

## Arabic And Western Rhetoric: A Conceptual Introduction To Argumentation Critical Discourse Analysis

Ibrahim Ramadan<sup>1</sup>, Abdulrahman Alkhamis<sup>\*2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Arabic Language and Literature, College Of Humanities And Social Sciences, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia  
ebff2014@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>, azizinmm@gmail.com<sup>\*2</sup>

### Abstract

This paper aims to present a theoretical approach to studying argumentative study, also known as modern rhetoric; the paper follows a limpid path, moving between the various definitions of argumentation using the descriptive-analytical method. Firstly, it differentiates the two types of argumentation: the logical and the linguistic. Then, it deals with the most well-known contextual definitions of argumentation in both Arabic and Western argumentative studies. Aristotle was the first to refer to the types of argumentation. Hence, the paper shows his endeavors in this respect. The article advances Arabic language and teaching by providing theoretical foundations, pedagogical insights, cross-cultural understanding, historical context, methodological applications, relevance to modern scholarship, and validating Arabic rhetorical traditions. This study aims to give a brief and easy idea of Aristotle's efforts in the field of argumentation, especially the logical arguments and the subjective moral arguments, and the functions of these moral arguments of benefit, influence, and enjoyment, whether they relate to the orator (Aetos), the audience (Pathos), or the speech itself (Logos). Then, the research concluded with examples of these self-created arguments. The study results showed a comprehensive concept of the arguments in Arab and Western thoughts. Moreover, the researchers proved that Aristotle's topics and thoughts were one of the most significant sources of nourishment for the modern argumentative lesson; Arabic rhetoric did not lag behind the Western lesson in its care for argumentations and its methods of analysis, and they demonstrated the applicability of the mentioned concepts in the study.

**Keywords:** Argumentations; Aristotle; Arguments; Ethos; Bathos; Logos.

### INTRODUCTION

The background to the phenomenon of the development of the Arabic language and its teaching can be further understood in light of the current study, which emphasizes Aristotle's influence on argumentation and the implications for Arabic rhetoric and language instruction (Keshav et al., 2022). The historical context surrounding Aristotle's exploration of argumentation holds significant relevance to the development of the Arabic language (Geoffroy, 2020). Understanding the historical evolution of linguistic thought, including the influence of classical scholars like Aristotle, provides a foundation for comprehending the intricacies of Arabic rhetoric (Baffioni, 2020). Arabic, with its rich cultural and linguistic heritage, has been shaped by the contributions of classical scholars (Guellil et al., 2021). Aristotle's enduring impact on argumentation is part of this broader cultural heritage. Recognizing and embracing this heritage contributes to a more holistic approach to Arabic language teaching, integrating historical linguistic traditions with contemporary methods.

This paper aims to present a theoretical approach to studying the Argumentative study, also known as modern rhetoric, which is a contemporary concept in critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Kock, 2021). The paper has followed a limpid path moving between the various definitions of Argumentation. Firstly, it differentiates the two types of argumentation: the logical and the linguistic. Then, it deals with the most well-known contextual definitions of argumentation in both Arabic and Western argumentative studies. Furthermore, it tackles the

various approaches of argumentation: dialectic, classic, semantic, philosophical, and discursive argumentative approaches which are interested in delving into the ties enveloped in different texts and discourses (Forchtner, 2021).

Aristotle was the first to refer to the types of argumentation. Hence, the paper shows his endeavors in this respect (Aberdein, 2021). It also deals with objective, logical arguments, and subjective moral arguments. Discussing the first type of argument, the paper has tackled the different types of analogy, word argumentation, division argumentation, contradictory results argumentation, etc. Additionally, scrutinizing the second type of argument has included ethos, logos, and pathos. Notwithstanding its theoretical approach, the paper asserts its hypotheses with some applications to simplify the matters of argumentation and clarify its methodology of analysis. The focus of this paper is 1. defining argumentation, and distinguishing between its intermingled types. 2. Showing Aristotle's concept of argumentation for Aristotle, 3. Classifying the various arguments, and differentiating between them. 4. Presenting texts for application as an introduction to argumentative analysis. The study's assertion that argumentation is considered the primary function of language by many modern scholars highlights the integral role of persuasive communication in linguistic expression (Rigotti & Greco, 2019). This insight is crucial for educators developing language curricula, emphasizing the need to incorporate argumentative skills into language teaching methodologies (Nejmaoui, 2019). The descriptive-analytical method employed by researchers in the study offers a specific methodological approach that can be applied in the broader context of Arabic language studies. Integrating such analytical methods into language research enhances the rigor and depth of linguistic investigations. The study's emphasis on Aristotle's enduring relevance in modern argumentative discourse reinforces the idea that traditional linguistic principles continue to shape contemporary language scholarship. This awareness prompts language educators to balance traditional linguistic foundations with evolving language dynamics (Jarvis, 2019).

