

A Grammatical Argumentations, through The Debate Between grammar and logic. Abū Sa'īd al-Sīrāfī and Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus al-Qunnā'ī. facus

Pr. MOUSSA FATAHINE¹, Dr. Embarek Ahmed², Dr. AMMOUR MISSOUM³

¹Department of Humanities Sciences – Philosophy, University Khemis Miliana, PRFU: An argumentations in cultural discourse
University Khemis Miliana, Algeria, PRFU / I05L07UN440120220001
(Algeria). ORCID/ 0000-0001-5181-5303

²Department of Humanities Sciences – Philosophy, University Khemis Miliana (Algeria).

³Department of Human Sciences – Philosophy (Algeria).

The Author's E-mail: m.fatahine@univ-dbkm.dz¹, a.embarek@univ-dbkm.dz², m.ammour@univ-dbkm.dz³

Received: 10/07/2024

Published: 08/04/2025

Abstract:

In this paper, I examine the logic of language (informal logic) which is being present in literary discourse when trying to persuade or to seek persuasion. Since life is full of communication and dialogue between a source and a recipient, a linguistic or rhetorical solution has become necessary for every attempt at persuasion, victory, demolition, refutation or, at least, influence in the other. Is there in the literary heritage what confirms the convergence between the logic of language and the language of logic, or between a grammatical argumentations and reason? Is there a functional interaction between the links of Argumentations in construction and demolition?

Keywords: logic of language, argumentation rhetoric, Abū Hayyān al-Tawhīdī Abū Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus al-Qunnā'ī, Abu Said Al-Sirafi – persuade, seek persuasion, new rhetoric, demonstration, meaning, logical thinking, new logical and conciliation.

Argumentation grammaticale dans l'héritage arabe. Le débat entre Abū Sa'īd al-Sīrāfī et Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus al-Qunnā'ī. facus

Résumé:

Dans cet article, j'examine la logique du langage qui est présente dans le discours littéraire lorsqu'il s'agit de persuader ou de rechercher la persuasion. La vie étant pleine de communication et de dialogue entre une source et un destinataire, une solution linguistique ou rhétorique est devenue nécessaire à toute tentative de persuasion, de victoire, de démolition, de réfutation ou, du moins, d'influence sur l'autre. Y a-t-il dans l'héritage littéraire ce qui confirme la convergence entre la logique du langage et le langage de la logique, ou entre la rhétorique argumentative et la raison ? Existe-t-il une interaction fonctionnelle entre les liens des Argumentations en construction et en démolition ?

Mots-clés: logique du langage, rhétorique argumentative, Abû Hayyân al-Tawhîdî Abû Bishr Mattâ b. Yûnus al-Qunnâ'î, Abu Saïd Al-Sirafî – persuader, chercher la persuasion, nouvelle rhétorique, démonstration, sens, pensée logique, nouvelles orientations logiques, plaisir et conciliation.

1. Introduction

I am going to analyze the famous debate mentioned by Abû Hayyân al-Tawhîdî in his Book of *l-imtâ' wal muânasa*. This debate has proceeded between Abû Sa'id Ḥasan al-Sirāfî, on the one hand, and Abû Bishr Mattâ ibn Yûnus al-Qunnâ'î, the logician and interpreter of some Greek logical texts, on the other hand. This conversation took place in the Council of Ministers headed by Al-Faḍl ibn al-Furr'at, 921-1001 during the reign of the Abbasid caliph Al-Muqtadir (Ilya Gershevitch, William Bayne Fisher, Iḥsân Yāršātir, Richard Nelson Frye 1968, p82)

First, my aim is to consider some intersection points between dialectical and logical argumentation in the Book of *Kitâb al-imtâ' wal-muânasa* in one of the most famous texts belonging to the Arabic literary tradition that had absorbed the ancient eloquence over the centuries, and became the basis of social means directed to supporting and refuting opinions in the Islamic culture. Second, I shall also show the meaning of dialogue in Arabian culture, be it persuasive rhetoric or logical argumentation. For reaching both aims I appeal to the heritage of Abû Hayyân al-Tawhîdî to make it relevant and promising from the point of view of modern logic and philosophy.

