An Analytic Study of a Religious Text: Moses Story with Pharaoh as a Case Study

Dr. Mohammed Hamza Kanaan

University of Al Hamdaniya, Iraq

College of Education

Department of English

Abstract: This study carries out a strategic analysis of a religious text namely Moses story with Pharaoh which has been analyzed within the framework of meta pragmatics as a perspective. It aims at investigating the psycholinguistic strategies implemented by AL-Taguts in the Glorious Qur'an to influence their people. The study also documents various types of strategies as well as points to important differences between the strategies used by Pharaoh and those used by Moses. This study is based on the hypothesis that Al-Taguts are tyrants or oppressors who adopt an oppression policy to control their people by force. The results of the analysis show that Pharaoh uses destruction strategies while Moses uses reformulation ones. Al-Taguts' desire to be worshipped destroys civilizations, beliefs, values and the whole ideologies of their nations and eventually leads to their fatal destiny. The   same conclusion has been arrived at in all Shakespeare's tragic plays. This is why the analyzed   story makes use of such literary devices as flashback and foreshadowing. Flashback has been used to remind Pharaoh and his people of the fate of past tyrants and disbelievers. Foreshadowing has been used figuratively   as a symbol or sign for the victory of Moses and the end of Al-Taguts dreams and ambitions. It also been found that there is also frequent use of offensive and unpleasant words in the language of   Pharaoh . Moreover, Pharaoh violates all Grice's maxims of conversation. As such ,Pharaoh uses the language of fear whilst conversely Moses chooses words of hope because his message is to guide people and lead them to the right track.

Key words Allah, Qur'an, Strategies, Moses, Pharaoh, Taguts, and Magicians.

دراسة تّحليلية لنص ديني: قصة موسى (ع) مع فرعون انموذجا

الملخص:أجرت الدراسة الحالية تحليل أستراتيجي لنص ديني و هو قصة مـــوسى (ع) مـــع فرعون والتي تم تحليلها وفق النموذج اللغوني التداولي المسمى (ميتابراغماطيقيا). حيث تهدف الدراسة الى التعرف على الاستراتيجيات اللغوية – النقسية المستخدمة من قبل الطواغيت في القران الكريم للتاثير على شعوبهم. وذكرت الدراسة انواع عديدة من الاستراتيجيات القمعية للطواغيت مـع الاشارة الــى الاختلافات المـــوجـدة بين أستراتيجيات الطواغيت مثل فـرعون وأستراتجيات الانبياء مثل موسى (ع). ويفـترض لباحث بان فرعون أستخدم أستراتجيات مؤذيــة و فـي غــاية الخطورة ضد شعبة لاقناعه و جعله يركع له. و أظهرت الدراسة العديد من النتائج . ومـــن بيـن تلـك النتائج أن فرعون أستخدام أستراتجيات مدمرة والتي ادت الى تدمير شعبه وبــالتالي هلاكه شخصياً. وهذه النتيجة تم التوصل اليها في جميع مـسرحيات شكسبير التراجيدية. ولهذا السب فان القصة استعانت بالاسلوبيين الادبيين : التنبؤ بالمستقبل والعودة الى الماضي . بينما استخدم موسى (ع) الاسلوب الاصلاحي الذي يهدف الى حماية الشعوب وهدايتهم الى الطريق السليم. كما أظهرت الدراسة ايضا بان فرعون أستخدم لغة التهديد والوعيد الكاذب والتي تكثر فيها المفردات العدائيــة وغير المرغوب فيها لتخويف شعبه بينما أستخدام موسى (ع) لغة الامـــل والمغفرة.

Introduction

Analytic studies of texts be they religious or non- religious can be done from various perspectives: cognitive ,sociolinguistics ,strategic, psycholinguistic and pragmatic. The current study deals with the psycholinguistic strategies implemented by Al-Taguts (TGTS ,for short), in the Glorious Qur'an to influence their people. Since we follow Verschueren's (1999) notion of strategy, it is necessary to make some preliminary remarks on the strategic competence. Verschueren (Ibid: 186) defines strategies as "metacognitive devices which refer to ones preferences and planning". She argues that language use is the continuous making of choices at all levels of analysis from the sound level to the levels of text, discourse and ideology. On her view strategic

knowledge is part of pragmatics and/ or metapragmatics because she uses the two terms interchangeably. She states that "Although both pragmatics and metapragmatics deal with language use, yet some phenomena in particular reflexive strategies need to be investigated at more abstract and deeper level (p.188)". She calls this deeper level metapragmatics (See Section 7). Verschueren believes that effective or successful communication is one in which linguistic, sociolinguistic, psychological and cognitive trends jointly contribute to the generation of meaning in discourse be it written or spoken.

Recently, scholars and methodologists have produced tremendous work on communication strategies in general and on language learning strategies in particular

(Chamot,2004,Dorngei ,2005,kamarul. et. al,2013 and Oxford,1990)to mention only few among many others. They have suggested various dichotomies of both communication and language learning strategies. Similarly, some research has been done on the power and persuasion strategies of some important and wealthy persons.(CockCroft,2014:Falbo,1982 and Taylor,2011).With regard to the Qur'anic discourse, there currently exists little to no academic research on the topic of Al-Taguts strategies. This is the primary purpose behind examining this interesting topic. Another motivation is that to the best of our knowledge, there is no extensive research at all on the psycholinguistic strategies of TGTS with a focus on the marriage between linguistic and non – linguistic factors including the context of revelation.

This has inspired the researcher to suggest a synthetic model for investigating TGTS strategies. The current study therefore, gives one the opportunity to study the psycholinguistic strategies used by TGTS in order to know their cultural, ethnic , psychological and linguistic backgrounds and their world views and the way they think and behave. It also provides the chance to see how TGTS use the Qur'anic discourse as a communicative resource to execute their actions and wrong deeds.