## METHOD

The researchers used the descriptive analytical method in the current study. In conducting the present study, researchers employed the descriptive analytical method. This method facilitated a systematic examination and interpretation of the subject matter, allowing for a comprehensive and detailed exploration of the various facets under investigation. By utilizing descriptive analysis, the researchers aimed to provide a clear and insightful depiction of the phenomena under study, offering valuable insights into the intricate elements of argumentation, especially focusing on logical and moral aspects. The methodological choice underscores the commitment to a rigorous and meticulous examination, ensuring a robust foundation for the study's findings and contributing to the scholarly understanding of the subject.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Argumentation: A Conceptual Introduction

Argumentation is not only a linguistic phenomenon, but it is also a linguistic, rhetorical, discursive, philosophical, and logical phenomenon. It is a set of constructivist introductions leading to the meant conclusions that the speaker intended to address so as to influence and convince his audience. While convincing is closely related to thought and mind, influence is tightly related to emotions (Seyoum et al., 2022). In fact, thought and emotions are both intended in argumentation. Needless to say, argumentation includes logic, sociology, philosophy, the philosophy of language, rhetoric, textology among others (Chen et al., 2019). The aim of studying argumentation is discovering the logic of language. That's to say, studying argumentation means learning the rules forming the discourse, and controlling the sequence and flow of statements in a gradually increasing manner (Nejmaoui, 2018).

There is an undeniable difference between logical argumentation and linguistic argumentation (Hahn, 2020). On the one hand, logical argumentation, firstly introduced by

Aristotle, is a constructivist argumentation that includes introductions and conclusions or logical issues. To put another way, its aim is to identify the true issues and the false ones, and this, of course, lends itself to philosophy more than it does to language logic and nature. On the other hand, linguistic argumentation soars from the premise that the language used in communication implies, in its essence, an argumentative discourse that can be concluded by a set of strategies and connectors with a logical tinge, buried under the used lexis. Argumentation is immersed in all human discourses because commercial advertisements and political discourses have an argumentative feature. In the same vein, the juridical discourse has an argumentative tinge when the lawyer defends the accused, and when the judge announces his decree and its grounds. Similarly, both the philosophical discourse and the poetic discourse have the same feature, too. Poetry and speeches (social, religious, scientific, etc.) frequently change the audience's opinion whether negatively or positively (Baumeister et al., 2021).

The Arabic linguistic root of argumentation (Hejaj/ حجج /H, J, J) revolves around disputes and conflicts. Additionally, it means a proof offered by the speaker to the listener (Ibn Manzur, *Lisan al-Arab*, the root of حجج. Ibid 2/ 228) — both are disputing over a matter — because each one of them attempts to take the upper hand over the other by brilliant arguments, and clear-cut proofs, armed with mental arguments or that type of arguments which is based on textual or auditory examples from holy books. According to Chaim Perleman, argumentation is “the way by which arguments are presented logically and mentally to defend or refute a hypothesis so that others can accept or refuse it (Hamdāwī, 2021).

The contextual meaning involves:

1. A discourse between two persons (a speaker and a listener) talking about a specific topic. The first has to affirm what he says by adding arguments and proofs to convince the listener who has the right to either agree or disagree.
2. Argumentation has some linguistic and discursive techniques, styles, and/or connectors that are employed orally or written to influence and convince the audience/listener. Argumentation is effective only when its main pillars are taken into consideration: the speaker, the listener/audience and the aim.
3. Argumentation is both logical based on reasoning, and linguistic interested in language and communication
4. The concept of argumentation is broad as it includes dialogues, the freedom of expression, argument and conflict.
5. Violence is contrary to argumentation since everyone assumes he is right, but dialogue helps them reach a common ground, and/or adopt the same case. Without argumentation, violence prevails.

Argumentation is “a mental process with the aim to convince through a set of proofs and reasons.” (Ibn Aḥmad, 2012) also, “Argumentation is all that is said to make the other understand a specific argument to which they can object” (‘Abd-al-Raḥmān, 1998) Argumentation is included in each dialogue between two persons, where the speaker argues and the listener can object. It is all about statements connected by logical relations, and the argument requires a stated argument or a counter one. De facto, each introduction leads naturally to a conclusion, and the conclusion drives towards another proof. Surely, each statement is connected to what precedes or follows it through a group of connectors constituting an argumentative discourse.

Variably defined, argumentation has to include two concerns: it is a convincing discourse whose aim is to persuade, which is a pivotal dimension of the language by its very nature —a strategy targeted mentally and linguistically (Jagham, 2015). The techniques of argumentation include explaining, analogy, induction, reasoning, contrasting, debating, exception, parallelism, aim, cause, addition, result, etc (Hamdāwī, 2021).

