A Discourse Analysis of the Linguistic Strategies in the Debate between Moses and Pharaoh

Dr. HameedMchayetFayyadh (Instructor)

University of Anbar - Education College for Women

Abstract

This study is intended to analyze the effectiveness of linguistic strategies used in the debate between Moses and Pharaoh and how they are best used in order to overcome an opponent and to persuade the listeners. Such strategies, when used well, can be very powerful tools to shape public feelings and opinions about certain issues, as there is an intrinsically situated rhetorical motive in the persuasive use of language. It is important for the listeners to be aware of these strategies in order to be discerning listeners, making the right judgment and not just swallow what is presented to them. The method of analysis is to locate expressions where linguistic choices seem to have been made in order to convey certain views. The linguistic strategies explored in this study include:*the use of pronouns, modality, propaganda language, and lexical repetition*. The study concludes that debates are verbal battles in which each side uses different linguistic techniques to discredit the other side.

<div dir="rtl">

المستخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة الى تحليل فاعلية الاستراتيجيات اللغوية في السجال بين موسى "عليه السلام" وفرعون و الاستخدام الأمثل لهذه الاستراتيجيات للتغلب على الخصم واقناع المستمعين. إذ يمكن أن تكون هذه الاستراتيجيات اللغوية أدوات فاعلة في تشكيل مشاعر وآراء العامة حول قضية معينة عند الاستخدام الأمثل لها حيث أن هناك حافز بلاغي متمثل في جوهر اللغة كوسيلة اقناع. إن من الضروري للسامع أن يكون واعيا ومدركا لهذه الاستراتيجيات ليكون على بصيرة من الأمر قادرا على اتخاذ الحكم الصحيح وليس مجرد مزدرد لما يقدم إليه. وأما طريقة التحليل المتبعة فهي تعيين مواقع التعابير حيث تجري الاختيارات اللغوية لإيصال آراء معينة. وقد اشتملت الاستراتيجيات اللغوية التي تناولتها هذه الدراسة على: استعمال الضمائر وشكليات السجال ولغة الدعاية والتكرار. وقد استنتجت هذه الدراسة أن السجالات هي معارك كلامية يحاول فيها كل طرف استخدام الفنون اللغوية المختلفة للتأثير على السامع و اضعاف ثقته بالطرف الآخر.

</div>

Introduction

Discourse analysis in general and political discourse in particular has extensively been scrutinized by linguists for many decades. The task of these linguists is not limited to modern discourses but speeches of antique orators such as Demosthenes, who delivered "On the Crown" in 330 B.C., have been explored (see Adams, 1927 cited in Duran, 2008:267). Thus, it is no surprise to shed light on the linguistic strategies of a discourse that comes in an old and always renewing holy text – Al-Qur'an Al-Kareem.

It is well known that, in political speeches, orators choose the most powerful linguistic devices to convince their listeners. This study, therefore, explores the most powerful linguistic devices in the debate between Moses and Pharaoh and how they are best used by them. The primary source for the study is the debate between the two men that comes in سورة الشعراء (The Poets Surah)with reference to some other Surah's when necessary[1]. The study focuses on analyzing some features of the debate under study, such

as: the use of pronouns, modality, propaganda language,and lexical repetition. The study also aims at evaluating the old audience to see whether they just swallow what is presented to them or they evaluate and criticize what is said to obtain real knowledge about their world and form their own subjective views of what is discussed.

Thematically the topic is primarily related to religion and religious activities, ideas, and relations, i.e. the relation of the individual with the other individuals and with his God or god. Yet, this discourse is seen as the language produced in institutional settings just like nowadays political discourses that take place inside parliaments or between parties. It has all the features that characterize present discourses which form fertile fields for linguists. Therefore, it is intended to shed light on the powerful tools that shape the public feelings and opinions   hoping that the study would be useful to those who are interested in discourse analysis.

Finally, the researcher won't make a comparison between the old strategies and the strategies adopted by the powerful of the present to convince people of the 'right' way they follow. The comparison is to be convened by the readers who would compare the strategies adopted by the tyrant Pharaoh of the old times and those adopted by contemporaryPharaoh's to see the aspects of similarity and to judge for themselves.

The Model

Many have analyzed the language used to manipulate people against an opponent. One of those analyses is by RiikkaKuusisto(1999) whose dissertation explores the language used by the major Western leaders and how they construct meaning and credibility in their acts of violence against their opponent in the Gulf War in 1990. It is possible to say that they succeeded in their verbal battle even before the battle on the ground has started. That study provides the core for thisstudy with the BIG difference between the causes and the characters that play the major roles in Kuusisto's study and this one.

The Western leaders described their cause as being absolutely necessary, exciting, profitable and noble, while their opponent was described as a "mad dog", a monster, an evil criminal, and a threat to everyone, who wouldcertainly destroy all if they did not constantly fight and defend themselves (Kuusisto, 1999 : 36). The same strategy was followed by Pharaoh against Moses and the children of Israel.

Language and Discourse

Language and discourse are intimately interwoven. They are two linked dimensions to form a central and a crucial activity to human recognition. Thus, the analysis of language is affected by the system of social relations. Therefore language is perceived as the foundation of socially constructed individual or group relationships. That is why it is possible to say that discourses, spoken or written,

stem from different sources such as power or social status. The discourse understudy is cognately seen as a struggle for power in order to put certain religious and social ideas into practice. In this respect the roles played by the two opponents are highly influenced by the language used.

Here the discourse is used for asserting power and knowledge on one side (Pharaoh) and for resistance and critique on the other (Moses). Moses expresses his ideological content in texts as does the linguistic form of the text. His selection or choice of linguistic forms is a live process for the individual speaker and the discourse is a reproduction of that previously learned discourse.

So go you to Pharaoh, and say[2],   ﴿ فَأْتِيَا فِرْعَوْنَ فَقُولَا ﴾الشعراء: ١٦

The discourse here tackles important ideological and social issues. Accordingly, the opponents interact while the audiences critically observe the process.