2-The Origins of the Word Tagut

The word AL-Tagut (Arabic: recitation) also spelt tyrant occurs in five Suras of the Glorious Qur'an[1]. It occurs for the first time in (Al-Cow Sura: V.256):

"Whoever disbelieves in Taguts and believes in Allah, and then he has grasped the most trustworthy handhold that will never break".

The word Taguts in this verse can be interpreted in more than one way. On the one hand, it refers to stars , devils, idols, stones, planets, angles and human beings who are falsely worshipped and taken as Taguts. On the other hand, it may refer to rulers and leaders who are falsely worshiped and wrongly followed by people (AL-Hilali and khan, 2007:58).

Two points are of immediate concern to the purpose of the current study .The first point is that the Glorious Qur'an is the first book which mentions the word Al-Taguts and draws attention to their aggressive and offensive behaviors. The origins of the TGT therefore, go as far back as the revelation of the

Qur'an. The second point is that wealth, power, arrogance and people create TGTS.

3- Research Issues

The research issues that this study tries to address are twofold (a) the sociolinguistic strategies used by TGTS and (b) the impact of such strategies on their people. In this study ,the notion of strategy is regarded as a purely pragmatic phenomenon rather than as a cultural variation which simply manifests itself in the utterance of speakers of various languages. Accordingly, the psycholinguistic strategies are defined here as metapragmatic persuasion strategies implemented by TGTS to influence their people.

4- The Problems

The main problem is that TGTS have become global threat nowadays.

What is more is that there is always a potential for manipulation and deceptive communication . What is worse is that some people are more receptive to the opinions of important or wealthy people in their lives. This can naturally lead to a situation where TGTS can exercise all kinds of influence on their people .As such, TGTS have become a real pest for their nation.

5-Literature Review

The topic of TGTS can be investigated from three perspectives: anthropological, sociolinguistic and discoursal. Each approach has advantages and disadvantages. The athropological approach considers the psycholinguistic strategies as a cultural phenomenon granted in one's language and culture . Advocates of this perspective believe that cultural differences are the primary reasons for the way people construct their perception of the social world of which they are apart (Dodd,1996.cited in Williams and Burden.1997). They argue that culture imposes some restraints on the communication strategies used by speakers of a language. However ,the main shortcoming of this approach is that it fails to provide an adequate model to help account for the notion of strategy pragmatically.

The second approach advocated by(Brown and levinson,1978,Grice,1975 and kelller,1979) is characterized by its reliance on the fact that conversational participants intentionally manipulate both the linguistic code and the context in which their conversational messages are produced. The problem with

this approach is that it does not lay out a clear-cut mechanism by which one can account for the speaker's intention for the enactment of the strategies (Cf Verschueren,1999) .

The third approach represents the views of (Blakemore,1996 and Fraser,1996,and many other discourse analysts who have produced a tremendous work on discourse analysis. Research findings done by conversational analysts have come up with certain interactional strategies like openings and closings, back channel cues, adjacent pairs, insertion pairs, etc. Similarly, scholars working on written discourse have focused on such notions as cohesion, coherence and relevance [2] . They have also identified a number of rhetorical devices which link sentences and

larger portions of discourse like paragraphs. The primary concern of discourse analysts is with organizational strategies. While the discourse – oriented approach seems more reliable than the previous two approaches, yet some phenomena in particular reflexive awareness strategies need a wide approach in which many factors interact with each other to give a more viable and comprehensive approach to the phenomenon.

Having briefly sketched the various approaches to the analysis of the topic under investigation, it is new time to discuss in some detail the hypotheses and the model of analysis adopted in the present study.

6-The Hypotheses

Based on the literature review, this study has formulated the following

hypotheses:

1-TGTS are oppressors who have transcended all divine rules and regulations and have adopted an oppression policy to control their people by force.

2- In their attempt to achieve the above objective, TGTS implement a set of extremely powerful and harmful strategies which result in a catastrophic divine punishment.

3-TGTS like Pharaoh use a high tone and fearful language, whilst prophets like Moses use language of hope.

7- The Model of Analysis

This study suggests a synthetic model of analysis which is basically an extension of Verschueren's (1999) framework for metapragmatics as a perspective. The main reason for choosing this

model is that it is the most comprehensive model on the basis that it lays out an adequate mechanism to enable researchers to make generalizations to account for the notion of strategy as used by speakers to achieve some personal wants. However, some resource is also made to Freud's psychoanalysis[3] . This analysis is used for treating mental illness and as theory of human behavior . The basic tenet of Freud's analysis is that human impulses, desires and feelings influence emotions and behaviours of people.

However, the researcher has modified, reduced and re-classified the available options. This has been done by eliminating some existing categories and sub-categories and also by adding new ones so as to

make it applicable to the Glorious Qur'an (See Section 8 below).

8-Classification of Taguts Strategies

In language- learning field, strategy implies a conscious movement towards a language goal. (Oxford, 1990). In subject areas outside of the language – learning field, research comparing experts to navies indicates that experts use more systematic and useful problem solving and native language reading comprehension strategies. By comparing TGTS to prophets, it has been found in this study that the former use a variety of harmful , oppressive, non- solidatry and terroristic strategies which are destructive to their people. These harmful strategies are classified into the following six categories each of which has a number of sub – categories:

1- Metapragmatic Awareness Strategies. These are reflexive in nature since they refer to the speaker. This category is reflected through the use of pronouns "I" "We" and "Our"

2- Action Strategies. This category deals with what Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) call per formatives or simple statements including items like threat, warn, promise ,reward, etc. These performatives are non-propositional because they are non-truth conditional. They are speech acts which can be felicitous or non-felicitous.

