and a time to uproot.

(Ecclesiastics 3:1-8)

2.8.3. Phonological Markers of Persuasive Style

Phonological markers, in general, play an important role in persuasive texts. By making a text more appealing to the hearer, it becomes more persuasive. The theory of rhetoric defines phonological markers in terms of Alliteration, Euphony and Cacophony.

2.8.3.1 Alliteration

Alliteration is of Latin origin meaning ‘more letters’. In style, alliteration constitutes in a sequence of repeated consonantal sounds in any stretch of language, whether prose or poetry. The matching of consonants is usually at the beginning of words or stressed syllables. One example in this respect is

Dickens play with **l**, **m**, and **w** sounds in the opening of Bleak House (1853) (Gray 1984:12).

(16)

London. Michaelmas term lately over and the Lord Chancellor sitting in Lincoln's Inn Hall. Implacable November weather. As much mud in the streets, as if the waters had but newly retired from the face of earth, and it would not be wonderful to meet a Megalosaurus, forty feet long or so, waddling like and elephantine lizard up Holborn hill.

2.8.3.2 Euphony

This is a pleasant-sounding expression, usually used to describe an unpleasant task or object.

(17)

I, Jesus, have sent my angel to give you this testimony for the churches – I am the root and offspring of David, and the Bright morning star.

(Revelation 22:16)

2.8.3.3 Cacophony

Cacophony is the opposite of euphony in that it involves the use of loud or harsh words in sentences or in whole discourses as shown in the following example:

(18)

When the trumpets sounded, the people shouted, and at the

sound of the trumpet, when the people gave a loud shout, the wall collapsed.

(Joshua 6: 20)

2.9 Pragmatics and Persuasion

Pragmatics is a new subfield of linguistics developed in the late 1970s. It studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation, which is usually a conversation. Pragmatics distinguishes two intents or meanings in each utterance or communicative act of verbal communication. One is the informative intent or the sentence meaning, and the other the communicative intent or speaker meaning (Leech, 1981; Sperber and Wilson, 1986). The ability to comprehend and produce a communicative act is referred to as pragmatic competence which often includes one's knowledge about the social distance, social status between the speakers involved, the cultural knowledge such as politeness, and the linguistic knowledge explicit and implicit (Kasper, 1997). Therefore, the acquisition of pragmatic competence is a prerequisite for the generation of persuasive messages.

The pragmatic principles people abide by in one language are often different in another. Thus what can be considered a persuasive message in one culture may fail to be so in some other culture. Likewise, Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural studies reported what is considered polite in one language is

sometimes not polite in another. Contrastive pragmatics, however, is not confined to the study of a certain pragmatic principles. Cultural breakdowns, pragmatic failure, among other things, are also components of cross-cultural pragmatics (Liu, 2002: 2).

2.9.1 Grice's Theory of Conversational Implicature

By elaborating the sense of pragmatism in his concern of conversational meanings, Grice (1985) enlightened modern treatment of meaning by distinguishing two kinds of meaning, natural and non-natural. Grice suggested that pragmatics should center on the more practical dimension of meaning, namely the conversational meaning which was later formulated in a variety of ways (Levinson, 1983; Leech, 1983).

In a series of lectures at Harvard University in 1967, Grice outlined an approach to what he termed conversational implicature -- how hearers manage to work out the complete message when speakers mean more than they say. An example of what Grice meant by conversational implicature is the sentence:

(19)

A: Do you have the ability to tell me the time?

B: Well, the milkman has come.

All that the semantic theory can tell us about the meaning of that exchange is that there is at least one meaning for it which

is the following:

(20)

A- Do YOU have the ability to tell me the time?

B- The milkman came at some time prior to the time of speaking.

However, it is obvious that what a native speaker can deduct from B's answer is considerably more than this. That is B cannot tell the time exactly as indicated by a watch, but he can provide information from which A would be able to deduce the approximate time, namely that the milkman has come.

The gap between what is literally said by B and what meaning he is trying to convey is so considerable that we can safely suggest that a “semantic theory can only provide a small part of the account of how we communicate using language” (Levinson, 1983: 98). The notion of implicature bridges the gap between what is literally said and what is meant or implied. By contrast, a semantic theory is based on the belief that natural language expressions tend to have simple, stable, and unitary senses. Consequently, a semantic theory will never be able to give full account of how we use language in our conversations (ibid. 99).

A conversational implicature is an inference, an additional message that the hearer is able to work out from what is said by appealing to the rules governing successful conversational interaction. To this end, Grice (1975: 60) sketches out a theory

of pragmatic implication distinct from semantic implication, as a means for resolving certain linguistic problems in the theory of conversational meaning. Grice's theory of conversation attempts to distinguish between what is said and what is implicated. Two major contributions provided by Grice are the cooperative principle and its conversational maxims on the one hand, and conversational implicature on the other. Grice's theory of conversation is one of the most important developments in the study of pragmatics in its broader sense.

According to Grice (1975) the study of implicature attempts to explain how it is possible to convey information without a need to say it in words. Implicature, then, is "what is said between the lines." This is related to the traditional notion that one can say something and mean something else as in irony, metaphor, and double entendre. However, Gricean implicature is a systematic part of communication that involves the interplay between what a speaker actually says and those broad rules, shared by speakers and hearers, which govern communication (Thomas, 1995: 57).

2.9.2 The Cooperative Principle (CP)

Pragmaticians are keen on exploring why interlocutors can successfully converse with one another in a conversation. A basic idea is that interlocutors obey certain principles in their participation so as to sustain the conversation. One such

principle is the Cooperative Principle which assumes that interactants cooperate in the conversation by contributing to the ongoing speech event (Grice, 1975). A cognitive explanation to social interactive speech events was provided by Sperber and Wilson (1986) who hold that in verbal communication people try to be relevant to what they intend to say and to whom an utterance is intended.

In his attempt to account for meaning as it develops in conversation, Grice (1975: 45) concludes that there is a general underlying assumption called Cooperative Principle or CP between the speaker and hearer that controls the way in which a conversation might proceed.

'Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. ' In other words: act in conversation according to the general principle that you are mutually engaged with your listener in an activity which is of benefit to both of you.

Grice further analyses the cooperative principle into the four conversational maxims quoted hereunder:

The Maxim of Relation: Be relevant.

The maxim of Quantity: Be only as informative as required for the current conversational purposes.

The Maxim of Quality: Say only what you believe to be true and adequately supported.

The Maxim of Manner: Be clear, be brief and orderly and avoid obscurity and ambiguity.

Levinson (1983: 101) states these maxims are assumptions that arise from rational considerations. They guide our communication which and may be formulated as guidelines for efficient and effective use of language to further cooperative ends (ibid. 45-60). These maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational and cooperative way; they should speak sincerely, relevantly and clearly while providing sufficient information (ibid. 102).

The reason for the linguists' interest in the maxims is that they generate inferences beyond the semantic content of the sentences uttered. These inferences are important for persuasion. Grice uses the term "exploitation" to refer to the exploitation of the general maxims of cooperation. Conversational maxims are exploited in at least two ways in deriving implicatures in conversation. The first way is when the hearer assumes that the speaker is obeying the maxims, while the second is when the speaker violates some maxim(s) so flagrantly that the hearer must conclude that the violation was purposeful.

2.10 Rhetorical Clause Relations and Persuasion

In modern discourse analysis approaches, the term rhetorical clause relations acquires a slightly different, more specific meaning. Here the term rhetoric does not refer to all the

textual means available for persuasion. Rather, it refers to specific and discoverable binary logical relations that can occur intersententially and/or intrasententially as discussed hereunder.

According to this relational approach, textual persuasion can be realized in the use of a small set of highly recurrent logico-semantic relations holding between potentially any two parts of a text, whether paragraphs, sentences, clauses, or even nominal groups or single words (Jordan, 1992: 180). The number of these relations is finite and culturally-specific, but is open to modification and addition (Mann et al., 1992: 46). These relations include: Cause-Effect, Condition-Consequence, Problem-Solution, Argument-Evidence, Error-Correction, Generalization-Exception, and Assessment-Basis. Any of the latter logical relations can either be explicitly signalled by certain lexical items or implicitly indicated.

These rhetorical relations may connect elements of texts at all levels by definable persuasive meanings as is the case in the following example offered by Beekman and Callow (1974: 317):

(21)

1. Christ has now reconciled you (to God)
2. by means of dying physically Means of 1.
3. in order that you will be holy. Purpose of 1.

Where the first clause enters into a relationship of Means with the second by providing the means of reconciliation, and of

Purpose with the third clause by providing the purpose of the reconciliation.

2.10.1 Clause Relations

The fundamental basis of the theory of rhetorical structures is that coherent stretches of text are connected to other coherent stretches of text by means of complex combinations of rhetorical relations (Jordan, 1992:185). This theory is a way of accounting for the functional potential of text as a communicative message. It describes what sorts of parts texts have and the principle of combining these parts into entire texts.

A rhetorical structure is a combination of relations governing the logical development of (stretches of) discourse. The relation between the smaller binary clause structures and the larger rhetorical structures is that of composition. In other words, a rhetorical structure is a higher level (larger) clause relation whose binary members consist of further membership of clause relations (Winter, 1982:190, 1986:96, 1992:141). The advocacy and development of the relational model of analysing whole discourses was pioneered by Winter (1974, 1976, 1977, 1979, 1982 ...). Winter (1982:190-2) further investigates two of the basic rhetorical structures which he has identified since 1974 and termed: "Larger Clause Relations". These are Situation-Evaluation, and Hypothetical-Real. Winter considers these larger clause relations as the carriers of all the

remaining “standard clause relations” of the message. In Situation-Evaluation, the “situation” is what we know, and it can predict Basis/Reason; while the “Evaluation” is what we think about what we know, and can predict Basis (Reason or Justification). “Hypothetical” is a Hypothetical Situation, and “Real” is an Evaluation of a likely reality (see also Winter, 1986:96-12; 1992:141-1). Here a statement modified by the True relation (hypothetical) is followed by another True relation of Denial, followed by Assessment (Reason) for the Denial and Basis for that Assessment.

Many combinations are possible in both of these rhetorical structures, such as following the element of Denial by Correction (Jordan, 1992:225). Similarly, in the following example of Situation-Evaluation, the two sentences (4 and 5) of the Basis of Evaluation also reveal a relation of Matching Contrast (Winter, 1992:142-143):

(22)

SITUATION:

(1) Then Jesus began to denounce the cities in which most of his miracles had been performed, because they did not repent.

EVALUTION (of SITUATION)

(2) Woe to you, Korazin! (3)Woe to you, Bethsaida!

BASIS (of EVALUATION)

(4) If the miracles that were performed in you had been performed in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes.

(5) But I tell you, it will be more bearable for Tyre and Sidon on the day of Judgement than for you.

Another widely used rhetorical structure is that of “Situation-Problem-Solution-Evaluation” which was first investigated by Winter (1976) who noticed that the categories of information in many technical texts were organized according to this pattern. Later, Winter (1982; 1986) and Hoey (1979; 1983) developed this area of analysis by concentrating on fairly short texts. On the other hand, Jordan (1981, 1984, 1988) sought to apply this same metastructure on texts which do not exactly conform with this four-element pattern in that they show many problems, or many solutions, or omissions of entire elements such as “Mind the Gap”, “Steep Hill”, and “Go Slow” which indicate Solution-Problem, Problem, and Solution respectively. Jordan’s studies have helped to reveal the potentialities of this pattern in understanding the rhetorical structuring of texts having many possible combinations. One of his insights was defining the complex concept of “Evaluation” in terms of the binary clause-relational pair: Assessment/Basis (1984, 1988).

Many other complex metastructures are also possible in

texts such as the ones of “Situation-Purpose-Means-Result”, and “Thesis-Concession-Rebuttal”. However these and other possible patterns have not been as widely investigated and discussed as one may have expected them to.

3. Rhetoric and Persuasion in Classical Arabic

3.1 Introduction

This chapter offers a broad survey for the theory of Rhetoric and persuasion in Classical Arabic that was developed by Muslim Scholars during the Middle Ages. One aim of this survey is to highlight the originality of this theory in its terminology and basic tenets. Then an attempt is made to compare this theory with that of classical rhetoric and modern poetics and pragmatics whenever such a comparison is found to be possible and useful.

3.2 Arabic Rhetoric

The study of rhetoric by medieval Arab scholars was quite advanced. Classical Arabic rhetoricians from the ninth century onwards studied the properties of highly effective discourses, and came up with their own description of Arabic Rhetoric and poetic texts. During the last phases of its development, rhetoric was divided into three separate, but related components: علم (علم) (the science of meaning), علم البيان (علم البيان) (the science of clear speech), and علم البديع (علم البديع) (the science of beautiful speech). The first science is related to the successful delivery of **meaning in its abstract sense**. The second deals with the correct **choice of lexis in order to unambiguously formulate the intended**

meaning. The third science tackles the ways of **embroidering speech** (الهاشمي ، جواهر البلاغة : 4) through the use of figures of speech and poetic devices. Each of these three components will be discussed in the following sections, but the use of specialized terminology in this respect requires to be tackled first.

3.2.1 The Terms البيان and البلاغة

The general Arabic term that denotes rhetoric is that of (البلاغة) meaning ‘the successful getting at the intended meaning’. In fact, this use of the term (البلاغة) is essentially a metaphorical one in that it reflects conceiving of successful speech as a race in which the ultimate aim of the runner (i.e., the speaker) is to have his meaning successfully delivered to the addressee. With such a successful delivery, the runner manages to arrive at his destination. In its linguistic use, the term (البلاغة) is defined as:

Q1

مطابقة الكلام لما يقتضيه حال المخاطب (الهاشمي ، جواهر البلاغة: 32)

Matching the speech with the requirements of the context of situation of the addressee.

Arab rhetoricians also use the term (البيان) in reference to rhetoric. The general denotative value of this term is that of

making the intended meaning apparent and clear, while its specialized meaning is defined as the science that deals with:

Q2

معرفة إيراد المعنى الواحد في طرائق مختلفة بالزيادة في وضوح
الدلالة عليه وبالنقصان ليحترز بالوقوف على ذلك عن الخطأ في
مطابقة الكلام لتمام المراد (السكاكي، مفتاح العلوم: 342) .

The knowledge of how to express one meaning in different ways by making it clearer or more concise to avoid errors in making the speech match the entire intention.

The term (البيان) eventually evolved to cover three main components: (التشبيه)(the likening), (المجاز), (the transcending) and (الكناية) (metonymy). Before proceeding with the description of each of these components, it is necessary to touch upon the concept of the context of situation mentioned in Q1 above.

3.2.2 The Arabic Concept of the Context of Situation

In modern linguistic literature, the notion that meaning is contextually determined is attributed to Malinowski (1923). According to this precept, the situational dimensions of each

speech event add their own constraints on both its suitable productions and understanding.

For all Classical Arabic scholars, the concept of the relevance of the context of situation to both rhetoric and discourse was simply common knowledge. In fact, the Arab rhetorician Al-Jāhidh (*d.* 232 AH) (ninth century, AD) expresses even a wider view of the context of situation notion than that of Malinowski by considering it to envelope the speech event itself, its participants, and their cultural and linguistic context. In addition, his evaluation of the effectiveness of any discourse makes use of three criteria: rhetorical and grammatical well-formedness (الصواب), attainment of purpose (إحراز المنفعة), and the correspondence of speech with the requirements of the context of situation (موافقة الحال) in that each event has a corresponding suitable type of speech (لكل مقام مقال) as shown in the following quotation:

Q3

. . . أن يكون لفظك رشيقياً عذباً وفخماً سهلاً ، ويكون معنك ظاهراً مكشوفاً ، و قريباً معروفاً ، إما عند الخاصة - أن كنت للخاصة قصدت - وإما عند العامة أن كنت للعامة أردت . والمعنى ليس يشرف بأن يكون من المعاني الخاصة ، و كذلك ليس يتضح بأن يكون من معاني العامة ؛ و إنما مدار الشرف على الصواب ، و إحراز المنفعة ، مع موافقة الحال، وما يجب لكل مقام من مقال . (الجاحظ ، البيان و التبيين ، 86)

Your utterance must be elegant and fresh, prominent and simple, and your intentional meaning need be apparent and explicit, accessible and known whether addressed to the elite or to the commons, for the meaning does not become effective (high) just because it belongs to the speech of the elite, nor does it become easy to understand just because it belongs to the commons. This is because the orbit of effectiveness revolves around well formedness, and the attainment of the desired utility, in conformance with the context of situation and the requirements that each speech corresponds with each situation.

In the quotation above, al-Jāhidh differentiates between the speech of the elite and the speech of the commons. In this differentiation, none of these two modes of speech (genres) is favoured *per se*. Regardless of the standing of the speaker or the genre used, the effective speech is that which is both communicative and purposeful.

Similarly, in the following extract from the same book, all the three constant components of the message model: i.e., the speaker (المتكلم), the listener [المستمع] , and the message (الكلام) are unambiguously stated, with the context of situation (الحالة) given

as a fourth integral component. According to al-Jāhidh what differentiate between one message and another are the values (dimensions) of each of its four given constants, with rank as an inherent factor applying to all:

Q4

ينبغي للمتكلم أن يعرف أقدار المعاني ، ويوازن بينها وبين أقدار المستمعين وبين أقدار الحالات ، فيجعل لكل طبقة من ذلك كلاماً ولكل حالة من ذلك مقاماً حتى يقسم الكلام إلى أقدار المعاني على المقامات وأقدار المستمعين على أقدار تلك الحالات . (الجاحظ ، البيان و التبيين، 88)

The speaker has to be aware of the values of meanings, and should balance between them and the listener's values and the values of the situations by selecting for each level of those values a corresponding speech, and selecting for each of those situations a rank, to the effect that the speech is apportioned in accordance with the values of meanings, and the values of meanings are apportioned in accordance with the ranks, and the values of the listeners are apportioned in accordance with the values of those situations.

It is clear from the quotation above that the meaning potential of the message is represented in the following manner:



where (v) is ‘value’, and (R) is ‘rank’. It is also clear that this message model offers a quite advanced and sophisticated understanding for the dimensions of the speech event.

3.2.3 The Likening (التشبيه)

The concept of likening (or comparing) in Classical Arabic rhetoric is both a broad and a precise one. It envelops the two Western concepts of *simile* and *metaphor*. This type of figure of speech is succinctly defined by al-Qizwīnī (d. 739 AH) as:

Q5

الدلالة على مشاركة أمر لأمر في معنى (الإيضاح ، 213)

The reference to the sharing of some meaning by two entities.

The structure of the likening is defined by Medieval Arabic Classical Scholars in terms of the following four components:

1. المشبه (the likened)
2. المشبه به (the likened with)
3. أداة التشبيه (the likening article)
4. وجه الشبه (the aspect of likening)

Thus, the likening in the poetic hemistich:

أنت كالورد لمساً و شذا (الهاشمي، 1960 / 248).

You are like roses in touch and fragrance.

The likened is (أنت = you), the likened with is (الورد = roses), the likening article is (ك = like), and the aspect of likening is that of (اللمس و الشذا = the touch and fragrance of the roses).

In English, a comparable componential analysis was first offered by Richards as late as 1936 in his translation of Briton's "*The Philosophy of Rhetoric*". Richards' terms are **tenor** for (المشبه), **vehicle** for (المشبه به) and **ground** for (وجه الشبه) (Ullmann, 1966: 184).

