A Pragma-Rhetorical Study of Argument in Islamic-Christian Debates

ABSTRACT

A debate is a special form of an argumentative dialogue in which two or more parties take part in attacking and defending certain claims through reasoned discourse. This study has set itself to pragmatically analyze and evaluate selected arguments of religious debates. Islamic-Christian debates are specifically chosen as data for the current study because they have not received due attention in language studies. This study is essentially concerned with investigating the pragma-rhetorical strategies utilized in the context of Deedat-Swaggart’s debate. To fulfill the aims, it is hypothesized that debaters utilize certain rhetorical pragmatics strategies: figures of speech (metaphor, allusion, irony, rhetorical question, and hyperbole), argumentation appeals (logos, pathos, ethos), and politeness strategies; and highlighting the rules that have to be fulfilled to produce a successful speech act of persuasion. The study employs a mixed method (qualitative and quantitative) to analyze the data and to verify or reject the hypotheses. The results of the study reveal that the most frequent pragmatic strategies utilized by debate are: rhetorical questions, logos, and off record politeness strategies, whereas Swaggart highly employs: metaphor, ethos, and off record politeness strategies. The results have also shown that Deedat’s arguments are stronger and more persuasive than Swaggart’s in terms of satisfying the rules of the successful speech act of persuasion.
1. Introduction:

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that has been defined differently by different scholars. Levinson (1983: 1) asserts that the term pragmatics has been first used by Morris (1938) as a branch of semiotics. According to Thomas (2013: 1-2), the most common and general definitions of pragmatics are “meaning in use” or “meaning in context”. It covers a wide range of contextual factors. It deals with those aspects of language meaning that cannot be captured by semantic theory. Linguistic pragmatics is concerned with studying what a message is intended to communicate.

Religions have shaped human life and, to a large extent, have determined the course of history. Sinnott-Armstrong and Fogelin (2015: 449) state that “Religion is central to the lives of many people across the world … even when they are not engaged in explicitly religious practices, religion also affects believers’ views in morality, politics, and even science.” It can be argued that all of the religious traditions are born in argumentative contexts, and religious argumentation is perhaps as old as human history. Argumentation is a communicative process of supporting, modifying, criticizing a target claim. It involves engaging the minds of the audience through interaction (Rieke, Sillars and Peterson, 2013: 234). It can be argued that all of the religious traditions are born in argumentative contexts, and religious argumentation is perhaps as old as human history (ibid.: 222).

Rybacki and Rybacki (2012: 7) comment that Aristotle is a highly influential source of modern argumentation theory. He presents complementary aspects of a theory of sound arguments that are seen as the most effective means of persuasion. Rhetoric is concerned with the available means of persuasion, it is the persuasive use of language, with regard to the context of situation (Al-Hindawi, et al., 2017: 11). According to Aristotle, arguers may employ means of three categories to be persuasive: ethos (persuasion through personality, for example, wisdom), pathos (persuasion through the arousal of emotion, for example, love), and logos (persuasion through reasoning, the argument itself) (ibid).

Heffernan and Burman (2005: 56) argue that “The whole Christian / Muslim encounter in the early Islamic period could be characterized as a conflict over the proper understanding of the narratives in the scriptures” (italics in origin). In such debates, the scriptural evidence (warrant) is said to be the most natural and strongest tool to dispute with, yet when faced with a religion that does not accept the scripture of others or rather does not accept them as divinely revealed but they have been corrupted by those who passed them (with definite evidence of distortion), the matter becomes quite different.

More recently, in both linguistics and argumentation studies, attention for the interconnectedness of language and argumentation has been increasing. Scholars from different theoretical backgrounds who explicitly include both language and argumentation in their research. The correlation between pragmatics and argumentation has been referred to by
Walton (2006: 341) as he states “since pragmatics covers language in use, argumentation may be seen as a subfield within it”.

To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, no previous study that tackles the pragmatics of argument in Islamic-Christian debates (henceforth, I-CDs) has been conducted. Within the scope of the present study, the questions that are intended to be answered can be formulated as follows:
1. What are the most frequent pragma-rhetorical strategies utilized by Deedat and Swaggart?
2. What is/are the highly politeness strategy(s) employed in the context of I-CDs debate?
3. What are the rules abided by in the chain of arguments advanced by the Muslim and the Christian debaters?

2. The Pragma-Rhetorical Approach to Argumentation:
Leech (1983: 15) adopts an approach to pragmatics by which he characterizes as a rhetorical one. Al-Hindawi et al., (2017: 10) add that rhetoric belongs to a goal-oriented situation when a speaker uses certain linguistic forms to produce a particular effect in the mind of the hearer. In a new combined way, Larrazabal and Korta (2002: 1) propose the integrative analytical approach: ‘pragma-rhetoric’. They (ibid) propose to combine pragmatics and rhetoric “in order to explain the intentional phenomena that occur in most communicative uses of language, namely the communicative intention and the intention of persuading.” Their proposal is based on a precedent article written by Dascal and Gross (1999). The crucial notion of intention to persuade is linked to rhetoric, while communicative intention, on the other hand, is attributed to pragmatics. Both levels are presented in Figure (1) below:

![Figure (1): Intentionality Levels of Rhetoric and Pragmatics](image)

The fulfillment of the persuasive intention follows from the success of the communicative intention. Ilie and Norrick (2018: 90) observe that pragmatic analysis “concerns the use of language that depends on the speaker’s communicative intentions and the strategies that the hearers employ to determine what those intentions are.”

2.1. Rhetoric:
Leech (1983: 15) states that rhetoric is the art which studies “the effective use of language in communication.” Zhang (2005: 1) adds that rhetoric is primarily concerned with oral discourse. Oratory is considered to be the foundation of rhetoric (ibid). Rhetoric is defined by Corbett (Cited in Marsh, 2013: 5) as “the art or the discipline that deals with the use of discourse, either spoken or written, to inform or persuade or motivate an audience, whether that audience is made up of one person or a group of persons.” Wayne Booth
(Cited in Zhang, 2005: 4) defines rhetoric as “the art of changing men’s minds.” Rhetoric is considered both stylistic ornamentation and a persuasive discourse.

Traditionally, Aristotle defines rhetoric as “an ability in each particular case to see the available means of persuasion.” (Oakley, 2014: 191) (emphasis added). Piazza (2013: 540) claims that this definition reveals “a theoretical point of view on rhetoric and is based on the belief that persuasion plays a crucial role in human life”.

2. 1. 1. Persuasion:

From a linguistic perspective, Dontcheva-Navratilova et al., (2020: 5) point out that persuasion is seen as an indirect speech act. Abdul-Raof (2019: 99) maintains that persuasion “requires linguistic wit and linguistic power.” Persuasion is considered an audience-oriented process. There are certain pragma-rhetorical devices that arguers may employ to enhance their arguments and to make it more effective. Before introducing these devices, Walton (1998) lists certain rules or requirements that an argument must go in line with in order to be persuasive. Besides, he characterizes such an argument as a successful speech act of persuasion (henceforth, SAP). The next sub-section elaborates this model as the normative dimension regarding the model adopted by this study.


Walton (1999: 100) suggests that, in discussions involving religions, when the nature of an arguer’s commitment is identified “it will be apparent to the other party in the argument that this person is (fairly predictable) going to cleave to certain views and reject other views, quite firmly, and that his or her flexibility and openness to opposing views is likely to be very limited”.