﴿ قَالَ لِمَنْ حَوْلَهُ أَلَا تَسْتَمِعُونَ ﴿٢٥﴾ ﴾الشعراء: ٢٥

Said he (Pharaoh) to those about him. Do you not hear?

The speech events here are addressed either to be performed or as mass media to satisfy the audience. Thus they are based on two criteria: functional and thematic. They fulfill different functions due to different activities that are historically and culturally determined.

The core of this discourse resides in the manipulation of concepts that have powerful forms as slogans and principles.

I am your lord, the most high!   ﴿ أَنَا رَبُّكُمُ الْأَعْلَى ﴿٢٤﴾ ﴾النازعات: ٢٤

Therefore, the study of this discourse can be seen in terms of general concepts such as power and ideology. It shows how language reflects and affects the perception of the world. Language can be used to convince or to manipulate. A skillful speaker can turn the opinion to his advantage (see Beard, 2000:35). It might be used to manufacture an ideology which would steer the way people think (Nile& Searle-Chatter-jeer, 2005:156). Thamas and Wareing(2000:34) take a more extreme position. They see that language can be used to control the way people think, and by controlling the discourse one can control how the audience think. Thus, discourse has its role in shaping the beliefs which affect people's behaviour, motivations, desires and fears and in establishing certain ideologies as commonsense. This is grounded in the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis: that language determines our perception of the world. The same idea is also emphasized by Fetzer and Lauer Bach(2007:239).

Such ideology serves to create group identity by establishing and reinforcing shared meanings within the group and by communicating this group identity to others as an act of self-legitimization. It claims that what is in the interests of the group is in the interests of all; it is a representation of what is truthful for some as being truthful for all. This is what Pharaoh emphasized when he said[3]:

Who desires to expel you from your land. الشعراء: ٣٥ ﴿ يُرِيدُ أَن يُخْرِجَكُم مِّنْ أَرْضِكُم ﴾

Consequently, by establishing a shared view, a group engages in a process of self-legitimization through which it aspires to power. Eventually, language is central in the process of ideology formation because it is verbalization of sets of ideas that constitute ideological representation of the world and the basis for activating it. In nature, ideological statements are textual, but they have the speech act force that inspires the members of a group to certain forms of action. Ideologies are, therefore, "formal statements on which subsequent legitimacy claims are based." (Zinken&Musolff, 2009 : 99- 100).

Thus, it is possible to learn more about how language influences perceptions, convictions and identities by studying language in circumstances where all its functions and variations are taken into consideration.

This paper will look at how two opponents compete by using persuasive language to win the audience assent. Pharaoh tried to present valid arguments disregarding of their correctness or truth, while Moses did his best to accomplish persuading an audience of the new perceptions and convictions by attracting the attention to surrounding facts such asheavens and earth and what between them is. Therefore, this study examines and exposes implicit statements to detect examples of linguistic strategies adopted by both opponents toconvince others and obtain credit with the use of language.

The Use of Pronouns

The use of pronouns may tell us more than referential meaning. They may tell us how much responsibility a speaker wants to assume for an idea. The first person singular pronoun **I**, for instance, clearly declares who is responsible for an idea or action; while the first person plural pronoun **we** makes the status of responsibility more unclear (see Jones &Wareing, 1999: 46). Furthermore, the use of first person plural pronoun may appeal to the sharing of interests, between speaker and audience (Charteris-Black, 2005: 4). Thus, while Pharaoh includes a very rich system of different participants, Moses uses only few pronouns: the singular first person to refer to himself and the second person singular with reference to his addressee, as in:

﴿ قَالَ أَوَلَوْ جِئْتُكَ بِشَيْءٍ مُّبِينٍ ﴾ الشعراء: ٣٠

He said, what, even though I brought thee something manifest?

or the plural to include his counter-addressees as well, as in:

﴿ قَالَ رَبُّكُمْ وَرَبُّ ءَابَآئِكُمُ ٱلْأَوَّلِينَ ﴿٢٦﴾ ﴾الشعراء: ٢٦

He said your lord and the lord of your fathers, the ancients.

In addition, Halliday&Hasan, (1976: 53) mention some other uses of <u>we</u>: "royal and editorial" with an assumption of status behind it.They state that <u>we</u>is also used to imply "a particular group of individuals with which the speaker wishes to identify himself" (ibid), as in: ﴿ قَالَ أَلَمْ نُرَبِّكَ فِينَا وَلِيدًا وَلَبِثْتَ فِينَا مِنْ عُمُرِكَ سِنِينَ ﴿١٨﴾

﴾الشعراء: ١٨

Pharaoh said, did we not raise thee amongst us as a child? Didst thou not tarry among us years of thy life?

Yule (1996: 11) mentions two interpretations for <u>we</u>in such uses:

1. exclusive<u>we</u> (speaker plus other(s), excluding addressee).

2. inclusive<u>we</u> (speaker and addressee included).

It is noticed that only the exclusive <u>we</u> is used by Pharaoh. In no occasion the inclusive <u>we</u>is used. This means that Moses was taken as an opponent and a dangerous rival.

In some verses Pharaoh used the pronoun **I** to mean the speaker only:

﴿ أَمْ أَنَا۠ خَيْرٌ مِّنْ هَٰذَا ٱلَّذِى هُوَ مَهِينٌ وَلَا يَكَادُ يُبِينُ ﴿٥٢﴾ ﴾الزخرف: ٥٢

Or am I better than this man, who is contemptible and scarcely makes things clear?

The pronoun **I** is used to specify the role of the speaker:

And he said, I am your lord, the most high!   ﴿ فَقَالَ أَنَا۠ رَبُّكُمُ ٱلْأَعْلَىٰ ﴿٢٤﴾ ﴾النازعات: ٢٤

First and second person forms in the text understudy are defined by the speech roles assumed by the speaker and hearer, and thus they are normally interpreted exaphorically rather than anaphorically. In other words, they are defined as roles in the speech situation (ibid: 48).