3- Thinking Strategies. These are cognitive in nature because they describe strategies that occur in the human brain. (Oxford, 1990). The sets of strategies included in this category are scientific, deep , careful and spoiled or superficial thinking[4].

4- Social Strategies. These are the largest category since they include many sub-categories. They are behavioral in nature in the sense that they do not occur in the mind but are performed as behaviors. (Oxford, 1990). This category includes bargaining (arriving at mutually agreeable solution); persistence (continuing in ones influence attempts or repeating the same strategy);verbal manipulation (like lying , betraying , accusing and belittling or insulating others) and evasion strategies i.e. avoiding the difficult situation and going to someone else.(Gloria et. al 1984).

5- Visual Strategies. This is invented since the Glorious Qur'an contains observable facts. These strategies are used to draw attention and provide solid documentation . They can be seen through signs , objects, illustrations and divine miracles[5].

6- Rhetorical Strategies. Appeals to pathos and ethos are the main sub-classes of this category . This class also includes the literary devices of flashback foreshadowing . Rhetorical strategies have long been used by rhetoricians since Aristotle's times. (See Table 1)

Table (1) Classification of   Taguts strategies

strategy	Type of strategy	definition	examples
1	Meta pragmatic strategies	Self-reflexive statements	What I want is ---- Our aim is to ------
2	Action strategies	Simple statements including items like warn, order. etc.	I warn I promise
3	Thinking strategies	They refer to the mind	I think
4	Social Strategies	Interpersonal relations referring to the speaker's job ,social position and role in the society and their way of be behavior	Who are you? Who is your Lord? Why do not you?
5	Visual strategies	Non-verbal means of communication like signs and pictures	Don't you see? Look at------ Are you blind?
6	Rhetorical strategies	Appeals to pathos and ethos	He is honorable He is wicked

9- The Value of the Study

The   significance   of   the present   study can be   presented   as follows: first   it   underlies   the sociocultural rules , beliefs, norms and values of TGTS as presented in

the Glorious Qur'an. Second, it identifies the motivations and reasons that lead TGTS to use Qur'anic verses to achieve their personal wants and objectives. Third, it identifies the various persuasive strategies they implement to control their people and fourth , it underscores or highlights the significance that Allah attaches to the use of Qur'an language as a communicative resource to guard and guide people against inclined doctrines as those hold by TGTS .Finally, it is hoped that this study will be of value to those who are interested in interpreting the meanings of the Glorious Qur'an.

10- Methodology

10.1- The participants

The main speaker in the material analysed is Al-Mighty Allah Himself and the addressee is prophet Muhammad (P.B.U.H).

Other speakers are Moses, Pharaoh, the magicians and Pharaohs Uma or people. In one situation, reference to Allah is made directly by using the pronoun (I) as in the following verse (V. for short).

" Verily *I* am Allah ! la ilaha illa Ana (none has the right to be worshipped but *I*), so worship *Me*, and perform As- Salat for my remembrance". (Sura Taha, V.14)

In another situation, reference to Allah is made by using the pronouns (We and Our) as in (Ash-shuara' Sura, V.15)
Allah said, "Nay! Go you both with Our signs, verily, We shall be with you hastening".
Other speakers also use the first person singular or plural (I and We).

10.2 The Procedure

This study has examined twenty one verses of the story from two perspectives , the types of strategies used and their pragmatic functions. Using these two methods, the study has also examined whether

the strategies used by Moses and Pharaoh are the same or different. There has been great differences in the strategy use where the story presents two types of conflicting strategies : the destruction strategies implemented by Pharaoh and the reformulation ones used by Moses.

10.3 The Structure of the Story

Moses story with Pharaoh is binary in nature in the sense that it consists of two parts, the first of which states a problem , while the second one gives a solution to the problem. The first part comprises two dialogues, the first of which is between Al-mighty Allah (where Allah orders Moses to go to Pharaoh), while the second dialogue is between Moses and Pharaoh(where Pharaoh argues against the existence of Allah). The second part consists of one dialogue between Moses and magicians which results in the defeat of Pharaoh together with his nation and in the victory of Moses and the trust of magicians in Allah. The two parts are related through the

question and answer technique and also through the literary devices of flashback and foreshadowing.

10.4 The Material

The material chosen for analysis consists of twenty one verses which reflect the strategies of Taguts. Moses story with Pharaoh has been repeated in more than twenty Suars of the Glorious Qur'an. The excessive repetition of the story has been one of the most basic motivations behind investigating the topic in addition to those mentioned earlier (See Section 1) . Since the story consists of many verses that it could be virtually impossible to handle them adequately, the researcher has purposely selected and analysed (21) verses only because such verses clearly reflect the oppressive policy of Pharaoh . other verses of the story, have been left out because

they have been repeated more than once. The verses belong to different Suras of the Glorious Qur'an. Since the analysis is contextual, Suras are arranged according to the context of revelation. For ease of reference, verses are numbered. Verses are written in both texts, Arabic and English. Qur'anic translations are based on Al- Hilali and khans' Interpretation of the Meanings of the Noble Qur'an (2007). See (Table 2)

Table (2) The Material Analysed

Text No.	Vole .No	Sura Name	Surah No.	Context of revelation	Verse No.
1	16	Taha	20	Meccan	24
2	19	Ash-Shu'ara	26	Meccan	13
3	19		26	Meccan	15
4	19	Ash-Shu'ara	26	Meccan	23
5	19		26	Meccan	27
6	19	Ash-Shu'ara	26	Meccan	29
7	19	Ash-Shu'ara	26	Meccan	32
8	19		26	Meccan	33
9	19	Ash-Shuarsa	26	Meccan	34
10	19		26	Meccan	35
11	19	Ash-Shu'ara	26	Meccan	41
12	19	Ash-Shu'ara	26	Meccan	42
13	19		26	Meccan	49
14	20	Ash-Shu'ara	28	Meccan	4
15	20		28	Meccan	38
16	24	Ash-Shu'ara	40	Meccan	29