The idea that the credibility and authority of the religious texts is restricted to only those who believe in it is supported by many scholars. Govier (2014: 134) asserts that “the problem is that if one did not have the religious beliefs, one would not grant any credibility to the religious texts.” In the same vein, Lunsford, Ruszkiewicz, and Walters (2019: 190) emphasize that “religious believers often base arguments on books or traditions that wield great authority in a particular religious community. But the power of such texts is often limited to that group and less capable of persuading others solely on the grounds of authority.” As a consequence, it is irrational to prove to an atheist that God exists, by stating:

- The Bible is the Word of God. Therefore, God exists.

Or even to convince someone that The Glorious Qur’an is the best guide book on the earth by only advancing the following argument (Govier, 2014: 134):

- The Qur’an is the best guide for living. Therefore, people should live according to the prescription provided in The Qur’an.

Such arguments are bad (fallacious) because their premises assume “what the argument is trying to demonstrate” (ibid). If someone wants to
persuade a listener, he should ground his argument on what the listener believes to be true.

Persuasion dialogue is defined by Walton (1998: 37) as “the type of conversational exchange where one party the proponent is trying to persuade the other party -the respondent- that some particular proposition -the thesis- is true, using arguments that show or prove to the respondent that the thesis is true.” Walton (2014: 35) adds that “persuasion dialogue is adversarial in that the goal of each party is to win over the other side by finding arguments that defeat its thesis or casts it into doubt.”

One distinctive feature of persuasion dialogue is that arguer’s arguments are supposed to have premises that the respondent is committed to. Walton (1998:39) asserts that the notion of commitment is central to persuasion dialogue. By drawing on the concept of commitment, Walton (2008: 5) shows two types of proof (or methods) an arguer may make use of as argumentative moves to prove his claim correct in persuasion dialogue. These are:

1. **Internal Proof**: this type refers to propositions (or premises) that are inferred from the other party’s commitments. This means that each debater is committed to a set of certain beliefs which can be used by the other party to support his point of view. Put in other words, arguer A should draw his conclusion from premises that arguer B accepts or believes to be the case. The situation can be illustrated in the following figure:

   ![Figure (2): Obligations of Debaters. Adopted from Walton (2008: 5)](image)

2. The second type is **the external proof**. In this type, the debater appeals to proofs other than those in the first method, for instance: a well-known saying. Proofs of this kind are not necessary to be believed or considered to be committed by the other arguer. Consequently, this type is not convinced enough because it can be rejected by the other party.

   Walton (ibid) refers to the first type as “primary method” and “secondary method” to the second. The degree of the strength of persuasion varies according to the method employed in the argument. If a respondent accepts all the premises of an argument, then he must also accept the conclusion (Walton, 2007: 54). Walton (ibid.: 55) suggests that the conclusion of such argumentation, which is based on the other party’s commitment, produces SAP.

   In persuasion dialogue, Walton (2007: 56) acknowledges that SAP is not a one-step process. Simply put, this act starts with a single argument then proceeds through a series of connected arguments forming “a chain of argumentation” supporting the ultimate claim (ibid: 57). Al-Hindawi and Al-Khazaali (2017, 53) believe that when participants are engaged in a debate they produce “a sequence of speech acts in order to achieve their...
communicative goals.” Van Dijk (1992: 206) introduces the concept of the sequence of illocutionary acts. He (ibid: 238) states such sequence of speech acts is called ‘Macro-speech act’ or ‘Global speech act’ that “require global planning and interpretation.”

Walton (1999: 29) notes that “the purpose of persuasion dialogue is to test out the strongest arguments on both sides of a particular proposition.” Walton (1998: 43) proposes four constraints taken together “to assure that the argumentation used will be relevant.” He (ibid) states that “relevant argumentation in persuasion dialogue is bound only by four requirements (rules)” (see also Walton 2004: 126):

**R 1:** The respondent accepts the premises as commitments.

**R 2:** Each inference in the chain of argumentation is structurally correct.

**R 3:** The chain of argumentation must have the proponent’s thesis as its ultimate claim.

**R 4:** Arguments meeting these three rules are the only means that count as fulfilling the proponent’s goal in the dialogue.

Having introduced the notion of persuasion dialogue, it can be stated that persuasion can be enhanced by other aspects. Generally speaking, debaters, in the context of I-CDs, strengthen their arguments by producing certain pragmatic strategies. Moving on to explore the pragma-rhetorical strategies which encompass three major components: figures of speech, argumentation appeals, and politeness strategies.

### 2. 1. 2.Pragma-Rhetorical Strategies:

Jacobs (2000: 265) states that “Not all rhetorical strategies involve arguments, but all arguments involve rhetorical strategy and all rhetorical strategies involve language use. All language use is organized by the inferential and strategic principle - the domain of pragmatics.

Pragma-rhetorical strategies are considered, according to Abdulmajeed and Finjan (2017: 235), “as powerful tools of deviation that characterize rhetorical means combined with pragmatic devices.” The following subsections are devoted to shed light on the three aspects of the pragma-rhetorical approach that will be used in analyzing the argumentative discourse of Deedat-Swaggart’s debate.

### 2. 1. 2. 1. Figures of Speech:

Levinson (1983: 109) argues that a deviation from Grice maxims gives rise to figures of speech. According to McQuarrie (Cited in Al-Hindawi, et al., 2017: 25) figures of speech can be classified into schemes and tropes. A figure of speech in the schematic mode “involves a deviation from the ordinary pattern or arrangement of words, it is a change in the standard word order or pattern”, such as repetition and ellipsis (Abdulmajeed and Finjan, 2017: 235), which is out of the scope of the current study. A figure of speech in the tropic mode, on the other hand, “involves a deviation from the ordinary and principal signification of words, e.g., pun, hyperbole etc.” (Al-Hindawi, et al., 2017: 25). All of the tropes are paradigmatic examples of implicatures.
McQuarrie and Phillips (2008: 86-90) differentiate between two types of tropes: destabilization tropes, and substitution tropes. The former comprises metaphor, irony, and allusion. The latter, on the other hand, encompasses rhetorical question and hyperbole. Tropes are semantically inconsistent, and this inconsistency generates a unique argumentation process.

2. 1. 2. 1. Destabilization Tropes:

A destabilization trope, according to Al-Hindawi et al., (2017: 25) involves “the use of an expression whose meaning is indeterminate in its context.” This means that the meaning of that expression is not taken to be literal but implied and hidden in the context. It is the audience’s task to develop the implication (ibid).

2. 1. 2. 1. 1. Irony:

Irony is defined by Xiang Li (2008) (Cited in Al-Hindawi and Al-Khazaali, 2017: 168) as “a discrepancy between what a speaker says and what he or she believes to be true”, such as the utterance:

- What a sunny day!

During a storm. It is a pragma-rhetorical strategy which is also defined by Grice (1975: 124) as “a particularized conversational implicature triggered by an overt violation of the first maxim of quality.” The pragmatic nature of irony can be understood through maxims, cooperation principle, and implicature (Gurillo and Ortega, 2013: 1).

In irony, Brown (2005: 462) demonstrates that the relationship between what is said and what is meant is completely contrasted. She (ibid: 463) adds that this gives the speaker the freedom to exaggerate or understate the matters and to be sarcastic, sardonic, or cynical at will. For example:

- That was clever.