So I fled from you (to Madyan), fearing you.   ﴿ فَفَرَرْتُ مِنكُمْ لَمَّا خِفْتُكُمْ ﴾الشعراء: ٢١

Here the first and second person forms refer to the situation; they do not have anaphoric or cataphoric reference.In contrast, the use of the singular second person pronoun in ﴿ وَتِلْكَ نِعْمَةٌ تَمُنُّهَا عَلَيَّ أَنْ عَبَّدتَّ بَنِىٓ إِسْرَٰٓءِيلَ ﴾عبدت:

﴿الشعراء: ٢٢ ﴿٢٢﴾

That is a blessing thou reproachest me with, having enslaved the children of Israel.implied that Pharaoh personally was responsible for the enslaving strategy. It raised the status to a virtually divine level and impliedthat Pharaoh was entrusted with a solemn responsibility towards the citizens.Furthermore,the use of the plural second person pronouninخفتكم seems to personalize responsibility and points out complexity of the case as it comes to a vast cause of the nation.

Modality

Politicians, of modern times, according to Fairclough(2003: 167), modalize their utterances by using various verbs like: seem, appear, look ...etc. or adverbs like: actually, evidently, in fact ...etc. Fowler(1985: 73) remarks that modality is also signified by adjectives such as, necessary, unfortunate, certain. Someverbs and many nominalizations are essentially modal: permit, prove; obligation, likelihood, desirability, authority...etc. (ibid). Within critical discourse analysis, modality concerns the speaker's attitudetowards confidence in the proposition being presented (Lillia , 2008 : 2) . Such use of modality is exploited by politicians to maintain politeness. Along with this line, relative power and hierarchical status are important factors to consider when tackling politeness or impoliteness between two speakers. Holmes (1995:16) and other researchers emphasize the importance of the factor of power in explaining patterns of linguistic politeness, because power depends on a variety of factors, such as: money, knowledge, social prestige, role ...etc. High power tends to make people use negative politeness(Moskow, 2005 : 23).

These thoughts are found nearly accurate when analyzing how Pharaoh and Moses used politeness or impoliteness. Moses was the one who showed most politeness. This confirms what Holmes mentions since Pharaoh has more known power than Moses, whose unseen power is represented by God accompaniment.

﴿ قَالَ لَا تَخَافَآ إِنَّنِى مَعَكُمَآ أَسْمَعُ وَأَرَىٰ ﴿٤٦﴾ ﴾طه: ٤٦

Fear not, said He; surely I shall be with you, hearing and seeing.

However, when offended, Moses, withoutreluctance, rebuked his opponent:

﴿ فَقَالَ لَهُۥ فِرْعَوْنُ إِنِّى لَأَظُنُّكَ يَٰمُوسَىٰ مَسْحُورًا ﴿١٠١﴾ ﴾الإسراء: ١٠١

And Pharaoh said to him, Moses, I think thou art bewitched.

Moses directly said:

﴿ وَإِنِّي لَأَظُنُّكَ يَـٰفِرْعَوْنُ مَثْبُورًا ۝ ﴾الإسراء: ١٠٢ And Pharaoh, I think thou art accursed.

According to Holmes (1995:4)"politeness is an expression of concern for the feelings of others." Speakers may express concern for others' feelings in many ways, both linguistic and non-linguistic. In the discourse understudy, only linguistic expressions for others' feelings are discernible. Moses seemed really engaged and had quite a lot to say in few words when speaking to the people:

﴿ قَالَ رَبُّ ٱلسَّمَـٰوَٰتِ وَٱلْأَرْضِ وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَآ إِن كُنتُم مُّوقِنِينَ ۝ ﴾الشعراء: ٢٤

He said, the lord of the heavens and earth, and what between them is if you have faith.

These words ان كنتم موقنين give a very serious and polite impression. Moses used appealing and effective words to catch the attention of the listeners. But when Pharaoh accused him of being possessed:

﴿ قَالَ إِنَّ رَسُولَكُمُ ٱلَّذِىٓ أُرْسِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ لَمَجْنُونٌ ۝ ﴾الشعراء: ٢٧

Said he, surly your messenger who was sent to you is possessed!

he said:

إِن كُنتُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ'if you have understanding'.

﴿ قَالَ رَبُّ ٱلْمَشْرِقِ وَٱلْمَغْرِبِ وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَآ إِن كُنتُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ ۝ ﴾الشعراء: ٢٨

He said the lord of the East and West, and what between them is if you have understanding.

He used these words to stress his opinions and to challenge his opponent. Pharaoh, on the other hand,gives the impression that he was arrogant and oppressive:

﴿ قَالَ لَئِنِ ٱتَّخَذْتَ إِلَـٰهًا غَيْرِى لَأَجْعَلَنَّكَ مِنَ ٱلْمَسْجُونِينَ ۝ ﴾الشعراء: 29

Said he, If thou takest a god other than me, I shall surely make thee one of the imprisoned.

Pharaoh used the language of insults, orders, demands or intruding. In other words, he imposed what Holmes (1995:4) calls "a face threatening act". He had the power that enabled him of imposing his will on others and the ability to control the behaviour of others. On the contrary, Moses showed a

positive face. He desired to be liked and admired by others. He avoided threatening people's face. He had a "saving face" and positive politeness trying to express closeness and affiliation. In terms of power, he had an implicit, unseen power (being a messenger with great miracles and God's companionship). Nevertheless, he showed politeness to a large extent that conforms to the cultural values of the society in his time. Holmes (1995:23) remarks that linguistic features of what is regarded as polite behaviour can differ from one culture to another. Thus whensomething is analyzed as polite or impolite, the influence of the analyst's background should not be ignored.

Pharaoh followers and all those surrounding him had only one duty – to implement or to find ways of implementation for his orders. This way of acting did not produce of Pharaoh a picture of a good, polite guide for his people.