Ruth Amossy postulates that argumentation has invaded all types of discourses. That is to say, no discourse is devoid of some sort of argumentation. However, there is always a hidden

argumentation in narrative and news discourses where they are apparently away from any argumentative aim; argumentation however truly lies under the surface. Moreover, there is an obvious argumentation in the discourses where the speaker tries to get the listener's agreement. For instance, negotiation discourses are an example of argumentation discourses since argumentative is crystal clear (Mashbāl, 2017). By contrast, O. Reboul assumes that odes, tragedy, melodrama, the non-didactic novel, fantasy, comedy and folktales do nothing with argumentation (Şūlah, 1998). There are two views of argumentation: the first limits it to augmenting and dialectic jargon introduced by Aristotle, while the other broadens its cycle to include all types of argumentation, considering that every discourse is pregnant with argumentative goals. However, there is an in-between view that some discourses have nothing to do with argumentation. Confessions and folktales, for example, cannot be approached argumentatively. As such, the argumentative discourse exceeds logical argumentation and whatever is said by the speaker. This umbrella definition includes linguistic, rhetoric, semantic, discursive, dialogic argumentations.

### **Argumentative Approaches: Reading Patterns**

Depending on why it is used, there are many approaches of argumentation, as follows: (Ḥamdāwī, 2021).

1. Argumentative approach focuses on discovering facts; sophistical arguments as well as Socrates and Aristotle's true arguments are the same.
2. Classical approach which is based on convincing and influence, as Aristotle sees.
3. Modern approach seeking persuasion according to Chaim Perelman, Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, Stephen Toulmin, Charles Hamblin, and M.Meyer.
4. Semantic approach which focuses on language and its uses, and the notion that argumentation is semantic situations and interactive contexts.
5. Linguistic approach which considers language an apparent or a hidden argumentation, as O. Ducrot and Anscombe contend.
6. Logical and philosophical approach focuses mainly on linguistic and philosophical argumentation, as in the thought of J. B. Grize.
7. Discursive argumentative approach which is interested in discovering links and argumentative processes implied in texts and discourses, according to Michel Meyer and Dominique Maingueneau.

Classical argumentation can be classified into two categories: persuasion argumentation, which is a pure mental argumentation, cares about introducing logical arguments, introductions and conclusions. Its aim is to show what is true and what is untrue. The second type is influence argumentation which aims to leave its impact on emotions through focusing on feelings. The purpose of the second type is to urge the audience/listener whether to take an action or to ignore the whole matter. The audience of the first type of argumentation is few and confined to the intellectuals. The audience of the second type is big because it is easier to influence emotions. It may influence the audience negatively when it has pragmatic aims like getting more money and/or changing truths.

Sophists kept using both types: the mental and the influential. They, therefore, influenced the society in Athens. They also had a very long experience in giving speeches and influencing their audience. As a result, they distorted the truth, influenced judges in courts because they were pragmatic, not caring about getting to the truth. However, they mentioned that truth alone would not suffice to be the core topic of a speech, and this might be the reason why Socrates and later Plato ferociously attacked them.

In Athens, the dispute was not minor over an inferior matter, yet it was over authority and ruling. Who would be the best ruler? Was it better to be a philosopher or an orator? Plato decided that the ruler should be a philosopher after watching his professor Socrates sipping poison by court order as a result of political choices. On the other hand, Sophists believed that the ruler should be

an orator. Then, the Sophists' voices boomed in the society, attracting youth who wanted to learn how to give a speech (oratory) because it was a way to get power and rule. Henceforth, oratory became expensive merchandise, and wide-spread goods that was well-marketed by its owners. It is said that the fees of Protagoras's preliminary course were ten thousand drachmas, equal to the fees of ten thousand workers (Al-Walī, 2006).

### **Aristotle's Conceptualization Of Argumentation**

Aristotle was the first to refer to the two types of argumentation. Hence, he proclaimed that any spokesperson should be armed with both of them. He "did not forget to warn of following the sophists who use oratory as a way of blinding and camouflage, so he unveiled their tactics of argumentation so that both spokesmen and listeners could be aware." (Hilāl, 1997). Aristotle has divided argumentation into two types. The first is non-artistic arguments which exist already without any effort done by the orator to invent them such as testimonials, confessions, documents, laws and instruments. Orators use these arguments in delivering speeches because they strengthen orators' argument. By contrast to his precedents, Aristotle did not care about this type of arguments, maybe because the orator does nothing to create them.

The second type is the arguments invented by orators, and these arguments have a strong presence in oratory. Aristotle has divided this type into three subsections. The first is related to the orator's personality (ethos). It is significant in advisory speeches in the first place, and judicial ones in the second place. The orator's personality is a way of convincing audience/listeners. Confident about all that is said by the speaker/orator, listeners accept what is said and change their behaviors through mental convincing and emotional influence.

The second type is related to audience's circumstances (pathos). The orator should know his audience's nature and the moral values he wants to urge them to have. Additionally, he should be aware of emotions, knowing each emotion (its reasons, conditions, and how to get people feeling that particular emotion). Pathos, knowing audience's circumstances, is a major technique to positively influence and persuade the audience to take a specific action, or to negatively influence the audience to get away from a certain deed. "The orator does not only address minds and arguing intellectuals and ordinary people, but they must be emotionally influenced by purgation, arousing pity and fear, employing pathos, which is emotions, and depending on ethos, which is the principle virtues." (Ḥamdāwī, 2021).