This statement can be said when people respond to an action stupidly done by someone. Likewise, Harris (2018: 27) suggests that when this rhetorical device is used, the meaning of the statement will have the opposite of its literal meaning. Adopting a similar position, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969: 207) claim that this strategy conveys the opposite of what one actually says. The use of pragma-rhetorical irony produces indirect argument (ibid).

2. 1. 2. 1. 2. Metaphor:

Perloff (2017: 360) defines metaphor as “a linguistic phrase of the form ‘A is B,’ such that a comparison is suggested between the two terms leading to a transfer of attributes associated with B to A.” The choice of the metaphoric expressions that the speakers employ depends on the rhetorical goals. Harris (2018: 91) maintains that metaphor is seen as involving a violation of Grice maxim of quality. This pragma-rhetoric strategy compares two different things. One difference between metaphor and simile is that a metaphor identifies the subject with the image. For instance:

- A good book is like a friend (simile).
- A good book is a friend (metaphor).
The conceptual metaphor, proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) “hinges on conceptual mappings between source and target domains that are predominantly shared by interlocutors” (Colston, 2015: 106). The mapping usually links between a concrete concept such as ‘snooze’ with an abstract one such as politics.

- Politics is such a snooze.

Tindale (2015: 206) states that metaphor is “an effective means of communicating argumentation in social contexts.”

2. 1. 2. 1. 3. Allusion:

An allusion is a short, informal reference to a famous person or event. Allusion often “functions as a brief analogy or example to highlight a point being made” (Harris, 2018: 113). Allusions are mostly drawn from history and sacred texts. For an allusion to be effective, it must have the following qualities:

- **Familiarity**: the audience must be familiar with the allusion.

- **Endurance**: the allusion must be accessible for a long time (such as sacred texts).

- **Focused Attribute**: The allusion must possess an attribute to relevant reference (ibid).

What makes ‘allusion’ a pragma-rhetorical strategy in argumentative discourse, according to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969: 170), is that “allusion can never be recognized independently of their context, for their structure is neither grammatical nor semantic, but depends on a relationship with something that is not the immediate object of discourse.” Allusion nearly always has argumentative value because it is essentially an element of agreement and communion (ibid). It is a culture-dependent device since it is achieved through references to a common culture, tradition, past, or religion (ibid: 177).

Allusion enriches meaning for it triggers the imagination of the audience to figure it out. To support a claim, or to refute a claim, a debater may refer to scripture verses or well-known sayings. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981: 181) maintain, drawing on prior text, an arguer may allude because the “well-known texts are more suitable as being more readily accessible to the receiver audience.”

2. 1. 2. 1. 2. Substitution Tropes:

According to McQuarrie and Mick (Cited in Abdulmajeed and Finjan, 2017: 236), the pragma-rhetorical operation of this type of tropes is accomplished by an expression that requires an adjustment by the audience, the latter’s task, metaphorically speaking, is filling the blanks. Substitution tropes comprises rhetorical question and hyperbole.

2. 1. 2. 1. 2. 1. Rhetorical Question:

Cummings (2010: 409), defines rhetorical question as “a question used as a challenging statement to convey the addressee’s commitment to its implicit answer in order to induce the addressee’s mental recognition of its obviousness and the acceptance, verbalized or non-verbalized, of its
validity.” Pragmatically speaking, a rhetorical question is a pragma-rhetorical strategy which has the illocutionary force of a question and the perlocutionary effect of a statement (Ilie and Norrick, 2018: 111).

Rhetorical questions are not treated as questions although they are interrogatively formatted (Sbisà and Turner, 2013: 415), for example:

- How old are you?

In a situation where the addressee has done something childish, the speaker, clearly, does not need to know the age of the addressee nor expects to hear it. The main function of this strategy is to “induce, reinforce, or alter assumptions, beliefs, ideas, in the addressee’s mind” (ibid).

2. 1. 2. 2. Hyperbole:

Hyperbole is defined by Leech (1983: 145) as the case in which “the speaker’s description is stronger than is warranted by the state of affairs described, and litotes refers to the converse of this.” According to Cruse (2006: 80), hyperbole involves “deliberative exaggeration for rhetorical effect, to increase impact or to attract attention.” When someone claims:

- I’m hungry enough to eat a horse.

For a rhetorical effect, the speaker violates Grice’s maxim of quality. This claim cannot be taken literally, the audience will interpret it figuratively (Sinnott-Armstrong and Fogelin, 2015: 36). For the audience to comprehend this strategy, the contrast between what is said and what is meant should be large enough.

Enos (2013: 334) argues that the most recognized functions of this strategy are to emphasize, for example, the feelings of the arguer, or an opinion, and to intensify the rhetorical effect of his argument. Cruse (2006: 80) states that hyperbole may be positive or negative, it depends on the speaker’s purpose. He may exaggerate to achieve positive goals, as in; expressing approval, or to criticize his opponent.

Claridge (2011: 44-66) classifies hyperbole into different forms. Hyperbole can be single word, phrase, clause, numeric, superlative, comparative, and repetition. Claridge (ibid: 44) adds that “Whole texts and even whole discourses can be instances of hyperbole.”

2. 1. 2. 2. Argumentation Appeals:

The second sub-category of pragma-rhetorical strategies is argumentation appeals (or rhetorical appeals). Ethos, pathos, and logos are different means of persuasion. Houser (2020: 35) asserts that a skilled speaker can use any rhetorical appeal but a persuasive speaker is the one who can use all three. These appeals can be utilized by arguers in the context of argumentation to provide support to their arguments.

2. 1. 2. 1. Logos:

The first pragma-rhetoric strategy is logos which refers to the appeal to reason, or rhetorical reasoning (Tindale, 2015: 13). Zhang (2005: 23) confirms that effective logical reasoning comes from coherent sentences, logical thinking, proper organization, and words that appropriately conveys one’s intended meanings. Houser (2020: 37) assumes that this strategy is the most
important one because it concentrate on the message to be delivered by the speaker. He (ibid) claims that this is where logic and rhetoric come together. In an earlier study, Zhang (2005: 23) states that an arguer may cite facts, statistics, historical and literal analogies, and certain authorities on a subject.

2. 1. 2. 2. Ethos:

Ethos is defined, according to (ibid), as the authority and the credibility of the speaker. Credibility is related to the perception of an audience to manage how believable an arguer is. It is the degree to which an arguer is perceived to be ethical, sincere, and trustworthy. They (ibid) add that “speakers want to enhance their ethical authority by providing respectable credentials, for instance, by citing or quoting respected authorities.” Another definition is given by Pelclová and Lu (2018: 48) by combining the rhetorical features and linguistic pragmatic features, as “a strategy of presentation of a speaker’s character; characteristics and persuasive function of ethos are anchored in the context of moral and social norms of a certain society and are activated in language use.” One reason to combine pragmatics to rhetorical ethos is “to provide a framework for more thorough analysis of the character presentation in the given discourse” (ibid). Another reason is pragmatics enables a better comprehension or rhetorical ethos and it provides the toolkit for the analysis of contextual aspect of their use.

