

QUASI-LOGICAL ARGUMENTS IN LITERARY TREATISES OF THE BUYID ERA

Hawraa Hamid Hassan, Suad Badeea Muttair

Department Arabic, College of Education, University of Wasit, Ministry of Higher Education
and Scientific Research, Iraq

Abstract

These are the arguments that rely on logical structures such as (congruence, pluralism, contradiction), but unlike pure logical arguments, they can easily be rejected on the grounds that they are not logical, due to the objectionable factors that require great effort to remove the objections and strengthen the connections. They are of two types: semi-arguments. Logic, which relies on logical structures, and quasi-logical arguments, which rely on mathematical relationships.

Introduction

Arguments of contradiction and disagreement: which is when the writer presents two propositions in his message: the first is true and the other is false, and the recipient discovers which of them is correct by looking at the situation and the surrounding circumstances. This allows him, through the use of logic, to refute and deny the false proposition, and we seek this type of The arguments in the letters of this era, such as the saying of Qaboos bin Shamkir: “As for what the people of this claim claim, that the stars are the ones that bring good and evil to all creatures and human beings, and that the hardship and prosperity that afflicts a person is due to the differences in their movements and course in the sky: it is a proof of sight.” And raising the proof, because the reason for the arrival of good and evil to people is clear: that is, we see evil and benevolence as visible human actions, and everything that happens in this world of blessing and calamity is intentional or by agreement, and both of them have a cause: except that this is an accident without calculation. This occurs through effort and acquisition..., so it is impossible to attribute this to the planets and claim that its cause is the entry of a planet into a sign of the zodiac, and if that were the case, it would be necessary for it to do its first action every time it enters it”, so in order for the writer to convince the reader of his text with his opinion, he called for an argument contradiction; To serve the idea that he presents, and to support the argument that he presents, the writer made a persuasive effort by presenting two opinions, one of which represents the prevailing opinion that believes in the influence of the planets on human life, and another opposing opinion that he adopted in this letter (the invalidity of the rulings of the stars), which is an opinion supported by the argumentative methods that It makes all opinions weak, so the reader leans towards him after making logical and rational balances between the different opinions until the last one arrives at the best and most correct. The writer may resort to using this type of argument to address the recipient’s feelings and conscience, as in Al-Khwarizmi’s letter to the chief of Tus, condoling him on the death of his brother. “My book is about safety, and what is the safety of one who sees every day a threatened corner, a godless soul, a lost brother, and a basin of death brought to him”, so we notice that its occurrence had an impact on the recipient’s psyche and directed him to the intended

meaning without the other meanings within this. The text, considering the arguments of contradiction; to explain his position and emotions to the addressee, he began his letter by saying: (My book is about safety.) This suggests to the reader that this book contains the contents of safety and that it is the general meaning of the message. However, examining it gives a contradictory meaning (And what is safety is he who sees everything), which resulted in a broken horizon. The expectation in the existence of peace was to negate it entirely in order to prove the meanings of condolence, so it was tantamount to refuting an argument with its opposite.