17	24	Ash-Shu'ara	43	Meccan	51
18	24	Ash-Shuarsa	43	Meccan	52
19	24	Ash-Shu'ara	43	Meccan	54
20	30	Al-Qasas	79	Meccan	24
21	30	Al-Qasas	79	Meccan	25
		Ghafir			
		Az-Zukhruf			
		Az-Zukhruf			
		Az-Zukhruf			
		An-Naziat			
		An-Naziat			

10.5 Text Analysis and Discussion

Moses story with Pharaoh starts with an order from Allah to Moses to go to Pharaoh in order to rescue the Children of Israel from his power as shown in text (1):

SL text (1)

"اذْهَبْ إِلَىٰ فِرْعَوْنَ إِنَّهُ طَغَىٰ " (سورة طه : الاية ٢٤)

TL Text

 "Go to Fir'aun (Pharaoh)! Verily, he has transgressed all bounds (in crimes, sins, polytheism , disbelief)".

At first, Moses seems to be hesitated and he immediately makes a polite request from Allah to send his brother Aaron with him because he is more fluent than Moses who was suffering from speech disorders:

SL Text (2)

قَالَ رَبِّ إِنِّي أَخَافُ أَن يُكَذِّبُونِ (١٢) وَيَضِيقُ صَدْرِي وَلَا يَنطَلِقُ لِسَانِي فَأَرْسِلْ إِلَىٰ هَارُونَ (١٣)" " (سورة الشعراء:الاية ١٢ـ ١٣)

TL Text

 He said: "My lord! Verily, I fear that they will deny me, and my breast straitens , and my tongue

expresses not well. So send for Harun (Aaron) (to come along with me)".

AL-Mighty Allah's agreement to Moses mild request is shown in text (3) below

SL Text (3)

"قَالَ كَلَّا ۖ فَاذْهَبَا بِآيَاتِنَا ۖ إِنَّا مَعَكُم مُّسْتَمِعُونَ" (سورة الشعراء :الاية ١٥)

TL Text

 (Allah) said:"Nay! Go you both with Our signs. Verily. We shall be with Listening.

 Text (3) shows that Allah promises Moses and Aaron that He will be with them. Then the argument begins between the target and the agent where Pharaoh asks about Moses Lord saying .

SL Text (4)

قَالَ فِرْعَوْنُ وَمَا رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ " (سورة الشعراء الاية ٢٦)"

TL Text

Fir'aun (Pharaoh) said: "And what is the lord of the Alamin (mankind, jinn and all that exists)?"

In all the so – far mentioned texts, the language of the argument is logical, natural and standard . Allah urges Moses and Aaron to speak to Pharaoh in a peaceful , democratic and humanistic way. This is the peaceful policy which Al Mighty Allah has ordered all his messengers to follow in conveying their divine messages to their nations. Pharaoh argues against the existence of Allah and this is why he has asked Moses about the lord of mankind as if he did not really know who that lord is . In an answer to Pharaoh's question,

Moses and Aaron offered all signs (i.e. heavens , earth, moon ,sun) proofs and other visible pieces of evidence which prove the existence of one and only one Creator (visual strategy).Moses uses this strategy because it is the most reliable evidence since it can be seen and observed by all people. But Phaoh's arrogance leads him to ignore or neglect all the facts and visible proofs given by Moses and to accuse Moses of being a mad man:

Sl Text (5)

قَالَ إِنَّ رَسُولَكُمُ الَّذِي أُرْسِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ لَمَجْنُونٌ "(سورة الشعراء:الاية ٢٧)"

TL Text

Fir'aun (Pharaoh) said :" Verily ,your messenger who has been sent to you is a mad man.)"

In text (5),it is obvious that the first harmful social strategy used by Pharaoh is that of accusation .The text shows, that Pharaoh is trying to persuade his people that he is clever, intelligent and right while his opponent Moses is wrong and mentally ill or mad. Here there is a conflict between right and wrong policy or strategy .Pharaoh appeals to the pathos of his audience where he assigns habits of unbelievers (wrong) to believers like Moses[6]. All people know that disbelievers are wrong and big liars. Moses in a fair tone language continuous on giving more and more concrete manifestations of Allah's power and grace , such as miscellaneous aspects of the naturel world or the punishments that Allah is said to have on sinful peoples of the past (lie flashback)[7]. This leads Pharaoh to

become in a difficult situation where he can do nothing to falsify Moses and then he suddenly began to threaten Moses by putting him in Jill:

SL Text (6)

قَالَ لَئِنِ اتَّخَذْتَ إِلَٰهًا غَيْرِي لَأَجْعَلَنَّكَ مِنَ الْمَسْجُونِين" (سورة الشعراء : الاية ٢٩)"

TL Text

Fir'aun (Pharaoh) said: " If you choose an ilah (god) other than me, I will certainly put you among the prisoners."

Pharaoh's threat motivates Moses to give the most reliable divine proof that Allah Alone is the Creator of everything where he shows Pharaoh his stick and his white hands:

SL Text (7)

" فَأَلْقَىٰ عَصَاهُ فَإِذَا هِيَ ثُعْبَانٌ مُّبِينٌ "
(سورة الشعراء:الاية ٣٢)

TL Text

So, (Musa (Moses) threw his stick , and behold , it was a serpent manifest.