Arab Rhetoricians call the first two components of likening: (طرفي التشبيه), meaning "the two sides of the likening". Each one of these two can either sensory or conceptual. Thus the likening relationship can either relate a sensory entity with a conceptual one, sensory with sensory, conceptual with sensory, or conceptual with conceptual (السكاكي، مفتاح العلوم / 559). In case the likening article is mentioned, the likening is called (مفصل) (detailed); otherwise, it is (مجمل) (summarized). When both of the likening article and the aspect of resemblance are omitted, then the likening is called (التشبيه البليغ = rhetorical likening) or (التشبيه المؤكد المجمل = assertive, summarized likening).

As far as the aspect of likening is concerned, seven variations are possible, (التشبيه = التشبيه الحقيقي = factual likening), (التشبيه التخيلي = imaginative likening), (الشبه القريب = close likening), (الشبه البعيد = remote likening), (المركب = compound), (المفرد = single), (متعدد = numerous) (41 / 1991، حلوي و الزوبعي).

3.2.4 المجاز Transcending

Classical Arabic Rhetoricians define (المجاز) as the non-literal use of the lexical item (الجرجاني ، أسرار البلاغة / 304). This is the same definition offered by Halliday (1985 :) for “grammatical metaphor” . Here, the literary meaning is transcended over by virtue of (القرينة = nexus). Thus when one says ‘I saw a sea’, the sea meant must be a real sea; but when he says ‘I saw a sea walking in a caravan’, then the mentioning of the nexus ‘walking in a caravan’ tells the addressee that this sea is not a literal one. In this case, the literal meaning is discarded in favour of the metaphorical one, in this case a “very rich or generous person”.

Two types of transcending are specified: (المجاز الحقيقي = factual transcending) and (المجاز المرسل = free transcending) as exemplified hereunder:

Spring has given life to the land. (المجاز الحقيقي = factual transcending)

The hand has become wide in the town. (المجاز المرسل = free transcending)

It is important to note here that there is no resemblance relationship in transcending (الجرجاني ، أسرار البلاغة / 359).

3.2.5 The Borrowing الإستعارة

This type of figure of speech involves a likening in which the article, the aspect of likening, and either the likened or the likened with is deleted. In other words, it is a likening that shows either the likened component (in this case it is called الإستعارة التصريحية = explicit borrowing) or the likened with component only (termed: الإستعارة المكنية = implicit borrowing) (ابو هلال العسكري ، كتاب الصناعتين ، 274)

You have shown light (meaning a great knowledge).

3.2.6 Properties of Persuasive Speech

Classical Arabic rhetoricians tie persuasion with the capability of the successful expression of meaning that suits the requirement of the context of situation. Thus, the Arab scholar of the ninth century, AD, Al-Jāhidh (d. 232 AH) offers the following set of selected properties for the requirements of persuasive discourse:

(Q5)

وعلى قدر وضوح الدلالة وصواب الإشارة ، وحسن الاختصار ، ودقة المدخل ، يكون إظهار المعنى .

The highlighting of meaning corresponds with the degree of the clarity of meaning, correctness of

reference, proper brevity, and precision of topic-
introduction

(al-Bayān wa Tabyeen, 1968: 64):

(Q6)

تصحيح الأقسام ، واختيار الكلام .

The rectification of discourse sub-parts, and the
selection of speech.

(ibid. 64).

(Q7)

حسن الاقتضاب عند البداهة ، والغزارة يوم الإطالة .

Proper brevity when improvising, and affluence on
those situations that require long speeches (ibid.).

(Q8)

جماع البلاغة البصر بالحجة ، والمعرفة بمواضع الفرصة .

The totality of rhetoric is insight in argumentation and
knowledge about the occasions of speaking up (ibid.).

(Q9)

قلت للعتابي ما البلاغة ؟ قال كل من أفهمك حاجته من غير إعادة ولا حبس ولا استعانة فهو بليغ .

Al-‘Attābi was asked, “what is rhetoric?”

He said, “Whoever conveys to you his intention without repetition, hesitation, or non-topical support is an eloquent person.” (ibid. 80).

(Q10)

تخير اللفظ في حسن الإفهام .

Rhetoric means the [adequate] selection of words plus [the use of] proper ways to engender understanding (ibid: 81).

The quotations above clearly exemplify al-Jāhidh’s standpoints regarding the pragmatics of persuasion. Most of Grice’s maxims are explicitly spelled out, and many additional, but useful, maxims are suggested. Thus, rhetorical speech requires clarity, brevity, sound argumentation, specificity, selection of proper lexical items, the ability in expressing one’s intentions, fluency, avoidance of ambiguity, and the observance of the requirements of the context of situation. Interest in the context of situation, especially the addressees, is typical of Classical Arabic linguists. To them, Rhetoric is primarily

concerned with the requirements of letting one's message get through to the addressee(s) as a prerequisite of the process of persuasion. This issue is discussed in the next section.

4. Persuasion Elements in The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the first empirical part of this study by analyzing elements of persuasion found in the English text of The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures. It starts with data collection and description, then the analysis is offered by investigating the various linguistic elements of persuasion deployed in each subtext. The outcome of the analysis is then summarized in order to be used in the comparative analysis given in Chapter Five.

4.2 Data Collection

The researcher has selected twenty texts from Matthew, all quoting the speeches of Jesus Christ and Moses. Since this study is after investigating elements of persuasion in actual speech, such method of data selection seems quite appropriate in that it serves to eschew those texts that are purely narrative or descriptive. The selected texts include both monological and dialogical discourses. Each analysed English Text (ET) is given a serial number and is quoted by keeping the original punctuation marks.

4.3 Data Analysis

The next sections offer a discourse analysis for each selected text. The analysis relates the context of situation for each text, plus its thematic structure and import. This is followed by a description of the persuasive means actually present in the text at all levels of linguistic representation. If a certain linguistic level is not mentioned in the description, this means that the text under description shows no special use of persuasive means through it. Data analysis is conducted through the application of abroad model of analysis that covers the various means of persuasion present at all the levels of linguistic realization. This model of analysis investigates the following aspects of discourse analysis:

1. Techniques of Persuasion (2.7)
2. Situational Dimensions (2.8)
3. Pragmatic Aspects of Persuasion (2.9)
4. Rhetorical Relations (2.10)
5. Elements of the Classical Arabic theory of Rhetoric (Chapter 3).

4.3.1 English Text 1

This dialogical text reports in three conversational exchanges how Satan's temptation of Jesus to abandon the way of God fails. The temptation act itself is shown to have been anticipated beforehand and this is why the Spirit leads Jesus to

the desert to rebuff this very act. Jesus has been fasting for forty days and nights, so the Tempter (Satan) challenges him to turn the stone into bread in order to substantiate his claim that he is the Son of God. This is followed by a change of scene from the desert to the highest point of the Temple in the Holy City of Jerusalem. Here a second challenge is reported wherein the Tempter asks Jesus to throw himself from there so that God's Angels would lift him up. The third temptation takes place in yet another place, this time to the summit of a very high mountain that overlooks all the kingdoms of the world. The Tempter offers Jesus all those kingdoms in return for Jesus' bowing and worshipping him. Each temptation has a different venue that is strongly related to the nature of the temptation made; Jesus' hunger and his need of some bread in the desert, the highest point in the Temple to throwing oneself off, and the summit of a very high mountain to overlooking all the kingdoms of Earth. However, each challenge is rebuffed as shown in the following text:

The Temptation of Jesus

1 Then Jesus was led by the Spirit into the desert to be tempted by the devil. 2 After fasting forty days and forty nights, he was hungry. 3 The tempter came to him and said, "If you are the Son of God, tell these stones to become bread."

4 Jesus answered, "It is written: 'Man does not live on

bread alone, but on every word that comes from the mouth of God”.

5 Then the devil took him to the holy city and had him stand on the highest point of the temple. 6 "If you are the Son of God," he said, "throw yourself down. For it is written: " 'He will command his angels concerning you, and they will lift you up in their hands, so that you will not strike your foot against a stone."

7 Jesus answered him, "It is also written: 'Do not put the Lord your God to the test.'"

8 Again, the devil took him to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendor. 9 "All this I will give you," he said, "if you will bow down and worship me." 10 Jesus said to him, "Away from me, Satan! For it is written: 'Worship the Lord your God, and serve him only.' "

11 Then the devil left him, and angels came and attended him.

Matthew 4. 1-11

4.3.1.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

On the semantic level, the major persuasive technique used by both Jesus and Satan in ET1 is that of appealing to authority as realized by the word of God. This appeal is linguistically triggered by quoting of a certain holy saying introduced by the clause ‘it is written’ which recurs four times, three by Jesus and only once by Satan. Each citation strictly observes the maxim of

Relation by relating the subject of each temptation to a relevant rebuff in the form of a word of God. In addition, the arguments are brief and to the point as shown hereunder.

Propositional Content of the First Temptation: Jesus is in bad need of bread in the desert. Satan challenges him to demonstrate that he is the Son of God by using the powers invested on him by God by turning the stones into bread to satisfy his hunger as a means of survival.

Propositional Content of the First Rebuff: Bread is not the only means of man's survival which requires that man abide by all the words of God.

Implicature of the First Rebuff: I, Jesus Christ, would not be tempted to follow your words in my duress in the desert. I would rather abide by the words of God which include your damnation. Since you are damned by God in the Holy Scriptures, I am required to follow God's words, not yours for this is the only way of survival decreed by God. Therefore, I will not change these stones into bread (i.e. be tempted by you) since bread is not the only means of survival.

Propositional Content of the Second Temptation: You claim that you are the Son of God and that you are keen to follow God's word. If these claims are true, then give me a proof that you are the Son of God by throwing yourself off this Temple in order to test God's saying that

"He will command his angels concerning you, and they

will lift you up in their hands, so that you will not strike your foot against a stone".

Propositional Content of the Second Rebuff: As you have just said I, Jesus Christ, am keen to follow God's words. Since this act of throwing myself down is meant to test God, therefore I would rather observe God's saying, "Do not put the Lord your God to the test".

Implicature of the Second Rebuff: I follow God's words, not yours which stand against God's saying. I will not be tempted by you.

Propositional Content of the Third Temptation: I, Satan, am ready to give you the splendour of all the kingdoms of earth that you are beholding now in exchange to your worshipping me.

Propositional Content of the Third Rebuff: I know that you are the damned Satan, so get away from me, for I follow God's words who says, 'Worship the Lord your God, and serve him only'.

Implicature of the Third Rebuff: I, Jesus Christ, follow God's words, not your temptation which stands against God's rules. No earthly pleasure can tempt me to abandon God's words and follow you.

4.3.1.2 Rhetorical Level

At the highest level, the rhetorical structure of ET1 takes

the form of:

Argument 1 – Counter Argument 1; Argument 2 – Counter Argument 2; Argument 3 – Counter Argument 3.

Specifically, the general rhetorical structure above can be broken up into the following rhetorical elements:

Claim 1 (Jesus is the Son of God)/ Required Evidence (turning stones into bread)/ Counter Evidence 1 ('Man does not live on bread alone, but on every word that comes from the mouth of God) – Claim 2 (Jesus is the Son of God = Claim 1)/Required Evidence 2 (throw yourself and God's angels will rescue you)/ Counter Evidence 2 ('Do not put the Lord your God to the test.') – Condition (all the Kingdoms of the Earth)/ Consequence (Jesus' worship of Satan)/ Rejection ('Worship the Lord your God, and serve him only).

4.3.1.3 Syntactic Level

On this level, two basic syntactic structures recur; the first is conditional, taking the form of:

If you are the Son of God, then do so and so,

or

I will do so and so if you do so and so,

the second is a direct reported speech:

It is written so and so (therefore I will not be tempted by you).

The first conditional syntactic structure serves the purpose

of argumentation by means of cause effect; the second structure of direct reported speech serves the purpose of confirming the authenticity of the reported text since the actual words of the two participants are quoted as they are.

Another persuasive technique used is that of temporal and spatial immediacy realized through the present tense and near demonstratives.

4.3.2 English Text 2

This short speech event consists of a single turn that takes place at the shores of the Sea of Galilee. The participants are Jesus Christ, the addressors, and two brother fishers: Simon (Peter) and Andrew who are the addressees. The two brothers are engaged in their bread-winning daily work of fishing by casting their nets into the sea when Jesus' calls to join him is heard, and the two brothers immediately leave their nets and follow the Caller. The main persuasive technique used is that of the promise of a morally valuable job of "catching men" in the sense of winning them over to Christianity as illustrated in the text hereunder:

The Calling of the First Disciples

18 As Jesus was walking beside the Sea of Galilee, he saw two brothers, Simon called Peter and his brother Andrew. They were casting a net into the lake, for they were fishermen. 19

"Come, follow me," Jesus said, "and I will make you fishers of men." 20 At once they left their nets and followed him.

Matthew 4. 18-20

4.3.2.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of the speech event in ET2 is that I, Jesus Christ, call upon you two men, Simon and Peter, to leave your work as fishermen and follow me. The promised result is that I will make you fishers of men rather than fish.

This speech act is followed by the happy perlocutionary result that proves the high persuasive effect of the speech act used wherein the two callees respond immediately by leaving their nets and following their Caller, Jesus Christ.

The implicature of the speech event and its sequel is that the Caller offers the two fishermen to be catchers of men rather than mere fish. Since men are by far the most valuable creatures on Earth, then the two brothers are promised a far more valuable and nobler job than the one they were engaged in before the call. In addition, given that the promised job is a moral one rather than a material bread-winning one, then the instatement and the spread of moral values are more valuable than material ones. The third implicature is that the two men in their immediate response to Jesus' call prove themselves to be men of high integrity who have absolute faith in Jesus, and who are willing to quit their current bread-winning job in favour of another

moral job that offers no material gains.

Significantly, the speech event observes the maxims of Relevance, Quality, Quantity, and Manner. Of special importance is the relevance of the promised job (fishers of men) with the present one (fishers of fish).

4.3.2.2 Rhetorical Level

At this level, the logical structure of ET2 is that of Cause (come with me)/ Effect (I will make you fishers of men)/ Evaluation (immediate acceptance). The first two members of the structure (Cause/Effect) take the form of an illocutionary force expressed by a direct speech act, the third (Evaluation) is a description of the perlocutionary result of this speech act.

4.3.2.3 Syntactic Level

The brief speech event takes the form of two successive (or double) imperative clauses (come, follow me) followed by a coordinative clause (I will make you fishers of men) introduced by and. The happy sequel takes the form of two coordinate clauses introduced by the important temporal conjunct 'at once'. As for the coordination, it is also introduced by 'and'.

4.3.2.4 Lexical Level

Of special importance is the high density of collocant lexical items (phrases and words) related to the domain of

fishing. The first is the phrase "casting a net", the second is the phrase "into the lake", the third is the lexical item "fishermen", the fourth is the phrase "fishers of men", the fifth is "their nets". Such a condensation of collocant items at a close proximity renders the whole text highly cohesive and more persuasive.

Another important lexical feature is the implicature triggered by the phrase 'at once' already briefly mentioned in A above. It shows that the two callees show no hesitation in joining with the good cause of Jesus. This implies that they are not only true believers in Jesus' cause, but also willing subjects who dedicate their life and destiny to such a good cause.

4.3.2.5 Tropes

The metaphorical use of the phrase fishers of men plays a major persuasive role in this text. The innovative extension and transfer of the meaning of fisher from that of fish to that of men is highly effective, especially in this context where the addressees are fishermen who value their job. The intended meaning of winning over men to Christianity offers a singular opportunity to the callees to learn a far more honorable job which can only be learnt by following their Caller; hence their prompt response.

4.3.3 English Text 3

This text is a monological sermon delivered in a single turn by Christ to his disciples on the Mount. The main moral persuasive means used is the promise of Godly blessing, rejoice, and reward for the depraved, the bereaved, the merciful, the peacemakers and the persecuted. This is coupled with the effective use of semantic, rhetorical, and syntactic parallelism and foregrounding as discussed in the next sections.

Sermon on the Mount

1 Now when he saw the crowds, he went up on a mountain side and sat down. His disciples came to him, 2 and he began to teach them, saying: 3 "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. 4 Blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted. 5 Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth. 6 Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they will be filled. 7 Blessed are the merciful, for they will be shown mercy. 8 Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God. 9 Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called sons of God. 10 Blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. 11 Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you and falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me. 12 Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven, for in the same way they persecuted the prophets who were

before you.

Matthew 5.1-13

4.3.3.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this text promises blessings and the kingdom of Heaven to the poor, comfort to the poor in spirit, inheritance of the earth to the meek, satisfaction to the righteous, belief in God to the pure in heart, good fame to the peacemakers, the kingdom of Heaven to the persecuted, and to his Disciples. In other words, assertive promises of happiness and reward constitute the main semantic content of persuasion. Significantly, the promised type of blessings satisfies what the believers lack by pairing the antonymous states above.

Pragmatically, the speech event observes the maxims of relevance, quality and quantity. It is also credible in that the promised blessings are pronounced by Jesus himself.

4.3.3.2 Rhetorical Level

The text presents a series of ten parallel claim/evidence structures throughout the whole argumentation as shown in Table (1) hereunder:

Table (1) Rhetorical Patterns in ET3

Claim

Evidence

Blessed are the poor in spirit

Blessed are those who mourn

Blessed are the meek

Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness

Blessed are the merciful

Blessed are the pure in heart

Blessed are the peacemakers

Blessed are those who are persecuted because of
righteousness

Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you and
falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me

Rejoice and be glad

1. for theirs is the kingdom of heaven

2. for they will be comforted

3. for they will inherit the earth

4. for they will be filled

5. for they will be shown mercy

6. for they will see God

7. for they will be called sons of God

8. for theirs is the kingdom of heaven

9. do

10. because great is your reward in heaven, for in the same
way they persecuted the prophets who were before you.

4.3.3.3 Syntactic Level

The uniform rhetorical pattern above is matched with a syntactically matching structure of the following form:

(a) Blessed are NP (X), (b) for NP1 VP NP2 (X)

Where the adjective 'blessed' in (a) is always fronted as the sentence initial element for emphasis. In two cases NP2 in (b) [theirs] is also fronted for the same purpose. The pattern above is always realized in compound sentences with the coordinator 'for'.

4.3.3.4 Lexical Level

The pairing of parallel rhetorical and syntactic structures is matched by the pairing of antonymic lexical items where the binary elements:

the poor / king(dom)
mourners / comfort
the meek / inheritance (of earth)
hunger and thirst / filling
merciful / given mercy
persecuted/ happy
are juxtaposed.

The use of immediate time, the present simple tense serves

the purpose of persuasion because it denotes eternal truths (facts). So is the mentioning of all the elements of the sentence without ellipses which enhances the denotative specificity of the text.

4.3.3.5 Tropes

The following expressions reveal metaphorical uses whose intended meaning is paraphrased hereunder:

hunger and thirst for righteousness = ardent justice-seekers

pure in heart = honest

see God = become true believers

sons of God = Saints (Jesus Disciples)

4.3.4 English Text 4

In the following text, the main persuasive technique used is that of metaphor which equate the value of the Disciples first with salt, then with light. The text is monological, assertive, and highly suggestive. The suggestion used here is a positive one that puts the Disciples mission of propagating Christianity in a positive light through praise.

Salt and Light

13 You are the salt of the earth. But if the salt loses its

saltiness, how can it be made salty again? It is no longer good for anything, except to be thrown out and trampled by men. 14 "You are the light of the world. A city on a hill cannot be hidden. 15 Neither do people light a lamp and put it under a bowl. Instead they put it on its stand, and it gives light to everyone in the house. 16 In the same way, let your light shine before men, that they may see your good deeds and praise your Father in heaven.