The third type is related to the speech itself (logos). It is interested in telling the truth through seemingly convincing proofs. Logos basics, approached by Aristotle, connect rhetoric with logic on one hand and philosophy to politics on the other. As such, Aristotle has greatly cared about them, and has sided with them over emotional basics (pathos). He has focused on implied/discursive analogy, considering it the main argumentative basis. He has stressed its significance for judicial speeches discussed by judges and defenders who are actually intellectuals. In addition, he has drawn attention to the significance of examples or discursive induction in advisory speeches when the speaker/orator tries to persuade his audience that he is the best one to represent them in parliaments, for instance. Aristotle has, in the aggregate, focused on logos, and has cared about emotions as a link among rhetoric, morals, politics and psychology. In effect, disregarding the role of emotions while delivering speeches abolishes a big part of the way oratory works, and contributes to the audience's acceptance of speeches more effectively than the mental arguments upon which Aristotle's logos is based. In a nutshell, Aristotle has divided argumentation into two categories: objective, logical arguments and subjective moral arguments.

### **Objective, Logical Arguments**

An argument is a proof used either to confirm something or to refute it. It has two subsections: an argument based on textual or auditory proofs derived from the sacred books and prophets' sayings, and mental arguments based on logic and mind with which we are going to

deal in the following lines. There are five types of statements: a proof when the argument is absolutely certain, a speech when the argument is uncertain, a debate when the argument is well-known, poetry when the argument is emotional, and fallacy when the argument is an illusion reaching nowhere.

Objective, logical arguments are evidential arguments aiming at reaching certainty because it is composed of evidential introductions. Logically, the proof is the highest rank of all previous statements. Because proof is related to logic, arguments used in oratory are also related to logical arguments. Examples, in oratory, substitute induction in logic, and implied analogy represents the tripartite analogy in logic. Oratory depends on accepted or uncertain evidence, and its topics are the possible matters on condition that they are not deceptive because deceptive matters make oratory depart from its moral function to sophism. Examples belong to objective, logical arguments. They mean bringing in various cases that resemble the case in hand, that we want to infer to prove that both cases are the same. An example in oratory represents induction in logic. It is better for any speaker/orator to use examples in advisory speeches because they judge futuristic cases. Additionally, an example is a trial to expect the future according to how we actually read the past. According to Aristotle, examples can be divided into two sections bellow.

Historical example: when a speaker cites an example from the past. For instance, “we should get ready for war against the Persian ruler and prevent him from dominating Egypt because Darius did not dominate Europe until he had dominated Egypt.” Surely, these are historical events that have the power of examples directing the future. Mock examples are examples invented by the speaker. It is mentioned in Socrates’s dialogues that he compared the process of selecting judges to voting, and this was totally incorrect since swordsmen were not selected by voting, but because of their strength and patience. In a similar vein, if judges were selected by voting, we would become similar to those who would select the sea captain by voting. If the example is stated by an animal, it is a fable. What Aristotle mentioned, ascribed to Setesecors, in Sicily when they had chosen Phalaris, the tyrant, to be their ruler. He recounted the story of a horse living in grasslands, and then a gazelle came and corrupted this grassland. To take vengeance on it, the horse asked a man to help him. The man immediately accepted on condition that the horse would be reined, and the man would straddle the horse’s back. Finally, the man was on its back and sadly the horse became his slave.

Implied analogy is a type of objective, logical arguments. It represents the tripartite analogy in logic except that the short introduction of tripartite analogy is omitted (Hilāl, 1997). We say, for instance, “the one who floods us with blessings deserves to be thanked, Allah must be thanked.” The previous example is originally a tripartite analogy with an omitted small introduction which is “Allah floods us with all blessings.” Implied analogy comes to show the reasons and prove, so it is much more efficient in judicial speeches than advisory or festive speeches because they illuminate past events. Implied analogy is bisectional: Deductive implied analogy and implied rebuttal analogy.

Firstly, deductive implied analogy is used as follows:

1. Contradiction means the search for an opposite of a topic in a statement (Aristotle, 1979). The argument is get in the speech through contradiction. For example, ignorance and knowledge, and right and wrong: if ignorance is the reason for society deterioration, knowledge is the reason for its progress. We can notice that this is an implicit analogy because its middle term, which is the small introduction that means knowledge is not the reason for deterioration, has been omitted.
2. The relation between the less and the more means that if something is more probable to happen to something else, yet it was prevented. Then, it cannot happen to something (a third party) to which it is less probable. For example, prophets do not know the divine secret, so ordinary people cannot learn it, too.