SL Text (8)

وَنَزَعَ يَدَهُ فَإِذَا هِيَ بَيْضَاءُ لِلنَّاظِرِينَ "
(سورة الشعراء: الايه ٣٣)"

TL Text

And he threw out his hand , and behold, it was white to all holders. These divine proofs (i.e. miracles) make Pharaohs arguments very weak and his situation very difficult. To save his face. Pharaoh again restores to the accusation strategy that Moses is a magician rather than a prophet. Again, there is a complete ignorance of Allah's existence and his power on the part of Pharaoh . The irony is that Pharaoh's power depends on the power of the magicians who were the most powerful at that time and could transform things from one shape in to another . Hence, Pharaoh began to urge his people to stand against Moses, claiming that Moses is trying to control their land :

SL Text (9)

قَالَ لِلْمَلَإِ حَوْلَهُ إِنَّ هَٰذَا لَسَاحِرٌ عَلِيمٌ "
(سورة الشعراء الاية ٣٤)"

TL Text

Fir'aun (Pharaoh) said to the chiefs around him:" Verily , this is indeed a well – versed sorcerer.

TL Text (10)

" يُرِيدُ أَن يُخْرِجَكُم مِّنْ أَرْضِكُم بِسِحْرِهِ فَمَاذَا تَأْمُرُونَ " (سورة الشعراء: الايه ٣٥)

TL Text

"He wants to drive you out of your land by his sorcery :what is then what you command?"

In text (9), Pharaoh is appealing to pathos and ethos of his people. He tries to have a complete control on the attitudes, emotion, values and behaviors of his people. The text also shows that morally, Pharaohs objective is that of saving his people and preventing Moses from displacing them out of their lands. Pharaoh wants to align himself with his audience (Cockcroft, 2014:88). After consulting his chiefs, Pharaoh and Moses implemented the social strategy of bargaining , i.e. both target and agent arrive at a mutually agreeable solution. They agreed to make on assembly between Moses and magicians. Pharaohs objective of making the assembly is

to defeat Moses and to gain crowd consensus. People were told to attend the assembly to see who will win?

Sl Text (11)

فلما جاء السحرة قالوا لفرعون أئن لنا اجرا ان كنا نحن الغالبين (سورة الشعراء الايه٤١)

Tl Text

So when the sorcerers arrived, they said to Fir'aun (Pharaoh): "will their surely be a reward for us if we are the whinnies?"

SL Text (12)

" قَالَ نَعَمْ وَإِنَّكُمْ إِذًا لَّمِنَ الْمُقَرَّبِينَ "   (سورة الشعراء الاية ٤٢)

TL Text

He said : " Yes and you shall then verily be of those brought near (to myself).

In these two texts , the action strategy of promise and reward is implemented by Pharaoh who promised magicians a great reward in case they win. Allah also promised Moses and Aaron (Ash-Shuara,V.15) Allah's promises are real and are given to prevent people from the quick pleasure that sin offers. While Pharaohs promises are given for secular benefits which will soon vanish and disappear. In Allah's promises, all felicity conditions are satisfied, while Pharaohs promises are non – felicitous or not satisfied. The magicians were more interested in wealth and materialism than in their deepest meanings of their interior life. This dimension of materialism is as harmful as Pharaohs damaging persuasion strategies.

In all the texts so – far analysed, Qur'anic discourse is developed mainly through the question and answer technique , through repeating some verses and strategies , through irony and through flashback and foreshadowing . The main purpose of flashback is to remind Pharaoh and his people of the fate of disbelievers of the past so that they may follow the right track. Foreshadowing colors the propositional content of verses and draws the attention of the audience to what will come next-Pragmatically, flashback brings or adds the background information into discourse, while foreshadowing functions as attention – drawer . These devices motivate the readers of the Glorious Qur'ans to think actively and deeply in order to interpret what they hear and

anticipate and to respond accordingly. In answering Pharaohs questions, Moses gives answer from the Glorious Qur'an itself. All Moses questions and answers are based on the recall of facts, signs and proofs that can be found directly in the Qur'an. Pharaohs questions and responses are not based on solid and reliable grounds and so they are not convincing . Here Pharaoh began to search for new strategies. The assembly ended and the magicians lost the battle because Allah has promised Moses and Aaron that he will be with them (Ash – Shuara.V,15) What is the most worst for Pharaoh is that magicians themselves believed in Allah because they saw the reality, i.e. Moses divine miracles where much stronger than their ropes and sticks. As usual, Pharaoh again restores to the accusation strategy

saying that Moses is the biggest magician who has taught magic to others . Pharaoh threatened Moses and promised magicians sever types of abnormal punishment:

SL Text (13)

" قَالَ آمَنتُمْ لَهُ قَبْلَ أَنْ آذَنَ لَكُمْ ۖ إِنَّهُ لَكَبِيرُكُمُ الَّذِي عَلَّمَكُمُ السِّحْرَ فَلَسَوْفَ تَعْلَمُونَ ۚ لَأُقَطِّعَنَّ أَيْدِيَكُمْ وَأَرْجُلَكُم مِّنْ خِلافٍ وَلَأُصَلِّبَنَّكُمْ أَجْمَعِينَ " (سورة الشعراء الاية ٤٩)

TL Text

Fir'aun *(Pharaoh) said: "You have believed in him before I give you leave. Surely. He is your chief, who has taught you magical so verily, you shall come to knew . verily,(will cut off your hands and gourd feet on opposite sides, and q will crucify you all."*