Mathew 5.13-15

4.3.4.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The saying starts with the direct equation between the Disciples and salt. The implied idea here is that the work of the Disciples is as important to the people as the importance of salt to all food. If the Disciples quit their message of converting people to Christianity, then they will lose their true value and become as useless as the salt that has lost its essential quality of saltiness.

The comparison then moves to that of light. Here the Disciples are identified with the light of the world that envelops everything. Here again the suggested idea is that of equating the Disciples' good office to the benefit of light in the middle of darkness. The two important properties of light are developed in the extended metaphor. The first is that true light should never

be concealed from the people (i.e., true faith requires to be conveyed to all the people of earth). The second is that when light illuminates the place, the good deeds of the Disciples will become highlighted, and the people will praise Father in heaven for leading them to the path of belief.

Pragmatically, a clear and specific message is directly conveyed to the addressees by means of highly effective and relevant metaphors, which appeal to the senses of seeing and tasting. Though the main thrust of the message is carried out in figurative terms, the expressed proposition is quite true and rewarding to the addressees.

4.3.4.2 Rhetorical Level

The rhetorical structure of ET4 is highly complex. It is organized around two major claim/evidence/ evaluation relations embedded with two matching comparisons and four cause/effect sub-relations as shown hereunder:

1. You are the salt of the earth. (Claim)
2. But if the salt loses its saltiness, (Cause)
3. how can it be made salty again? (Effect)
- 2 & 3 = (Extended Claim)
4. It is no longer good for anything, (Evidence)
5. except to be thrown out and trampled by men.
(Extended Effect) (Evaluation)

2-4 & 4-5 (Matching Detail)

6. "You are the light of the world. (Claim)

7. A city on a hill cannot be hidden. (Evidence)
(Cause/Effect)

8. Neither do people light a lamp and put it under a bowl.
(Evidence)

9. Instead they put it on its stand, (Evidence) (Cause)

10. and it gives light to everyone in the house. (Evidence)
(Effect)

11. In the same way, (Matching Detail)

12. let your light shine before men, (Cause)

13. that they may see your good deeds (Effect)

14. and praise your Father in heaven. (Evaluation)

7-13 = (Extended Evidence)

If translated into major relations, leaving out the embedded ones of cause/effect and matching detail, one gets the following pattern, with numbers substituting each clause relation element:

1-3 (Claim)/4 (Evidence)/5 (Evaluation)

6 (Claim)/7-13 (Evidence)/14 (Evaluation)

Significantly, evidence is provided by appealing to commonly experienced elements of nature (salt and light).

4.3.4.3 Syntactic Level

The text uses simple present tenses that reflect temporal immediacy. Sentence structures range from simple ones (for both of the two Claim members) to compound and complex ones. Polysyndeton is also used (but if ..). Denotative specificity is highlighted by stating the agent, object, and action explicitly for all transitive verbs. Other syntactic persuasive means include:

- a. The use of rhetorical question (How can it be made salty again?),
- b. Addressing the audience directly through the use of second person plural pronoun ‘you’,
- c. The use of indirect directives (let your ...).

4.3.4.4 Lexical Level

The most important lexical property of this text is that of collocation. Two sets of closely related lexical items dominate the whole text; the first is that of salt (salt, saltiness, salty), the other is that of light (light, lamp, shine). It is remarkable to see that these two sets are related to the two items of the text’s title (Salt and Light). In addition, the use of reference via the pronominal is coextensive with reference to these two items in the text.

Full and partial antonyms are abound in this text as shown in the following list:

loses saltiness / salty

put a lamp under a bowl/put it on its stand

hide/shine

earth/heaven

4.3.4.5 Tropes

Metaphors related to salt and light dominate this text. Both stative and dynamic verbs are used to realize such metaphors:

You are the salt of the earth. (Stative verb)

You are the light of the world. (Stative verb)

Let your light shine before men. (Dynamic verb)

4.3.5 English Text 5

In the following text, assertions of various types are used as the main persuasion device. This technique is quite suitable for the topic of discourse which is the keenness to refute the falls allegations that Jesus is after abolishing the Laws of the Prophets before him.

Jesus and the Law

17 Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. 18 I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished.

Matthew 5.17-18

4.3.5.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

In this text, the speaker, Jesus Christ, asserts to his Disciples that he has not come to abolish any of the laws of the prophets before him. On the contrary, he is keen to reinstating every word written in them.

Pragmatically, the refutation is made via conclusive and definitive means in order to rule out any cause for ambiguity or doubt, whatsoever. The cooperative principle is observed, together with all its maxims of quality, quantity, relation and manner.

4.3.5.2 Rhetorical Level

The text shows a Claim/Evidence relationship. The claim constitutes in the warning that Jesus gives to the Disciples in the

first sentence not to think that he has come to abolish the laws and the teaching of the Prophets before him. This is followed by extended evidence which spans the rest of the text.

4.3.5.3 Syntactic Level

This text shows all the syntactic features typical of asserting ones position to the an audience: The use of denial (I have not come to abolish... , not the smallest letter..., not the least stroke ..., by any means...), direct prohibition (Do not think that...), simple present tense verbs, impossible situation to the opposite effect (until heaven and earth disappear), and assertion (I tell you the truth.., everything is accomplished.).

All the sentences used are complex ones, necessitated by the deliberate use of the conjunctions (that, but, until, until). Negations are found in all sentences (do not, have not, not the smallest.., not the least..).

4.3.5.4 Lexical Level

Antonymy is again the most striking feature in this text: (abolish: fulfill; abolish: accomplish; heaven: earth). Another

notable lexical feature is the use of collocative items related to religious teachings: law, letter, stroke of the pen, law.

4.3.6 English Text 6

In this text, persuasion is based upon the idea of substituting a vanishing property with a lasting one. The appeal is to the judgment-value of the addressees who are induced to think and decide upon the more advantageous of two alternatives.

Real Treasure

19 Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy, and where thieves break in and steal. 20 But store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where moth and rust do not destroy, and where thieves do not break in and steal. 21 For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also.

4.3.6.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of the text is that believers must not accumulate wealth on earth because this is a futile enterprise since wealth is subject to decay and theft. Instead, the believers are induced to accumulate wealth in heaven through their good deeds. This type of wealth can neither wither, nor be stolen. In addition man's desire and interest lies where his wealth is.

The implicature is that given that man's real belief is strongly tied to what he considers to be most valuable, then God knows those who value earthly treasures and those who value heavenly ones, and rewards each according to his deeds.

The basic pragmatic means used here is that if promising reward for man's choice of the better and the more lasting of two alternatives: earthly pleasures or heavenly ones.

4.3.6.2 Rhetorical Level

Argumentation in this text is based upon the rhetorical pattern of Problem/Solution/Evaluation. The first clause is a prohibition of earthly wealth accumulation because the problem with this indulgence is that such wealth is subject to loss.

The solution offered lies in the accumulation of heavenly treasures which will stand to man's benefit forever since these are imperishable. The evaluation is both a literal and a moral one. Man's decision to the accumulation of any one of the two treasures reveals where his real belief and conscientious lies, and each person will be rewarded by God accordingly.

4.3.6.3 Syntactic Level

The text consists of three compound-complex sentences where double conjunctions are used: (and where), (and where), and (for where). The syntactic structure of the first two sentences is parallel on a clause-by-clause basis as shown hereunder:

- 1a. Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth,
- 1b. But store up for yourselves treasures in heaven,
- 2a. where moth and rust destroy,
- 2b. where moth and rust do not destroy,
- 3a. and where thieves break in and steal.
- 3b. and where thieves do not break in and steal.

The only syntactic difference between the clauses in (a) and (b) above is the presence or absence of negation. This technique is quite effective since it juxtaposes the two alternatives on a par, though the semantic, pragmatic and rhetorical difference and consequences between the two are antonymic.

4.3.6.4 Lexical Level

The key lexical item in the text above is that of “treasure”, used in its literal sense in the first sentence, in its figurative sense in the second one, and in its both senses in the third

sentence.

The positive verbs in the first sentence are negated in the second one, and the vice versa. In the third and last sentence, all the verbs are only positive ones. The first sentence speaks about the earth, the second about heaven, the third about both. The tense used is again that of the present simple tense which helps to convey both habitual acts and facts in English.

4.3.6.5 Tropes

As already indicated, the key persuasive means used in this text is that of the figurative use of the word ‘pleasure’ to mean good deeds and true belief. A related metaphor is that of “storing” good deeds, against storing wealth. A third one is the use of “heart” to mean true belief and conscience.

4.3.7 English Text 7

The text here preaches love to one’s enemies. The main persuasive technique used is that of asking the Disciples to be as perfect as God is in His all-inclusive gifts to human beings. Another technique is that of comparing divine love with that of the tax collector’s and the pagan’s. The imperfect act of loving those who love the believers and hating those who hate them is deemed imperfect in that it is done even by the tax-collector and

pagan.

Love for Enemies

40 "you have heard that it was said, 'Love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' 44 But I tell you: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, 45 that you may be sons of your Father in heaven. He causes his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous. 46 If you love those who love you, what reward will you get? Are not even the tax collectors doing that? 47 And if you greet only your brothers, what are you doing more than others? Do not even pagans do that? 48 Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

Matthew 5.40-48

4.3.7.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The text begins by rejecting the law of loving one's neighbour and hating ones enemies. Then, the opposite law of loving one's enemies and praying for one's persecutors is given as a proper substitute to the first law. The reward of following this last law is that of becoming the sons of the Father in heaven. To press the matter forward, God's care for every human being without exception is given as an example to be followed. Then such Godly love, which includes everything, is compared with that of the tax collector and the pagan. The Disciples are

required to transcend above the ordinary love of these two categories of men since the tax-collector can only love his employer, while the pagan has no belief in Divine God. The text ends with a call for doing as God does in loving all human beings so that perfection is attained.

Pragmatically, the new law of loving ones enemies is made favourable to the addressees by appealing to their desire to be as perfect as God, and gain heavenly reward. The call to transcend above earthly hatred made closer by comparing Divine love with that of the tax-collector and the pagan. The choice of these two men is pragmatically significant in that both are maculate and deserve no emulation. The use of the Relation Maxim is quite revealing here.

4.3.7.2 Rhetorical Level

The text has a rhetorical organization of Claim/Counter-Claim/ Evidence/ Evaluation as shown in the following extracts. In Aristotelian terms, the Claim presents the Argument, the Counter Claim refutes the Claim via justified Evidence. Then the rhetorical structure is concluded with a positive evaluation.

Claim (= Argument)

"you have heard that it was said, 'Love your neighbor and hate your enemy.'

Counter-Claim (= Refutation)

But I tell you: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, 45 that you may be sons of your Father in heaven.

Evidence (= Justification)

He causes his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous. 46 If you love those who love you, what reward will you get? Are not even the tax collectors doing that? 47 And if you greet only your brothers, what are you doing more than others? Do not even pagans do that?

Evaluation (= Conclusion)

This member is expressed via Matching detail between the perfectness of God and of true believers.

Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

4.3.7.3 Syntactic Level

The Text presents its Argument and Counter-Argument by pairing antithetical clauses first, then the evidence is presented

via parallel conditional clauses:

Claim: Love your neighbor and hate your enemy...

Counter-Claim: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you...

Evidence: If you love those who love you... even the tax collectors are doing that ...

if you greet only your brothers ...even pagans do that ...

In addition, the parallel structures above are paired with four rhetorical questions, two having the pattern of (if you ... what ...?) and (are not even...?/do not even...?)

If you love those who love you, what reward will you get?

Are not even the tax collectors doing that?

And if you greet only your brothers, what are you doing more than others?

Do not even pagans do that?

Another observation is that the laws which the text quotes begin with direct commands:

Love your neighbor...

and hate your enemy...

Love your enemies...

and pray for those who persecute you...

Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect...

4.3.7.4 Lexical Level

This text is an exceptionally cohesive one in terms of reiterated lexis and reference. All the structural parallelisms mentioned in C above are strung with antonymous and synonymous lexical items:

love X hate

neighbor X enemy

love = pray

enemies = those who persecute you

the evil X the good

the righteous X the unrighteous

love = reward

love = greet

you = you /your

you (a true believer) X tax collectors

you (a true believer) X pagans

you X others

sons X Father

heaven = heavenly

Finally repetitive items and substitutions (e.g., love, hate,

neighbors, enemies, you, your, love = do that, greet = do that, in heaven = heavenly perfect) are abound all over the text:

you have heard that it was said, 'Love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' But I tell you: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, that you may be sons of your Father in heaven. He causes his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous. If you love those who love you, what reward will you get? Are not even the tax collectors doing that? And if you greet only your brothers, what are you doing more than others? Do not even pagans do that? Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

4.3.8 English Text 8

This text appeals to the believer's sense of sound reasoning in order to make them follow a certain right and happy conduct and avoid an injurious one. The reasoning is made up in a series of cause/consequence argumentation that ends up in the choice between the right conduct of quickly settling matters with one's debtors or facing imprisonment first then paying the debt next. This means that following the advisable conduct in this context makes all the difference between prison vis-à-vis freedom.

Anger

25 "Settle matters quickly with your adversary who is taking you to court. Do it while you are still with him on the way, or he may hand you over to the judge, and the judge may hand you over to the officer, and you may be thrown into prison.
26 I tell you the truth, you will not get out until you have paid the last penny.

Matthew 5.25-26

4.3.8.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The Text urges the addressee to settle financial matters with ones debtors as quickly as possible before the law-suit is brought before the judge; otherwise, he will be put into prison and is compelled to face both imprisonment and payment of the sum owed to the last penny.

The key to the required conduct is 'the quick settlement of matters' before the court interferes, and indictment becomes inevitable, which would blemish one's reputation and causes avoidable imprisonment over and above the eventual, inevitable payment of the whole debt. The implicature is that the prompt, timely settlement can make room for possible compromise as well as the maintenance of good-will and friendliness with one's adversaries. In addition, it allows the debtor to avoid imprisonment and humiliation. The wider implicature is that one resorts to negotiation and mutual understanding to settle ones

differences amicably with his adversaries rather than go to court. Another implicature is to acknowledge the rights and debts of others and settle them in time. Such understanding and settlement could make all the difference between peace of mind and freedom on the one hand, and prison and humiliation, on the other. Special emphasis is laid upon the timing of the settlement: before the law-suit is heard in the court. This timing is crucial in the avoidance of bearing the negative consequences of both prison and settlement.

4.3.8.2 Rhetorical Level

The global rhetorical structure around which this text is organized is that of the Problem/Solution pattern in which the Solution is given first. The Solution is the quick settlement of matters with one's adversaries; the Problem is imprisonment.

Solution

"Settle matters quickly with your adversary who is taking you to court. Do it while you are still with him on the way,

Problem

or he may hand you over to the judge, and the judge may hand you over to the officer, and you may be thrown into prison. I tell you the truth, you will not get out until you have paid the last penny.

Particularly, the Problem member is made up of four successively interrelated causes, all connected with court action:

Cause 1 : Non-settlement of matters

Consequence 1/ Cause 2: he may hand you over to the judge,

Consequence 2/ Cause 3: and the judge may hand you over to the officer,

Consequence 3/ Cause 4: and you may be thrown into prison.

Consequence 4: you will not get out until you have paid the last penny.

4.3.8.3 Syntactic Level

The Text makes use of the syntactic structure:

Do this quickly..... or (else) so and so (adverse consequences) may happen to you.

To add the element of authority to the propositional, a speech indicating clause is inserted for emphasis:

I (Jesus Christ) tell you the truth (which is) so and so... .

4.3.8.4 Lexical Level

Collocations around two semantic frames dominate this

text: financial matters and judicial, punitive law.

Lexical Items Related to Financial Matters

Settle matters, Do it, paid, the last penny

Lexical Items Related to Judiciary Matters

adversary, court, the judge, hand over, the officer, thrown
into prison, get out

4.3.9 English Text 9

This text offers another example of the Aristotelian-type of persuasive argumentation: Argument, Counter Argument, Evidence, and Conclusion. The argument type is enhanced with the appeal to the traditional laws of religion of: i) keeping one's oaths, and ii) the avoidance of swearing. This means that logical argumentation is the main technique of persuasion involved in ET9.

Oaths

33 Again, you have heard that it was said to the people long ago, 'Do not break your oath, but keep the oaths you have made to the Lord.' 34 But I tell you, Do not swear at all: either by heaven, for it is God's throne; 35 or by the earth, for it is his footstool; or by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the Great King. 36 And do not swear by your head, for you cannot make even one hair white or black. 37 Simply let your 'Yes' be 'Yes,' and your

'No,' 'No'; anything beyond this comes from the evil one.

Matthew 5.33-37

4.3.9.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The two main themes of prohibiting the breaking of one's oaths and swearing by sacred and dear symbols are supported by logical evidence. The traditional saying that believers are required not to break their oaths is rejected in favour of total abstinence from swearing at all, neither by heaven, nor by earth, or Jerusalem. This is because heaven is God's throne, earth is God's footstool, while Jerusalem is the city of the Great King. In addition, swearing by one's head is prohibited since man is incapable of creating even one thread of hair. Accordingly, the simple answer in mere 'yes' or 'no' is decreed, with the conclusion that those who do abide by this degree are condemned as evil ones.

From the pragmatic point of view, the quittance of oaths and swearing rather than abiding by them is clearly elucidated in a step-by-step logical progression supported by irrefutable evidence. Each grand oath is shown to be either as infringing upon the Kingdom of God, or as futile and idle. In addition, background information are supplied and the truth value of all the propositions are observed. The prescribed conduct, besides avoids meddling with the affairs of God, offers a simple and

beneficial alternative to the believers.

4.3.9.2 Rhetorical Level

The rhetorical pattern of Situation/ Problem/ Solution/ Evaluation spans the whole of this text, with the sub-pattern Claim/Evidence interspersing the Problem member:

Situation

Again, you have heard that it was said to the people long ago, 'Do not break your oath, but keep the oaths you have made to the Lord.'

Problem

1. But I tell you, Do not swear at all: either by heaven, for it is God's throne; 2. or by the earth, for it is his footstool; or 3. by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the Great King. 4. And do not swear by your head, for you cannot make even one hair white or black.

Solution

Simply let your 'Yes' be 'Yes,' and your 'No,' 'No';

Evaluation

anything beyond this comes from the evil one.

The Problem member above consists of four sub-structures of Claim/Evidence as the figures show:

Claim: 1. But I tell you, Do not swear at all: either by

heaven,

Evidence: 1. for it is God's throne

Claim: 2. or by the earth,

Evidence: 2. for it is his footstool

Claim: 3. or by Jerusalem

Evidence: 3. for it is the city of the Great King

Claim: 4. And do not swear by your head

Evidence: 4. for you cannot make even one hair white or black.

4.3.9.3 Syntactic Level

All the prohibitions in this text are expressed by the parallel syntactic structure of: "Do not VP, for/but it is so and so"

Do not break your oath, but keep the oaths you have made to the Lord.

Do not swear at all: either by heaven, for it is God's throne;
or by the earth, for it is his footstool;
or by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the Great King.

do not swear by your head, for you cannot make even one hair white or black.

The final prescribed conduct is expressed by the mild directive with 'let':

Simply let your 'Yes' be 'Yes,' and your 'No,' 'No'

As for the conclusion, it is spelled out via an absolute declarative sentence:

anything beyond this comes from the evil one.

4.3.10 English Text 10

In the following text, discreet help is of the needy is recommended in order to preserve the personal dignity of the recipients of charity reward. The most important persuasive means used is that of the promise of Godly reward in reciprocation to earthly charity.

Giving to the Needy

2⁵⁰ when you give to the needy, do not announce it with trumpets, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and on the streets, to be honored by men. I tell you the truth, they have received their reward in full. 3 But when you give to the needy, do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing, 4 So that your giving may be in secret. Then your Father, who sees what is done in secret, will reward you.