In this era, the writer may resort to disseminating contradictory meanings in the form of contradictory images attributed to princes and kings. Lumaan wants to prove it in a way that suits the context of the situation, such as Al-Tha'labi's saying: "Our lord the prince, may God prolong his life. He is a cloud full of rain, and his beast is relief, but he has not greeted my land with rain, nor has he ever wet my throat." It is - may God bless his victory - a full sea, overflowing with blessings, but I I am thirsty in its vicinity, deprived of its good effects, just as it is a full moon that fills the eyes with grace and fills the earths with radiance. And my footstool is empty from its light, and for my life... This is not the case, so how astonished I am at the thirst next to the teeming sea, and at the darkness facing the bright full moon." So the writer wanted In this text, it conveys an image based on contradiction by conveying the other side of the addressee when his generosity reaches its extent and is not sufficient for it and is not included in his kindness, if he invokes for the described the image of the clouds, the sea, and the full moon that indicate generosity and generosity, then he brings another image that contradicts the beloved images (thirst, darkness), and these The images do not agree with the others. They were brought to enhance the persuasive energy by attracting the reader to them. Rhetorical methods helped in consolidating and proving the idea, as they eliminate any possible contradictory interpretation. Because going beyond the literal meaning of the texts leads us to the conclusion that their content is broadcasting the meanings of complaint and reproach to the reader so that he is covered by his abundance and done justice to him by his generosity. It can be said that the appearance of the argument of contradiction in the texts of messages is related to the richness of the persuasive content, as it is a rational argument with a logical nature, in which the writer depends on good selection. Being able to convey the idea to the reader in order to make it more relevant in his mind, while the reader must digest it well and be patient in discovering it. Because comparing and contrasting contradictory parties requires focusing between the two statements in order to integrate the information and understand the general result.

Arguments based on similarity: These are arguments that are based on defining the thing itself by making the predicate the same as its predicate. They are often used in explaining the value of the thing, such as our saying: (The Iraqi is Iraqi) in explaining pride, since we have defined the thing by itself and have not added anything new to it. These arguments are used to present The main idea is through definitions and setting boundaries in a formal way that distances him from accuracy and clarity, "The addressee intends to use definitions and setting limits in their formal way to evaluate concepts positively or negatively in the mind of the addressee, and push him to acts of thought regarding what is presented to him in order to accept or reject it, according to the

semantic value. These definitions are in order to obtain the result, and an example of these arguments is Al-Tawhidi's complaint of his distress and misery to his friend Al-Buzjani, saying: "Travelling from one country to another has humiliated me, and standing at the door of another has failed me, and the knower has denied me, and the one close to me has distanced himself from me, so he used the relationship of similarity based on the formal formula." For the word (Bab), which is identical in wording and varies in connotation, to repel the suspicion we have that he did not add anything new. Through careful exploration and research, we discover that the first word Bab came with a connotation different from the second. Because the second one conveyed the meaning of comprehensiveness and multiplicity, as he did not knock on one door, but rather several doors, which gave the idea a presence in the mind of the reader and achieved its consolidation. To be a way to win him over and persuade him, as well as the saying of Qaboos bin Shamkir: "The sheikh performs this task as the people of goodness and goodness do, and he strives in it as the great does in the great, and he fulfills his generosity for himself and seeks from his generosity that day. In the text, the analogous relationship is repeated to serve the context of the topic, which carries meanings of praise." And praise, the writer himself defined the thing in formal formulas that he used to remove doubt with certainty due to the existence of a semantic relationship between similar sentences. The first "good" indicated the combination of good qualities that oppose evil qualities, while the second word "good" gave the meaning of generosity, generosity, and generosity. Likewise, the first word (great) came to indicate Elevation of prestige and high status, while the second word (great) gave a different meaning, which is the virtues of actions such as intercession, forgiveness, and others. Thus, the writer established with these arguments relationships that are similar in their elements and differ in their distant meanings in order to reach one goal embodied in achieving persuasion, and letter writers may not be satisfied with a single argument of definition. They cite several diverse arguments, out of a desire to achieve what they aspire to, an example of which is what was stated in Al-Khwarizmi's letter to the chief of Benisapur: "And my master came before he provided me with an answer about this book, and by my life, if he responded to me before he wrote the answer to me, the writer has been justified. And if he breaks the book, then he has done good to the great, and disobeyed the small, and because he soothes my eyes in a moment, he is dearer to me than soothing my hearing with his words, even if his words are clear water to my soul, and lawful magic to my ears, and the words of the Beloved are Beloved, and everything that is near is near.