In text (13), there is a series of very dangerous strategies like

abnormal killing and killing by nailing or tying a person to across. These are pagan – like strategies of the pre- Islamic period where fathers used to bury their daughters alive. What is really unbelievable is that Pharaoh wanted magicians to seek apology from him in order to be allowed to have trust in Allah. Pragmatically, this text presupposes that Pharaoh is a real tyrant. What supports this presupposition is that Pharaoh seem to purposely and arrogantly ignore all facts, thoughts, ideas and concepts and tossed them to the back of his brain . The is the main problem with Pharaohs way of thinking .There is nothing wrong with his cognitive set hut he does not use his Mind. Moses on the other hand, seems to think carefully and deeply .As such . he is in full control of his attitudes, emotions

and behaves logically. Pharaohs tyranny prevents him from repenting and meanwhile encourages him to go on pursuing the wrong track[8]. *What also supports the presupposition that Pharaoh is an oppressor is that he continuous on using a number of the most harmful, shameful and insulting strategies . Look at the following texts:*

SL Text (14)

" إِنَّ فِرْعَوْنَ عَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَجَعَلَ أَهْلَهَا شِيَعًا يَسْتَضْعِفُ طَائِفَةً مِّنْهُمْ يُذَبِّحُ أَبْنَاءَهُمْ وَيَسْتَحْيِي نِسَاءَهُمْ ۚ إِنَّهُ كَانَ مِنَ الْمُفْسِدِينَ "
(سورة القصص: الايه ٤)

TL Text

Verily Fir'aun *(Pharaoh) exalted himself in the land made its people sects, weakening a group (lie. Children of Israel) among them: killing their sons , and letting their*

females live. Verily, he was one of the mufsidun (i.e . those who commit great sins and crimes, oppressors, by rants).

Text (14) verifies hypothesis number one. It talks about Pharaohs behavior with his people and shows that he is an arrogant and proud of himself and regards his people as fools or slaves who have no right to refuse his orders. He wants to have an absolute control over his people. He has succeeded in achieving his objective by killing the sons of his people and taking their women as slaves (women slavery) and thus he has become a real threat and the source of fear. Since no one could stand against him , Pharaoh continuous hurting his people until he transcends all divine rules and regards himself as a god :

Sl Text (15)

" وَقَالَ فِرْعَوْنُ يَا أَيُّهَا الْمَلَأُ مَا عَلِمْتُ لَكُم مِّنْ إِلٰهٍ غَيْرِي فَأَوْقِدْ لِي يَا هَامَانُ عَلَى الطِّينِ فَاجْعَل لِّي صَرْحًا لَّعَلِّي أَطَّلِعُ إِلَىٰ إِلٰهِ مُوسَىٰ وَإِنِّي لَأَظُنُّهُ مِنَ الْكَاذِبِينَ " (سورة القصص الايه ٣٨)

TL Text

Fir'aun (Pharaoh) said:" O chiefs! I know not that you have an ilah (god) other than me. So kindle for me (afire), O Haman, to bake (bricks out of) clay, and step for me a Sarh (a lofty tower , or palace)in order that I may look at (or look for) the ilah (god) of Moses , and Verily, I think that he (Moses) is one of the liars."

Taking women as slaves is a very shameful strategy. Pharaoh also accuses Moses of being a liar. The irony is that Pharaoh himself is the biggest liar of the period. Pharaoh tries to torture Moses psychologically but the latter stands against him and he does not kneel to him. This behavior makes Pharaoh himself

suffer psychologically. The result of this state of mind is that Pharaoh suddenly declares that he is the god of the world . To prove that , Pharaoh tells his minister Haman to build a high tower so that he may arrive at the ways of heavens in order to see Moses Allah[9]. Pharaohs justification is fabulous and what is more in this text is that he again accuses Moses of being a liar.to torture him, while Pharaoh himself has been implementing lying as a persuasion strategy. The text also shows the way Pharaoh is thinking. His thinking is spoiled and unbelievable. His arrogance and tyranny have dominated his thinking. He never thinks that one day Allah will sleep up his heart. He argues about Allah's verses without having the authority to do that. One of the pragmatic implications of text (15) is that the wrong and the oppressive policy implemented by Pharaoh is unilateral while Moses basically uses bilateral strategies, which require the cooperation and response of the other side (e .g bargaining). Moreover, Pharaoh also

appeals to the pathos and ethos of his people. Since Pharaoh has no more than lying strategies, he continuous on using unilateral strategies:

SL Text (16)

" وَقَالَ فِرْعَوْنُ ذَرُونِي أَقْتُلْ مُوسَىٰ وَلْيَدْعُ رَبَّهُۖ إِنِّي أَخَافُ أَن يُبَدِّلَ دِينَكُمْ أَوْ أَن يُظْهِرَ فِي الْأَرْضِ الْفَسَادَ " (سورة غافر-الايه ٢٦)

TL Text

Fir'aun (Pharaoh) "leave me to kill Musa (Moses), and let him call his lord (to stop me from killing him)! I fear that he may change your religion , or that he may Couse mischief to appear in the land."

In text (16) there is a real intention of killing Moses. Pharaoh's purpose is to show his people that Allah is unable to protect Moses from being killed. Pharaohs justification for his attempt to kill Moses is to prevent him from changing the religion of the children of Israel or not to let Moses do wrong deeds. The great

irony here is that the policy or strategy of killing and slaughtering and doing evil things or changing religion and doctrines of people is peculiar to Pharaoh himself not to Moses who advocates from the start a friendly and humanistic policy to reform the society and to protect people from the slavery created by Pharaoh , who tries to control his people by force. Pragmatically, text (16) shows that Pharaoh is implementing the strategy of religious appeals to the ethos of his people in the sense that he tries to align himself with the religious ideologies of the period[10]. This is an extremely powerful strategy because through it, Pharaoh has been able to move the audience to conform to his ethos and to modify the audiences habits and values (Hyde,2004:13).