Matthew 6.2-4

4.3.10.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The text prohibits making a fuss over giving charity to the

needy. Those who do not observe the secrecy of giving will be condemned rather than rewarded on the Day of Judgment because in trumpeting their donation they trample upon the dignity of the needy in order to gain prestige. Instead, total secrecy is required to the effect that the left hand is forbidden from knowing what the right hand gave. Observation of such a secrecy will ensure Godly reward since God sees everything.

The speech compares two contrasting situations: that of trumpeting ones charity donations for the sake of prestige and is condemned, and that of keeping such donation secret and receiving heavenly reward. The first state is described as hypocritical and deserves punishment, the second worthy of heavenly reward. Again, the promise of reward for the good conduct and punishment for the bad one provide persuasive moral incentive for abiding by the good conduct.

4.3.10.2 Rhetorical Level

This text offers a complete example of Situation/ Problem/ Solution/ Evaluation rhetorical structure as shown hereunder:

Situation:

when you give to the needy,

Problem:

do not announce it with trumpets, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and on the streets, to be honored by men. I tell you the truth, they have received their reward in full.

Solution:

But when you give to the needy, do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing, So that your giving may be in secret.

Evaluation:

Then your Father, who sees what is done in secret, will reward you.

4.3.10.3 Syntactic Level

Both the prohibition of negative conduct and the recommendation of the positive one are expressed with the parallel syntactic structure 'do not':

do not announce it with trumpets

do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing

In the text, the truth-highlighting clause is also used as a

token of authority:

I tell you the truth, they have received their reward in full.

4.3.10.4 Lexical Level

Three key lexical items emerge in this text. The first is the verb 'give' repeated for three times, the second is 'reward' mentioned twice both as a noun and a verb, the third is the collective noun 'the needy'. Of special importance is the fact that the first 'reward' is actually a punishment for hypocrisy, while the second is a real reward for secrecy. Such antithetical use of the same lexical item provide an additional effective persuasive means to this text.

Lexical items related to the two opposite states of secrecy and announcement appear on four occasions: announce, not know the doing, in secret (twice).

4.3.10.5 Tropes

Metaphorical use is exploited on two occasions; first through the lexical item "trumpet" to mean loud, repetitive announcement of the giving, secondly through the metonymic use of the hand as the verb of giving, and its personification by making it 'know':

Do not announce it with trumpets

Do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing

4.3.11 English Text 11

Similar to previous text, ET11 warns against hypocritical prayer and recommends secret prayer. Punishment for the first act and reward for the second offer the main persuasive means used.

Prayer

5 And when you pray, do not be like the hypocrites, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and on the street corners to be seen by men. I tell you the truth; they have received their reward in full. 6 But when you pray, go into your room, close the door and pray to your Father, who is unseen. Then your Father, who sees what is done in secret, will reward you.

Matthew 6.5-6

4.3.11.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

Hypocritical conduct in the act of prayer is prohibited. Accordingly, believers are warned against stand-prayer in the synagogues and on the street corners, for this is sinful. In contrast, true secret prayer within the gates of one's house is

encouraged and rewarded.

The pragmatic inference is that prayer should be done in good faith, for the sole purpose of drawing closer to God rather than as a hypocritical means of gaining earthly honour.

4.3.11.2 Rhetorical Level

Another complete rhetorical structure of Situation/ Problem/ Solution/ Evaluation is offered in this text:

Situation:

And when you pray,

Problem:

Do not be like the hypocrites, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and on the street corners to be seen by men. I tell you the truth; they have received their reward in full.

Solution:

But when you pray, go into your room, close the door and pray to your Father, who is unseen.

Evaluation:

Then your Father, who sees what is done in secret, will reward you.

4.3.11.3 Syntactic Level

Unlike the previous text, the recommended act of secret

prayer is not expressed via the prohibitive structure 'do no', which is kept for the prohibited act only:

Do not be like the hypocrites

But when you pray, go into your room, close the door and pray to your Father, who is unseen

The recommended act above is verbalized by means of three parallel syntactic structures, all beginning with a command:

Go into your room,

Close the door and

Pray to your Father

Once again, the usual authoritative clause is mentioned:

I tell you the truth, they have received their reward in full.

4.3.11.4 Lexical Level

Like the previous text, the lexical item 'reward' is used in two antithetical senses: 'punishment' and 'reward'. The main lexical item: 'pray' is mentioned for four times in the text. Words related to 'seeing/unseeing/secret' are also repeated in the text to bring about the contrast between public and home prayer.

4.3.12 English Text 12

In this text, the correct wording of prayer to God is given in full, in order to be pronounced by the believers. Being a prayer that requires to be learnt by heart and repeated time and again whenever necessary, its persuasive import lies in its nature as prayer-text per se.

The Lord's Prayer

9 This, then, is how you should pray: "Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name, 10 your kingdom come, your will be done on earth as it is in heaven. 11 Give us today our daily bread. 12 Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. 13 And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.

Matthew 6.9-12

4.3.12.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this text is that of prayer in which the name of God is invoked on a certain almighty basis and then the petition is spelled out. The latter consists of asking God to give the believers their daily bread, forgiving their debtors, sparing them temptation, and delivering them from the evil one.

The prayer is carefully stylized in simple, memorable words, while the petition, as a package, covers the most basic aspirations of the average human beings.

4.3.12.2 Rhetorical Level

This text shows a simple Problem/Solution structure as shown hereunder:

Problem

This, then, is how you should pray:

Solution

Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come, your will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us today our daily bread. Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.

The solution has the form of a prayer which begins with an Invocation followed by Basis, and Petition:

Invocation:

Our Father in heaven,

Basis:

Hallowed be your name, your kingdom come, your will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Petition:

Give us today our daily bread. Forgive us our debts, as we

also have forgiven our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.

4.3.12.3 Syntactic Level

The petition part of the prayer is all expressed via parallel imperative clauses:

Give us today our daily bread.

Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.

And lead us not into temptation,

But deliver us from the evil one.

4.3.13 English Text 13

This text provides evidence to the fact that true belief and the love of God cannot co-exist with the one's love of money.

God and Money

24 No one can serve two masters. Either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve both God and Money.

Matthew 6.24

4.3.13.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this text is that the love of God and the love of money do not go hand in hand. Therefore, one has to choose either the love of God with its heavenly rewards, or the love of money with its earthly rewards. In other words, Greed and True faith stand against each other. All good believers should quit greed.

4.3.13.2 Rhetorical Level

This text shows another example of Claim/Evidence rhetorical structure.

Claim:

No one can serve two masters.

Evidence:

Either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve both God and Money

4.3.13.3 Syntactic Level

The basic content of this text is expressed via two parallel clauses, one stated in general terms, the other in specific ones:

No one can serve two masters.

You cannot serve both God and Money.

4.3.13.4 Lexical Level

One basic lexical item that stands out as being especially important in this text is that of 'master', referring to both God and figuratively to money. While these two contrastive terms are expressed via one word, other contrasts are expressed via antonyms:

Hate X love, the one X the other, be devoted to X despise.

4.3.14 English Text 14

In this text, the promise of God's abundant giving to those who ask presents the fundamental means of persuasion used. Significantly, the giving is expressed in absolute terms.

God Gives To Those Who Ask

7 Ask and it will be given to you; seek and you will find; knock and the door will be opened to you. 8 For everyone who asks receives; he who seeks finds; and to him who knocks, the door will be opened.

Matthew 7.7

4.3.14.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

Believers are induced to ask for whatever they are in need of and God will give them, seek and find, knock at the doors, and they will be opened in front of them. Without asking, seeking, and knocking at doors nothing will be gained.

4.3.14.2 Rhetorical Level

This text reveals a typical pattern of Cause/Consequence rhetorical structure as shown in the following table:

Consequence

Cause

Ask

Seek

Knock

For everyone who asks

He who seeks

And to him who knocks,

And it will be given to you

And you will find

And the door will be opened to you.

Receives

Finds

The door will be opened

4.3.14.3 Syntactic Level

Two basic syntactic structures dominate the whole of this text. The first is that of an imperative clause followed by an 'and' coordinate clause whose verb is 'will', the second is that of the complex declarative sentence with NP S VP:

(1)

Ask and it will be given to you

Seek and you will find

Knock and the door will be opened to you

(2)

For everyone who asks receives

He who seeks finds

Foregrounding the believer himself distinguishing the final clause of the text:

To him who knocks, the door will be opened.

4.3.14.4 Lexical Level

Reciprocal verbs also dominate the text:

Ask / be given

Seek / find

Knock / be opened

Asks / receives

Seeks / finds

Knocks / be opened.

4.3.15 English Text 15

This text makes an extensive use of figures of speech in describing false prophets and inducing believers to avoid their harmful effect:

A Tree and Its Fruit

15 Watch out for false prophets. They come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ferocious wolves. 16 By their fruit you will recognize them. Do people pick grapes from Thom bushes, or figs from thistles? 17 Likewise every good tree bears good fruit, but a bad tree bears bad fruit. 18 A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, and a bad tree cannot bear good fruit. 19 Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. 20 Thus, by their fruit you will recognize them.

Matthew 7.15-20

4.3.15.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

This speech warns believers against the harm caused by

false prophets who wear the clothes of sheep but are as ferocious as wolves. In order to recognize these harmful imposters, the believers are asked to judge them by the consequences of their teaching in that they are like bad trees which can never give good fruit, and is therefore only good for cutting and turning them into fire-wood.

The appeal of figurative language has an effective pragmatic import in that it provides a convincing basis for recognizing false prophets. These imposters are incapable of doing anything good. Accordingly, they must be judged by the consequences of their teaching and action.

Two common fields of experience are utilized for the sake of persuasion: shepherding and farming. The first is expressed in the comparison between the outward appearance of sheep and the inward ferocity of wolves; the second by the fruits of useful and bad trees. These two domains offer universally shared fields of knowledge that render the speech clear and convincing.

4.3.15.2 Rhetorical Level

This speech shows a global Problem/Solution pattern expressed through the successive use of Claim/Evidence pairs.

Solution

Watch out for false prophets.

Problem

They come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ferocious wolves. By their fruit you will recognize them. Do people pick grapes from Thom bushes, or figs from thistles? Likewise every good tree bears good fruit, but a bad tree bears bad fruit. A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, and a bad tree cannot bear good fruit.

Evaluation/Conclusion

Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. Thus, by their fruit you will recognize them.

4.3.15.3 Lexical Level

Lexical items related to shepherding and farming control the sense relations of the whole text. The word 'fruit' is repeated seven times, and 'bear' and 'tree' five times, not to mention the other collocants of these lexical items:

Watch out, sheep's clothing, ferocious wolves, fruit, pick, grapes, Thom, bushes, figs, thistles, tree, bears, fruit, tree, bears, fruit, tree, bear, fruit, tree, bear, fruit, tree, bear, fruit, cut down, fruit

4.3.15.4 Tropes

Three main comparisons are made in this text, all related to false prophets. The first is likening their outward appearance to that of sheep and their true inward nature to that of wolves; the second is comparing the bad effect of their teaching to the fruit of bad trees in contrast with the fruit of good trees like grape and fig. The third and the last figure prescribe the mode action required once a false prophet is recognized; like a bad tree, he is cut and put to fire.

4.3.16 English Text 16

The promise of reward and the threat of punishment provide the basic means of persuasion in this text:

Confessing and Rejecting Christ

"Whoever acknowledges me before men, I will also acknowledge him before my Father in heaven. 33 But whoever disowns me before men, I will disown him before my Father in heaven.

Matthew 10.32-33

4.3.16.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The text shows how any person's acknowledgement of Christ has the consequence of Christ's acknowledgement of this person in front of God, while the disowning of Christ is followed by Christ's rejection on the Day of Judgment.

The pragmatic import of 'acknowledging' and 'disowning' subsumes reward and punishment on the Day of Judgment. The speech event is quite brief, clear, and memorable.

4.3.16.2 Rhetorical Level

Argumentation in this text is presented in the form of double cause/consequence rhetorical structure. Each of one of this structure is given in one complex clause:

Cause:

"Whoever acknowledges me before men,

Consequence:

I will also acknowledge him before my Father in heaven.

Cause:

But whoever disowns me before men,

Consequence:

I will disown him before my Father in heaven.

4.3.16.3 Syntactic Level

The whole text comprises two concessive complex clauses beginning with 'whoever' and joined with 'but':

Whoever acknowledges me before men, I will also acknowledge him before my Father in heaven.

But whoever disowns me before men, I will disown him before my Father in heaven

4.3.16.4 Lexical Level

The concession above is realized on the lexical level through the double repetition of the lexical pair 'acknowledge/disown'. Significantly, all the other lexical items (with the exception of the coordinator 'but') are only once repeated. The lexical field of each member of the pair above is quite wide in that the verb 'acknowledge' denotes belief, courage, and acceptance while the verb 'disown' denotes rejection and disbelief. In addition, the lexical items in the prepositional phrase 'before my Father' imply 'the day of Judgment'.

4.3.17 English Text 17

This text uses reward and punishment on the Day of Judgment as a means of inducing believers to stop pronouncing careless words.

Judgment of Words

36 But I tell you that men will have to give account on the Day of Judgment for every careless word they have spoken. 37 For by your words you will be acquitted, and by your words you will be condemned."

Matthew 10.36-37

4.3.17.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

ET 17 expresses the idea that both acquittal or condemnation on the Day of Judgment depend on one's spoken words. In this context, considerate words bring happiness, while foul ones bring punishment.

Pragmatically, the use of fair punishment versus due reward represents one of the acknowledged means of persuasion, especially when the better choice is beneficial to the believer both in this life and the life hereafter.

4.3.17.2 Rhetorical Level

This text has the rhetorical structure of Cause/

Consequence. Two implied causes are at stake here; i) avoidance of careless words, and ii) pronouncing such words. The explicit consequence is acquittal for (i), and punishment for (ii) on the Day of Judgment.

4.3.17.3 Syntactic Level

The text begins with the authoritative truth-asserting clause:

I tell you that

This is followed by the statement of the key fact in the form of a complex declarative sentence:

Men will have to give account on the Day of Judgment for every careless word they have spoken.

Then come two parallel clauses in which the point of focus is fronted in the structure of PP NP VP:

For by your words you will be acquitted,

And by your words you will be condemned.

4.3.17.4 Lexical Level

Besides the key lexical item of 'words' – which is

mentioned three times – there are many lexical items that are related to judgment that enhance the idea of punishment and reward:

Give account, the Day of Judgment, acquitted, condemned

4.3.18 English Text 18

Persuasion in this text depends upon the figurative style of comparing the well-instructed teachers of heavenly law with the owner of a house which is full of treasures.

Teacher of the law

52He said to them, "Therefore every teacher of the law who has been instructed about the kingdom of heaven is like the owner of a house who brings out of his storeroom new treasures as well as old."

Matthew 10.52

4.3.18.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The gist of this text is that when the teachers of law become well-versed in heavenly instructions, their speech will

be full of valuable wisdom that is as valuable as treasure house.

Pragmatically, the attainment of valuable wisdom is tied with the state of being well-instructed about the kingdom of Heaven. The comparison is presented in brief terms that exploit common human knowledge.

4.3.18.2 Rhetorical Level

Given that the text is based on figures of speech, its rhetorical structure exploits the Hypothetical/real structure in which the Real element is given first:

Real

He said to them, "Therefore every teacher of the law who has been instructed about the kingdom of heaven

Hypothetical

Is like the owner of a house who brings out of his storeroom new treasures as well as old."

4.3.18.3 Syntactic Level

The comparison in this text has the complex syntactic structure of:

Every X who has been so and so is like Y who does so and so.

The first real state is made structurally parallel to the hypothetical picture.

X who has been (so and so)

is like

Y who does so and so

4.3.18.4 Tropes

The comparison in this text is presented in the form of a simile with 'like'. The picture is a multiple one in which the compared entity is every teacher of law who is well instructed about the laws of heaven, while the comparee is the owner of a treasure house in which both old and new treasures are stored..

4.3.19 English Text 19

The following text utilizes the well-known fact that one small seed of mustard can, if suitably planted and nurtured can become a large garden tree that provides shelter to singing birds. This agreeable growth is ultimately compared with the belief in the Kingdom of Heaven.

Parable of the Mustard Seed

He told them another parable: "The kingdom of heaven is

like a mustard seed, which a man took and planted in his field.
32Though it is the smallest of all your seeds, yet when it grows,
it is the largest of garden plants and becomes a tree, so that the
birds of the air come and perch in its branches."

Matthew 13.31-32

4.3.19.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The basic idea conveyed in this text is that a tiny seed if properly planted and watered can grow up into a large fruitful tree upon which birds chant. This state of affairs is juxtaposed with the mission of the disciples who have to nurture and sustain the belief of the few in order to reach out to all people, and win them to God. Many of these new people will soon join in the act of propagating this belief to all hearers as beautifully (=effectively) as birds do when they warble on trees.

From the pragmatic point of view, the text appeals to common human knowledge to explain the complex mission of the Disciples. By comparing the fruits of their mission with that of planting mustard trees, the utility and significance of their actions are made clearer, and the promise of gaining many supporters who will maintain their mission after them provides great hope in fulfilling their sacred mission.

4.3.19.2 Rhetorical Level

This text begins by offering the Real member of rhetorical structure followed by the Hypothetical one. The propositional content of the Real member is the Disciple mission of propagating belief in God, the hypothetical member is the comparison between this Real member with that of growing mustard seed and the winning of new believers who join in the Disciples missionary act.

The Hypothetical member also subsumes an embedded structure of Argument (a tiny seed) plus Counter Argument (growing into a very large fruitful tree that shelter new supporters and missionaries).

4.3.19.3 Syntactic Level

The speech presents its comparisons with the syntactic structure of:

X is like Y.

Then the Argument/Counter Argument is give through the concessive structure of:

Though Y is (only) so and so, yet it becomes so and so.

Lexical Level

The text utilizes the effective lexical field of farming (gardening or growing fruitful trees) in the presentation of the its comparisons:

Mustard, seed, planted, field, seeds, it, grows, garden, plants, tree, birds, perch, branches

4.3.19.4 Tropes

The parable that gives the essence of this text is expressed via a simile, using the likening article 'like'.

The kingdom of heaven is like a mustard seed

Then this simile is built upon to get at the big, fruitful mustard tree on which birds chant:

yet when it grows, it is the largest of garden plants and becomes a tree, so that the birds of the air come and perch in its branches."

Within this simile comes the picture of the largest tree in the garden on which birds chirrup. All this is metaphorical talk in that the tree now represents the numberless of new believers won to the new faith, the garden represents Heaven, while the chirruping birds represent newly won missionaries who propagate the word of God.

4.3.20 English Text 20

In this text, the use of simile provides the pivotal means of persuasion, too. Again, the analogy used is based upon common

knowledge, the understanding of the good office of spreading belief in God is made clearer, and the results sought are made surer by emphasizing the necessity and nobility of such a heavenly act.

Parable of the Yeast

He told them still another parable: "The kingdom of heaven is like yeast that a woman took and mixed into a large amount of flour until it worked all through the dough."

Matthew 13.33-34

4.3.20.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The main idea of this text is that belief in God and, through it, the attainment of the ultimate happiness in Heaven, is the one desirable tenet that is begun by few men whose teachings eventually penetrate the minds of all people just like the small amount of yeast that can penetrate a huge amount of dough, turning it into desirable food that nourishes heavenly life.