3. The consideration of time means that if something is valid in the past, it is better to be valid in the present. A good example is when the father says to his son: "I spent my money on you when you were young knowing nothing, so should not I do so now after you got older?"
4. The consideration of relativity means that if the effect occurs, its cause occurs, and if the effect does not, the cause does not as well. For example, Allah says: "Had there been therein (in the heavens and the earth) gods besides Allah, then verily both would have been ruined." Therefore, as long as Earth and Heavens have not been ruined, it is a proof that there is no god but Allah.
5. Argument by defining the word; this is for the purpose of taking the evidence from the new definition of a word of which the listener was not aware of. For instance, wealth is not an abundance of money, but it lies in the soul. Another example, parental blessing is not feeding them, but being gentle and kind to them.
6. Evidence by division means that the orator divides the thing into parts, taking the evidence from this division. For example, people are composed of reality and appearance; and we are asked to deal what we see and know (appearances) not that we do not know (reality).
7. Contradictory results; the orator may use contradictory results that contain a good part and an evil part in each one of them. The orator argues, using such contradictory results to encourage the listener to do or quit something by balancing the interests or abuses that would happen. For example, Omar (May Allah be pleased with him) said: "If I sleep at night, I lose myself, and if I sleep during the day, I lose my people."
8. Unifying the results makes the two introductions united; when the results are the same, the two introductions are united. For example, who only studies the night before the exam will fail the same as the one who has never studied because he will not be able to comprehend all the lessons he has missed. Hence, the evidence is taken from the unity of the results as the introductions are equal or united.
9. The purpose of what is done is not what is expected; in this context, the orator uses this argument to reveal the real aim that may not be known by the audience. The one who envies assumes that he shall defame the one who is envied, but surprisingly he gives him more fame and good reputation.

Aristotle intended to introduce these arguments to orators to help them craft their arguments properly. Aristotle expressed his thoughts in a limpid and easy way. However, he did not go deep like those who came after him, so they introduced logic to rhetorical studies. Aristotle also criticized his precedents who had dealt with oratory because they had not cared about the artistic rules of proofs. They focused on attracting the attention of judges to issues irrelevant to defending themselves. In addition, he criticized that they were only interested in judicial speeches. The means, they used, confused judges. As a result, the purpose of oratory became limited to personal interest, and its aim was not to reach truth and justice. Aristotle appreciated the decisions of some countries to prevent defenders from dealing with topics unrelated to defense.

Secondly, implied rebuttal analogy: we have previously investigated implied deductive analogy which is arguments created by orators to convince the audience. Yet, the opponent may have arguments that he put forward and the orator wants to refute. These refutations are called objections. There are four means of refutation, namely what is extracted from the opponent's analogy, another similar analogy, contradictory analogy, or from previous terms. Details are as follows:

1. The orator extracts his analogy from the opponent's analogy. He to takes his opponent's analogy and adapts it for himself in order to refute his opponent's

- argument. For example, when your opponent tells you: "I have strived with you," you reply: "Yes, you have strived for what has done me harm."
2. The orator extracts his argument from an analogy similar to his opponent's. All Adam's sons are characterized by jealousy, so why are male animals jealous of their females?
  3. The orator extracts his argument from an analogy which is contradictory to his opponent's. For example, the opponent says: "Marriage of Westerners takes place according to the church and there is no divorce." Then, the orator says: "But, Muslims get divorced only when life becomes impossible between the spouses."
  4. The orator extracts his argument from previous terms. During argumentation, the orator resorts to some of the well-known previous terms which have been admitted by all. For example, "all prisoners of war must be killed because if we do not do that, they will kill us." Then, the orator says: "If this opinion had been correct, the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, would not have forgiven the captives during the conquest of Mecca."

### Subjective Moral Arguments

The orator resorts to subjective factors as a different kind of arguments. Subjective factors mean the characteristics that help the orator emotionally influence his audience. To put it another way, they are the personal features of the orator while delivering his speech. Subjective moral arguments represent talent, competence, and persuasive performance that an orator can manipulate to influence his audience. After this persuasive tactic comes the role of the delivered message, and then comes the role of the listeners whom the orator wants to change a certain behavior or adopt a specific situation.

Argumentation seeks to fulfill the three functions of benefiting, influencing, and enjoyment that all come together in the discursive situation. Benefiting comes true through two matters: first, when the orator knows well the relevant information, so he is like the one who has collected raw materials to produce something specific. Second, the arguments and convincing tactics added by the orator. Influence comes true when the orator draws the audience's attention at the very beginning of his speech, and influence comes true at the end when the orator succeeds in persuading his audience. Enjoyment comes true when the orator manages to drive the audience's boredom away. And this happens when the orator varies his arguments because sometimes the issues discussed may be difficult to understand.

Arguments are divided into three categories based on how they leave an impact on the audience's emotions: what is pertinent to the orator/speaker and his character, as Aristotle describes, is *ethos*, *pathos* refers to the audience's emotions, and finally *logos* refers to the meaning/content of the message. The three categories are tied to the emotional influence of the speaker/orator while delivering his speech. If objective logical arguments focus on mental persuasion, these three categories are all about emotional influence that pushes the audience towards changing a specific conduct or quitting it.