Moskow(2005:26)remarks that "political speakers have goals set in order to convince their listeners, and politeness strategies of various types serve a rhetorical function to achieve the goals." In the debate understudy, Pharaoh tried to persuade the audience that his opponent (Moses) was not the man to make the right judgment and thus not suited to be listened to. He accused him of being a sorcerer:

﴿ قَالَ لِلْمَلَإِ حَوْلَهُۥٓ إِنَّ هَٰذَا لَسَٰحِرٌ عَلِيمٌ ﴿٣٤﴾ ﴾الشعراء: ٣٤

Said he to the Council about him, surely this man is a cunning sorcerer.

In another situation he accused him of being possessed:

﴿ قَالَ إِنَّ رَسُولَكُمُ ٱلَّذِىٓ أُرْسِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ لَمَجْنُونٌ ﴿٢٧﴾ ﴾الشعراء: ٢٧

Said he, surly your messenger who was sent to you is possessed! Thus, being defeated in the debate, his emotional reaction is shown by directing a trail of accusations against Moses.

Here the degree of politeness is central: he accused his opponent and discreditedhim. In another situation, and could be in these situations as well, he intended to discredit his opponent and give himself a credit:

﴿ أَمْ أَنَا۠ خَيْرٌ مِّنْ هَٰذَا ٱلَّذِى هُوَ مَهِينٌ وَلَا يَكَادُ يُبِينُ ﴿٥٢﴾ ﴾الزخرف: ٥٢

Or am I better than this man, who is contemptible and scarcely makes things clear?

He convened a comparison between himself and his opponent who was given an image of a contemptible man who scarcely makes things clear. Pharaoh was successful in attacking Moses positions and defending his own and thus he made his people unsteady and they obeyed him.

﴿ فَٱسۡتَخَفَّ قَوۡمَهُۥ فَأَطَاعُوهُۚ ﴾ الزخرف: ٥٤

So he made his people unsteady, and they obeyed him.

However, it was against the procedures of politeness stated by Holmes (1995:4) "politeness is an expression of concern for the feelings of others." Thus, it is noticed that Pharaoh showed any concern for the feelings of others neither linguistic nor non-linguistic.

Pharaoh used these strategies in order to gain support from his followers and to keep them blind in order not to see the facts that Moses called for. He intended to discredit Moses and even to make fun of him. Furthermore, it would be safe to claim that it is no coincidence that Pharaoh used the deictic word, *this* in his statement:

Or am I better than this man,   ﴿ أَمۡ أَنَا۠ خَيۡرٌ مِّنۡ هَٰذَا ٱلَّذِى ﴾ الزخرف: ٥٢

It is a way of showing further distancing against Moses. The word *this* would normally be close than *that*, but as Pharaoh used it here, it seems to imply a contrast between himself and Moses who, as seen by Pharaoh, is "contemptible and scarcely makes things clear." This comes in line with what Brogger (1992:83) says that "our emotional reactions are inextricably interwoven into the very words we use."

Occasionally, Pharaoh made a contextually determined use of rhetorical questions, namely if there was a known exception to the directly expressed negative or positive assertion:

﴿ وَنَادَىٰ فِرۡعَوۡنُ فِى قَوۡمِهِۦ قَالَ يَٰقَوۡمِ أَلَيۡسَ لِى مُلۡكُ مِصۡرَ وَهَٰذِهِ ٱلۡأَنۡهَٰرُ تَجۡرِى مِن تَحۡتِىٓ أَفَلَا تُبۡصِرُونَ ٥١ ﴾ الزخرف: ٥١

And pharaoh proclaimed among his people: o my people, do I not possess the kingdom of Egypt, and these rivers flowing beneath me? What, do you not see?

In these rhetorical questions it seemed that Pharaoh questioned the suitability of Moses trustworthiness. He followed quite straightforward ways to discredit Moses by producing a negative picture of him and smearing his reputation. On the other hand, he used an efficient device to gain support by showing himself better than Moses possessing the kingdom of Egypt, and the rivers were flowing beneath him. These questions were used to evoke emotional reactions and to direct the attention of the audience away from the facts Moses came with.

Within this emotional situation Pharaoh forgot his claim of being a god and asked his audience to command him while a god commands not is commanded.

What do you command?   ﴿ فَمَاذَا تَأۡمُرُونَ ٣٥ ﴾ الشعراء: ٣٥

Pharaoh made a colossal error of judgment when he accepted that people would assemble because he didn't deeply consider the result if Moses would be victorious. ٥٩ :طه ﴿ وَأَن يُحْشَرَ ٱلنَّاسُ ضُحَى ﴿٥٩﴾ ﴾

Let the people be mustered at the high noon

This is in line with what is said that those who are powerful sometimes work blindly. He misled his people to a situation that they all might overturn against him.

Speaking to people directly or indirectly is a way to show them respect or disrespect. It is noticed here that Pharaoh speaks directly to his elite:

Said he to the Council about him   الشعراء: ٣٤ ﴿ قَالَ لِلْمَلَإِ حَوْلَهُ ﴾

But indirectly to the people:

The people were asked, will you assemble?   الشعراء: ٣٩ ﴿ وَقِيلَ لِلنَّاسِ هَلْ أَنتُم مُّجْتَمِعُونَ ﴿٣٩﴾ ﴾

This supports the idea that someone who has a lot of power can be offered to be less polite than someone who doesn't have power is (seeDeucher, 1988 cited in Holmes, 1995: 8).

The situation may lead to talk about the direct and indirect intentions of the speakers. The direct cause of Moses was to "send forth with us the Children of Israel

الشعراء: ١٧ ﴿ أَنْ أَرْسِلْ مَعَنَا بَنِى إِسْرَٰءِيلَ ﴿١٧﴾ ﴾

Moses focused on enslaving the Children of Israel, killing their sons and sparing their woman. Yet, the indirect reason is that Pharaoh "has waxed insolent".