Pragmatically, the text is especially effective in asserting that all great and useful ideas are propagated by the elite few, hence the Disciples should not let the fact that they are only few people among all mankind discourage them from pursuing their sacred mission. In addition, the nobility and necessity of their

good action is enhanced by comparing this action with that of the yeast in fermenting dough, and offering good food for all.

The interpretation of this text requires a lot of inference in that most of the intended meaning is left to be deduced by the addressees themselves. However, given the commonality of the human experience under discussion, the addressees can easily get at the intended meaning.

4.3.20.2 Rhetorical Level

Rhetorically, the text has a clear Hypothetical / Real structure in which the Real member is given as a Claim, while the Hypothetical stands as the Evidence.

4.3.20.3 Syntactic Level

The whole Speech is spelled out in one complex sentence that has the syntactic structure of:

X = Y that is so and so....

4.3.20.4 Lexical Level and Tropes

Similar to the previous one, this Text is built around the structure of the simile of the yeast, which is the pivotal lexical

item in the text as a whole. The spread of belief among all mankind, turning them into good believers is compared with the spread of yeast into a large amount of dough, making it 'ripe' to be baked and eaten as good food. This comparison is particularly effective given the following points:

The use of yeast for dough fermentation represents one of the commonest sources of human knowledge that is based upon practical daily experience, which is accessible to all.

A sheer small amount of yeast is enough to ferment a very large quantity of dough and turn it into nourishing, good food.

Without yeast, the dough remains undesirable for both baking and human consumption as some enjoyable food-stuff. In addition, without such yeast, the dough is left short of the chance to serve as good food.

4.3.21 English Text 21

Genesis 3

2 Now the serpent+ was the most cautious* of all the wild animals of the field that Jehovah God had made. So it said to the woman: “Did God really say that you must not eat from every tree of the garden?”+ 2 At this the woman said to the serpent: “We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden.+ 3 But God has said about the fruit of the tree that is in the middle of the garden:+ ‘You must not eat from it, no, you

must not touch it; otherwise you will die.” 4 At this the serpent said to the woman: “You certainly will not die.+ 5 For God knows that in the very day you eat from it, your eyes will be opened and you will be like God, knowing good and bad.”+

4.3.21.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The main idea of this text is that belief in God and, through it, the attainment of the ultimate happiness in Heaven,

Satan asks Eve if God really said she shouldn't eat from the tree and Eve repeats what God had commanded her. The serpent then lies to Eve, telling her that God was wrong, that the fruit wouldn't kill her but would open her eyes and she would become like God, knowing good and evil . In telling this lie Satan is telling a partial truth, which is the most powerful sort of lie. Adam and Eve's eyes were opened, but in a way that brought death and destruction into the world.

This is one of the main ways Satan is a liar and deceiver—he frames questions based on false premises. He did this to Eve, delegitimizing God's commands, and asking her why she would not desire to have knowledge as well as benefit from eating the juicy fruit, since she had been granted the power to choose for herself . Satan framed his question to Eve with the false premise

that what God had defined as death (Genesis 2:17) would actually lead to life (Genesis 3:4-5). Satan used the same basic approach in tempting Jesus (Matthew 4:1-11).

is the one desirable tenet that is begun by few men whose teachings eventually penetrate the minds of all people just like the small amount of yeast that can penetrate a huge amount of dough, turning it into desirable food that nourishes heavenly life.

Pragmatically, the text is especially effective in asserting that all great and useful ideas are propagated by the elite few, hence Eve should not let the fact that God ordered should not be neglected. In addition, Adam have to rejected as well.

The interpretation of this text requires a lot of inference in that most of the intended meaning is left to be deduced by the addressees themselves. However, given the commonality of the human experience under discussion, the addressees can easily get at the intended meaning.

4.3.21.2 Rhetorical Level

Rhetorically, the text has a clear Hypothetical / Real structure in which the Real member is given as a Claim, while the Hypothetical stands as the Evidence.

4.3.21.3 Syntactic Level

The whole Speech is spelled out in one complex sentence that has the syntactic structure of:

X = Y that is so and so....

4.3.21.4 Lexical Level and Tropes

Similar to the previous one, this Text is built around the structure of the simile of the yeast, which is the pivotal lexical item in the text as a whole. The spread of belief among all mankind, turning them into bad believers is compared with the spread with the Satan and eaten from the tree. This comparison is particularly effective given the following points:

Satan is called a serpent in the New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures (Revelation 12:9, 20:2) referring back to his basic nature of being a deceiver and author of destruction. The serpent here appears to be Satan taking the form of a creature, and choosing the craftiest of all the creatures through whom to do his work. The fact that Eve did not appear to be surprised or suspicious that the creature spoke to her presents many possibilities, one of which is that lacking in experience and being innocent Adam and Eve did not know suspicion. The fact that God curses the serpent to crawl on his belly would indicate

that the serpent likely did not have the appearance of a snake at this time.

4.3.22 English Text 22

Exodus 32

Meanwhile, the people saw that Moses was taking a long time coming down from the mountain.+ So the people gathered around Aaron and said to him: “Get up, make for us a god who will go ahead of us,+ because we do not know what has happened to this Moses, the man who led us up out of the land of Egypt.” 2 At this Aaron said to them: “Take the gold earrings from the ears of your wives, your sons, and your daughters and bring them to me.” 3 So all the people began taking off the gold earrings that were in their ears and bringing them to Aaron. 4 Then he took the gold from them, and he formed it with an engraving tool and made it into a statue* of a calf.+ They began to say: “This is your God, O Israel, who led you up out of the land of Egypt.”

5 When Aaron saw this, he built an altar before it. Then Aaron called out: “There is a festival to Jehovah tomorrow.” 6 So they got up early on the next day and began offering up burnt offerings and presenting communion sacrifices. After that the people sat down to eat and drink. Then they got up to have a

good time.+

7 Jehovah now said to Moses: “Go, descend, because your people, whom you led up out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves.+ 8 They have quickly deviated from the way I commanded them to go.+ They have made for themselves a statue* of a calf, and they keep bowing down to it and sacrificing to it and saying, ‘This is your God, O Israel, who led you up out of the land of Egypt.’

4.3.22.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

What’s clear here is that the Israelites think Moses was the one who delivered them from Egypt. They think he is their god and their god has gone missing or has possibly died. Oh, Israel. Their big problem is, had they recognized that this thing wasn’t about Moses but about God, perhaps they would’ve had a bit more staying power. They may have been willing to wait and wait a bit longer knowing that God never forgets us. The real lesson is, know your God. Know that God is your source, He’s the one moving things around for you and aligning them in your favour. He’s the one planning your breakout, parting your Red Sea and drowning your Pharaoh. When you forget that, it’s easy to walk by sight and not by faith. When you think it’s your boss that gives the promotion, the prospective employer that selects

your resume, the counsellor that fixes your marriage or the doctor that heals you, it's quite easy to lose faith in the possibility of victory – simply because man is unpredictable. But it's never man. Friends, I implore you, know your God. The bible says, "...the people who know their God shall be strong, and carry out great exploits" (Dan 11:32). You know what exploits are? A "bold or daring feat". For your purposes, it's your victory – your supernaturally repaired marriage, healed body, job promotion etc. So, eyes on God, your source and deliverer!

4.3.22.2 Rhetorical Level

The text presents a series of ten parallel claim/evidence structures throughout the whole argumentation as shown in Table (1) hereunder:

Table (1) Rhetorical Patterns in ET3

Claim

Evidence

Blessed are the poor in spirit

Blessed are those who mourn

Blessed are the meek

Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness

Blessed are the merciful

Blessed are the pure in heart

Blessed are the peacemakers

Blessed are those who are persecuted because of
righteousness

Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you and
falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me

Rejoice and be glad

1. the people who know their God shall be strong, and
carry out great exploits”
2. You know what exploits are? A “bold or daring
feat”.
3. They think he is their god and their god has gone
missing or has possibly died
4. for they will be comforted
5. for they will inherit the earth
6. for they will be filled
7. for they will be shown mercy
8. for they will see God

4.3.22.3 Syntactic Level

The uniform rhetorical pattern above is matched with a
syntactically matching structure of the following form:

(a) Blessed are NP (X), (b) for NP1 VP NP2 (X)

Where the adjective 'blessed' in (a) is always fronted as the

sentence initial element for emphasis. In two cases NP2 in (b) [theirs] is also fronted for the same purpose. The pattern above is always realized in compound sentences with the coordinator 'for'.

4.3.22.4 Lexical Level

The pairing of parallel rhetorical and syntactic structures is matched by the pairing of antonymic lexical items where the binary elements:

The use of immediate time, the present simple tense serves the purpose of persuasion because it denotes eternal truths (facts). So is the mentioning of all the elements of the sentence without ellipses which enhances the denotative specificity of the text.

4.322.5 Tropes

The following expressions reveal metaphorical uses whose intended meaning is paraphrased hereunder:

hunger and thirst for righteousness = ardent justice-seekers

pure in heart = honest

see God = become true believers

sons of God = Saints (Jesus Disciples)

4.3.23 English Text 23

25 Moses saw that the people were unrestrained, for Aaron had let them go unrestrained, so that they were a disgrace before their opposers. 26 Then Moses took his position in the gate of the camp and said: “Who is on Jehovah’s side? Come to me!”+ And all the Levites gathered around him. 27 He now said to them: “This is what Jehovah the God of Israel has said, ‘Each of you must fasten on his sword and pass through all the camp from gate to gate, killing his brother, his neighbor, and his close companion.’”+ 28 The Levites did what Moses said. So about 3,000 men were killed on that day. 29 Then Moses said: “Set yourselves apart* for Jehovah today, for each of you has gone against his own son and his own brother;+ today he will give you a blessing.”+

30 On the very next day, Moses said to the people: “You committed a very great sin, and now I will go up to Jehovah to see if I can make amends for your sin.”+ 31 So Moses returned to Jehovah and said: “What a great sin this people has committed! They made themselves a god of gold!+ 32 But now if you are willing, pardon their sin;+ if not, please wipe me out from your book that you have written.”+ 33 However, Jehovah said to Moses: “Whoever has sinned against me, I will wipe him out of my book. 34 Go now, lead the people to the place about which I have spoken to you. Look! My angel will go ahead of

you,+ and on the day when I make an accounting, I will bring punishment on them for their sin.” 35 Then Jehovah began plaguing the people because they had made the calf, the one that Aaron had made.

5. Persuasion the Prophetic Traditions

5.1 Introduction

This chapter analyses the persuasive strategies in the Arabic traditions of the Prophet Muhammed as reposted in al Bukhary. The method of analysis is the same used in the previous chapters. Source text translations are provided by the researcher herself using the comments found in the same above-mentioned source-book. In case a particular linguistic level is not utilized, then this level will not be commented on.

5.2 Arabic Text

The following Arabic text is a monological Prophetic tradition consisting of a single complex (conditional) sentence. The Prophet Muhammed said it in reply to a question addressed to him by a number of his companion Muslims (الصحابية). The

text deploys multiple lexical, structural, semantic, rhetorical, and pragmatic persuasive devices as discussed hereunder.

قال النبي محمد (خياركم في الجاهلية خياركم في الاسلام اذا فقهوا)

(Al-Bukhary:3:143)

5.2.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this text is that those of you who were known to be good to the community in the pre-Islamic Era are the same good people who are among you, now that they have entered the new religion of Islam under the condition that they become informed of the rules of the new religion and abide by them. The quality of being good is dear to all Muslims since it means that they have attained the ultimate goal of their religion by winning this life and the life hereafter. Therefore, the implicit meaning here is that those who were good people both in the pre-Islamic epochs and who know the teaching of the religion will be rewarded eternal happiness in the life hereafter. The factor of eventual reward of the good in the next world is particularly effective here.

Moreover, the text makes use of enantiosis by juxtaposing two opposite concepts {(في الجاهلية) & (في الاسلام)} in order to mutually enhance each other and lend force to the expression as a whole.

Pragmatically, the tradition is clear, relevant, and precise. It also has the implicature of promising reward to the good believers by recognizing their good deeds before and after the advent of Islam.

5.2.2 Rhetorical Level

At this level, the text makes use of two rhetorical relations, the first is that of matching detail between (خياركم في الجاهلية) and (خياركم في الاسلام); the second is that of consequence/condition. The consequence element is that of (خياركم في الجاهلية خياركم في (الاسلام), while the conditional element is (اذا فقهوا). Given that the text as a whole is made up of just one sentence, then such a concentration of multiple inter-sentential rhetorical relations render it remarkably logical and convincing.

5.2.3 Syntactic Level

Parallel with the matching detail there runs a structural juxtaposition of two nominal phrases both having the structure of NP Pro Pro PP as shown hereunder:

خيارك-----م في الجاهلية

PP Pro Pro NP

خيارك-----م في الاسلام

PP Pro Pro NP

Put together, the two nominal phrases above make up a nominal sentence. Nominal sentences are particularly effective here in that they serve the purpose of expressing factual states. In addition, the two phrases are bound together in an equative sentential relationship of the type X=Z:

خياركم في الجاهلية = خياركم في الاسلام

Y = X

Another notable syntactic structure here is that the sentence-final conditional subordinate clause cannot undergo transition or fronting without spoiling the whole meaning:

* اذا فقهوا خياركم في الجاهلية خياركم في الاسلام

The reason why such is the case is that the fronting of the conditional clause (اذا فقهوا) changes its semantic scope from that of being informed in the teachings of Islam to that of being informed in the teachings of pre-Islam, which is something unacceptable since the latter teaching is rejected as a heathen one and deserves punishment, not reward. Such fixed structure

can easily become both memorable and non-substitutable in the addressees', minds.

5.2.4 Lexical Level

This text shows the following lexical persuasive devices:

1. the use of antonyms (الجاهلية) and (الاسلام);
2. lexical repetition of (خياركم)

5.3 Arabic Text 2

The following interactive text shows the importance of the fundamental principles of forgiveness and grace in the propagation of Islam. It also shows how Muslims regard other Muslims as their brethren in faith whose dignity and property must be respected. Multiple persuasive means are used as discussed hereunder.

عن عروة إن المسورة بن مخزومة رضي الله عنهما ومروان اخبراه ان النبي حين جاءه وفد هوزان قام في الناس فاثنى على الله بما هو اهله ثم قال: اما بعد فان اخوانكم جاءونا تائبين، واني رائيت ان ارد اليهم سبيهم، فمن احب منكم ان يطيب ذلك فليفعل، ومن احب ان يكون على حظه، حتى نعطيه اياه من اول ما يفيء الله علينا. فقال الناس: طيبنا لك

(AL-Bukhary,2:90)

5.3.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this interactive speech event is that the Prophet informs his followers that the tribe of Hawaazin has come to him showing repentance after their defeat in war. They have also become Muslim brothers. Accordingly, the Prophet has come to the decision that their females prisoners of war should be returned to them. Since these prisoners have been distributed among the Muslims, the Prophet gives their new owners the choice of either voluntarily relinquishing them to their tribe without further compensation, or surrendering them but keeping their lawful right for recompense. For those who prefer the last choice, the Prophet promises full recompense from future booty.

In reply to The Prophet's plea, all the Muslim-owners of female-slaves tell the Prophet that they agree to relinquish their legal share to their new Muslim brothers without any future compensation.

Three main persuasive strategies are used in this Prophetic Tradition. The first is represented by telling the Muslims concrete facts: the tribe of Hawaazin has come to the Prophet (from Ta'if to Medina) to declare their repentance and conversion to Islam. In doing so, they have become brothers-in-Islam. The fact that this piece of information is heard from the Prophet himself, as an authority, attests to its validity and credibility.

The second strategy used is that of appealing to the generosity and discretion of Muslim as two basic principles of their religion. As a gesture of good-will, The Prophet has come to the decision that the female prisoners of Hawaazin should be returned to their tribe now that they have become Muslim-brothers. Of particular interest is the pleasantness of the two verbs used to describe the act of ‘donning’ (أحب) and (يطيب) and the verb of ‘deciding’ (رأيت) as will be discussed in 3.4 below.

The third means is that of offering multiple options, including full future compensation to the effect that the Prophet’s decision is not meant to impoverish anyone, nor encumber on the lawfully acquired rights of Muslims. In addition, the act of freeing prisoners of war is made as voluntary good-will gesture of forgiveness and grace.

Pragmatically, the Tradition offers the background information, the fact that the Tribe of Hawaazin has embraced Islam and its tribesmen have become Muslim brothers. The implicature here is now that they have become Muslim brothers, their female prisoners of war have also become Muslim sisters and require to be treated as free believers. This *status quo* renders The Prophet’s decision to free their prisoners of war a desirable and discreet act of good faith that deserves to be observed and imitated.

On the other hand, the two options of either choosing to voluntarily free the prisoners or waiting for imminent future

material compensation, (the latter being quite a legitimate and feasible one) convey the implicature that material gains are set opposite moral ones. In such a case, true Muslims always opt for moral gains, and that is in fact the whole essence of true belief and commitment to high religious ideals and principles.

5.3.2 Rhetorical Level

This Prophetic Tradition shows an obvious cause/consequence/alternative/evaluation rhetorical structure where the cause is presented by a totally new situation (Hawazin's repentance and conversion to Islam). The consequence comes as a direct effect of such a cause and that is The Prophet's decision to free the female prisoners of Hawazin who have become Muslim brothers. The alternatives offered are clearly stated. Then each option has also its evaluative result: implicit moral compensation or an explicit material one pending on future victories aided by Allah's will.

5.3.3 Syntactic Level

This Prophet tradition begins with the topic-introduction phrase (أما بعد) which implies "putting what is said before behind the present issue that I want to tell you is...". The two options have parallel syntactic structures beginning with (فمن احب...أن)

those (of you) who liked. This is followed by an infinitival sentence starting with the subjunctival article (أن):

فمن أحب منكم أن يطيب ذلك فليفعل، ومن أحب أن يكون على حظه، حتى نعطيهِ
إياه من أول ما يفِيء الله علينا.

5.3.4 Lexical Level

Throughout this Prophet Tradition, the use of certain verbs rather than others helps to induce the hearers to positively respond to The Prophet. Among these verbs are: (رأيت) [Lit., I have seen= I have decided], (أحب) [likes, loves], (يطيب) [gracefully done], and (يفيء) [supply shed from sunlight = offer divine providence]. The effect of these euphemistic verbs becomes obvious once they are substituted with their direct equivalents:

رأيت

I have seen	X	I have decreed
أحب	X	أراد
Likes, loves	X	wants, prefers
يطيب	X	يتنازل عن
Gracefully	X	Give up, relinquish
يفيء	X	يعطي
Offer divine providence	X	give

5.4 Arabic Text 3

The next Prophetic Tradition tackles the vice of human greed. The main strategy used in describing this vice is that of tropes which help to offer a vivid description which is otherwise less obvious and consequently less persuasive.

عن ابن عباس قال : سمعت رسول الله (ص) يقول : لو ان لابن ادم مثل واد
مالا لاحب ان له اليه مثله، ولا يملا عين ابن ادم الا التراب، ويتوب الله على من
تاب.

(AL-Bukhary:4:119)

5.4.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The ideas expressed in AT3 are: i) human beings are greedy creatures to the effect that the more they get the more they desire. If one person is given a valley of money, then he would want another valley over and above the first one, ii) the only thing that can fill in this greed is death, however, iii) those who repent and quit this vice are granted forgiveness by Allah.