2. 1. 2. 2. 3. Pathos:

The third mean of persuasion is the appeal to the emotions and knowledge of the audience (Pelclová and Lu, 2018: 27). An arguer may manipulate the emotions of a particular audience, such as making them feel proud, confident, compassionate, angry, shameful, or afraid, etc. Accordingly, the target audience can be motivated to respond to certain acts. Abdul-Raof (2019: 101) calls for the use of emotional language, vivid language, and to the numerous sensory details. This appeal can be achieved by the use of rhetorical devices such as metaphor or general passion (ibid). Borchers (2013: 40) argues that Aristotle believed that an effective arguer understands an audience’s emotions and “uses those emotions to persuade them.”

Leech (1983) states that (Cited in Al-Juwaid, 2019: 104) the cooperative principle is important to open the channel of communication between debaters in debates. But it is limited in the sense that it is insufficient to keep the channel open. He (ibid) maintains that the principle of politeness comes into play the role to keep it opened.

2. 1. 2. 3. Politeness Strategies (Brown and Levinson 1987):

Politeness is defined, according to Huang (2014: 142), as “any behaviour including verbal behaviour of an interlocutor to maintain his or her face and that of the individuals he or she is interacting with.” One of the most popular approaches to the study of politeness is Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) theoretical perspective. The central concept to their theory is ‘face’ (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 13).

Face is defined as “the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself” (Al-Juwaid, 2019: 104). Watts (2003: 104) states that every
individual has two types of face, positive and negative. Positive face is defined as “the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others” (ibid). Positive face is supported by expressions of “understanding, affection, solidarity and/or by positive evaluation or formal recognition of one’s qualities” (Hinck and Hinck, 2002: 238). In contrast, negative face is “the want of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others” (Watts, 2003: 86).

Brown and Levinson’s theory is built on Grice’s Cooperative Principle (Watts, 2003: 85). Brown and Levinson (1987: 58) propose that a ‘Model Person’, a fluent speaker of a natural language, is endowed with rationality and two faces. Rationality means that the model person makes a rational choice by observing the hearer’s face wants. This means that to achieve certain goals, it is rational to take into consideration face wants of others.

Brown and Levinson (Cited in Kádár and Haugh, 2013: 18) note that there are certain speech acts that intrinsically threaten face. Yule (1996: 61) defines a face-threatening act (henceforth, FTA) as an act that causes the audience to feel disliked, rejected, or restricted in terms of freedom to choose what they would like to do. In contrast, a face-saving act would mitigate that threaten (Watts, 2013, 25). Accordingly, Brown and Levinson (1987: 56) derive a set of linguistic strategies “as means [of] satisfying communicative and face-oriented ends, in a strictly formal system of rational practical reasoning.” Hinck and Hinck (2002: 234) assert that these strategies are “recognized universally as necessary for interaction to proceed.”

In the following sub-sections, Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness strategies will be briefly explored. Only three will be adopted in this study as pragma-rhetorical devices a debater can use to achieve his purpose. They are: positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record politeness strategies.

2. 1. 2. 3. 1. Positive Politeness Strategies:

Positive politeness strategies are oriented toward the positive face of a target-audience (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 70). Positive politeness arguments are used as “a kind of metaphorical extension of intimacy, to imply common ground or sharing of wants to a limited extent even between strangers who perceive themselves, for the purposes of the interaction, as somehow similar” (ibid: 103). Brown and Levinson (1987: 101-129) propose three broad strategies of conveying positive politeness by which the arguer appeal the audience’s wants. These strategies are face-saving acts. These strategies are manifested in terms of more specific mechanism. In the following fifteen sub-strategies, the Capital letter S is used to refer to the speaker, whereas the letter H refers to the hearer.

Strategy (1): Notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods).
Strategy (2): Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H).
Strategy (3): Intensify Interest to H.
Strategy (4): Use in-group identity markers.
Strategy (5): Seek Agreement.
Strategy (6): Avoid Disagreement.
Strategy (7): Presuppose, raise, assert common ground.
Strategy (8): Joke.
Strategy (9): Assert or presuppose S’s knowledge of and concern for H’s wants.
Strategy (10): Offer, Promise.
Strategy (11): Be Optimistic.
Strategy (12): Include both S and H in the activity.
Strategy (13): Give (or ask for) reasons.
Strategy (14): Assume or assert reciprocity.
Strategy (15): Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation).

2. 1. 2. 3. 2. Negative Politeness Strategies:
Brown and Levinson (ibid: 70) state that negative politeness strategies are oriented toward partially satisfying the addressee’s negative face. These strategies are at the heart of respect behaviour. Brown and Levinson (1987: 130) comment: “it is the stuff that fills the etiquette books.” They are used “whenever a speaker wants to put a social brake on to the course of his interaction.” They (ibid: 129-211) list the following ten sub-strategies:
Strategy (1): Be Conventionally Indirect.
Strategy (2): Question, Hedge.
Strategy (3): Be Pessimistic.
Strategy (4): Minimize the Imposition, Rx.
Strategy (5): Give Deference.
Strategy (6): Apologize.
Strategy (7): Impersonalize S and H.
Strategy (8): State the FTA as a general rule.
Strategy (9): Nominalize.
Strategy (10): Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H.

2. 1. 2. 3. 3. Off Record Politeness Strategy:
Off record strategies are “linguistic strategies in context” (ibid: 212). An FTA is performed in such a way that more than one interpretation is possible, and it is left to H to decide how to interpret it (ibid: 211). Off record politeness is a clear instance of indirect speech acts. Watts (2003: 86) believes that off record strategies are based on violating different kinds of Grice’s maxims that are used by the speaker who wants to do an FTA without taking the full responsibility for doing it.
Strategy (1): Give hints (Violating Relevance Maxim).
Strategy (2): Give association clues (Violating Relevance Maxim).
Strategy (3): Presuppose (Violating Relevance Maxim).
Strategy (4): Understate (Violating Quantity Maxim).
Strategy (5): Overstate.
Strategy (6): Use tautologies (Violating Quantity Maxim).
Strategy (7): Use contradiction (Violating Quality Maxims).
Strategy (8): Be Ironic.
Strategy (9): Use Metaphor.
Strategy (10): Use Rhetorical Questions.
Strategy (11): Be Ambiguous.
Strategy (12): Be Vague.
Strategy (14): Displace H.
Strategy (15): Be Incomplete, Use Ellipsis.

2. Methodology:

2. 2. Data Collection and Description:

The data to be analyzed in the present work includes (8) arguments. These arguments are taken from a transcribed debate (Web Source I) between Mr. Deedat and Mr. Swaggart that was held on the 3rd of November, 1986 at the University of Louisiana in the USA.

2. 2. Research Design:

This study adopts a mixed method to analyze the data chosen, i.e., a qualitative and a quantitative method. It depends on a mixed method since the qualitative one allows deeper understanding of the language analyzed. The quantitative method is also utilized in order to support the findings based on the qualitative analysis.

2. 2. 3. The Model Adopted:

The pragma-rhetorical approach to argumentation combines the descriptive and the normative dimensions. The former comprises figures of speech, argumentation appeals, and politeness strategies, whereas the latter involves four rules an argument must meet in order to constitute SAP. Taken together, the eclectic model of analysis is diagrammed as follows:

2. 3. Data Analysis:

This section presents the analysis of the data. The data is analyzed quantitatively (pragmatically) using the eclectic model adopted, then, the results are analyzed quantitatively, i.e., using figures and tables. The latter includes frequencies and percentages whereas the former involves percentages only.