Go to Pharaoh, for he has waxed insolent.   ٤٣ :طه ﴿ اذْهَبَا إِلَىٰ فِرْعَوْنَ إِنَّهُ طَغَىٰ ﴿٤٣﴾ ﴾

The most prominent aspect of his insolence was his claim of being the lord of heavens and earth. Thus, indirectly Moses told Pharaoh that he was not a god and the real God is "the Lord of heavens and earth, and what between them is"

الشعراء: ٢٤ ﴿ قَالَ رَبُّ ٱلسَّمَٰوَٰتِ وَٱلْأَرْضِ وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَآ ﴾

"your Lord and the Lord of your fathers, the ancients"

الشعراء: ٢٦ ﴿ قَالَ رَبُّكُمْ وَرَبُّ ءَابَآئِكُمُ ٱلْأَوَّلِينَ ﴿٢٦﴾ ﴾

"The Lord of the East and West, what between them is."

﴿ قَالَ رَبُّ ٱلْمَشْرِقِ وَٱلْمَغْرِبِ وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَآ ﴾الشعراء: ٢٨

Pharaoh found himself in a critical situation. He found nothing to say only to resort to threatening Moses and indirectly all the audience saying "If thou takesta god other than me, I shall surely make thee one of the imprisoned"

﴿ قَالَ لَئِنِ ٱتَّخَذْتَ إِلَٰهًا غَيْرِي لَأَجْعَلَنَّكَ مِنَ ٱلْمَسْجُونِينَ ۝ ﴾الشعراء: ٢٩

It was a verbal battle in which Moses intensified the evilness and aggression of his opponent, picturing him as a proud disbeliever. Pharaoh, on the other hand, painted a picture of his people as being rightly guided and his land as the land of righteousness, while Moses came only to change their right religion or to cause corruption in the land.

﴿ إِنِّي أَخَافُ أَن يُبَدِّلَ دِينَكُمْ أَوْ أَن يُظْهِرَ فِي ٱلْأَرْضِ ٱلْفَسَادَ ﴾غافر: ٢٦

In other words he produced himself in an image of a great god, possessor of the kingdom of Egypt and beneath him the rivers are flowing .Furthermore, while Pharaoh centered his discourse on a string of pastevents- raising Moses as a child, the act of killing Moses did,...etc. Moses concentrated on the current situation of enslaving the Children of Israel and the true creatorof heavens and earth and what between them is.

PropagandaLanguage

It is important to look at the ideological position of the speaker and how it is reflected in language and at that of the listener and how it is affected by language. Speakers always try to influence the ideological position of the listeners. In the case of the text understudy, one should not expect that Pharaoh would tell the truth or accept it.

Pharaoh kills the sons of Israeli Children and spares their women to be enslaved claiming that this is an honest and correct moral behaviour:

I only guide you in the way of rectitude٢٩غافر: ﴿ وَمَآ أَهْدِيكُمْ إِلَّا سَبِيلَ ٱلرَّشَادِ ۝ ﴾

This was the way pharaoh saw rectitude. It was a form of power. He constrained the interpretation and wording of events to certain meanings, while excluding others. He tried to convince people that his way was the only way- a tactic used by present politicians.

Mesthrie, et al (2000: 329) remark that emotional language is a key element of propaganda language and it is simplification of reality. The degree of control and persuasion, though implicitly, is clear in Pharaoh's language. He was, just like the super powers of today, working to form ideology via language. The way he followed in administering the state was described as rectitude and that of his opponent as corruption.

When he talked about Moses he used the word corruption "cause corruption to appear" which is the opposite word of rectitude. Thus, rectitude and corruption can be differently interpreted or valued.

This tells us a lot about the nature of language and the impossibility to define even the professional meaning of words with absolute certainty (see Baker, 1992:17). Thus, the meanings of words are seen as negotiable and are realized in their specific contexts. The meaning of **_rectitude_** in Pharaoh's statement can be differently interpreted or valued. His definition of **_rectitude_** means his behaviour, his aggressive action against the Children of Israel. So what is regarded as rectitude to Pharaoh is regarded as a crime against humanity to those not approving of his policy.

The statements of Pharaoh contributed to his determination to keep the neat order he built and to prevent any corruption intended by others. About Moses he said:

﴿إِنِّي أَخَافُ أَن يُبَدِّلَ دِينَكُمْ أَوْ أَن يُظْهِرَ فِي ٱلْأَرْضِ ٱلْفَسَادَ ﴾ غافر: ٢٦

I fear that he may change your religion, or that he may cause corruption to appearin the land

He wanted his rectitude to stand in contrast with Moses corruption as righteousness can be stressed by stating its opposite. This exemplifies false ethics when a leader wants to convince a people of false rectitude. He played on the people's fear and by mentioning these fears, people would think that they had no choice but to agree to what he was going to decide.

Pharaoh portrayed the conflict between himself and Moses as a struggle between good and evil. He announced that any intervention in the old feud he built was bound to have terrible consequences. He used these statements that receive attention from a large number of people.

Change your religion ﴿يُبَدِّلَ دِينَكُمْ﴾ غافر: ٢٦

Expel you from your land.   ﴿يُخْرِجَكُم مِّنْ أَرْضِكُمْ﴾ الشعراء: ٣٥

he may cause corruption to appear in the land   ﴿يُظْهِرَ فِي ٱلْأَرْضِ ٱلْفَسَادَ ٢٦﴾ غافر: ٢٦

He intended to create a feeling that there was an imminent danger.

Pharaoh resorted to another key element of propaganda language which is creation of association. According to Mesthrie et al (2001:331) the orator creates association when he connects thoughts or ideas with something that the listeners are already acquainted with. Pharaoh accused Moses of being a cunning sorcerer as the Egyptians at that time were acquainted with sorcery.

This strategy is emphasized by Charteris–Black(2005:10) who argues that successful speakers need to appeal to attitudes and emotions that are already within the listeners.