2. Abû Hayyân al-Tawhîdî and his Position in the Discourse

The full name of Abû Hayyân al-Tawhîdî is Alî b. Muḥammad b. al-'Abbâs Abû Hayyân al-Tawhîdî, where al-Tawhîdî is considered a nickname being reported by some biographers. According to one story, his father was a seller in the markets of Baghdad, and *tawhîd* was a name for the product he was selling. In another story, he was named a *mu'tazilite* in theology it means, belonging to

al-mu'tazilah, "those who stand apart, and the mu'tazilites were known as people who follow the tawhîd principle – the idea of divine unity? The biographers also disagreed about the date of his birth and death, some say that he was born 923AD in Baghdad and died 1023AD in Shiraz. In addition, some biographers did not trust him; such as al-Zarkili, who accused him of heresy, while others described him as one of the people of tawhîdî (the doctrine of divine unity) and Sufism. Therefore, it is not easy to assess him. The disagreements about this philosopher are related to his personality, despite the abundance of his writings and differences in styles, as well as accuracy in writing and composition. Anyway, although al-Tawhîdî was not a native Arab, his thought was written in Arabic and had a great influence in the Arabic culture, therefore he should be considered an Arabic thinker. I have relied on what Yāqūt Shihāb al-Dīn ibn-'Abdullāh al-Rūmī al-Hamawī (1179 – 1229) wrote in his dictionary about Abū Hayyān al-Tawhîdî that he is a philosopher. (Hamawi, Y. 1980. pp.05-25)

Abū Hayyān al-Tawhîdî has written numerous books, namely: the Book of Enjoyment and Conciliation book al-*imtâ' wal-muânasa* published by Ahmed Amine and Ahmed Al-Zein in 1943, which is the fruit of thirty seven night meetings with Abu Abdullah El Ardh, the Book of Insights and Munitions, the Book of Friendship and Friends, both published by Ahmad Fares Al-Shadiaq in 1901, the Ethics of the Two Ministers which was edited and published by Ibrahim Al-Kilani in Damascus 1961, Hummers and Roasters which was published by Ahmad Amine and Ahmad Al-Saqr in Egypt in 1951, (Haitham, K.A. 2011)

It seems from this rich heritage that al-Tawhîdî has closed the gap between philosophy and literature, between logical argumentation and rhetorical persuasion, and he was credited with inventing questioning prose after interweaving rhetorical grammatical language with logical language. However, he saved "prose from the domination of poetry in the eleventh as pointed out by the Dean of Arabic Literature Taha Hussein in the book of the history of Arabic literature in its second edition of Beirut 1976 to get further to the nature of this combination of logic, language and rhetoric which characterized heritage of al-Tawhîdî,

I chose the eighth night from al-Tawhîdî's the book of Enjoyment and Conciliation as a model for this proposal. This night includes an interesting dialogue between Abū Zayd Ḥasan al-Sīrāfī and Abū Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus al-Qunnā'ī about the differentiation between Arabic grammar and Greek logic. This dialogue or debate reveals a conflict that had happened between the supporters of the Greek logic and the defenders of the Arabic language" (Michel 1994. p.284) there was then a conflict between the empire of eloquence and persuasion from one side, and the empire of inference and proof from the other side, with two different mechanisms which al-Tawhîdî unveiled in That debate which presented a new beginning to a prose genre, which took a new suit with an

unprecedented. Now, where does the excellence in this text lie? And what are the mechanisms used by al-Tawḥîdî in persuasion and arguing through the debate between the grammarian Abu Saïd Al-Serafi and the logician Abū Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus al-Qunnāṭ?