Jimmy Swaggart:

*I am in time again I have, before vast television audiences, I have held up this Bible or one like it, and I am sure most of you have seen me do
it. I have done it through television to one hundred forty countries of the world, and I have stated “this is the word of Almighty God,” I have stated that there is no other word of God, and we live, die, sink, or swim on this book. I believe that, and I believe that with all of my heart. But of course, saying that is really cheap. Those types of words do not really cost that much. And I want to start this out tonight by quoting a passage of scripture that Mr. Deedat and I might disagree somewhat over. But which is one of the dearest passages in the word of God to the world of Christendom found in Saint John 3:16, “For God so loved the world that He gave his only unique son. That whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life.” And I want to use that as the basis for this simple statement that I would attempt to make tonight.

Analysis:
The pragma-rhetorical strategies to be identified within this approach are figures of speech, argumentation appeals, and politeness strategies. As far as figures of speech are concerned, Swaggart utilizes hyperbole “one hundred forty countries of the world”; metaphor “with all of my heart”, “the word of God.”, “cheap”, “words do not really cost”. Regarding argumentation appeals, Swaggart heavily relies on ethos. He depends on his character and personal experience to deliver his argument to the audience. This is reflected by the use of the pronoun ‘I’ scattered all along the argument. He also makes use of pathos which is presented in the biblical verse “… should not perish but have everlasting life” which gives hope and happiness to Christians. The third set of strategies comprises positive politeness; “I am sure most of you have seen me do it” (strategy 11), this is mainly directed to Christians. He includes himself and Christians “we” (strategy 12); negative politeness strategies: “might disagree” (strategy 2), “Mr. Deedat” (strategy 5); and off-record strategies: “again” (strategy 3), “there is no other word of God”, “somewhat” (strategy 4), “one hundred forty countries of the world” (strategy 5), “with all of my heart”, “the word of God”, “words do not really cost”, “cheap”. (Strategy 9). It is important to note that Swaggart’s utterance “there is no other word of God” reveals impolite behaviour and it shows his disrespect to Muslims and The Holy Qur’an. Generally speaking, he means that Holy books other than the Bible are not God’s words.

As far as the rules of the successful SAP are concerned, Swaggart brings to light the secondary method or the external proof. He employs an incorrect scheme structure. As such, the acceptability of such premises is restricted mainly to the speaker and to the audience whom Swaggart shares beliefs with. Examining the whole argument, Swaggart does not make a serious effort to fulfil his obligation. However, the argument has Swaggart’s ultimate claim that the Bible is the word of God, but it does not count as fulfilling his goal in the debate.

Jimmy Swaggart
There is no book on the face of the earth that has the textual criticism that this book has had. I sort of feel insignificant when I stand here
attempting to speak about the Bible, when I realize that some of the world’s most eminent scholars have critically looked at every single text over and over again, sparing no expense, no time, no effort ascertain it was what it said it was. I have read the Bible many, many, many times, and others such as I have read it many more times, much more educated than I could ever be, understanding both Hebrew and Greek.

Analysis:
As far as figures of speech are concerned, Swaggart employs hyperbole “There is no book on the face of the earth that has the textual criticism that this book has had.”, “over and over again”, “many more times” and “many, many, many times”. He also makes use of metaphor “face of the earth.” Concerning argumentation appeals, Swaggart’s argument is also loaded of ethos which are represented by the use of the pronouns (I) in six positions in the argument, and logos “the world’s most eminent scholars.” With reference to politeness strategies, Swaggart employs positive politeness: “I sort of” (strategy 6). Off record strategies: “I sort of feel insignificant” (strategy 4), “There is no book … has had”, “over and over again”, “many more times” and “many, many, many times”. (Strategy 5), and metaphor “face of the earth” (strategy 9).

With reference to the rules of SAP, Swaggart exploits the secondary method or external proof, i.e., premises that Deedat is not committed to. The argument employed is structurally correct and it has his ultimate claim. Finally, the argument is considered an attempt that Swaggart makes to reach his goal in the debate.

Jimmy Swaggart:
Concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, Harvard professor Simon Grimley, who together with Supreme Court Justice Joseph Storey, was credited with the rise of the Harvard Law School to its eminent position. He abandoned his agnosticism only after months of careful study and hard searching recognized as America’s greatest authority on legal evidence. Grimley found himself logically forced to conclude after lengthy and critical examination that the literal and historical death, burial and resurrection of Christ as the son of God in payment of our sins was established by undeniable and overwhelming evidence. One of the most brilliant, legal man on the face of the earth.

Analysis:
In this argument, Swaggart utilizes metaphor “face of the earth” and “the rise of the Harvard”; and hyperbole “one of the most brilliant legal men on the face of the earth” as a substitution trope. As far as argumentation appeals are concerned, Swaggart makes use of logos: he employs the character “Simon Grimley” as a piece of evidence to support his claim, and “He abandoned his agnosticism only after months.” Regarding politeness strategies, Swaggart exploits (strategy 12) addressing Christians by including them and excluding Muslims “our sins.” Off record strategies; “one of the
most brilliant legal men on the face of the earth” (strategy 5). “Face of the earth”, and “the rise of the Harvard” (strategy 9).

With regard to the rules of SAP, Swaggart’s argument is considered as a secondary method or external proof since he appeals to argument from expert opinion that Deedat and Muslim audience are not committed to. The argument does not have Swaggart’s ultimate claim ‘the Bible is the word of God’. In spite of the fact that this argument is structurally correct, it does not count as an attempt to fulfil Swaggart’s goal in the debate.

Jimmy Swaggart:

I guess I would ask this question: if God gave those two original books, The Torah and the Injil, they were God’s words as Quran says they were, and I think any steadied Muslim would guarantee that, that the Quran does say that there were books given by God Almighty other than the Quran; the Torah and the Injil. If God gave those books, could not God have preserved them? We Christians believe that God is omnipotent. Islam believes that God is omnipotent. And if God is omnipotent, He could have easily preserved those books without them being lost. Muhammad referred to these books quite a number of times in the Quran and in other holy books, that were written. I submit to you tonight that the Old Testament that I hold in my hand was the same Old Testament the Jews had in the day and time of Muhammed. It has not changed. The Injil or the New Testament that I hold in my hand is the same book that the church had in the days and the time of Muhammed. God did preserve it. Our faith is not in vain.

Analysis:

The first pragma-rhetorical strategy in this component is figures of speech. Swaggart utilizes a rhetorical question “If God gave those books, could not God have preserved them?” With regard to argumentation appeals, Swaggart employs logos “The Qur’an does say that there were books”. He (God) could have easily preserved those books and “Muhammed referred to these books”; pathos “our faith is not in vain”, and ethos “I submit to you.”

Swaggart makes use of positive politeness strategies: “as Quran says”, “the Quran does say”, “Muhammad referred to these books” (strategy 5), “Islam believes that God is omnipotent” (strategy 7), “Our faith is not in vain” (strategy 11), “We Christians” and “Our” (strategy 12); negative politeness strategies; “I think” (strategy 2); and off record strategies: “quite a number of times” (strategy 4), “If God gave those books, could not God have preserved them?” (Strategy 10), “Islam” (strategy 13).