He also used this technique of association when he spoke about sorcery. Instead of just using the word ساحر sorcerer, he used the collocation ساحر عليم cunning sorcerer. This is an effective way to intensify the effect of each word and to make them sound much more powerful. Thus, he created a new image to catch the listeners' attention, and by linking the two words he set the idea of Moses as a dangerous man in the people's minds.

This image is also confirmed by the meanings of the words 'sorcery' and 'sorcerer'. Sorcery is defined in the Cambridge dictionary as: *a type of magic in which SPIRITS especially evil ones, are used to make things happen*, while sorcerer is defined as: *a man who has magical powers and who uses them to harm other people*. Thus pharaoh played atrick to divert the attention of the people from any other alternative towards Moses and maintain focus on sorcery.

He defined himself as the creator of people:

And he said, I am your lord, the most high!   ﴿ فَقَالَ أَنَا۠ رَبُّكُمُ ٱلْأَعْلَىٰ ۝ ﴾النازعات: ٢٤

He took the role of being the god of the whole country, while Moses was given the role of a magician and described as "contemptible and scarcely makes things clear" intending to reveal corruption in the world. He was dangerous, criminal:

"And thou didst the deed thou didst"   ﴿ وَفَعَلْتَ فَعْلَتَكَ ٱلَّتِى فَعَلْتَ ﴾الشعراء: ١٩

denying all the good given unto him when he was young:

Did we not raise thee amongst us as a child?   ﴿ قَالَ أَلَمْ نُرَبِّكَ فِينَا وَلِيدًا ﴾الشعراء: 18

Pharaoh intended to make Moses a symbol for all that was wicked, humble, and ineloquent. He tried to convince his co-addressees that Moses was not a threat to him only but to everyone. If the people did not defend their state and their neat order, certainly it would be destroyed by Moses.

The other side, Moses, focused on the cruelty, enslavement, and slaughter carried out by Pharaoh against the Children of Israel:

Having enslaved the children of Israel. ﴿عَبَّدتَّ بَنِىٓ إِسۡرَٰٓءِيلَ ۝﴾الشعراء: ٢٢

Here, Moses told Pharaoh that the blessing of raising him is nothing in comparison with enslaving and killing of the children of Israel .He unfolds a negative perspective of the current situation. The use of the past tense عبدت(enslaved) refers to a current situation that started in the past and is still at the present; yet it is a momentary condition that eventually will change if Pharaoh accepts what Moses is calling for: ﴿فَأَرۡسِلۡ مَعَنَا بَنِىٓ إِسۡرَٰٓءِيلَ وَلَا تُعَذِّبۡهُمۡ﴾طه: ٤٧

So send forth with us the Children of Israel and chastise them not.

Hiscause is described as just. He intended to direct the attention of people toward, a "new God", the creator of everything.

Lakoff& Johnson (1980) argue that metaphors have a very important role in argumentation. In a debate there is a verbal battle, you attack the position of your opponent and defend your own, and it is possible to win or lose arguments.Thus, Pharaoh's evilness and aggression were intensified, picturing him as a proud disbeliever.

Surely he was a high one, of the prodigals ﴿إِنَّهُۥ كَانَ عَالِيٗا مِّنَ ٱلۡمُسۡرِفِينَ ۝﴾الدخان: ٣١

Pharaoh, on the other hand, painted a picture of his people as being rightly guided and his land as being the land of righteousness in which Moses came to cause corruption to appear. He was a skillful propagandist, who was aware of the relationship between propaganda and the public opinion.

Lexical Repetition

The use of keywords repetitively is another effective type of linguistic devices. Moses repeated a few crucial words in his speech to emphasize his main issue. This gave his speech a sense of shape, and gave harmony to its various parts, so that his listeners would see the connection (see Beard, 2000: 49) or at least be able to understand the point by listening to the keywords.

﴿قَالَ رَبُّ ٱلسَّمَٰوَٰتِ وَٱلۡأَرۡضِ وَمَا بَيۡنَهُمَآۖ إِن كُنتُم مُّوقِنِينَ ۝﴾الشعراء: ٢٤

He said, the lord of the heavens and earth, and what between them is if you have faith.

﴿قَالَ رَبُّكُمۡ وَرَبُّ ءَابَآئِكُمُ ٱلۡأَوَّلِينَ ۝﴾الشعراء: ٢٦

He said, your lord and the lord of your fathers, the ancients.

﴿ قَالَ رَبُّ ٱلْمَشْرِقِ وَٱلْمَغْرِبِ وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَا إِن كُنتُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ ۝ ﴾ ﴿الشعراء: ٢٨

He said, the lord of the East and West, and what between them is if you have understanding.

The message these short statements transmit is that there is only one God, the Lord of everything. Jones and Wareing argue that "repeating certain phrases contributes towards making the ideas contained in them seem 'common sense'"(Jones and Wareing, 1999:39).

Moses used this device to highlight his ideology and to convince people that Pharaoh was not their true god. Their true God is the creator of heavens and earth and all that is between them which is all gifted to them and they must pay for this gift by believing in God not in Pharaoh, according to the theory of 'moral accounting' presented by Lakoff (1995) who argues that the idea of owing something to someone else is ametaphorical concept in the minds of human beings where human interaction is conceptualized as transactions and morality is understood in terms of accounting.

When Pharaoh asked: "what is the Lord of all being?" Moses gave an answer that implies the inability of Pharaoh by referring to things which are found in the universe even before Pharaoh was born: My Lord is "the Lord of heavens and earth, and what between them is." He discredited Pharaoh telling that he was a lord of nothing. Feeling defeated, Pharaoh turned to his pro-addresses asking with surprise "Do you not hear?".He constructed a belief of trustworthiness and credibility of himself in his people by claiming god of his people.He focused on the construction of these beliefs in his elite and in all his followers:

I know not that you have any god but me ﴿ مَا عَلِمْتُ لَكُم مِّنْ إِلَٰهٍ غَيْرِي ﴾﴿القصص: ٣٨

So, he expected them to rise against Moses, who directed the attention of the people towards the true God, but they didn't.