In this letter, the writer deliberately used several definitions in order to clarify a specific idea and communicate it to the recipient. For the purpose of achieving compatibility and persuasion, the first argument for similarity that is taken into account is his saying: (He has been vindicated by the great, the great), which is a definition that lacks clarity and accuracy. Because the addressee may think that the two words carry one meaning, which is old age and advancement in the decades of life, but in reality the speaker wants to reach the meaning of sympathy, so the first word gave the meaning of advancing in age, while the second word gave the meaning of greatness and great importance, and among the definitions that were available for it This text: (Aqq fi al-Saghir al-Saghir), so the writer sought to correct this analogous relationship; Desiring to influence the

recipient and gain his sympathy and pardon, he defined the adjective “small” itself to refer to argumentative meanings, so the first word “small” came to suggest the smallness and insignificance of the sin, while the second carried the meaning of diminishing importance and value and intended it for himself, and the writer kept repeating these arguments to create Meanings with which he tries to reform his affairs by creating a psychological impact on the recipient so that he submits to his idea. Then the writer moves from the meanings of sympathy to the meanings of praise by introducing other definitions, which are: (the beloved is beloved) and (the relative is close), and they also do not give us the meaning extracted from the construction. The verbal meaning of the word, and the writer did not want to define the word itself, but rather wanted meanings through which the secrets of his soul would be revealed to prove his case, so the first two words: (beloved, and relative) indicated the physical presence, which is the addressee himself, while the other two words gave the moral meaning, which is the constancy of love, affection, and closeness to the soul. So that it has a presence in his thought and imagination, even if it is absent, and all of these are qualities through which he sought positive evaluation that brings him closer to the recipient by devising these arguments according to the position “that gives these expressions their specific connotations, and from the above we say: These arguments have an effective energy that adds Speech has a clear effect that leads to persuasion. Because it imitates logic, it provides two meanings: a real, simple meaning, and a metaphorical meaning that stimulates the mind of the addressee to obtain it when understanding and comprehension are attained. Persuasion cannot be achieved unless there is understanding and comprehension.

Arguments based on reciprocal relationships: These are arguments that seek to combine two issues in one ruling and apply one treatment to them to form a reciprocal relationship, so “we will be able to prove that the relationship between (A, B) is the same as (B, A), and the writers of this era used These arguments are an attempt to combine the rulings to produce a similar text so that the recipient feels its logic. However, they remain outside the limits of logic, because they are “attributing the same ruling to two matters that we claim are identical. The fact is that if we subjected them to careful study, we would end up with many differences, and among their letters that were full of this type” One of the arguments is what Al-Khwarizmi said in his book that he sent to Abu Muhammad Al-Alawi: “The master departed into the presence of a man who, for generosity, raised a soul, and for virtue represented a person. If an Arab looked at him, he became a non-Arab, and if a non-Arab looked at him, he became an Arab, and if an admirer saw him, he divorced his arrogance and left his pride.” He is a companion of generosity and his friend, a colleague of generosity and a guest, so this text, which carries meanings of praise and commendation, established the reciprocal relationship that exists between “If a non-Arab looks at him, he becomes an Arab” and “If an Arab sees him, he becomes a non-Arab,” which are contradictory arguments that he combines. The writer treated her in the same way in order to achieve his suppressed goal. Through the context, we notice that the arguenter applied the rule of justice between the debate between the Arab and the non-Arab so that the reader feels their logic. However, the focus on the two arguments shows that there is a clear discrepancy between them, as the Arab has become a non-Arab. Because of the eloquence of his speech, the strength of

his memorization, and his mastery of different languages, which made the (Arab) viewer feel like a non-Arab, and because of the strangeness of the generosity he witnessed, to the point that it was as if no one had seen anyone like him in giving, so he became a non-Arab, and the non-Arab became an Arab. Because of the clarity of mind and the sophistication of the tongue that he acquired from that man, and there is nothing strange about this, they were “hesitating in the areas of knowledge and literature, and descending into the season of Persians and Arabs, and this is what they heard from the words of the minister, who if the beasts heard him would be stunned, and if the mute were addressed by him, they would speak.” Or by it I summoned the birds, they would descend, and whoever sat there mastered a craft, he would master it, and whoever had listened to the ruling for a long time would pronounce it, and the best teacher would be the neighbor, and the best hearing and sight would be the Messenger, so this quasi-logical argument helped to add beauty to the speech and then influence the recipient until it leads him to persuasion.