Pragmatically, all Grice's maxims are attained by means of the picturesque style used to describe the vice of greed. The use of the conditional particle (لو) in this context has its pragmatic implications in that it denotes thought of the counter factuality

of the situation, the impossibility of satisfying greed by any means. The implicature is that if such a desire is impossible to satisfy, then it is better for believers to quit it given that it is an evil desire that can never be totally satisfied. The metaphorical mentioning of (العين) the ‘eye’ to denote greed is also to the point. Here, greed is likened to the eye that is never satisfied with seeing and aspiring to grasp whatever desirable things that are found on the face of earth. The eye is the one organ that wants to ‘envelope’ whatever can be seen; it is never tired of seeing and re-seeing all the desirable things that could be seen. This metaphor is pragmatically important in conveying to the addressees the ultimate idea of never gaining total dissatisfaction of any desire. The third pragmatically persuasive idea is that of death which is metaphorically related to the eye. The insatiable eye can only be stopped from desiring more through death. After that, its orbit is filled with the lowest of elements: dust. In this case it could not aspire to see any more. The implicature here is that however rich a man becomes, the only material thing that he can be in possession of after death and burial is mere dust which will eventually ‘fill his eye’.

5.4.2 Rhetorical Level

This text has complex rhetorical structure of:
Condition/Consequence/Claim/Evidence/Cause/Consequence

where the Condition of having a valley full of money is related to the Consequence of desiring another such valley because of insatiable greed. This is followed by that Claim element that human greed is never satisfied and its Evidence: is till one is dead. The structure is closed with the Consequence of Allah's forgiveness for the Cause of one's true repentance.

Another possible way of analyzing the rhetorical structure of this text is to see it as an example of the Problem/Solution/Evaluation pattern, where the insatiable greed is the Problem, death is the Solution, and Allah's forgiveness through true repentance is the Evaluation.

5.4.3 Syntactic Level

The whole text has three sentences. It begins with a conditional sentence that serves the purpose of showing the impossibility of satisfying greed through the acquisition of earthly means. Then the only possible material way of satisfying greed is given by the second restrictive declarative sentence of the structure:

لا (nothing)	+	VP	+	NP	+	لا (but)	+	NP
nothing		fills		a human eye		but		dust

This verbal sentence is followed by the third closing verbal sentence where Allah's forgiveness is foregrounded:

VP +NP +PP(Prep +*Wb*-clause (who+VP))

Allah forgives who repents.

5.4.4 Tropes

Tropes play a significant role in this text in that they are used to explicate two fundamentally important concepts: man's greed and man's cure from greed. The first concept is described through the metaphor of having a valley full of money or riches, the second is that man's greed can only be satisfied through death which is expressed via the dust that fills in the emptiness (insatiability) in man's eyes (greed) when one dies and is buried.

5.4.5 Sound Effects

The text of AT3 dominated by two sound effects. Its first part shows eleven successive repetitions of (ل) sound:

ل و ل ابن مثل مال أ ل أحب ل ه إل يه مثل ه ، ول ا يم ل أ إلل ا

The second part has three words having the rhyme of (ب) sound in close connection with (ت) sound:

التراب / يتوب / تاب

5.5 Arabic Text 4

Two strategies are used in the following text: i) the statement of the agreeable state of fair conduct between Muslim brothers, and ii) the appeal to Godly assistance.

عن عبد الله بن عمر رضي الله عنهما ان رسول الله (ص) قال : المسلم اخو المسلم لا يظلمه ولا يسلمه، ومن كان في حاجة اخيه كان الله في حاجته.

(AL-Bukhary:4:202)

5.5.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

In this Text, The Prophet declares that all Muslims are brothers and that no Muslim should treat his brother unfairly nor should he let him down. In addition, if one Muslim is in need of his brother's help, then this need is that of Allah.

5.5.2 Rhetorical Level

At this level, the Tradition is governed by the Cause/Effect pattern. The first cause is Muslim brotherhood, and the second is Allah's becoming in need of a human being. The first effect is that a Muslim should never treat his Muslim brothers unfairly or let them down, while the second Effect is satisfying the needs of other Muslim brothers.

An alternative analysis is to see the text as a representative of the Claim/Evidence pattern where Muslim brotherhood and

the need of brotherly support are Claims matched with the Evidence of fair treatment and non-betrayal, plus God's need of brotherly support.

5.5.3 Syntactic Level

The first sentence of this tradition spells out a general rule; therefore, a nominal clause is used.

المسلم اخو المسلم

When the tradition moves from the general to the specific, to verbal clauses are presented in parallel structures with the negative particle. (لا)

لا يظلمه

لا يسلمه

Ngnv(MV+NP+NP)

Then the argument moves to a general fact again, using a conditional sentence, with partially parallel syntactic structures, for the sake of the symmetrical variation

كان في حاجة اخيه

كان الله في حاجته

Mv pp Np Np (pron)

Mv Np pp Np (pron)

5.5.4 Tropes

The main figure of speech used in this text is the personification of Allah the Almighty in the picture of a person in need of another person's support. This is quite an effective image since it shows that when a Muslim does his duty in satisfying the needs of his brothers, he is in fact doing favour to Allah the Almighty, which is the greatest thing one can imagine himself to be achieving.

5.6 Arabic Text 5

In this text the prohibition of anger as is especially tied with passing verdicts to contesting claimants. This prohibition of an abhorred conduct supplies the main persuasive strategy.

عن عبد الرحمن بن ابي بكر قال: سمعت النبي يقول : لا يقضين حكم بين اثنين وهو غضبان.

(AL-Bukhary:4:236)

5.6.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this text is that no judge should pass his verdict in a lawsuit if he were in a state of anger.

5.6.2 Rhetorical Level

The text shows straightforward rhetorical structure of Cause (the anger of a judge)/Effect (passing no judgment).

5.7 Arabic Text 6

Again, this text shows two persuasive strategies: i) the recommendation of generally accepted positive social attitudes, and ii) the use of poetic devices, through semantic, syntactic and phonological parallelisms

عن ابن بريدة قال: سمعت ابي قال: بعث النبي ابي ومعاذ ابن جبل الى اليمن فقال:
يسرا ولا تعسرا وبشرا ولا تنفرا وتطاوعا.

(AL-Bukhary:4:240)

5.7.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

In this text, the Prophet tells the two emissaries whom he is sending to Yemen to do three things. Firstly, they are required to opt for simple and easy decisions and solutions rather than difficult ones. Second they are required to propagate rewards rather than hateful attitudes and options. Thirdly, they need to agree upon a united opinion between themselves.

5.7.2 Rhetorical Level

This Tradition is organized via the rhetorical pattern of Assertion/Prohibition/Assertion/Prohibition/Assertion. The assertion elements are simplifying teachings and decisions, preaching reward, and getting at unified attitude through mutual agreement.

5.7.3 Syntactic Level

The text has five parallel verbal sentences of the structure VP NP. Each separate sentence conveys a brief command of single action or attitude:

يسرا

ولا تعسرا

وبشرا

ولا تنفرا

وتطاوعا

5.7.4 Lexical Level

Parallelisms in syntactic structures are conditioned with the pairing of antonyms related to the recommended prohibited deeds:

يسراً/لا تعسر

بشراً/لا تنفر

The last, but most important commandment is given without its antonym as a culmination of the whole text.

5.7.5 Sound Effects

Four out of five sentences that comprise this Tradition rhyme together with the sound (را) [ra:]. In addition, the first, third, and fourth sentences have three syllables each, while the second and the fifth one have four syllables each. These multiple poetic devices render the text a particularly memorable one.

5.8 Arabic Text 7

In this text, the Prophet appeals to the sense of justice among all claimants and warns those who use hypocrisy to gain unlawful rights of Hell.

عن ام سلمة زوج النبي عن رسول الله (ص) انه سمع خصومة بباب حجرته فخرج اليهم فقال: ان ما انا بشر، وانه ياتيني الخصم فلعل بعضكم ان يكون ابلغ من بعض

فاحسب انه صادق فاقضي له بذلك، فمن قضيت له بحق مسلم فانما هي قطعة من النار، فليأخذها او ليتركها.

(AL-Bukhary:4:241)

5.8.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this text the Prophet hears two contesting parties arguing at the door of his room, so he comes out and says that he is only a human being who has been sought as judge between them. So it might be the case that one party pleads his cause more eloquently and persuasively than his adversary and such eloquence would make the Prophet decide on his behalf. So, if The Prophet's decision gives one party a certain Muslim's right, then this right is a piece of hell which he is free to take or leave. The implicative is that since the Prophet himself may give the right judgment subsequent judges may also make such judgments thus all who may gain such unrighteous judgments are also warred.

5.8.2 Rhetorical Level

The whole of Text 7 is governed by the recursive Cause/Effect rhetorical pattern. The Cause elements are (i) the Prophet being only a human being, (ii) one claimant being more eloquent in presenting his cause than the other, (iii) the Prophet

deciding on the rights of a Muslim man. The Effect elements are (i) the Prophet may make a misjudgment, (ii) the Prophet may judge in favour of the more eloquent claimant (iii) the given right is piece of Hell.

It is worth mentioning here that the Tradition ends with the alternative elements of the claimant taking the rights that are his and leaving what is not lawfully his, otherwise he would be thrown into Hell. The last effect is an implied one for the second alternative which also serves as a cause element.

5.8.3 Tropes

The main argument in this Tradition-that no Muslim should contrive to usurp the rights of other Muslims through eloquence and unsubstantiated claims- is given via the metaphor of this right that is given via court decision is a piece of Hell. This means that if one unlawfully gets at this piece, then he will be sent to Hell, otherwise not.

5.9 Arabic Text 8

The main persuasive strategy in this text is brevity and all-inclusiveness. It preaches the love of life by providing for a good cause to making life meaningful.

عن سعد ابن عبيد ان رسول الله (ص) قال : لا يتمنى احدكم الموت اما محسنا فلعله يزداد واما مسيئا فلعله يستعذب.

(AL-Bukhary:4:250)

5.9.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

In this Tradition, the Prophet warns the Muslims that no one of them should wish to die, for if he has been a good person, then his virtues might increase through life, or if he has been a bad person, he could repent in the rest of his life.

5.9.2 Rhetorical Level

This text is governed by the rhetorical pattern of Evaluation/Cause/Effect/Cause/Effect pattern. The Evaluation element is that no person should wish to die or commit suicide. The Cause/Effect elements are of making more good deeds or stopping bad deeds and repenting the past by bad ones.

5.9.3 Syntactic level

The all –inclusive two state of any human being either (good or bad). Are juxtaposed with the two possibilities

I making more good things for the first case

II or repenting for the second case.

These two pairs are rendered in parallel clauses

اما محسناً فلعله يزداد
واما مسيئاً فلعله يستعتب

In the example above, two antithetical lexical pairs are patterned

محسناً/مسيئاً
يزداد/يستعتب

5.10 Arabic Text 9

Syllogism provides an admirable persuasive means in the following interactive text. The development of the line of argument is given in a step-by-step progression.

عن ابي هريرة رضي الله عنه ان اعرابيا اتى رسول الله (ص) فقال: ان امراتي ولدت غلاما اسود واني انكرته فقال له رسول الله (ص): هل لك من ابل؟ قال: نعم فقال فما الوانها؟ قال: حمر قال: هل فيها من اورك؟ قال: ان فيها لورقا. قال: فاني ترى ذلك جاءها؟ قال: يا رسول الله عرق نزعها؛ قال ولعل هذا عرق نزعها، ولم يرخص له في الانتفاء منه.

(AL-Bukhary:4:264)

5.10.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this question-and-answer dialogue between the Prophet and a certain white-skinned Arab tribesman is that the latter tells the Prophet that his wife has given birth to a black-skinned baby-boy and that he has disowned it. The Prophet asks him if he owns camels and the Arab says he does. Then the Prophet asks him if any of his camels are brown. The Arab tribesman answers that indeed many of them have given birth to white camels. The Prophet asks him how it comes that the brown camels give birth to white ones. The Arab answers that this could be a root that has sprung to it. So, the Prophet tells him that his son's black skin can also be a root that has sprung from his parents to it. Accordingly, the Prophet forbids the Arab from disowning his son.

Pragmatically, the Prophet makes use of syllogism to persuade The Arab tribesman of his fatherhood to the newborn child. He reasons with him along the same line of argument that he himself provides in order to refute the latter's wrong argument. Initially, the Arab tribesman's argument has the following structure:

He is a white-skinned person/ his newborn baby is black-skinned/ therefore this baby is not own and must be disowned. In formal terms, the argument has the following logical structure: A is not B, C is B, then C is not A's.

As the Prophet makes the Arab tribesman admit the fact that his brown camels have indeed given birth to white ones, the Prophet uses this empirical observation to provide his persuasive counterargument very succinctly in one short sentence:

ولعل هذا عرق نزعہ

And so it is possible that this (your son's black skin) is also a root that has sprung to it (from his partents).

Putting together the argument developed in a step-by-step question-and-answer procedure, the following syllogism emerges about the characteristics of brown camels and their newborn white camels: A has B, A may have C, D has C, then D can be A's. Applying this structure to the problem under discussion gives the following syllogism:

The Arab tribesman has a white-skin, the white tribesman may give birth to a black-skinned baby, the newborn baby has a black skin, then this baby is the tribesman's legitimate child.

5.10.2 Rhetorical Level

This Tradition is governed by the Cause/Effect rhetorical structure that is paralleled with matching detail. The Cause is that the man's new born child with black-skin is truly his father's son; the Effect is that the father should not disown him.

The matching detail is: given the fact that brown camels could give birth to white ones, then white-skinned human beings could legitimately give birth to black-skinned babies.

Another way of rhetorically analyzing this text is to consider it to be of a Problem/Solution structure. The Problem is that of the birth of a black-skinned baby to a white-skinned Arab tribesman and the latter's disowning of his child, the Solution is that of the emergence of a latent root in the hereditary features of the parents, and the annulment of paternal disowning on such grounds.

5.10.3 Tropes

In this text, the idea of a latent hereditary feature passing from the parents to the children is likened to the springing of a different root in plotted area. In fact this metaphor provides the key to the solution of the whole issue under discussion.

5.11 Arabic Text 10

عن ابي سعيد الخدري عن النبي قال: لتتبعن سنن من كان قبلكم شبرا شبرا وذراعا بذراع حتى لو دخلوا جحر ضب تبعتموهم، قلنا يا رسول الله (ص) اليهود والنصارى؟ قال: فمن؟.

(AL-Bukhary:4:264)

5.11.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

In this Tradition, The Prophet orders the Muslims to follow the laws of their predecessors a hand pan by a hand pan, and a cubit by a cubit and to follow them even if they enter a lizard hole. Then the Muslims ask him if he means by their predecessors the Jews and Christians, and The Prophet answers that he means none but them.

5.11.2 Rhetorical Level

At this level, the text is governed by the rhetorical structure of Assertion/Detail. The Assertion element is that of the Muslims following the Laws of Moses and Jesus. The detail is provided through the physical dimensions of tracking their steps a hand pan by a hand pan, a cubit by a cubit, even if their

laws require Muslims to enter holes as small as those of lizards, i.e., what is seemingly impossible.

5.11.3 Tropes

In this text, the moral acts of strictly observing the laws of Moses and Jesus are likened to those of following the tracks of the predecessors in physical terms: a hand pan by a hand pan, a cubit by a cubit. The stipulation that such laws should be followed even when they seem to be harsh and hard to observe is represented via the metaphor of obligatorily entering lizard holes.

5.12 Arabic Text 11

In this monological text, progression from the general to the specific provides the main persuasive strategy.

عن ابي هريرة رضي الله عنه قال: قال النبي: يقول الله تعالى: انا عند ظن عبدي بي وانا معه اذا ذكرني، فإن ذكرني في نفسه ذكرته في نفسي، وان ذكرني في ملأ ذكرته في ملأ خير منه، وإن تقرب الي بشير تقربت اليه ذراعا، وان تقرب الي ذراعا تقربت اليه باعا، وان اتاني يمشي اتيته هرولة.

(AL-Bukhary:4:278)

5.12.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

I satisfy what my worshipper believes in me and I am with him when he remembers me. So if he recollects me then I also recollect him, and if he mentions me in front of a certain audience then I will also mention him in front of a better audience, and if he draws one hand pan nearer to me then I will draw one cubit nearer, and if he draws one cubit closer then I would draw two stretched arms closer, and if he comes walking to me then I will go running to him.

5.12.2 Rhetorical Level

Again, this text is governed by the Claim/Evidence patterns. The claim elements are those of Allah being with His worshippers whenever they remember Him, mention Him or draw closer to Him. The Evidence is that of Allah's remembering or drawing closer to His worshippers each time they do so and even to greater extents than they do.

5.12.3 Lexical Level

Lexical parallelism combine with syntactic once through out the whole text. The clause (ذکرني) is repeated three times, while the clause (ذکرته) is repeated twice. The same parallelism is repeated with the clause(تقرب) and (تقربت).

5.12.4 Tropes

The main figure of speech used in this text is that of metonymy. The act of morally and spiritually drawing closer to Allah is meticulously described along metonymic physical dimensions: hand pans, cubits, two arms stretch, or through physical movement: walking and running.

5.13 Arabic Text 12

عن ابي هريرة رضي الله عنه ان رسول الله (ص) قال: مثل المؤمن كمثل خامة الزرع يقيء ورقه من حيث انتها الريح تكفئها، فاذا سكنت اعتدلت وكذلك المؤمن يكفأ بالبلاء. ومثل الكافر كمثل الارزة صماء معتدلة حتى يقصمها الله اذا شاء.

(AL-Bukhary:4:291)

5.13.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this Tradition is likening the true Muslim believers to new plants that bend with the wind that blows to put them down. Once the wind stops, the plant stands upright. That is why the true believers are forborne by injury. As for the non-believers, they are like cedar trees that always stand hard till Allah brings it down if He wills.

5.13.2 Rhetorical Level

The pattern of Claim/Evidence spans the whole of this text. Two claims are put forward: i) true Muslims are able to cope with injury and hard times, whereas ii) non-believers are unable to do so. Two parallel evidences are also supplied: i) the ability of useful crop plants to cope with strong wind, and ii) the inability of fruitless cedar trees to cope with such wind if Allah wishes them to fall down.

5.13.3 Tropes

Two images are used in this text. The first image is that of likening true believers to a newly grown plant that promises good crops and can cope with the blowing of wild winds by temporarily bending to it, only to stand up again once the blowing stops. In this case, by being adaptable to the environment, the plant preserves itself and does not fall down. Like this wind, true believers are tested by hard times and injury.

Unlike crop-plants, non-believers are likened to a cedar tree which is incapable of coping with the wild winds by leaning itself, so it has to fall down at any time, by Allah's will.

5.14 Arabic Text 13

In this text, the use of simile presents the main persuasive means. The image used is a structural one that has proved to be of universal import in the description of mutual relatedness.

عن ابي هريرة رضي الله عنه ان رسول الله (ص) قال : ان مثلي ومثل الانبياء من قبلي كمثل رجل بنى بيتا فاحسنه واجمله الا موضع لبنة من زاوية فجعل الناس يطوفون به ويعجبون له ويقولون: هلا وضعت هذه اللبنة قال: فانا اللبنة وانا خاتم النبيين.

(AL-Bukhary:2:270)

5.14.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

In this Tradition, the Prophet likens his standing and that of the Prophets before him to a person who has built a house and made it perfect and beautiful but for one brick in a corner. So when people go around this house, they admire its structure, but demand that the position of that brick should be filled in. So, I am that brick and I am the last of the prophets.

5.14.2 Rhetorical Level

At this level, the Tradition is structured as a Claim Evidence logical argument. The Claim is that the previous

Prophets have erected a perfect body of laws that resembles a splendid building that is in need of just one brick to be complete. The Evidence is that the teachings of Islam fill in this building position.