First, *ethos*: the Roman oratory with Cicero was based on *ethos*. If compared to *logos*, *ethos* endowed orators with high positions. *Ethos* focuses on the speaker/orator who is well-mannered, just, and knowledgeable. If the orator has good qualities, his influence will be much greater (Şammūd, 1998). Persuasion will be impossible if the orator does not appear credible from the very beginning of his speech. Listeners confide the speaker when he possesses three qualities, namely intelligence, virtue, and modesty (Hilāl, 1997). If the orator is not intelligent, he will surely corrupt his argument; if he is not virtuous, he may say what he does not believe, or he does not urge people to do good deeds he is fully aware of. The reason for this deception is because he is evil, so the bad spirit forces him to say what he does not believe. Similarly, if the orator possesses the two preceding qualities but is not modest, he may not be kind, so his words go in



vain. Henceforth, the orator who possesses the three preceding qualities is able to persuade his audience. Aristotle's pieces of advice were directed to the orator who is the initial element of communication. Undoubtedly, the value of ethos has been demonstrated in a variety of contexts, including education and politics. There are many teachers who lack the logical elements, scientific effectiveness, and pedagogical ways of teaching, but they are successful because they have mastered the emotional aspects. In a similar vein, we can find a successful politician who lacks powerful argumentative techniques, yet the audience is pleased with him since he focused on the emotional aspect of his speech.

The orator must have a symbolic authority over his audience; otherwise, how can the listener accept and adopt the orator's argument. The orator's authority is built on three fundamental pillars:

1. The orator's image that he, himself, draws in the hearts of his audience.
2. The listener and his readiness to accept the orator's argument.
3. The purpose of the speech.

The orator's success in attaining his purpose can be assessed by what his image offered him as well as the arguments and proofs he presented. Overviewing the history of oratory proves that emotional proofs are more influential than mental arguments. "most sociologists believe that groups accept emotional and affective evidences without boredom, unlike boring mental proofs" (Abū Zahrah, 1980). Addressing feelings is easier than addressing the mind, and people instinctively go towards the easiest things to understand for fear of exhausting minds with difficult-to-understand mental arguments.

Ethos relies on realistic experience, and scientific, political and religious efficiency. The orator's performance depends on these matters that influence and persuade the audience. Ethos is linked to a number of qualities that the orator should have, including his efficiency and knowledge in the issues he is arguing because this makes listeners confide him. Additionally, the orator should be faithful and sincere to his topic because the one who is not true to what he says cannot convince his audience. Furthermore, confidence cannot be built unless the orator is modest. Since argumentation is a symbolic power, the speaker should be gentle to his audience. In the past, orators used to talk about their talents and abilities, but nowadays he is faithful to what he says. Arrogant dictators' speeches are not argumentation, yet decrees out of their power. Argumentation is a symbolic power that needs modesty.

Second, logos: logos means intellectuality, the mind and language. It is also related to the argumentative language, the figures of speech and the verbal methods. It indicates the various types of linguistic reasoning achieved by analogy, induction and other evidences that aim to convince and influence the listener. Logos is not limited to logic, evidence and induction, but it goes beyond that to linguistic and discursive fields based on the language. Aristotle sees logos as a group of arguments, evidences as well as linguistic and stylistic methods on which oratory is based. Aristotle insisted that convincing the listener should be merely objective. This means that the speech itself with its evidences and proofs is the reason for such convincing, not the appearance of the orator because such appearances are external matters that help the speaker/orator win over the audience, and prepare the audience for proofs. If Aristotle insisted that convincing should be through logos or mental arguments presented by the orator, those who followed him focused on the ethos which is the state of the orator. The purpose of argumentation is not always to refute and defeat the opponent but to win the opponent's support and tendency towards the case in debate. Perlman contends that "the aim of every argumentation is to make minds submit to what is presented to them, or to increase the degree of that submission. The most successful speakers are those who succeed in making the intensity of submission strengthen its degree among the listeners to a point that motivates them to do the required work." (Ḥamdāwī, 2021).

Third, pathos: pathos is about arousing the audience's emotions so that the orator can deliver his message, and control the behavior of his audience. By Pathos, Aristotle means the

inclinations and whims that affect the audience. He concluded those inclinations in thirteen statuses, namely anger, calmness, cordiality, hatred, fear, security, shyness, rudeness, kindness, pity, irritation, envy and joy. All these conditions are feelings towards other people or things. It causes pleasure or pain. They are conditions and their counterparts as the opposite of friendship is hatred, and the opposite of anger is calmness, etc. Aristotle states: in each condition, we should differentiate between three demonstrations. In anger, for instance, we should know in what condition the angry people are in, with whom do they usually get angry, and to what subject do they get angry. Hence, if we considered just one aspect of these manifestations, not considering them all, it becomes impossible to suggest anger, and the same applies to the rest of the motives (Aristotle, 1979).