Among those who invoked these arguments was al-Sahib ibn Abbad in the letter addressed to Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Katib, on the authority of Mu’ayyad al-Dawla: “And We commanded you to rely on the one who receives alms on the written obligations of God, and His established rulings, not combining or separating between the two, so when the talk was about imposing zakat. The writer made a connection between his message and the noble Prophetic hadith: “It does not differentiate between a society, nor does it bring together a crossroads of fear of charity, so it included the reciprocal relationship that brought together two disparate issues, asking those in authority to give zakat to those who deserve it and adhere to its provisions and controls. This argument was a means of persuasive argumentation that was used to confirm the idea.” Organize it with his message in professional harmony by making it part of the text, collaborating to achieve one goal that is evident to the recipient and he complies with it towards persuasion and conviction. From this, Ibn al-Ameed says in his letter to Ibn Balka: “So I appealed to God when you spoke the truth about what I ask you: How did you find what you were still doing, and how do you find what you have become? Were you not among the first in a shady shade, a gentle breeze, a wind at night, morning air, and irrigated water? And a quiet cradle, and be a shelter, and a secure place, and a fortified fortress, that protects you from harm, protects you from fears, protects you from the calamities of time, and protects you from the ravages of the two events. You were strengthened by it after humiliation, you increased after scarcity, you rose after poverty, you were made easy after hardship, and you were enriched after dust. After the tribulation, you expanded, you won mandates, banners fluttered above you, men stepped on your heels, hopes were attached to you, and you began to multiply and be multiplied, you would be mentioned and referred to, and your name would be mentioned on pulpits and in lectures you would be mentioned, so we notice that his saying: “You will multiply and be multiplied, you will point out and be referred to” contributed. In supporting and reinforcing the writer’s idea, and multiplying the persuasive argumentative energy of the text, because it is an attempt to prove the claim through the reciprocal relationship that seeks to establish balance and justice between two statements that are at the height of contradiction, for there is a difference between his multiplication in blessings, and the people’s multiplication of him in pride and number, and the reference to He commanded that he was

empowered by his authority, and made it clear that people referred to him because of his high status and elevation. The behavior here is not the same, but rather it is different, which the writer sought. To prove an implicit result, which is establishing a balance between his state in the past and his current state that he reached as a result of his disobedience. To summarize the above, this type of argument has a storehouse of persuasive energies that come from establishing a reciprocal relationship between the contradictions that the writer brings together under one rule to give the recipient the illusion of the truth, which is Away from it, in order to gain his acceptance and approval, but the recipient's involvement in it is achieved by stimulating the mind and reconsideration, which distances him from the false certainty that the arguer may rely on to prove his claim.

The transitivity argument: These are arguments that aim to “prove that the relationship that exists between (A) and (B) on the one hand and (B) and (C) on the other hand is one relationship. Based on this, we can prove to the recipient that (A) and (C) When the common factor between them (B) is deleted, based on the deductive mechanism that involves the mind of the recipient in this mathematical relationship, leading to the conviction that comes from recognizing the validity of the major and minor premise. We find these arguments in the texts of their letters in a way that we will show in the following evidence:

Qaboos bin Shamkir said in his letter in which he described the world and mentioned its formation: “If it is said: His creation in manifesting the world is not a single creation, but rather many types of His creation, then his answer is that the world, even if it includes many types and includes different types, is one creation and a system.” An example of this is a city that a prince orders to be built, bringing together everything he needs of houses, palaces, railways, markets, shops, inns, and other artifacts. For it is one building and one city, even if the things mentioned in it are combined and the buildings are different in their squares. In this text, the writer relied on the principle of analogy and deduction that It allowed him to move from one argument to another, bringing together in his argumentative text multiple parties that he wanted to combine between them to come up with a unified final result. The writer, while talking about the universe and its formation, invoked the major premise that wants to prove that (the different world is the creation of one), and it represents the relationship between (A) And (C) which we mentioned earlier, then he moved to a minor premise that says: (The city is a single creation) and it represents the relationship between (B) and (C), so we notice that the single creation is the mediator that combined arguments that do not belong to each other in an apparent relationship, with the aim of It makes the recipient believe in the issue that he wants to prove through the arguments, which say: The Almighty of His Face is the Creator of the universes, even if they differ in their types, like the creation of a city that differs in its features. Thus, moving from the introduction to the results helped to make the reader's mind ready to receive the information and be convinced of it, and examples of these arguments are Also, what al-Tawhidi said in his letter to Abu al-Wafa' al-Muhandis al-Buzjani: “Spend your prestige, for by the praise of God it is abundant, and if you are diligent in money, then also diligent in prestige, for they are brothers. In this text, there is a semantic relationship between the major premise: (spend your money), which represents the

relationship between (A) and (B), and the minor premise (earn money), which represents the relationship between (B) and (C), based on a deductive procedure based on The transitive relationship. The aspect of transitivity in these two premises lies in the result of the saying: (For they are brothers), which represents the relationship between (A) and (C), as spending formed the linking element between the two premises and gave the connotation of sharing in credit and reward between money and prestige, with the desire to urge the recipient to Spending and spending. Invoking this argument helped engage the reader's attention and focus on the statement presented. To make it influential and affected, he had to be vigilant in linking the introductions with which the writer builds his analogies. A desire to convince the addressee and his compliance. Also among the arguments for transgression is the saying of Al-Sahib Ibn Abbad: "We have seen you with this conquest whose canopies are extended, whose people are drawn up, whose banners are raised, whose clubs are inflated, so that you will shout about it on the pulpits, and spread the news of it among the subjects and the soldiers, so that the present and those who come will be known, and those who are following and those who are hostile will be certain. That God is responsible for this state with a firm structure and clear proof, even if he gives hope to its enemies for a period of time, and lures them after a long pause, so what do you think? In this text, the writer invoked the argument of transgression as a means of conveying his idea, so he built it on two premises and a conclusion, the first major, which lies in his saying: "He knows "The Present and the Beginning." Then he supplemented it with a minor introduction: "And the Master and the Host are certain." We notice in this logical structure the existence of a semantic coexistence, because the minor introduction is subsumed under the meaning expressed by the major introduction, in addition to the presence of the element of transitivity linking the two introductions, which is (information), which is considered a hamza. The connection and evidence that enables the reader to understand the connections between the statements, even if they are far apart, and to reach the conclusion: (God is responsible for this state), which constituted a turning point from the postulates to the goals and the attainment of the goals. The conclusion about the argument of transgression is that it is an effective means of convincing the recipient by bringing him to the result by relying on The statements that build on each other in the form of introductions are directly related to the tendencies of the text, thereby achieving persuasion even if the topic is far from the rugged paths of logic.

Quasi-logical arguments that rely on mathematical relationships:

First: Integrating the part into the whole: This is a relationship based on the statement that what applies to the whole applies without a doubt to the part; Because the rulings and characteristics of the whole are the same in the part, "the part is considered an appropriate value within the whole, so the ruling that is applied to this whole can be withdrawn to apply to the part, and the purpose of this type of argument during the Hajj is to direct the recipient and lure him to the intended results of the argument, so the recipient's belief in the ruling Addressing the whole does not prevent him from believing the part of it, and these arguments lose their logic when the writer forgets that the whole is not like the part, so his argument becomes a fallacy. Whoever used these arguments, Al-Khwarizmi, in his satire of Camphor: "But treachery is among the morals of women, so whoever clings to one part of it has deceived himself from The perfection of the males, and their attraction

to the female part, and he is androgynous in terms of character, not androgynous in terms of character, and a person may improve his character, but he cannot change his character, so treachery in this case is the greatest effeminacy, and the most general feminization, which is implied by the writer's saying: "Treachery is part of the morals of women" based on an argumentative fallacy. Because he attributes the attribute of treachery to the attributes of everyone, as if he forgot that treachery may lead to another, unknown reason other than it being an essential attribute for women. It is not logical to include treachery in women and make it pertain to them without exception. This argument reinforced the writer's intent and purpose in proving the meanings of bashing women. The attacker, so this argument added to him the quality of treachery and effeminacy together, out of a desire to draw a clear picture of him in order to direct the recipient in the direction that the speaker wants, and to make him feel that he is a part of the whole, so he included him with women in this capacity, and this is the focus of the work of the argument for inclusion, and among those who used this type of argument is a monotheist. In his treatise, *Explaining the Fruits of Science*, he said: "Anger, although it is reprehensible according to some characteristics, is praiseworthy in some circumstances, and just as continued anger, in all circumstances, is a kind of corruption of morals, likewise contentment in all matters is a form of hypocrisy, and no It is necessary to fluctuate between contentment and anger, just as it is necessary to hesitate between comfort and fatigue. We notice that the arguer here relied on the argument of inclusion and inclusion to prove the meaning that he wanted to convince the recipient of, and this argument lies in his saying: "Continuing anger is a kind of corruption of morals and contentment with all "Things are a kind of hypocrisy." That is, continuing anger is part of corruption of morals and carries its characteristics and its conditions apply to it. Similarly, continuing contentment is part of hypocrisy and carries its provisions. However, the question here is: Is continuing anger in all circumstances corruption of morals? Or is contentment a reason for hypocrisy? The answer is definitely no! Because the speaker invoked a rule based on exceptions in proportion to the circumstances of the situation, so we see it moving away from its demonstrative logic. However, it was presented in a consistent form that helped realize the writer's ideas, arouse the reader's curiosity, and push him to engage in the search for implicit results that might achieve his acquiescence at the time. Reaching it and discovering it These arguments were present in Ibn al-Ameed's letter as well, such as his letter to al-Sahib bin Abbad explaining to him the reasons for the collapse of the countries: "The reason why many kingdoms and many countries became corrupted was not that the ministry's destinies were reduced, and the edges of the emirate contracted, and there is no corruption, as I see it." the rest of the earth, unless he seeks the help of my servants in this matter. My master will not be stingy with the benefactor of his blessings thanks to his knowledge, for from this state has flowed what his virtue and the virtue of the trustworthy sheikh before him", so the author of the text talks about the administration of the state and the reasons that led to its collapse, presenting his warning arguments against He formed advice, attributing the reason for this to the decline in the value of the ministry and the shrinkage of the emirate. The arguer used the argument of generalization, so the whole (the collapse of countries) would not be achieved unless the part (the decline in the value of the ministry) was achieved, which he made a condition for achieving the

whole, and it is incorrect to make this generalization a stable and established ruling; Because there are many countries that fell without achieving this reason. Therefore, this argument is no longer logical, but it has an argumentative effect. Because it made the text more compact, more acceptable, and closer to the path in mastering the recipient's thought and directing him towards the main idea, and based on the above we say: The writers of this era made conscious use of this type of argument, governed by intent, for persuasive argumentative purposes, so they served as bridges to achieve meanings. Different, but in a manner based on generalization, so that it gives the part the characteristics of the whole and gives it strength to force the recipient to believe in the meaning of the speech and rely on it.