5.14.3 Tropes

The whole Tradition is presented as a conceit, or an extended metaphor. The laws of all the Prophets before Muhammed are likened to a perfectly structured building that pleases its beholders in all aspects, except for the position of one brick which is left as a gap. The teachings of Muhammad (Islam) are likened to the one brick that fills in this gape in order to render the building a completely perfect stature.

5.15 Arabic Text 14

Brevity is the main persuasive strategy used in AT14. Another strategy is the equation between true belief and the avoidance of harming other people.

عن ابي بردة ابي موسى رضي الله عنه قال: قالوا يا رسول الله (ص) اي الاسلام افضل قال : من سلم المسلمون من لسانه ويده.

(AL-Bukhary:1:11)

5.15.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this Tradition is that the Muslims ask The Prophet which Muslim is the best. The Prophet replies that it is the Muslim who spares his fellow-Muslims from the injuries of his tongue and hand.

As usual, the text observes all Grice's maxims in being clear, obvious, and to the point.

5.15.2 Rhetorical Level

This text shows a simple Basis/Assessment rhetorical organization in that a good Muslim (Assessment) is the one who spares his fellow Muslims from any injuries that are caused by his tongue or hands (Bases).

5.15.3 Tropes

In this text, metonymy is apparent by using the tongue to allude to verbal abuse and the hand to allude to inflicting physical injuries to others.

5.16 Arabic Text 15

This interactive text specifies to all Muslims the most fundamental deeds that are tokens of true belief: generosity and the maintenance of good-will.

عن عبد الله بن عمر رضي الله عنهما ان رجلا سأل النبي اي الاسلام خير قال: تطعم
الطعام وتقرأ السلام على من عرفت ومن لم تعرفه.

(AL-Bukhary:1:11)

5.16.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

In this Tradition a person asks The Prophet what Muslim trite is good. The Prophet answers that it is offering food and greeting those whom he is acquainted or not acquainted with.

The text is characterized by clarity, brevity, and exhaustiveness. The deeds required are socially acclaimed ones and are easy to observe. In other words, those who abide by them are always seen by their communities as good citizens.

5.16.2 Rhetorical Level

Like the previous Tradition, this text shows a simple Basis/Assessment rhetorical organization in that a good Muslim (Basis) is the one who offers food to others and greets all whom he meets by saying “piece be on you”. This greeting is literally

meant to show friendship and assure one's interactants that the speaker has no bad intentions towards them.

5.17 Arabic Text 16

This interactive text uses the strategy of punishment to induce Muslims to avoid raising arms against each other.

عن ابي بكره قال: سمعت رسول الله (ص) يقول: اذا التقى المسلمان بسيفيهما فالقاتل والمقتول في النار. فقلت يا رسول الله (ص) هذا القاتل، فما بال المقتول؟ قال: انه كان حريصا على قتل صاحبه.

(AL-Bukhary:1:15)

5.17.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this Tradition is that if two Muslims attack each other with their swords, then both of them are doomed to Hell. The reporter of the Tradition asks The Prophet that it is understood why the killer should go to Hell, but why should the person killed also go to Hell? The Prophet answers that that is because he was keen to kill his brother.

5.17.2 Rhetorical Level

The structure of Condition/Consequence/Cause governs the rhetorical organization of this Tradition. The Condition is

that of two Muslim men fighting each other with swords with one killing the other. Consequence is that both of them will be put in Hell, the killer for his crime, the killed for his keen intention to kill his adversary, the intention that has made him take his sword and fight his killer in the first place.

5.18 Arabic Text 17

This text gives in three conditional sentences all the signs of hypocrisy. Such all-inclusiveness presents the main persuasive strategy deployed.

عن ابي هريرة عن النبي قال: اية المنافق ثلاث: اذا حدث كذب، واذا وعد اخلف، واذا اؤتمن خان.

(AL-Bukhary:1:15)

5.18.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this Tradition is that there are three attributes that characterize the hypocrite; if he speaks he lies, if he gives promise he breaks it, and if he is trusted, he betrays his trustees.

The text observes all Grice's maxims. In addition, it is all-inclusive, and depends on the explication of universal facts.

5.18.2 Rhetorical Level

This text shows a multilayered (embedded) rhetorical patterning. At the highest level, there is the assessment (hypocrisy) / Basis (Evidence or proofs) structure in the form. However, the Basis structure is realized through the three conditions of lying, breaking one's promises, and betraying those that have trust in him.

5.18.3 Syntactic level

The combination of three conditional sentences is used where two antonymical clauses are paralleled

إذا حدث / كذب

إذا وعد / أخلف

إذا أوْتمن / خان

In using the technique above, semantics is structurally related to syntax when each VP is followed by another VP that ——— runs in apposition to what is expected of the first VP.

5.19 Arabic Text 18

The following text proceeds from the general to the particular. Firstly, it gives forth the principle that all deeds are judged in the life hereafter by the actual intentions or motivations that are behind them. This is followed by another related principle and that is every person is the owner of his own intentions. Then the contextual details are given. This logical progression provides the main persuasive strategy of the text.

عن عمر ان رسول الله (ص) قال: الاعمال بالنية، ولكل امرئ ما نوى، فمن كانت هجرته الى الله ورسوله فهجرته الى الله ورسوله، ومن كانت هجرته لدنيا يصيبها او امرأة يتزوجها فهجرته الى ما هاجر اليه.

(AL-Bukhary:1:20)

5.19.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

This tradition explicates that all deeds are counted and judged on the basis of the true intentions that lie behind them, and every person owns the consequences of the intentions of his deeds. So, if one migrates for the sake of God and His Prophet, then that is how his migration will be judged. But if one migrates to get some earthly benefits or to marry a certain woman then his migration is judged to be for the sake of those actual intentions.

The principle that deeds are judged by the intentions behind them has now become a universally accepted maxim in

law and courts. In addition, it is the basis of all contracts, jobs, and commitments.

Pragmatically, the text argues through the statement of general principles that are enhanced by the provision of concrete examples. The general principles are expressed in the fewest possible words that can clearly express the intended meaning. The details are provided through one coordinated sentence which is precise and obvious.

5.19.2 Rhetorical Level

The text shows a recursion of the Basis/Assessment rhetorical pattern in the following manner Assessment (the result of deeds)/ Basis (intentions)/ Assessment / Basis / Basis /Assessment / Basis / Assessment. The first two basis / assessment are represented by the judgment that the benefits of each deed (Assessment) are subject to their intention (Basis). The second two pairs provide matching detail of migrating for the sake of God and his Prophet and their Godly reward (paradise) and migrating for the sake of money or wife and getting their earthly reward.

5.19.3 Syntactic Level

The text shows parallelism between the complexity of syntactic structures and general/specific information conveyed. The first two general principles are both formulated in nominal sentences of the structure: NP PP and PP s (NP):

الاعمال بالنية	NP PP
ولكل امريء ما نوى	PP S (NP)

In contrast, the specific information is provided via complex verbal sentences. Such a parallelism provides a memorable syntactic structure to the text.

5.20 Arabic Text 19

In this text the statement of observable social facts provides the main persuasive strategy. Muslims are urged to earn their living through hard work which would spare them the humiliation of begging.

عن الزبير بن العوام ان النبي قال: لان ياخذ احدكم حبله فيات بحزمة الحطب على ظهره فيبيعها فيكيف الله بها وجهه خير له من ان يسال الناس اعطوه او منعه.

(AL-Bukhary:1:257)

5.20.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this Tradition is that if a Muslim man took his rope for gathering wood and brought on

his back a bundle of wood to sell and save his face is better than asking alms from other people be it that he is given or not.

The text conveys a social fact that becomes an accepted convention in most communities, if not all. Hard work provides man with personal dignity as well as a means of bread-winning. In contrast, begging is looked down upon as an idle activity especially for able-bodied persons. It is also degrading job.

5.20.2 Rhetorical Level

At 20 is organized according to the rhetorical structure of Means/Purpose/Evaluation (positive/negative). The Means element is represented by taking the rope and carrying the bundle of wood on the back, the Purpose element is given by sequence of selling the wood and saving one's face. As for the Evaluation element, it is given by evaluating the Means/Purpose elements together as being much better than the condition of begging, whether alms are given (positive) or not (negative) because they serve as a face-saving act in front of God.

The text argues from the standpoint of common daily experience that cannot be refuted since it is based on concrete social facts. Although believers are expected to give aid to those in need, they are encouraged to earn their living by themselves, even if they were to work hard. Therefore, it is obvious that this message is clear, concise, and credible.

5.20.3 Syntactic Level

The text comprises one complex sentence that begins with a conditional sentence that has four successive, coordinated subordinate clauses:

لأن ياخذ احدكم حبله
فيات بحزمة الحطب على ظهره
فبييعها
فيكف الله بها وجهه

These are followed by the main clause:

خير له من ان يسال الناس

Then this clause is modified by two other asyndetically related clauses:

اعطوه
او منعه

The complex structure above utilizes the full potentialities of the single sentence in compactly delivering bundles of meanings without the need to break down the message into multiple, separate sentences.

5.20.4 Tropes

The only figurative device in this text is that of using the lexical item “face” to denote self-dignity and community

respect. Significantly, this metaphor has been borrowed by Modern Pragmaticians in the same sense (cf. Levinson: 1983).

5.21 Arabic Text 20

in this last brief Tradition, the use of simile offers the main persuasive means. Gesture is also used to represent the idea of unity to the addressees.

عن ابي موسى عن النبي انه قال: ان المؤمن للمؤمن كالبنيان يشد بعضه بعضا،
وشبك اصابعه

(AL-Bukhary:1:95)

5.21.1 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

The propositional content of this Tradition is that true believers unite with other true believers like a structure in which each part ties the other parts, and he put his fingers together like a net.

Pragmatically, this single-sentence Tradition is quite brief, and clear.

5.21.2 Rhetorical Level

The text is rhetorically organized around the structure of Effect (Muslims becoming like a building)/ Cause (Muslims

supporting each other). One relevant observation in this respect is that Cause/Effect argumentation is one of the rhetorical strategies that has a Universal appeal, especially in matters related to knowledge conveyance.

5.21.3 Lexical Level

Three lexical items serve a particularly important function in this text. These are: (المومن), (البنيان), and (يشد). The first lexical item means “a true believer” and is the ultimate aim of all Muslims. So, when this virtue is closely tied with being in support of other true believers, the whole idea of reciprocal brotherly support acquires religious import as a key to attaining the ultimate state of true belief.

The second lexical item of (البنيان) is even more important since it provides the key concept of close functional interrelatedness. In addition, this image is quite effective in this context because a building is made of identical parts (bricks) just like the community which consists in identical human beings.

The third key lexical items is the present simply verb (يشد) which means “tying”, signifying multilateral close relations that require reciprocation.

5.21.4 Tropes

The role of simile is fundamental here in that the whole idea of Muslims supporting each other is give via the image of a closely structured building where each brick is related to all the other bricks in the same structure. The choice of this particular image effective since it is best known man-made structure in which all the identical constituent parts enter into close relations of each other part, and as such each part acquires extra relational values by virtue of being one integral part of a unified whole.

Chapter six

Contrastive analysis

6.1 Introduction

The result of textual analyses conducted in the two previous chapters are compared in this chapter in order to test the validity of the hypotheses presented in Chapter One. The contrastive analysis will also aim at identifying similarities and

differences and the feasibility of pointing Universal Tendencies in the use of persuasive techniques.

6.2 Semantic and Pragmatic Level

Data analysis has shown that background information is always supplied in religious texts whenever it is particularly necessary to the illocutionary force of the text involved.

Another observation is that all the religious texts are characterized by clarity and brevity. In addition, their prepositional content is strictly true and beneficial in the daily life of all human beings. In other words, the themes and values prescribed present universally acknowledged general facts about good deeds that are required to follow and bad deeds to quit. Therefore, it is not surprising that conflicting values and attitudes such as greed versus charity, true faith versus hypocrisy, forgiveness versus enmity, dedication and abiding by the laws versus indifference and breaking the laws, unity in faith versus factions, simplicity versus pomposity are dealt with in both the Islamic and Christian data.

6.3 Rhetorical Level

The following tendencies have been identified in the Arabic and English data:

1. The frequent use of assertion as a primary linguistic means of truth-initiation and establishment;
2. The wide use of such rhetorical structures as problem/solution, claim evidence, hypothetical/real, and cause effect.

6.4 Syntactic Level

Parallel syntactic structures almost always accompany parallel rhetorical patterns. They are spread across all types of clauses: declarative, interrogatory, and imperative, though the use of indicative clauses is far more prevalent. In addition, the effective use of rhetorical questions is frequent in the data.

6.5 Lexical Level

The use of collocative lexical items and the manipulation of sense relations in terms of synonyms and antonyms are found in all texts, Arabic and English.

Repeated lexical items that are of key significance to the main idea of the text are also widely used. The semantic field of most of the lexical items is that which mostly has to do with human actions, beliefs and religious values as opposed to bad, injurious deeds.

6.6 Sound Effects

Sound effects in terms of repetitive morphemes and phonemes are more widely used in the Arabic texts than the English ones. This observation is closely related to the difference in the morphological and the phonological potentials of the two studied languages.

6.7 Tropes

Especially in the explication of the importance of abstract religious values and good trite, the use of tropes (similes and

metaphors) is prevalent in the data. The domain of picturesque style is often that related to common human activities such as shepherding, plant cultivation, fishing and natural elements.

6.8 Conclusions

One of the findings of this study constitutes in the fact that the majority of the religious texts analyzed reveal that each text makes use of one specific and prevalent persuasive technique, to which the other potential techniques merely play a supportive role. The choice of the particular major technique is always tied to the i) theme of the text, ii) its context of situation. Thus the use of tropes is always related to moral values such as the commitment to and propagation of true religious faith. Similarly, the dominance of one certain rhetorical structure is closely related to argumentative texts that appeal to the intellect of the addressees rather than to their emotions. Argumentation in terms of the rules of logical analogy is also found in both Arabic and English texts.

Appealing to truthful facts and situations that can be empirically tested and ascertained is indeed another universal tendency in the data to the effects that both kinds of texts revolve around universally acclaimed moral values.

Assertions of all types are prevalent in the Arabic and English data alike. Sometimes, lexical repetition is used; other times, assertive indicative clause and oaths are given, all appealing to some socially acknowledged authority.

6.9 Pedagogical Recommendation

In the light of the results above, it is felt that in order to enhance the writing capabilities of the Iraqi EFL learners, it is imperative to incorporate some, if not all, the strategies of persuasion identified in this piece of research with a comparing examples from both languages in the teaching of the writing of argumentative texts especially at the university level.

6.10 Suggestions for Further Research

1. The history of both languages is sprinkled with names of brilliant orators at all these stages; thus a contrastive study of the persuasion strategies used a selection of renowned speeches in both languages is felt to be of significance since it will concentrate not only universals but also on idiosyncracies in the use of such strategies.
2. A contrastive diachronic study which involves the use of persuasion strategies past and present in both languages is also recommended, since this will shed light on whether such strategies have undergone any change in quantity and/or frequency of use.

English References

- Albert, S. & Dabbs, J. (1970) "Physical distance and persuasion".
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 22-23.
- Alderson, J. C. and Short, M. H. (1989) "Reading Literature". In
Short, M. H. (ed.).
- Allen, J. P. B. and Corder, S. P. (1973) (eds.) *The Edinburgh Course in
Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Allport, N (1935) *Persuasion*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Anderson, K.E., (1978) *Persuasion: Theory and Practice*. (2nd edition)
Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Aristotle, (d. 322 BC) *The Rhetoric*. (Trans. and ed. Kennedy, G.A.)
(1991) New York: Academic Press.
- Austin, J. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon
Press.
- Axson, D., Yates, S. & Chaiken, S. (1987) "Audience response as a
heuristic cue in persuasion" *Journal of Personality and
Social Psychology*. 66-67.
- Boxter, L.A. (1988) "A dialectical perspective on communication
strategies in relationship development". In S. Duck
(ed.) *Handbook of Personal Relationships*. New York:
Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bain, A. (1993) *English Composition and Rhetoric*. London:
Longman.
- Beardsley, M. C. (1950) *Practical Logic*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Beaugrande, R. de. (1979) "Toward a General Theory of Creativity".
Poetics. 8, 1979, 269-306.
- (1980) *Text, Discourse and Process*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- (1984) *Text Production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- (1985) "Test Linguistics in Discourse Studies". In van Dijk, T. A. (ed.) (pp. 41-70).
- (1991) *Linguistic Theory: The Discourse of Fundamental Works*. London: Longman.
- Beaugrande, R. de. And Dressler, W. (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Beekman, J. (1970) "Propositions and Their Relations within a Discourse". *Notes on Translation*, 37, 6-25.
- Beekman, J. and Callow, J. (1974) *Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Benson, J. D. and Greaves, W. S. (1992) "Collocation and the Field of Discourse". In Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A. (eds.) (pp. 397-409).
- Bettinghaus, E.P., (1968) *Persuasive Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bettinghaus, E.P., and Cody, M. J. (1994) *Persuasive Communication* (6th ed.) Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Blakemore, D. (1990) *Understanding Utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Board, Coles (ed.) (1980) *Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Toronto: Coles limited.
- Bolinger, D. (1977) *Meaning and Form*. London: Longman.
- Boone, T. and Kurtze, E. (1994) *Persuasion*. New York: William Morrow.
- Bower, G. H. and Cirilo, R. K. (1985) "Cognitive Psychology and Text Processing". In van Dijk, T. A. (ed.) London: Academic Press. (pp. 71-102).

- Brembeck, W. L. & Howell, W. (1976) *Persuasion: a Means of Social Influence*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Brooks, C. (1995) *Community, Religion, and Literature*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Brooks, C. and Warren P. (1970) *Modern Rhetoric*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Brown, T. (1963) *Persuasive Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brumfit, C. J. (1981) "Reading Skills and the Study of Literature in a Foreign Language". *System*. 9, 243-8.
- (1983) (ed.) *Teaching Literature Overseas: Language-based Approaches*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- and Carter, R. A. (1986) (eds.) *Literature and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canavan, P. J. (1974) *Rhetoric and Literature*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Carey, Christopher (1994) "Rhetorical Means of Persuasion." In Ian, Worthington (ed.) *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. London: Routledge.
- Callow, K. (1970) "More on Propositions and their Relations within a Discourse". *Notes on Translation*. 37.
- (1974) *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids, MI. Zondervan.

- Callow, K. and Callow, J. C. (1992) "Text as Purposive Communication: A Meaning-Based Analysis". In Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A. (eds.) (pp. 5-37).
- Carroll, D. W. (1986) *The Psychology of Language*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Carter, R. A. (1982) (ed.) *Language and Literature*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- (1985) "Stylistics". In Kaplan, R. B. (ed.).
- (1986) "Linguistic Models, Language and Literariness: Study Strategies in Teaching of Literature to Foreign Students". In Brumfit, C. J. and Carter, R. A. (eds.).
- Cegala, E. (1987) *Communication Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cialdini, Robert B. (1993) *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion*. New York: William Morrow.
- Chafe, W. (1987) "Cognitive Constraints on Information Flow". In Tomlin, R. (ed.) *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- (1992) "The Flow of Ideas in a Sample of Written Language". In Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A. (eds.) (pp. 267-295).
- Chaiken, S. (1987) *The Heuristic Model of Persuasion*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Clark, H. & Clark, E. (1977) *Psychology and Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Cole, P. (1981) (ed.) *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.