Ironically enough, ,all Pharaohs deceptive strategies have failed to influence Moses whose trust in Allah was absolute . This leads Pharaoh to use visual strategy as is shown below:

SL Text (17)

" وَنَادَىٰ فِرْعَوْنُ فِي قَوْمِهِ قَالَ يَا قَوْمِ أَلَيْسَ لِي مُلْكُ مِصْرَ وَهَٰذِهِ الْأَنْهَارُ تَجْرِي مِن تَحْتِي ۖ أَفَلَا تُبْصِرُونَ " (سورة الزخرف : الايه ٥١)

TL Text

And Fir'aun (Pharaoh) proclaimed among his people (saying):

"O my people! Is not mine the dominion of Egypt, and theses rivers flowing underneath me . See you not then?

In order to convince his people that he is the lord , Pharaoh accuses his people of being blind because they could not see the scope or the domain of his kingdom like the rivers flowing underneath his throne. Text (17) shows that Pharaoh is assigning divine authority to himself in the sense that he has created the rivers. But in fact, Pharaoh is no more than a tyrant ruler and the dominion of Egypt and the rivers' have been created by Allah (i.e. The Real

Creator). Pharaohs policy of assigning Allah's attributes to himself is again a unilateral strategy which is never used by his opponent. In an attempt to prevent his people from being affected by the right strategy used by Moses, Pharaoh suddenly begins to use the social strategy of insulting Moses:

SL Text (18)

أَمْ أَنَا خَيْرٌ مِّنْ هَٰذَا الَّذِي هُوَ مَهِينٌ وَلَا يَكَادُ يُبِينُ " (سورة الزخرف الايه:٥٢)"

TL Text

   "Am I not better than this one (Musa (Moses) who is despicable and can scarcely express himself clearly?

   Text(18) shows that Pharaoh is making a dichotomy , between himself and his opponent Moses. The text indicates that Pharaoh is honorable and praiseworthy, while Moses is wicked. Here again there is an obvious appeal to the ethos of the audience. Pharaoh tries to align

himself with his peoples political standing and to share personal similarity with them (Hyde ,2004:13). Self- praise is one of the important strategies for persuasion. It seems that Pharaoh was highly skilled in using rhetorical crevices. Cockcroft (2014:13) claims that rhetoric contains no inherent morality and the moral application of rhetoric depends on the intention of the speaker. He states that "Rhetorical skill cannot operate unless there is insight which will entail a proper empathy with the persuade, an understanding of his or her needs, and a sense of emotion that invests them" (P:3). He argues that once the speaker passes that insight, he can easily exploit the ideological, personal and contextual elements in his rhetoric. This is what Pharaoh has exactly done. By means of the insulting strategies, Pharaoh tries to belittle Moses and to exercise more psychological torture on him. Yet, Moses does not pay any attention to Pharaohs rhetoric. The oppressive or the offensive strategy implemented by Pharaoh has enabled him to change the attitudes

of his people and to frighten them . This has lead Pharaoh's people to worship him and to ignore Allah. This situation is obviously reflected in text (19) below:

SL Text (19)

" فَاسْتَخَفَّ قَوْمَهُ فَأَطَاعُوهُ ۚ إِنَّهُمْ كَانُوا قَوْمًا فَاسِقِينَ " (سورة الزخرف : الاية ٥٤)

TL Text

Thus he (Fir'aun (Pharaoh) befooled (and misled) his people and they obeyed him . verily , there were ever a people who were fasiqun (rebellious, disobedient to Allah).

They worshipped Pharaoh because they were rebellious. Joining others in worship along with Allah is an unforgivable sin. like Pharaoh, his people has also denied Allah and His messenger and has continued on committing all kinds of crimes . This has led Pharaoh to implement the most harmful strategy where he says that he is the most high lord.

SL Text (20)

" فَقَالَ أَنَا رَبُّكُمُ الْأَعْلَىٰ " (سورة النازعات : الاية ٢٤)

SL Text

Saying "I am your lord, most high"

The result of Pharaoh's tyranny, arrogance and ignorance of his people is the full defeat of Pharaoh together with his nation like the past generations and their rulers who were also disbelievers (flashback).

SL Text (21)

" فَأَخَذَهُ اللَّهُ نَكَالَ الْآخِرَةِ وَالْأُولَىٰ " (سورة النازعات : الاية ٢٥)

TL Text

" So Allah , seized him with punishment for his last and first transgression".

This text is a conclusion to the story being analysed. It shows the result of

Pharaohs arrogance whose mind was wrapped up with old ideas and concepts. What is worse is that Pharaoh never used his mind and thus he did not engage himself in self- examination. Consequently , Pharaoh could not get out of his old ideas which the Glorious urges us to chase them out and which Moses did his best to make Pharaoh and his people believe in Allah ,the Only creator of the world.

11. Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research

11.1 Conclusions

This study focused on how AL-Taguts implement the psycholinguistic strategies as persuasion devices to influence their people.

Firstly, the results indicate that Pharaoh as a tyrant appeals to pathos, ethos and plot theory to control his people by force. It was also found that there were great differences in the types of strategies used by Moses and Pharaoh . Moses uses reformulation strategies

because his message is to guide people to the path of the right policy and thus he advocates the right strategy which is clearly reflected in his language which is characterized by heavy use of words of hope. While Pharaoh uses destruction strategies because his aim is to mislead people to the path of the wrong policy and thus he adopts the wrong strategy which is based on lying, betraying, slavery ,frightening and slaughtering. As such , he has used a high tone language which is full of offensive, idiotic and unpleasant words to frighten people in order to make them worship him. Thus, the message delivered by Moses was completely rejected while the one delivered by Pharaoh was followed and perceived as stronger and elaborated on more positively .

Secondly, the analysis also shows that the Glorious Qur'an is discourse having speech acts which have real contexts (participants ,context of revelation and commutative purpose). The felicity conditions of the speech acts in the Qur'an are fully

satisfied because the Qur'an is the word of Allah. While promises given by Pharaoh are not felicitous. However , the idea of speech acts is useful in clarifying the interpretation of the Qur'an. Taguts like Pharaoh use speech acts as a persuasion strategy to convince their people either by reward or punishment.