Concerning the rules of the successful SAP, Swaggart uses a premise that needs Deedat to react, ‘Islam believes that God is omnipotent, so, the Bible is preserved by Him’. It can be stated that Swaggart employs the primary method or the internal proof which shifts the burden of proof to Deedat. Swaggart’s argument also carries the ultimate claim that the Bible is the word of God. In addition, the argument can be considered as an
attempt to fulfil Swaggart’s goal in the debate. Accordingly, the rules of SAP are accomplished in this argument.

Ahmad Deedat:

Then woe to those who write The Book with their own hands, and then say: “This is from God.” To traffic with it for a miserable price! Woe to them for what their hands do write, and for the gain they make thereby (The Holy Qur’an, 1: 79) (Ali, 1989: 38).

Mr. Chairman and brethren, though I wanted to go straight to the subject, the plea that brother Swaggart had made, forces me to make a confession of faith. And that is we Muslims happen to be the only non-Christian faith which makes an article of faith for its followers to believe in Jesus. No Muslim is a Muslim if he does not believe in Jesus. We believe that Jesus Christ was one of the mightiest messengers of God. We believe that he was the Messiah, we believe in his miraculous birth, which many modern Christians reject today. We believe that he gave life to the dead by God’s permission, and he healed those born blind and lepers by God’s permission. We are going together. The only parting of the ways, the only real difference between the Muslim and the Christian is that we say that he is not God the Almighty in human form. He is not God incarnate, and he is not the begotten son of God. Metaphorically, we are all the children of God, the good and the bad. And Jesus would be closer to being the son of God than any of us because he would be more faithful to God than any of us can ever be. From that point of view, we would agree that he is more preeminently the son of God. But not as the Christians say that he is the only begotten son of God, begotten not made, not in that sense.

Analysis:

Concerning figures of speech, Deedat employs metaphor “we are all the children of God”, “the son of God”, and allusion “Then woe to those who write the book with their own hands, and then say “This is from Allah”, to traffic with it for a miserable price! Woe to them for what their hands do write, and for the gain they make thereby.” It is important to mention that Deedat presents the Noble verse in Arabic with no attempt to translate a single word of it. This indicates that Deedat is addressing Muslims only.

With reference to argumentation appeals, Deedat employs ethos “We Muslims”, “We believe” “we would agree.” Deedat lists a series of logical proof to prove his claim; “No Muslim is a Muslim if he does not believe in Jesus…God’s Permission”, and pathos “We are going together.” Regarding politeness strategies, Deedat employs positive politeness: “brethren”, “brother Swaggart”, and the “Qur’anic verse” that Deedat recites in Arabic is considered to be in-group language as a positive politeness (strategy 4), “We Muslims happen to be the only non-Christian faith which makes an article of faith for its followers to believe in Jesus.” (Strategy
5). Deedat includes himself and Muslims “We believe”, “we would agree that”, and both Muslims and Christians “We are going together”, “we are all the children of God”, “any of us” (strategy 12), “no Muslim is a Muslim if he doesn’t believe in Jesus” (strategy 13); a negative politeness strategy: “Mr. chairman” (strategy 5); and off record politeness: “the only parting of the way”, “the only difference” (strategy 4), “we are all the children of God”, and “the son of God” (strategy 9).

As far as the rules of SAP are concerned, the use of the allusion in the first argument, as a speech act of refutation reveals Deedat’s intention to direct his argument towards Muslims to strengthen the faith in particular, and to refute Swaggart’s argumentation. The perlocutionary act of The Qur’anic verse has a great impact on Muslims rather than Christians since it is considered to be external proof. The argument has Deedat’s ultimate claim and it counts as an attempt to fulfill his goal. The rules of SAP are all kept to in the second argument. This means that the premises are accepted by Swaggart, internal proof, and the scheme used in the argument is structurally correct which also has Deedat’s ultimate claim in the debate. Thus, the argument is persuasive for both Christians and Muslims.

Ahmad Deedat:

You said this morning, I heard the tape, you said, “Even one word, if it is not supposed to be there is there, the whole book should be thrown away.”, the whole book. But it is not only one word. There are chunks and chunks of it, according to your revisers. And brother Swaggart tells me in one of his books that if you want to know anything factual, knowledge on any subject, you go to the experts. And he gives an example that if you want to know something about geology, you go to the geologist. If you want to know about the Bible, where do you go? To the barber? To the shoemaker? No, you go to the Bible experts, the Bible scholars. And they are telling you that this is a fabrication. Then, the Trinity, Fathers and the Holy Ghost. Brother Swaggart also at verbatim from the first episode of John Chapter 5, verse7, where it says “For there are three bear record in heaven, the Father, the word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.” If he gives me time and says “which book?” I can open it and show it to you which book at verbatim his quotation. I said “but it is not in my Bible.” Is this not the word of God? In my Bible it is not there [The RSV]. Why is it not there? Because your scholars, thirty-two scholars of the highest eminence backed by fifty cooperating denominations, Bible scholars, they say that this is another fabrication, another interpolation. So, they also threw it out without any ceremony. So, two, and I give you the ascension. Brother Swaggart quotes in his book (Water Baptism) [Mark 16:16] another place [Mark 16:19]. I say it is not in my Bible. I didn’t print this. The Jews didn’t print it. The Hindus didn’t print it. You Christians, you produced this book, and you are telling me this is the most up-to-date Bible going to the most ancient manuscripts. So, I looked up for (Mark 16) I see it ends at verse eight. Nine to twenty is missing. Did I take it out? The Muslims took it out? No! Thirty-two scholars of the highest eminence backed by fifty cooperating
denominations, they thought it fit that this is another fabrication imposed upon Christendom. And they also threw it out. It is not in my Bible; therefore, it is not the word of God. If this is the word of God, then that is not the word of God.

Analysis:

Deedat makes use of rhetorical questions “where do you go? to the barber? To the shoemaker?”, “Did I take it out? Did the Muslims took it out?” , “Why is it not there?”, “Is this not the word of God?”, and hyperbole “the highest eminence”, “the most up-to date”, “the most ancient manuscripts” as substitutional tropes.

Deedat employs ethos: “I can open it and show it to you which book at verbatim his quotation”, “I looked up for (Mark 16) I see”; pathos: “You Christians, you produced this book, and you are telling me this is the most up-to-date bible going to the most ancient manuscripts”; and logos: “Even one word, if it is not supposed to be there is there, the whole book should be thrown away”, “according to your revisers [the thirty-two Bible scholar backed by fifty cooperating denominations denominations]. Deedat presents the removal of John (5:7), and Mark (16:16) and (16:19) which represent the verses of the ascensions from the (RSV) as logical proof to support his claim.

Positive politeness are also utilized: “brother Swaggart” (strategy 4), “So, they also threw it out” (strategy 6), “If you want to know about the Bible, where do you go? To the barber? To the shoemaker?” (Strategy 8); and off record politeness: “if you want to know anything factual, knowledge on any subject, you go to the experts”, “Is this not the word of God?”, “it is not in my Bible” (strategy 2), “the highest eminence”, “the most up-to date”, “the most ancient manuscripts” (strategy 5), “where do you go? to the barber? To the shoemaker?”, “Did I take it out? Did the Muslims took it out?” “Why is it not there?” and “Is this not the word of God?” (Strategy 10).

With reference to the rules associated with SAP, the first rule is fulfilled since Deedat uses internal proof that his opponent, Swaggart, is committed to. The second rule is also satisfied because a structurally correct schemes are used. The conclusion directly supports Deedat’s ultimate claim that ‘the Bible is not the word of God’ in the sense the argument can be counted as a successful SAP.