Moses seized the opportunity to unfold the fact telling the people that "your Lord and the Lord of your fathers, the ancients" is not Pharaoh but the "Lord of the heavens and earth." Pharaoh found nothing to put against this clear fact only accusing his opponent of being possessed. Anyone who reads these repeated words رب ، ربكم، رب feels their hidden power. They challenge the listeners' expectations and create new images that catch their attention.

These statements could serve as sound-bites as well. A sound-bite is a short piece that can be reported as quickly as possible to sum up the content of a longer piece in few words (see Beard, 2000: 37). Sound-bites communicate clarity and self-confidence which are especially significant when a speaker intends to find ways to persuade the listeners to support a particular new thought. They created a critical situation from which Pharaoh found no escape only to play on the people's fear:

﴿ يُرِيدُ أَن يُخْرِجَكُم مِّنْ أَرْضِكُم بِسِحْرِهِ فَمَاذَا تَأْمُرُونَ ﴾الشعراء: ٣٥

Who desires to expel you from your landby his sorcery; what do you command?

The listeners can very easily get the feeling that there is an imminent danger, and in this way Pharaoh diverted the focus of their attention from a central issue about who the true God is to a marginal one "expel you from your land." He intended to agitate them against Moses as he knew that they highly like their land.

The statements can also be seen as contrastive pairs:

رب السماوات والارض،رب المشرق والمغرب،ربكم ورب ابائكم الاولين

The use of contrastive pairs helps the speaker to be persuasive and the ideas contained in them to seem common sense (see Jones &Wareing, 1999:39). Thus, it is noticed that while Pharaoh highly made use of propaganda language to discredit his opponent, Moses attacked his opponent's position by using different linguistic strategies.

Conclusions

This study concludes that debates are verbal battles in which each side may win or lose arguments. Each side attacks his opponent's positions and defends his own by using different techniques.

Both Moses and Pharaoh used specific linguistic devices to strengthen their statements and give their points more power trying to discredit each other:

- In the discourse understudy the system of pronouns is used to specify roles assumed by the speakers and their relationship with the addressees. It has also been shown that pronouns may be useful to tell how much responsibility a speaker intends to assume for an action or idea rather than referential meaning.

- While Moses considered himself the interpreter of the current situation that was corrupted and in need of change, pharaoh rendered himself the person of actions that had kept the neat order and would continue to do so.

- Whereas pharaoh portrayed himself as a more powerful participant, Moses regarded himself as a savior who cherished heaven values and guided by them. Later, while pharaoh ridiculed his opponent by high lightening his personal characteristics, Moses pointed to the negative consequences of pharaoh's deeds which are not in accord with the correct human rights.

-While pharaoh resorted to more material states to justify his deeds, Moses utilized heavenly characteristics to debase his opponent.

-While Moses concentrated on the use of keywords repetitively as an effective type of linguistic devices to give his speech a sense of shape and harmony to its various parts, Pharaoh resorted to propaganda language to influence the ideological position of his co-addressees. He used emotional language in which the degree of control and persuasion was clear. He portrayed the conflict between himself and Moses as a struggle between good and evil.

-While Pharaoh used rhetorical questions to lead Moses to understand the positive assertion, Moses used opposites as in the contrastive pairs as a successful way to challenge his opponent about the burning issue –Pharaoh's claim of being a god.

-This study also shows that politeness can be used by the opponents as a device in the debate to discredit each other. It has been indicated that the one who has less power shows most politeness.

-Besides, it has also been shown that repetition, and choice and collocating of words can affect how a speech can be interpreted and evoke emotional reactions.

<u>Notes</u>

1. The whole text of the debate, as it comes in سورة الشعراء (the poets Surah), is to be found in an appendix at the end of this paper.

2. The English interpretation of the verses is taken from: Arberry, Arthur   J. (Trans).(2005). Holy Qur'an. Qum: Ansariyan Publications.

3. One quote may be analyzed from the point of view of more than one strategy because both speakers often combine two or more strategies.

Bibliography

Baker, Mona. (1992). <u>In other words.</u>A Course Book on Translation. London: Rutledge.

Beard, A. (2000). <u>The Language of Politics.</u>London: Rutledge.

Brogger, Fredrik Ch. (1992). <u>Culture, Language, Tex: culture Studies with the Study of English as a Foreign Language</u>. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Bussman, Hadumod. (1996). <u>Rutledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics</u>. Rutledge, London.

Charteris- Black, J.(2005) <u>Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaph.</u> Hound mills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Duran, Jose Manuel. (2008).*The Analysis of Political Discourse Applied to Bush's and Kerry's Speeches.* In Nine Norgaard (ed).<u>Systemic Functional Linguistics in Use</u>. Odense Working papers in Language and Communication Vol.29 (ISSN 0906-7612, ISBN: 978-87-90923-47-1)

Fairclough, Norman, (2003). <u>Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research</u>. London: Rutledge.

Fetzer, Anita and Gerda Eva Lauer Bach(eds).(2007).<u>Political Discourse in the Media</u>. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

Fowler,R. (1985). *Power*.In T.A.vanDijk (ed), <u>Handbook of Discourse Analysis</u>, vol.4. London : Academic Press, Inc. pp. 61- 81.

Halliday, M.A.K. &RuqaiyaHasan.(1976). <u>Cohesion in English</u>. London: longman Group Limited.

Holmes, Janet. (1995).<u>Women, Men and Politeness.</u> Edinburgh: Longman Group UK Limited.

Jones, J. & S. Wareing. (1999). *Language and Politics*. In: Thomas, L. et al. (eds), <u>Language, Society and Power</u>. London :Routledge, pp,31-47.

Kuusisto, Riikka. (1999). <u>Western definitions of War in the Gulf and in Bosnia.</u> Helsinki: The Finish Society of Science and Letters and the Finish Academy of Science and Letters.