Thus, we find that Aristotle is focusing on that oratory should motivate the listener and cause him pleasure or pain so that he moves from a state of dissatisfaction to conviction, or from fear to calmness or vice versa, or from hatred to love or vice versa. By focusing on those inclinations and conditions, the orator gains the upper hand that enables him to move the audience perfectly. Many orators focused on the pathos and succeeded in influencing the audience. However, this does not mean that we can ignore the role of arguments and proofs, but it should be used along with the emotions so the oratory can be complete and integrated and then the orator shall succeed. "Pathos takes a psychological dimension on one hand, an ethical dimension on the other hand, and a rhetorical argumentative dimension on the third hand." (Aristotle, 1979). It is stated that ethos is related to Cicero in the western culture, Pathos is related to Plato and logos is related to Aristotle. Roland Barthes, who is one of the modernizers, linked ethos to the sender, pathos to the recipient, and logos to the message. Argumentation is linked to linguistics and semiotics and/or the three basic linguistic message elements.

### **Examples Of Argumentative Elements**

In any discourse, there are three essential elements: ethos that cares about the image of the speaker and his features, logos that is the discourse message, and finally pathos which means arousing pity and fear to achieve cleansing and convincing. Here are some examples in various argumentative processes to clarify the idea. Example (1): after the outbreak of COVID-19, when authorities urged the society to stick to the precautionary measures such as washing hands, wearing masks, etc. the three elements of this argumentative case should have been taken into consideration. As for ethos, the minister of health is the one who talks about the necessity of applying the precautionary measures. He is a doctor, fully aware of the epidemic and its updates. That the minister appears wearing a mask contributes to the society's acceptance because of his scientific efficiency and his image that encourages the audience to confide in what he says as he is experienced and follows these precautionary measures. As for logos, he stated these measures and notified that the ministry of health website would announce the numbers of the infected, the recuperated, and deaths and would update them with how to deal with the epidemic. Because the listeners put their confidence in the minister of health and his image was convincing, they would think of what he says. As for pathos, the ministry of health prepared a number of advertisements showing the efforts exerted by the members of the ministry of health to combat this epidemic. In the same vein, pictures of how the infection is passed from a person to another and testimonial videos of people who did not care about precautionary measures and consequently caught the virus push the audience to sympathize with the minister's words and follow the measures lest they would catch the virus.

Example (2): another example is convincing people to contribute to charitable work. As for ethos, A person, very dear to us — such as AlAzhar Sheikh, Imam of the Grand Mosque in Mecca, and/or a celebrity— appears to call for donation or appears while visiting a hospital for cancer and/or chronic diseases and visiting a wrecked area. The ethos of this person is achieved because he is a man to be trusted and his appearance reassures the audience. As for logos, this man might declare for example: "Donating just one dollar helps relieve the patients' pain, feed a

starved person, sheathe a naked person, or cure a patient.” And other similar statements that have argumentative meaning with a mental proof, or with linguistic meaning that contributes to conveying the idea of this person standing in this particular place. He may also refer to the fact that just one dollar would not impoverish the doner, but this one dollar would make a great change to the lives of those diseased/wrecked people. As for pathos, the camera is made to show a part of those people’s lives. Undoubtedly, these photos would hopefully influence the audience. A brief interview between this well-known person and some needy people is sometimes attached to these photos to show the extent to which they are in a bad need of the basics of life. These things leave an impact on the audience. The image of the orator in ethos, the meaning of the message in logos, and the audience’ sympathy in pathos motivate the audience to donate as the discursive message has been successfully conveyed so that it can affect the audience, and changed their attitude from being ignorant to being sympathetic with them and donating to help them.

Example (3): commercial advertisements (discourses of advertising) on goods and articles achieve these argumentative pillars. In commercial advertisements for a kind of soap, shampoo, a drink, and/or food, celebrities (footballers, artists, etc) using this product (soap, for example), drinking this drink, or eating this food represents ethos. Audiences have confidence in this famous character in the advertisement, and this motivates them to buy the product. In addition, the arrangement of food and the way it is eaten adds to this motivation. Logos is represented by the accompanying words to the celebrity drinking or eating this product, the name of the product appearing every now and then, and the celebrity’s encouraging words to buy the product that he cannot, as he says, do without. Needless to say, this convinces the listeners of this argument and pushes them to get the product. As for pathos, this commercial discourse focuses on the celebrity’s big influence on the audience who imitate his clothes, haircut, food, drinks, etc. The audience feels disappointed when they cannot get this product, so they try their best to get it as quickly as possible. The image plays a great role in argumentation, equal to the discourse itself. Commercial advertisements can just be a photo without voice, but logos can be transferred through this photo. Women, especially beautiful actresses, are frequently used to popularize the product. Companies, focusing on these argumentative tactics, gain much profits because they managed to convince the audience through successful commercial advertisements.

## CONCLUSION

Arabic rhetoric is no less than the Western study regarding caring about argumentation and its modes of analysis. Additionally, the paper presented an analysis of Aristotle’s types of argumentation, proving his pioneering role in classifying argumentation into two types. His hypotheses have been the greatest streams watering the modern argumentative study. The paper has carefully dealt with the types of arguments. It has defined each type and reinforced this with an application so the paper included theory and practice.