Second: Dividing the whole into a part: These are arguments that are used to explain the parts of a thing in detail, by enumerating the comprehensive parts of the overall argument to give the speech argumentative force, so it "proves the existence of the total and from there strengthens the presence in the sense of notifying others of the existence of the thing that is the subject of the division by declaring the existence of its procedure." However, the purpose of mentioning the parts depends on the speaker's intention in this use. Mentioning them in front of a recipient who is ignorant of them is for a demonstrative purpose, while mentioning them in front of a recipient who is aware of them is for an argumentative purpose that highlights its presence and confirms it. The purpose of this division may be to disperse the parts of the argument that the recipient believes in so that it weakens and undermines its pillars, and one of the examples of its occurrence in this letter is Al-Thaalibi's saying: "I complain to God and then to you, my lord - may God preserve your glory - a people whose promises are embellished with the statements of lies, laced with embellishments of falsehoods." So, when the one who hopes goes to them to ask for relief, he cannot do without waiting for them to seek three things: the treasures of Qarun. The like of whom has not been created on the left, and the life of Noah, who was not longer than him in terms of lifespan, and the patience of Job, which is set as a proverb in patience, and God is the one who seeks help in the burning of waiting, and the joys of Necessity, so we notice that the arguer has included his comprehensive argument for the first time, which is his saying: "He did not dispense with it." Waiting for their feasibility for three." Then he returned to listing the arguments for division and branching that make up the main comprehensive argument, with a desire to give it an argumentative dimension. Because each part of it will serve as evidence that supports the validity of the call. The writer here is complaining to his master about something that he was ignorant of, so he used his argument for demonstrative and illustrative purposes, dividing what the seeker needs into three: the treasure of Aaron, the life of Noah, and the patience of Job, so he gave each part an argumentative characteristic that carries a common meaning between the parts. The other and the general argument, and this argument constituted a double-edged proof that helped "make a choice between two matters, each of which leads to one negative result. When the writer said Aaron's treasure, he gave it another argumentative dimension when he described it by saying: "The like of which has not been created on the left," and when Omar Nuh said that he described him by saying: "The one who is not longer than him in lifespan," which is a Hajjaj description that suggests a long wait. Likewise, his saying: "And the patience of Job, which is used as a proverb for patience,"

which gave an indication of abundance of patience and intensity of endurance, all of which aim to achieve an effect on the recipient. Yes, he was drawn to the issue under discussion, and among those who also cited it as evidence was Al-Sahib Ibn Abbad in his book, which he recommended to the people of the borders: “And do not be distressed by the abundance of abominations, for they are the swarms of hyenas, the eaters of wild beasts, the paths of swords, and the pastures of the dead. Many of them are few, and their mighty are lowly, and they are between two thorns.” Either imposing great hatred - from God - or leading to a painful punishment, just as the mujahideen for the sake of God are among two good people. Either happiness in the life of this world, or testimony in that which is better and more lasting. And God is the protector of your support and guidance, and the strengthening of your supporters and your numbers, so this will emerge. The argument when the writer divided the fate of the sons of atheism and the mujahideen, so we see him summarizing the statement, explaining that the sons of atheism are divided into two evils, and the sons of jihad are divided into two heavens, then he divides them into partial arguments with which the argumentative charges of the main argument are divided; The addressee does not deny that the end of the atheist is hatred of God and His great torment, just as he does not deny that the mujahideen have happiness in this world and martyrdom is better and more lasting.