Thirdly, Pharaohs persistence on pursuing the wrong strategy has ended in a disaster. Allah has consigned Pharaoh and his people to hell and they become damned forever. As such .Pharaohs plot theory and tricky strategies have been completely defeated or destroyed because Allah's will is that Moses will be the winner (i.e. Allah's promise). In this way, the hypotheses of the study have been fully verified.

11.2 Suggestions for Further Research

1.One area for further research is to investigate the verses of the Glorious Qur'an which suggest ideas on how to counter and combat the threat of tyrants

2. Another area for further research is to carry out a similar study as conducted here , focusing on other tyrants in the Glorious Qur'an to discover if any of the persuasion strategies identified in this study are implemented by other tyrants .

3.The third area which needs to be invested is to carry out a comparative study between Allah's promises and the promises of rulers mentioned in the Glorious Qur'an.

Notes

1.The Suras and verses in which the word Al-Tagut occurs are:

(Sura 2. AL-Baqarah, Vs.250-257); (Sura4.An-Nisa Vs.51 and 60); Sura 5.Al-Ma'ida,V.60): (Sura 16.An-Nahl V.36) and (Sura 69.Al-Haqqah,V.5)

2.For more details on coherence and relevance , the reader is referred to Freud, (Brown and Yule. 1983, Schifrin,1987, Stubbs,1983 and Van Dijk,1977)

3. Freud, cited in Jung (2009) was the founding father of psycho-analysis.

4. Jung (2009:13) makes a distinction between scientific thinking and fantasy thinking. The former means logical thinking while the latter means mythological thinking.

5.This category has been invented by the researcher because the Glorious Qur'an makes heavy use of signs as solid and visible proofs which affirm the existence of Allah . These signs function as assertions pragmatically.

6.Aristohe,(cited in Cockcroft (2014:87)claims that the main purpose of appeals to pathos is to denote all kinds of emotional influence on the audience, potentially affecting attitude or choice.

7. Flashback and foreshadowing develop the story and push the conflict forward. Foreshadowing shows us the offensive style of Pharaoh and his arrogance , while flashback reminds us of the past events that contribute to the defeat of tyrants.

8. Campbell (1991,162) warns: "When you follow the path of your desire and enthusiasm and emotion, keep your mind in control, and don't let it pull you compulsively into disaster."

9.In text (15) Pharaoh wants to show his people that he will do something beyond the normal range of achievement and experience (Campbell,1991:151).

10. In text (16). Pharaoh tries to prove that he has an extraordinary experience which teaches him about haman spirituality (Taylor,2011).

References

AL –Hilali, M.and Khan, M.M., (2007) The Interpretation of the Meanings of the Noble Qur'an

in the English language. Riyad: Darussalam

Austin,J. (1962) How to Do Things with Words . Oxford: Oxford university press.

Blackmore, D. (1996).''Are apposition Markers Discourse Markers'' Journal of pragmatics,

vol.32,pp:325-347.

Braet, A.(1991) Ethos, Pathos and Logos in Aristotle's Rhetoric : A re-examination

argumentation.6 (3):307-326

Brown, G and Yule, G. (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. and S. l. Levinson. (1978) Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.

Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, J .(1991) The Power of Myth .New York: Anchor.

Chamot, A.U. (2004).'' Issues in Language Learning Strategy Research and Teaching.''

Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching.1(1):14-26

Cockcroft, R. Cockcroft ,S.(2014). Persuading People: An introduction to Rhetoric. New

York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dornyei, Z 2.(2005).Psychology of the Language Learners: Individual Differences in Second

Language Acquisition: Mahwah, N J: Laurence Erlbaum.

Falbo, T. (1982) "PAQ" Styles and Power Strategies used in Intimate Relationships ''. Psychology

and Women Quarterly, Vol.6:pp:399-405

Fraser, B. (1996)."What are Discourse Markers.'' Journal of Pragmatics.Vol.31, PP:431-457

Gloria, G . Joan. D, and Laurie Mac Gavin (1984). The Effects of Target , Age and Gender on

Use of Power Strategies." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.47(6):1391-1398

Grice, H.P (1975). "Logic and Conversation," In: Cole, p. and Morgana, J. (eds.) Syntax and

Semantics. Vol.3pp:20-40

Hyde, J .M. (2004) .The Ethos of Rhetoric. Columbia : University of South Carolina.

Jung, C.G (2009) .The Red Book: A Reader's Edition. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Kanan , M . H (2012). "A Schematic Analysis of Moses Story with Khidr." Journal of Science

and Education. 19(4):1-18

Karmarul ,S.M.T, Mohamed , A.E,and Nik , M.R. (2013) "Social and Affective Strategies Use

Among Language Students in Terengganu" Journal of Islamic and Arabic Education.5(1)11-18.

Keller, E.(1979)."Gambits: Conversational Strategy Signals" Journal of psychology.4(3):219-

238

O keefe, J. (2004)."Trends and Prospects in Persuasion Theory Research." In: J.S. seiter and

R. H. Gas (Eds.), Perspectives on Persuasion , Social Influence and Compliance. New York:

Pearson.pp:31-43

Oxford, R. l.(1990). Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know . New

York : Newbury House

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse Markers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, R. (1969). Speech acts: An Essay On the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge :

Cambridge University Press.

Stubbs, M. (1983). Discourse Analysis: the Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language.

Oxford : Basil Blackwell.

Taylor, P. (2011). Talking to Terrorists : Face to Face with the Enemy . London: Harper Press.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1977). Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse. London : Longman.

William, M. and Burden, R. (1997). Psychology for Language Teacher: A Social Constructivist Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.