- Connolly, Francis (1959) *A Rhetoric Case Book* (2nd ed.) New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Cook, G. (1995) *Discourse and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, M., and Nothstine, W.L. (1992) *Power Persuasion*. Greenwood, In: Educational Video Group.
- Copeland, J. E. (1984) *New Directions in Linguistics and Semiotics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Corbett, E.P.J. (1990) *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. (3rd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coulthrd, M. (1985) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
- Couture, B. (1986) (ed.) *Functional Approaches to Writing: Research Perspectives*. London: Francis Printer Publishing Ltd.
- Covino, W. A. and David A. Jolliffe (1995) *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Crismore, A. (1989) *Talking with Readers: Metadiscourse as Rhetorical Act*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Crombie, W. (1985) *Process and Relation in Discourse and Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1989) "Semantic Relational Structuring in Milton's *Areopagitica*". In Carter, R. A. and Simpson, P. (eds.) (pp. 113-20).
- Cronkhite, G. (1969) *Persuasion: Speech and Behavior Change*. New York. Bobss-Merrill Company Inc.
- Cruse, D.A. (1986) *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Crystal, D. (1987) *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (1997) *A Dictionary of Linguistic and Phonetic*. (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Crystal, D. and Davy, D. (1969) *Investigating English Style*. London: Longman.
- Cummings, D. W., Herum, J. and Lybbert, E. K. (1970) "Semantic Recurrence and Rhetorical Form". *Language and Style*. 3, 195-207.
- Dixon, P. (1971) *Rhetoric*. London: Methuen.
- Dittmar, N. (1976) *Sociolinguistics*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Doob, L. (1948) *Public Opinion and Persuade*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Dressler, W. (1977) (ed.) *Trends in Textlinguistics*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Duranti, A. (1985) "Sociocultural Dimensions of Discourse". In van Dijk, T. A. (ed.) (pp. 193-223).
- Eagly, A. (1974) "The comprehensibility of persuasive arguments as determinant of opinion change". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 80.
- Ehnlenger, D. (1968) *Philosophy and Rhetoric*. London: Longman.
- Empson, W. (1961) *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Enkvist, N. E., Spencer, J. and Gregory, M. J. (1964) *Linguistics and Style*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1981) "Pragmatics and the Description of Discourse". In Cole, P. (ed.).

- Festinger, L. (1957) *The Psychology of Persuasion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fowler, R. (1966) (ed.) *Essays on Style and Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- (1971) (ed.) *The Languages of Literature: Essays in the New Stylistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- (1981) *Literature as Social Discourse*. London: Batsford.
- (1986) *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frank, J. D. (1961) *Persuasion and Healing*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Garvin, P. L. (1964) (ed.) *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- (1969) "The Prague School of Linguistics". In Hill, A. A. (ed.) (pp. 259-268).
- Giles, H. and P. E. Powesland. (1975) *Speech Style and Social Influence*. London: Academic Press.
- Gordon, G. (1952) *Attitude and Persuasion*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gragan, J. F. & Shields, D. C. (1998) *Understanding Communication Theory: The Communicative forces of Human Action*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gray, M. (1984) *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Hong Kong: Longman.
- Grice, H. P. (1975) "Logic and Conversation". In Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds.) (pp. 41-58).

- (1981) "Presupposition and Conversational Implicature."
In Cole, P. (ed.) (pp. 183-198).
- Griffin, E. (1997) *A First Look at Communication Theory*. (3rd ed.).
New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Haider, H. (1946) *Balance Theory*. New York : Oxford University.
- Grimes, J. E. (1975) *The Thread of Discourse*. Dallas: Summer
Institute of Linguistics.
- Griffen, E. (2000) *A First Look at Communication Theory*. (4th ed.).
Boston, McGraw-Hill.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973) *Explorations in the Functions of Language*.
London: Edward Arnold.
- (1975) *Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the
Development of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- (1982) "How is a Text like a Clause." In Allen, S. (ed.) *Text
Processing: Text analysis and Generation, Text Typology and
Attribution*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiskell International. (pp.
209-247).
- (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London:
Edward Arnold.
- (1992) "Some Lexicogrammatical Features of the Zero
Population Growth". In Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A.
(eds.) (pp. 327-358).
- Halliday, M. a. K. and Hasan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London:
Longman.
- (1985) *Language, Text and Context: Aspects
of Language in a Socio-Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria: Deakin
University.

- Harris, W. V. (1988) *Interpretive Acts in Search of Meaning*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hawkes, Terrence. (1972) *Metaphore*. London: Methuen, Ltd.
- Hawthorne, H. (1987) *Propaganda, Persuasion and Polemics*. London: Arnold.
- Heider, H. (1958) *Theories of Persuasion*. California: Wadsworth.
- Hill, A. A. (1969) (ed.) *Linguistics*. Forum Series.
- Himmelfarb, Samuel & Alice H. Eagly, (eds.) (1974) *Readings in Attitude Change*. New York: John Welly & Sons.
- Hoey, M. (1979) "Signalling in Discourse". *Discourse Analysis Monographs*, 6. Birmingham: ELR, University of Birmingham.
- (1983) *On the Surface of Discourse*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- (1993) "A Common Signal in Discourse: How the Word Reason is Used in Texts". In Sinclair, J. McH, Hoey, M., and Fox, G. (eds.) (pp. 67-82).
- (1996) "Cohesive Words: A Paper of Consequence". In KVHAA Konferençer, 36: 71-90.
- Hoey, M. and Winter, E. (1986) "Clause Relations in the Writer's Communications Task". In Couture, B. (ed.) (pp. 120-41).
- Hovland, G. I. Janis I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1992) *Communication and Persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hurford, J. R., Heasley, B. (1996) *Semantics: A Course Book*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobson, R. (1935) "The Dominant". In Newton, K. M. (ed.) (pp. 26-30).

- (1960) "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics". In Sebeok, T. A. (ed.) (pp. 350-377).
- Janis. I. (1968) "Persuasion." In *International Encyclopedia of Social Science*. New York: MacMillan and Free Press.
- Jespersen, O. (1909-49) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard. Reprinted, London: Allen and Unwin, 1954.
- Johnson, R. I. (1986) *Communication: Handling Ideas Effectively*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Ltd.
- Johnston, D. D. (1994) *The Art and Science of Persuasion*. Madison: William C. Brown.
- Jordan, M. P. (1978) "The Principal Semantics of the Nominals 'this' and 'that' in Contemporary English Writing". Ph.D. Thesis. The Hatfield Polytechnic, and Birmingham University.
- (1980) "Short Texts to Explain Problem-Solution Structures and Vice-Versa". *Instructional Science*. 9.
- (1981) "Some Associated Nominals in Technical Writing". *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*. 11, 3.
- (1982) "The Thread of Continuity in Functional Writing". *Journal of Business Communication*. 19, 4.
- (1984) *Rhetoric of Everyday English Texts*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- (1985) "Systems of Logic in Technical Writing". In Hall, J. (ed.), *The 11th LACUS Forum*. Columbia SC: Hornbeam Press.

- (1989) "Relational Propositions within the Clause". In Embleton, S. (ed.) *The 15th LACUS Forum*. Lake Bluffs, IL: LACUS.
- (1992) "An Integrated Three-Pronged Analysis of a Fund-Raising Letter". In Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. R. (eds.) (pp. 171-226).
- Joseph, P. C. (1974) *Rhetoric and Literature*. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Jowett, G. S. & O'Donnell, V. (1992) *Propaganda and Persuasion*. (2nd edn.) Sage: Newbury Par.
- Karlins, M. & Abelson, H. I. (1970) *Persuasion: How Opinions and Attitudes are Charged*: New York: HD Kar.
- Kane, J.S. and Peters, L. J. (1966) *Expository Prose*. New York: Oxford University press.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966) "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education". *Language Learning*. 16, 1-20.
- (1988) "Contrastive Rhetoric and Second Language Learning: Notes Toward a Theory of Contrastive Rhetoric". In Purves, A. (ed.) (pp. 275-304).
- Kelly, R. (1953) *Persuasive Speech*. New York and London: Oxford University Press.
- Kempson, R. (1977) *Semantic Theory*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Kennedy, G. A. (1985) *Aristotle: On Rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- (1994) *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Kerrick, J. (1958) "The effects of relevant and non-relevant sources on attitude change". *Journal of Psychology*.8
- Knott, A. and Dale, R. (1994) "Using Linguistic Phenomena to Motivate a Set of Coherence Relations". *Discourse Processes* 18, 1, 35-52.
- Knott, A. and Mellish, C. (1996) "A Feature-Based Account of the Relations Signalled by Sentence and Clause Connectives". *Language and Speech*. 39, 2-3, 143-181.
- Kreuz, R. J. and Roberts, R. M. (1993) "The Empirical Study of Figurative Language in Literature". *Poetics*. 22, 1-2, 151-159.
- Lakoff, R.T. (1982) *Persuasive Discourse and Ordinary Conversation, Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Lakoff, R. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Larson, Charles U. (1979) *Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- (2001) *Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility*. (9th edition.) Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Leech, G. N. (1966) "Linguistics and the Figures of Rhetoric". In Fowler, R. (ed.) (pp. 135-156).
- (1969) *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. London: Longman.
- (1977) "Literary Criticism and Linguistic Description". *The Dutch Quarterly Review*, 7, 2-22.
- (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

- (1985) *Semantics: The Study of Meaning*. (2nd edition).
Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Leech, G. N. and Short, M. H. (1981) *Style in Fiction*. London:
Longman.
- Leeuwen, Theo van, (1985) *Persuasive Speed*. Sydney: Thompson
- Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press.
- Littlejohn, S. W. (1999) *Theories of Human Communication*. (6th ed).
Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Longacre, R. E. (1992) "The Discourse Strategy of an Appeal's
Letter". In Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. (eds.) (pp.
109-130).
- Lord, G. A. (1978) *People and Communication*. London: McGraw-
Hill Book Company Ltd.
- Lyons, J. (1968) *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.
- (1977) *Semantics. (2 Vols.)* Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.
- (1981) *Language, Meaning and Context*. Suffolk: The
Chaucer Press.
- (1985) *Language and Linguistics: An Introduction*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A. (1986) "Relational Propositions in
Discourse". *Discourse Processes*. 8, (1), 57-90.
- (1987) *Rhetorical Structure Theory: A Theory of Text
Organization*. USC Information Sciences Institute, Technical
Report ISI/RS, 87-190.

- (1992) (eds.) *Discourse Description: Diverse Linguistic Analysis of a Fund-Raising Text*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mann, W. C., Matthiessen, C. M., and Thompson, S. A. (1992) "Rhetorical Structure Theory and Text Analysis". In Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A. (eds.) (pp. 39-78).
- Matthiessen, C. and Thompson, S. A. (1989) "The Structure of Discourse and Subordination". In Haiman, J. and Thompson, S. (eds.) *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (pp. 87-183)
- McGuire, W.J. (1985). *Attitude and Attitude Change*. In Lindzey, G. & Elliot, A. (eds.)
- McGuire, W. (1961) "Resistance to persuasion conferred by active and passive refutation of the same and alternative counterarguments". *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 68.
- McManus A, Judith. (1998) *How to Write and Deliver an Effective Speech*. New York: Judith A. McManus.
- Mukarovskiy, J. (1964) "Standard Language and Poetic Language". In Garvin, P. L. (ed.).
- (1977) *The Word and Verbal Art: Selected Essays*. (Trans. & ed.: Burbank, J. and Steiner, P.) New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mulholland, J. (1994) *Handbook of Persuasive Tactics: A Practical Language Guide*. London: Routledge.
- Mey, J. L. (1993) *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

- Meyer, B. J. F. (1992) "An Analysis of a Plea for Money". In Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A. (ed.) (pp. 79-108).
- Miller, N. & Maruyama, K. (1976) "Speed of speech and persuasion". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 18, 5, 154-69
- Nash, W. (1990) (ed.) *The Writing Scholar: Studies in Academic Discourse*. Newbury Park: Sage Publication.
- Newton, K. M. (1988) (ed.) *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory*. London: Macmillan.
- Ostman, E. (1987) *Elements of Persuasion*. New York: Oxford University.
- Osgood, K. and Tannenbaum, R. (1955) *Attitude Change and Persuasion*. New York: Academic Press.
- Palmer, F. R. (1981) (2nd ed.) *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Payne, Rodger (2001). "Persuasion, Frames and Norm Construction". *European Journal of International Relations*. 6.2, 67-98.
- Packard, Vance (1957) *The Hidden Persuaders: An Introduction to the Techniques of Mass-Persuasion*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Perloff, Richard (1993) *The Dynamics of Persuasion*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Petofi, J. S. and Rieser, H. (1973) (eds.) *Studies in Text Grammars*. Dordrech: Reidel.
- Petty, R. E. & Cacioppo, J. T. (1981) *Attitudes and Persuasion: Classic and Contemporary Persective*. Dubque. IA: William C. Brown. (1987) [2nd Edition]

- (1986) *The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion*.
San Diego: Academic Press.
- (1994) "To think or not to think: Exploring two routes
to persuasion". In T. Brock, & S. Shavitt (eds.)
Psychology of Persuasion. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Petty, R. E., Ostrom, T. M., & Brock, T. C. (1981) *Cognitive
Responses in Persuasion*. Hillsdale: N. J. Erlbaum.
- Posner, R. (1982) *Relational Discourse and Poetic Communication*.
The Hague: Mouton.
- Pratkanis, A. & Aronson, E. (1992) *Age of Propaganda: The Everyday
Use and Abuse of Persuasion*. New York: W. H.
Freeman.
- Purves, A. (1988) (ed.) *Writing Across Languages and Cultures*.
Newbury Park: Sage Publication.
- Quirk, R. (1954) *The Concessive Relation in Old English Poetry*. New
Haven: Yale University Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1985) *A
Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London:
Longman.
- Rank, H. (1976) "Teaching about public persuasion". In D. Dietrich
(ed.), *Teaching and Doublespeak*. Urbana, IL:
National Council of Teachers of English.
- Reardon, K. K. (1982) *Persuasion: Theory and Context*. London: Saga
Publications.
- Renkema, J. (1992) *Persuasion*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Riker, William (1996) *The Strategy of Rhetoric*. New Haven: Yale
University press.

- Richard, M. (1990) *Propositional Attitudes: An Essay on Thoughts and How We Ascribe Them*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, I. A. (1936) *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, Pauline (1980) *English for Specific Purposes*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Roetter, Charles (1974) *Psychological Warfare*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.
- Roloff, M. E., and Miller, G. R. (1980) *Persuasion: New Directions in Theory and Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Rosnow, R.L. & Robinson, E. J. (1969) *Experiments in Persuasion*. New York : HD, Ross.
- Rank, H. (1976) *Teaching about Public Persuasion: Teaching and Doublespeak*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Sanddell, R. (1977) *Linguistic Style and Persuasion*. London: Academic Press.
- Searl, J. R. (1969) *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1979) *Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sebeok, T. A. (1960) (ed.) *Style in Language*. Mass: MIT Press.
- Sherif, Sherif and Hovland (1961) Social Judgment Theory.
- Simons, H. W. (1986) *Persuasion: Understanding, Practice and Analysis*. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Smith, S. M., & Petty, R.E. (1996) "Message framing and persuasion". *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 44.
- Soll, Ivan. (1989) "Aristotle". In *The World Book Encyclopedia*. Chicago: World Book, Inc.
- Spencer John, and Gregory, M. J. (1976) "An Approach to the Study of Style", in *Linguistics and Literary Style*. New York: Rinehard Winston, Inc.
- Stevens, Deborah (1975) *The Persuasive Writer*. New York: General Training Corporation.
- Stiff, J. B. (1994) *Persuasive Communication*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Strunk, W. and White, E. B. (1959) *The Elements of Style*. New York: Macmillian Publishing Co.
- Stubbs, M. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tadros, A. A. (1989) "Predicative Categories in University Textbooks". *English for Specific Purposes*. 8, 17-31.
- Tannen, D. (1984) *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse*. NJ: Ablex.
- (1988) (ed.) *Linguistics in Context: Connecting Observation and Understanding*. NJ: Ablex.
- Thomas, J. (1995) *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Thompson, S. A. and Mann, W. C. (1987) "Antithesis: A Study of Clause Combining and Discourse Structure". In Steele, R. and Threadgold, T. (eds.) (pp. 87-171).
- Thomson, O. (1977) *Mass Persuasion in History*. Edinburgh: JD Tho.

- Traugott, E. C. and Pratt, M. L. (1980) *Linguistics for Students of Literature*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Turner, G. W. (1973) *Stylistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ullman, S. (1966) *Language and Style*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- (1973) *Semantics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Urquhart, A. H. (1984) "The Effect of Rhetorical Ordering on Readability". In Alderson, J. C. and Urquhart, A. H. (eds.) (pp. 160-175).
- van Dijk, T. A. (1972) *Some Aspects of Text Grammars*. The Hague: Mouton.
- (1976) (ed.) *Pragmatics of Language and Literature*. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company.
- (1977) *Text and Context*. London: Longman.
- (1980) *Macrostructures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- (1981) "Discourse Studies and Education". *Applied Linguistics*. II, (1), 1-26.
- (1984) *Prejudice in Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- (1985) *Discourse and Communication*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- (1985) (ed.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. (4 Vols.) London: Academic Press.
- (1990) "The Future of the Field: Discourse Analysis in the 1990's". *Text*. 10, 133-156.
- van Dijk, T. A. and Kintsch, W. (1983) *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.

- Van Peer, W. (1989) "How to Do Things with Texts". In Short, M. H. (ed.) (pp. 267-297).
- Wales, J. (1989) *Persuasive Speech*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1973) "Stylistics". In Allen, J. P. B. and Corder, S. P. (eds.) (pp. 202-231).
- (1975) *Stylistics and the Teaching of Literature*. London: Longman.
- (1978) *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1979) *Exploration in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1983) *Learning Purpose and Language Use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1988) "Poetry and Pedagogy". In Tannen, D. (ed.) (pp. 183-197).
- Winter, E. O. (1968) "Some Aspects of Cohesion". In Huddleston, R. D., Hudson, R. A., Winter, E. O., and Henrici, A. (eds.) *Sentence and Clause in Scientific English*. University of London: OSTI Project.
- (1971) "Connection in Science Material: A Proposition about the Semantics of Clause Relations". *CILT Papers*, December.
- (1974) "Replacement as a Function of Repetition". Ph.D. Thesis, University of London: *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Sec. C., Autumn, 1977, 38, 4).

- (1976) "Fundamentals of Information Structure". The School of Humanities. The Hatfield Polytechnic, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, England.
- (1977) "A Clause Relational Approach to English Text: A Study of Some Predictive Lexical Items in Written Discourse". *Instructional Science*. 6, (1), 1-92.
- (1979) "Replacement as a Fundamental Function of the Sentence in Context". *Forum Linguisticum*. 4, 2.
- (1982) *Towards a Contextual Grammar of English*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- (1986) "Clause Relations as Information Structure: Two Basic Text Structures". In Coulthard, M. (ed.) *Talking about Text*. Discourse Analysis Monograph 13, University of Birmingham.
- (1992) "The Notion of Unspecific Versus Specific as One Way of Analysing the Information of a Fund-Raising Letter". In Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A. (eds.) (pp. 131-170).
- Winterrowd, Ross W. (1968) *Rhetoric: A Synthesis*. New York Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc.
- Wood, J.T (1997) *Communication Theories in Action. An introduction*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Wright, L. and Hope, J. (1996) *Stylistics: a Practical Course book*. London: Routledge.
- Young, Richard E., Alton L. Becker, and Kenneth L. Pike, (1970) *Rhetoric Discovery and Change*. New York. Harcourt, Brace and World
- Yule G. (1985) *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

----- (1996) *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zimbardo, P. G., Leippe (1991) *Psychology of Attitude Change and Social Influence*. New York: McGraw-Hill.