The purpose is not to prove this, but rather its main purpose is to give it an argumentative presence that contributes to the acquisition of the recipient's convictions and thus his response to the matter at hand. Qaboos bin Shamkir used this type of argument to undermine Qara's beliefs in his message entitled *The Invalidation of the Rulings of the Stars*, saying: “And they divided the signs by those stars.” They called it different names: such as the lion, the scorpion, the bow, the whale, the lamb, the scales, and others. There is no bow in the sky, no scorpion, no wolf there, no fox, no whale, no lamb, no locusts, and no camel. We notice that the arguer brought up the opposing opinion, dividing it into parts in order to give a picture. clear about their ideas that they believe in, so that the recipient feels that this perception is wrong and false and all of its components are invalid and rejected, so he divided these signs into several sections, with the desire to weaken and disperse them, then he continued by saying: “There is no bow in the sky, nor scorpion, nor There is no wolf, no fox, no whale, no lamb, no locusts, and no camel.” It is a result that carries with it sarcastic meanings that aim to change the opponent's thoughts and beliefs, to go beyond their linguistic dimension to reformative argumentative dimensions whose goal is to influence and persuade. From the above, these arguments have formed a persuasive tributary to the method of stating the entirety, which helps in conveying and understanding, then dividing it to consolidate it in the mind, and this is what helps the recipient's compliance, and this is the goal of every argumentative process.

References

1. In the theory of argumentation, studies and applications: 42.
2. Kamal al-Balagha: 100-101.
3. Prose of systems and solution of knots: 104-105.
4. See: Al-Hajjaj in Ancient Arabic Poetry: 200.

5. *Al-Hajjaj fi Kalila wa Dimna* by Ibn al-Muqaffa: Hamdi Mansour Judi, Amman, 1st edition, 2018 AD: 113.
6. He is Abu Al-Wafa Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Yahya bin Ismail bin Al-Abbas Al-Buzjani. He was born in Bozjan from the country of Nishapur in the year 328 AH. He was a scholar of arithmetic, algebra and astronomy, and he died in the year 387 AH. See: *Deaths of Notables*: 5/166-167, and see: *From the Messages of Abu Hayyan al-Tawhidi*: 38.
7. *From Al-Tawhidi's Messages*: 119.
8. *In the theory of pilgrimage*: 45.
9. *Lectures on New Rhetoric*: 44.
10. *Al-Hajjaj in Arabic poetry, its structure and methods*: 200.
11. Abu Tahir Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Abdul Rahim Al-Asbahani, the writer, the trustworthy and reliable imam, narrated a lot on the authority of Abu Al-Sheikh, on the authority of Abu Bakr Al-Qabab, and on the authority of Abu Bakr bin Al-Muqri. He traveled to Al-Daraqutni and took his Sunan from him, and he died in Rabi' Al-Akhir of the year 445 AH. See: *Siyar A'lam al-Nubala'*: 17/639.
12. Abu Mansur bin Rukn al-Dawla. His vizier was al-Sahib bin Abbad. He controlled his kingdom and managed well. He died in Gorgan in the Khawaniq in Sha'ban in the year 373 AH. See: *Same*: 16/512.
13. *Seas of Lights, the University of Pearls of News of the Pure Imams: Knowledge, the scholar, the Hujja, the pride of the nation, the Lord Sheikh Muhammad Baqir al-Majlisi, Arab Heritage Revival House, Beirut-Lebanon, 3rd edition, 1403 AH-1983 AD*: 39/36-37.
14. *Pilgrimage, its frameworks, principles, and techniques through a work on Pilgrimage - The New Rhetoric by Perelman and Titica, within the book The Most Important Theories of Pilgrimage in Western Traditions from Aristotle to Today*: 329.
15. *The Structure of Persuasive Discourse in Kalila and Dimna* by Ibn al-Muqaffa: Hamdi Mansour Judi, PhD thesis, Department of Arabic Literature and Language, Faculty of Arts and Languages, Muhammad Khudir University, Algeria, 1436 AH - 1953 AD: 191.
16. Abu Al-Misk Kafur bin Abdullah Al-Ikhshidi was an Abyssinian slave who was bought by Al-Ikhshid, the King of Egypt. He attributed his lineage to him and freed him, and he was promoted to the position of King of Egypt. He was known for his acumen and intelligence, and he died in the year 357 AH. See: *Deaths of Notables*: 4/99-106.