Lakoff, G&M. Johnson. (1980).<u>Metaphors We Live By .</u>Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lillian, Donna L. (2008). <u>Modality, Persuasion,</u>and <u>Manipulation in Canadian Conservative Discourse</u>. East Carolina University.

Mesthrie, Rajend et al. (2001). <u>Introducing Sociolinguistics.</u> Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Moskow, M. A. (2005).<u>The Impact of Linguistic Strategies in Political Debate</u>. A linguistic Discourse Analysis of the First Bush and Kerry Presidential Debate.US. Metropolitan State University.

Thamas, Linda and Shan Wareing. (2000). <u>Language, Society and Power: An Introduction</u>. London: Rutledge.

Yule,George. (1996). <u>Pragmatics</u>.Oxford University Press.

Zinken, Jorg and Andreas Musolff.(2009). <u>Metaphor and Discourse.</u> UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

<u>Appendix</u>

﴿ وَإِذْ نَادَىٰ رَبُّكَ مُوسَىٰٓ أَنِ ٱئْتِ ٱلْقَوْمَ ٱلظَّٰلِمِينَ ﴿١٠﴾ قَوْمَ فِرْعَوْنَ ۚ أَلَا يَتَّقُونَ ﴿١١﴾ قَالَ رَبِّ إِنِّىٓ أَخَافُ أَن يُكَذِّبُونِ ﴿١٢﴾ وَيَضِيقُ صَدْرِى وَلَا يَنطَلِقُ لِسَانِى فَأَرْسِلْ إِلَىٰ هَٰرُونَ ﴿١٣﴾ وَلَهُمْ عَلَىَّ ذَنۢبٌ فَأَخَافُ أَن يَقْتُلُونِ ﴿١٤﴾ قَالَ كَلَّا ۖ فَٱذْهَبَا بِـَٔايَٰتِنَآ ۖ إِنَّا مَعَكُم مُّسْتَمِعُونَ ﴿١٥﴾ فَأْتِيَا فِرْعَوْنَ فَقُولَآ إِنَّا رَسُولُ رَبِّ ٱلْعَٰلَمِينَ ﴿١٦﴾ أَنْ أَرْسِلْ مَعَنَا بَنِىٓ إِسْرَٰٓءِيلَ ﴿١٧﴾ قَالَ أَلَمْ نُرَبِّكَ فِينَا وَلِيدًا وَلَبِثْتَ فِينَا مِنْ عُمُرِكَ سِنِينَ ﴿١٨﴾ وَفَعَلْتَ فَعْلَتَكَ ٱلَّتِى فَعَلْتَ وَأَنتَ مِنَ ٱلْكَٰفِرِينَ

۞ قَالَ فَعَلْتُهَا إِذًا وَأَنَا۠ مِنَ ٱلضَّآلِّينَ ۞ فَفَرَرْتُ مِنكُمْ لَمَّا خِفْتُكُمْ فَوَهَبَ لِي رَبِّي حُكْمًا وَجَعَلَنِي مِنَ ٱلْمُرْسَلِينَ ۞ وَتِلْكَ نِعْمَةٌ تَمُنُّهَا عَلَىَّ أَنْ عَبَّدتَّ بَنِىٓ إِسْرَٰٓءِيلَ ۞ قَالَ فِرْعَوْنُ وَمَا رَبُّ ٱلْعَٰلَمِينَ ۞ قَالَ رَبُّ ٱلسَّمَٰوَٰتِ وَٱلْأَرْضِ وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَآ إِن كُنتُم مُّوقِنِينَ ۞ قَالَ لِمَنْ حَوْلَهُۥٓ أَلَا تَسْتَمِعُونَ ۞ قَالَ رَبُّكُمْ وَرَبُّ ءَابَآئِكُمُ ٱلْأَوَّلِينَ ۞ قَالَ إِنَّ رَسُولَكُمُ ٱلَّذِىٓ أُرْسِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ لَمَجْنُونٌ ۞ قَالَ رَبُّ ٱلْمَشْرِقِ وَٱلْمَغْرِبِ وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَآ إِن كُنتُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ ۞ قَالَ لَئِنِ ٱتَّخَذْتَ إِلَٰهًا غَيْرِي لَأَجْعَلَنَّكَ مِنَ ٱلْمَسْجُونِينَ ۞ قَالَ أَوَلَوْ جِئْتُكَ بِشَىْءٍ مُّبِينٍ ۞ قَالَ فَأْتِ بِهِۦٓ إِن كُنتَ مِنَ ٱلصَّٰدِقِينَ ۞ فَأَلْقَىٰ عَصَاهُ فَإِذَا هِىَ ثُعْبَانٌ مُّبِينٌ ۞ وَنَزَعَ يَدَهُۥ فَإِذَا هِىَ بَيْضَآءُ لِلنَّٰظِرِينَ ۞ قَالَ لِلْمَلَإِ حَوْلَهُۥٓ إِنَّ هَٰذَا لَسَٰحِرٌ عَلِيمٌ ۞ يُرِيدُ أَن يُخْرِجَكُم مِّنْ أَرْضِكُم بِسِحْرِهِۦ فَمَاذَا تَأْمُرُونَ ۞ قَالُوٓا أَرْجِهْ وَأَخَاهُ وَٱبْعَثْ فِي ٱلْمَدَآئِنِ حَٰشِرِينَ ۞ يَأْتُوكَ بِكُلِّ سَحَّارٍ عَلِيمٍ ۞ فَجُمِعَ ٱلسَّحَرَةُ لِمِيقَٰتِ يَوْمٍ مَّعْلُومٍ ۞ وَقِيلَ لِلنَّاسِ هَلْ أَنتُم مُّجْتَمِعُونَ ۞ لَعَلَّنَا نَتَّبِعُ ٱلسَّحَرَةَ إِن كَانُوا۟ هُمُ ٱلْغَٰلِبِينَ ۞ ﴾ الشعراء: ١٠ - ٤٠