Ahmad Deedat:

And yet these Bibles, each and every one of them tells us that Jesus when he went into Jerusalem, he rode the donkey into Jerusalem, Matthew says. Mark says he rode the donkey into Jerusalem. Luke says he rode the donkey into Jerusalem. John says that he rode the donkey into Jerusalem. Look God Almighty didn’t miss that out, His son riding the donkey into Jerusalem. Every Tom, Dick and Harry were riding donkeys into Jerusalem. That he didn’t forget. But the ascension is not mentioned not once, and where it is mentioned is now thrown out. But I buy another Bible, identical Bible. Look, printed by the same printers, I look it is there again. What was
thrown out, they put it back again. How come? How come? What games are you people playing? Look at this! Back again. This is the 1971 version, back again. The ordinary people, the poor people, they don’t know what is going on, what games being played? Who knows? You read the preface, but he won’t tell his congregation what is he reading. In the preface, we are told that individuals and two Church denominations, they stampeded them; they forced them that they should put it back. If not, they are going to preach against this book. They say don’t buy this, buy the King James Version, the most up-to-date Bible going back to the most ancient manuscripts. No, no, no, don’t touch that. This is the safer one, because it has everything that you want to preach to catch the fish. It is easier to catch the fish with this than with this. The bait, you know, like Dale Carnegie, he tells us in his book. It says “How to Gain Friends and Influence People?” He says I like strawberry and cream. I think most Americans do. But he says when I go fishing, I put a worm to catch the fish, not that I love worms, but this is what the fish loves. So, I put worm. So, now if you want to catch fish, you’ve got to use the right bait. Ascension is now restored to the text says the preface. Why? Not God told them so. God doesn’t speak freely to those scholars as freely as he happened to speak, as brother claimed, with him. Again, and again you read that God comes to him. Speaks to him and says, son, again son which he didn’t address “his own son” Jesus, He never called him son. He speaks in the third person. He says “This is my son in whom I well please.” But to brother Swaggart He says “my son, my son.” Not so freely. I say look this is not the word of God. They say that the church groups by the meantime this was being discovered that they made a net profit of fifteen million dollars on this version, before they could remove it. Fifteen million!

Analysis:

This category comprises; figures of speech, argumentation appeals, and politeness strategies. As far as the first is concerned, Deedat resorts to metaphor: “the fish”, “strawberry and cream”, “worm”, “the bait”; Irony: “God Almighty didn’t miss that out, His son riding the donkey into Jerusalem”, “That he didn’t forget. But the ascension is not mentioned not once”, “God comes to him. Speaks to him and says, ‘Son’, again ‘son” as destabilization tropes, rhetorical questions: What games are you people playing?”, “what games being played?”, “How come?”, and hyperbole: “Every Tom, Dick and Harry were riding donkeys into Jerusalem.”, “the most ancient manuscripts” as substitution tropes.

The second encompasses: ethos which is established by the use of the pronoun (I), “I look back again” and “I say this is not the word of God”; pathos: “What games are you people playing?”, “The ordinary people, the poor people, they don’t know what is going on, what games being played? Who knows?”, and logos; “the ascension is not mentioned, not once”, “What is thrown out, they put it back again”, “if not, they are going to preach against this book”, “they made a net profit of fifteen million dollars.”
The third component involves positive politeness: “brother” (strategy 4), “So, if you want” (strategy 6), and “we are”, “tells us” (strategy 12); and off record strategies: “Every Tom, Dick and Harry were riding donkeys into Jerusalem”, “the most ancient manuscripts” (strategy 5), “God Almighty didn’t miss that out, His son riding the donkey into Jerusalem. Every Tom, Dick and Harry were riding donkeys into Jerusalem.” (Strategy 7). “God Almighty didn’t miss that out, His son riding the donkey into Jerusalem”, “That he didn’t forget. But the ascension is not mentioned not once”, “God comes to him. Speaks to him and says, ‘Son’, again ‘son’ (strategy 8), “the fish”, “strawberry and cream”, “worm”, “the bait” (strategy 9), “What games are you people playing?”, “what games being played?”, “who knows”, “How come?” (Strategy 10)

As far as the rules of SAP are concerned, Deedat resorts to internal proof in the sense that Swaggart is committed to the premises provided in this argument. Such type of commitment demands Swaggart to advance a counter argument to rebut or to undercut Deedat’s argument. The schemes presented in the argument are correctly structured, and the argument provides a direct support to Deedat’s ultimate claim.

Ahmad Deedat:

Brother Swaggart has written some beautiful books, beautiful books; Incest, pornography, Homosexuality, Alcohol, Sodom and Gomorrah, and I can’t imagine myself doing any better. Beautiful writings. Incest, he says the dark stain on our American society. It has reached epidemic proportion, incest. In my country, the whites of South Africa according to statistics, 8% of all white people they commit incest. 8%, one in every twelve is committing incest. I don’t know what is the percentage here. But brother Swaggart tells us that it has reached epidemic proportions in your mighty country, America. And he gives examples from the holy Bible. That there are ten cases of incest in the holy Bible. I didn’t know that. I knew that in the first book of the Bible, Genesis, there were four cases. Brother Swaggart’s book enlightened me. I got the fifth one in the first book. As if this is a text book on incest to tell you what are the types of incest you can commit? In a book of God! Ten cases of incest. And I am told that the type of food you eat, you eat junky food you become junky. You read junky stuff; your mind becomes junky. It is these types of things you read. Can’t you see that we are getting programmed? Whatever you see, whatever you read, we are getting programmed. You read about incest, incest, incest: father with daughters, son with his mother, father-in-law with his daughter-in-law, brother with his sister!! What is this? Ten cases of incest! You read about incest, incest, incest. Little wonder that it has reached epidemic proportion. You see Dr. Vernon Jones, an American psychologist of great repute; he carried out experiments on groups of school children to whom certain stories were being read. And he said, “These stories make certain slight but permanent changes in character even in the narrow classroom situation.” The type of stories that you read, the type of stories that they read, the things that they see that is the type of
mentality they are going to have. So, I say book of God! Why would God Almighty Go out of his way in his holy book to reveal to you ten cases of incest coupled? Ten cases, so I say, therefore, my dear brothers and sisters, this is not the word of God.

Analysis:

Deedat resorts to irony: “Swaggart has written some beautiful books, beautiful books”, “I can’t imagine myself doing any better”, “Beautiful writings”, “In a book of God! Ten cases of incest.” as a destabilization trope, and rhetorical questions: “What is this?”, “Can’t you see we are getting programmed?”, “Why would God Almighty Go out of his way in his holy book to reveal to you ten cases of incest coupled?” as a substitution trope.

Concerning argumentation appeals, Deedat employs ethos: “I can’t imagine myself doing any better”, “I didn’t know. I knew that in the first book of the Bible”, “So, I say.” He makes use of logos: “8% of the white people commit incest”, “It has reached epidemic proportion”, “ten cases of incest in the Bible.” Deedat also utilizes positive politeness: “brother Swaggart”, “dear brothers and sisters” (strategy 4), “So, I say” (strategy 6), “you see” (strategy 7), “tells us”, “we are getting” (strategy 12); negative politeness: “incest has reached epidemic proportion” (strategy 3). “And I am told” (strategy 7), and off record: “little wonder” (strategy 4), “Brother Swaggart has written some beautiful books, beautiful books”, “I can’t imagine myself doing any better.”, “Beautiful writings”, “In a book of God! Ten cases of incest!” (Strategy 8), “What is this?”, “Can’t you see we are getting programmed?” “Why would God Almighty Go out of his way in his holy book to reveal to you ten cases of incest coupled?” (Strategy 10).