## REFERENCES

- Aberdein, A. (2021). *Was Aristotle a Virtue Argumentation Theorist?* (pp. 215–229). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70817-7\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70817-7_11)
- Abū Zahrah, M. (1980). *Al-Khaṭabah Uṣuluha Wa-Tarikhiha Fi Azhar ‘Uṣuriha ‘Inda Al-‘Arab*. Dar Al-Fikr Al-‘Arabi.
- Al-Walī, M. (2006). *Min Khaṭabah Aristu Albatwsyh* (Vol. 26). Majallat ‘Alamat Al-Maghribiyah.
- Aristotle, A. (1979). *Al-Khaṭabah. Tarjamat: Badawī, ‘Abd Al Raḥmān*. Dar Al-Qalam.
- Baffioni, C. (2020). Aristotle, Arabic: Poetics. In *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy* (pp. 205–208). Springer Netherlands. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1665-7\\_54](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1665-7_54)

- Baumeister, D., Järvisalo, M., Neugebauer, D., Niskanen, A., & Rothe, J. (2021). Acceptance in incomplete argumentation frameworks. *Artificial Intelligence*, 295, 103470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2021.103470>
- Chen, Y., Benus, M. J., & Hernandez, J. (2019). Managing uncertainty in scientific argumentation. *Science Education*, 103(5), 1235–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21527>
- Forchtner, B. (2021). Critique, Habermas and narrative (genre): the discourse-historical approach in critical discourse studies. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 18(3), 314–331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2020.1803093>
- Geoffroy, M. (2020). Aristotle, Arabic. In *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy* (pp. 188–203). Springer Netherlands. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1665-7\\_52](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1665-7_52)
- Guellil, I., Saâdane, H., Azouaou, F., Gueni, B., & Nouvel, D. (2021). Arabic natural language processing: An overview. *Journal of King Saud University - Computer and Information Sciences*, 33(5), 497–507. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksuci.2019.02.006>
- Hahn, U. (2020). Argument Quality in Real World Argumentation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 24(5), 363–374. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.01.004>
- Ḥamdāwī, J. (2021). *Khataḥ al-Ḥajjaj Bayna al-Nazariyah Wa-al-Taṭbiq*. Dar Al Rif Lil Ṭab' Wa Al Nashr Al Iliktruni.
- Hilāl, M. G. (1997). *Al-Naqd Al-Adabi Al-Ḥadith*.
- ‘Abd-al-Raḥmān, Ṭāhā. (1998). *Al-Lisan Wa-al-Mizan Aw Al-Takawthur Al-‘Aqli*. Al-Markaz al-Thaqafi al-Arabi.
- Ibn Aḥmad, ‘Alam Fāyizah. (2012). *Al Ḥajjaj Fi Al-Lisaniyat Al-Tadawuliyah Dirasah Li-Namadhij Min Al-Qur’an Al-Karim*.
- Jagham, L. (2015). *Istiratijiyyat al-Ḥajjaj fī al-Turath al-‘Arabi*. Dar al-Nabighah lil-Nashr wa-al-Tawzi’.
- Jarvis, E. D. (2019). Evolution of vocal learning and spoken language. *Science*, 366(6461), 50–54. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax0287>
- Keshav, M., Julien, L., & Miezal, J. (2022). The Role Of Technology In Era 5.0 In The Development Of Arabic Language In The World Of Education. *Journal International of Lingua and Technology*, 1(2), 79–98. <https://doi.org/10.55849/jiltech.v1i2.85>
- Kock, C. (2021). The Reception of Ancient Rhetoric in Modern Argumentation Theory and Pedagogy. In *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Ancient Rhetoric* (pp. 489–513). BRILL. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004470057\\_022](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004470057_022)
- Mashbāl, M. (2017). *Fi Balaghat Al-Ḥajjaj Nahwa Muqarabah Balaghiyah Ḥijajiyah Li-Tahlil Al-Khiṭabat*. Dar Kunuz al-Ma‘rifah.
- Nejmaoui, N. (2018). Improving EFL Learners’ Critical Thinking Skills in Argumentative Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 12(1), 98. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n1p98>
- Nejmaoui, N. (2019). Improving EFL Learners’ Critical Thinking Skills in Argumentative Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 12(1), 98. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n1p98>
- Rigotti, E., & Greco, S. (2019). *Inference in Argumentation* (Vol. 34). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04568-5>
- Ṣammūd, Ḥammadi. (1998). *Muqaddimah Fi Al-Khalḥiyah Al-Nazariyah Lil-Muṣṭalah*. Jami‘at Al Adab Wa Al Funun wa Al ‘Ulum Al Insaniyah.

Seyoum, W. M., Yigzaw, A., & Bewuketu, H. K. (2022). Students' Attitudes And Problems On Question-Based Argumentative Essay Writing Instruction. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 58–63. <https://doi.org/10.33365/jeltl.v3i2.2106>

Şūlah, A. (1998). *Al-Ḥajjaj Aṭrḥ Wa Muṭalaqatuhu Wa Taqniyatuh Min Khilal Muṣannaf Fi Al-Ḥajjaj Al-Khaṭabah Al-Jadidah Lbyrlman Wtytyka*. Jami'at Al Adab Wa Al Funun Wa Al 'Ulum Al Insaniyah.