Regarding the rules of the successful SAP, the first rule is satisfied since Deedat utilizes what Swaggart believes to be true such as the Bible and Swaggart’s personal publications. The premises of the argument are said to be internal proof. The second rule is also achieved through the use of structurally correct schemes. The argument provides new evidence that supports to Deedat’s ultimate claim that fulfills his goal in the debate. Therefore, Deedat’s argument can be considered a successful SAP.

2. 3. Results and Discussion:

A quantitative analysis is conducted in this section in order to verify of reject the hypotheses of the study. The statistical analysis is performed by means of the percentage and frequencies obtained from the qualitative analyses in the previous section. In terms of figures of speech, as indicated in Table (1) and Figure (4), Deedat employs (10) instances of rhetorical questions which represent the highest percentage that counts to (34.5%) of his argumentative discourse, whereas metaphor occupies the highest percentage with (50%) of (7) times of use in Swaggart’s argumentative discourse. 

Table (1): Statistical Comparison of Figures of Speech in Deedat-Swaggart’s Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figures of Speech</th>
<th>Deedat Fre</th>
<th>Deedat Per</th>
<th>Swaggart Fre</th>
<th>Swaggart Per</th>
<th>Total Fre</th>
<th>Total Per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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As for argumentation appeals, as it is shown in Table (2) and Figure (5), the dominant pragmatic strategy for Deedat is logos. This is supported by (12) times of use that represent the highest percentage which amounts to (44.5%). Swaggart, on the other hand, depends more on ethos as the most frequent strategy with (11) instances representing (57.9%) of the total percentage. 

**Table (2): Statistical Comparison of Argumentation Appeals in Deedat-Swaggart’s Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argumentation Appeals</th>
<th>Deedat</th>
<th>Swaggart</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as politeness strategies are concerned, as explained in Table (3) and Figure (6), off record politeness strategies are proved to be the dominant ones utilized by both debaters which occupy (56%) with (34) occurrences in Deedat’s argumentative discourse and (59%) of (20) times of use in Swaggart’s argumentation.

**Table (3): Statistical Comparison of Politeness Strategies in Deedat-Swaggart’s Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politeness Strategies</th>
<th>Deedat</th>
<th>Swaggart</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debaters</td>
<td>Deedat</td>
<td>Swaggart</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fre Per</td>
<td>Fre Per</td>
<td>Fre Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive politeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 3</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 4</td>
<td>8 13.1%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>8 8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 5</td>
<td>1 1.6%</td>
<td>3 8.8%</td>
<td>4 4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 6</td>
<td>3 4.9%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>4 4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 7</td>
<td>1 1.6%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>2 2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 8</td>
<td>1 1.6%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 9</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 10</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 11</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>2 5.9%</td>
<td>2 2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 12</td>
<td>9 14.8%</td>
<td>4 11.8%</td>
<td>13 13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 13</td>
<td>1 1.6%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 14</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 15</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24 39.2%</td>
<td>11 32%</td>
<td>35 37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fre Per</th>
<th>Fre Per</th>
<th>Fre Per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative politeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>2 5.9%</td>
<td>2 2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 3</td>
<td>1 1.6%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 4</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 5</td>
<td>1 1.6%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>2 2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 6</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 7</td>
<td>1 1.6%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 8</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 9</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 10</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 4.8%</td>
<td>3 9%</td>
<td>6 6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fre Per</th>
<th>Fre Per</th>
<th>Fre Per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2</td>
<td>3 4.9%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>3 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 3</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 4</td>
<td>2 3.3%</td>
<td>4 11.8%</td>
<td>6 6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 5</td>
<td>5 8.2%</td>
<td>6 17.6%</td>
<td>11 11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 6</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 7</td>
<td>1 1.6%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 8</td>
<td>7 11.5%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>7 7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 9</td>
<td>6 9.8%</td>
<td>7 20.6%</td>
<td>13 13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 10</td>
<td>10 16.4%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>11 11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 11</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 12</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 13</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 2.9%</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 14</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 15</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 56%</td>
<td>20 59%</td>
<td>54 57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fre Per</th>
<th>Fre Per</th>
<th>Fre Per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61 100%</td>
<td>34 100%</td>
<td>95 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of Both | 61 64.2% | 34 35.8% | 95 100% |
With respect to the rules of a successful SAP, as shown in Table (4) and Figure (7), the total instances of applying these rules are (36). The highest occurrences of keeping to these rules are (19) which represents (95%) of the total of Deedat’s arguments, whereas the highest frequency of violating these rules is (7) representing (43.7%) of the total of Swaggart’s chain of arguments.

Table (4): Statistical Comparison of the Rules of a Successful SAP in Deedat-Swaggart’s Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules of SAP</th>
<th>Deedat</th>
<th>Swaggart</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fre</td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>Fre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept to</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of both debaters</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (6): Rates of Politeness Strategies in Deedat-Swaggart’s Debate

Figure (7): Rates of the Rules of a Successful SAP in Deedat-Swaggart’s Debate

2.4. Conclusions:
According to the above analysis, the following conclusions are derived:

1. The pragma-rhetorical component comprises three strategies: figures of speech, argumentation appeals, and politeness strategies. As far as the first set is concerned, the results have revealed that rhetorical question is the dominant strategy for Deedat among the others with the percentage of (34.5%), followed by Irony with the percentage (24.1%), metaphor with the percentage (20.7%), hyperbole (17.2%), and allusion (3.4%). Concerning Swaggart, metaphor prevails over other strategies with the percentage (50%). Hyperbole comes
next with the percentage (42.9%), rhetorical question (7.1%) whereas irony, and allusion have similar percentages of (0%).

Logos has scored the highest portion with the percentage of (44.5%) as compared to ethos and pathos (37%, and 18.5% respectively) within Deedat’s argumentation. Swaggart, on the other hand, has utilized ethos as the most frequent pragmatic strategy with the highest percentage (57.9%), logos (31.6%), and pathos (10.5%). Accordingly, Deedat’s argumentation are logos-based rhetoric which benefits from considering then refuting views of his counterpart. Logos are associated with providing commonly accepted facts that support ultimate claims. Swaggart’s argumentation, on the other hand, is more colored with ethos. Credibility is the base for ethos that enables Swaggart to become persuasive. These strategies complement each other. This means that the presence of the three rhetorical strategies in an argument can have a great impact on the audience.

2. Off record politeness strategies have been detected as the highest pragmatic strategies among the others for Deedat and Swaggart with the percentages of (56%, and 59% respectively), followed by positive politeness strategies with the percentages (39.2%, and 32% respectively). Negative politeness takes the lowest strategies employed in the context of the debate.

3. Dealing with SAP, abiding by the four rules render argumentation to have a good degree of persuasion. It has been concluded that Deedat is more aware of these rules when advancing his arguments which make his arguments more persuasive than his counterpart. This is clear by the percentages of keeping to these rules which have reached (95%) for Deedat and (56.3%) for Swaggart.
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