3. The Pillars of Dialogue and Persuasion in the Debate

a. Language Mechanism in Argumentation

Classical theories were confined to restricting the function of language to communicating news and indicating reality to the others by adopting structures which carry meanings and exchange ideas. However, modern trends in the linguistic writings have focused on argumentation in "Language carries intrinsically an argumentative or dialectical reasoning". (Azzawi 2006) from our side, we seek to apply the syntactical grammatical debate - written by al-Tawḥîdî in his heritage arguing on the theory of the language of argumentation which has influenced contemporary discourse in different directions. Consequently, we attempt to answer the question: Is there a relationship between argumentation and linguistic mechanism in the debate?

Although the link between language and argumentation has its roots in the distant history of humanity, its employment is a recent emergence which has manifested simultaneously with the new Linguistic theories and exceeded the idea of limiting the language merely in communication and exchange of ideas. This happened mainly with the supporters and poles of linguistic argumentation (Al-Zu'bi and Al-Hamad 1992, p.288) as Jean-Claude Anscombe. and Oswald Ducrot (1930), who state that persuasion is not necessarily direct and being expressed by famous logical tools but it rather may be indirect and undeclared as a result to a deductive reasoning and it could have effect on the soul through the way in which speech could be used by employing words and its structures. "In this sense, I tried to draw the texts of al-Tawḥîdî and apply them to the new linguistic theories in order to determine the degree of argumentation and the degree of its impact and its effect" (Rabia, A, 2013).

a- Negation of frequency signifiers

Words signifying hesitation: It is a way in which language mechanism is used for showing to the reader or the recipient that the truth is what the interlocutor says only, as if it were locked and cannot be penetrated, such as what Sirafi opted for to convince the attendees and the minister that he has the capacity that matches Matta and they do not know it, and it was time to get it out; he said: "Abu Saïd Sīrāfī raised his head and says "Excuse me, Minister, the science preserved in the heart is different from what is presented in this fighting in a special battle is not like who speaks without thinking in a public space (Abū Hayyān 2011). into this text, there is an argument which prepares the void in the head of the listener

to fill it with the opinion he wants without paying attention to other ideas. As such, he will be able to block the way of the opponent, making himself the guardian of the judgments (science is preserved in the heart) but this is hidden, and everyone is waiting eagerly and passionately, as if he relied on hiding the effect to stimulate curiosity and affect the minister and those who are present, with the beauty of the pretext of hidden preserved Science, Abu Said Sīrāfī is able to debate Abū Bishr Mattāal-Qunnā'ī and demolish his views by demolishing his arguments which he used to support his views of Greek Logic.

1. **b-** Ask question: is a language mechanism which requires understanding or answer, used by Abu Said Sīrāfī as an argument for persuasion, confirming and invoking his authority. Because of the excitement and the emotions it stimulates, as it evokes the soul and charges it with an argumentative energy, which makes the recipient or the listener convinced by the answer, questioning" (Drydi.S, 2008), debate, there are many questions that al-Sīrāfī put to Abū Bishr Mattā for the purpose of testing the later, to inspect his cognitive load and to highlight the weakness of the opponent's argument. For instance, his statement: "Then he faced Abū Bishr Mattāal-Qunnā'ī said: Tell me about logic, and what you mean by it... Who knows what is weighed whether it is iron, gold or semi lead, what inspires the Turks, the Indians, the Persians or the Arabs to consider it and take it as a judge, or a rule over them? (Abū Hayyān 2011) These questions show clearly how and to which extent the grammarian, al-Sīrāfī is familiar with the questions of logic and its utilizations? he used logic as a mechanism to besiege and provoke the adversary under the pretext of the shallow linguistic balance of Abū Bishr Mattā to impose the logic of language as like as the language of logic, which did not help the logicians to overcome their problems. Aristotle's logic and rules are based on the Greek heritage and literature. Therefore, the question is to be a powerful tool of strength that supports the argumentation, and it is supported by a psychological force that will achieve the persuasion, which will be charged with a convincing and emotional energy. This is how al-Sīrāfī understood it, and the evidence for that is the way he followed up on the answer of Abū Bishr Mattā who said: "you made a mistake" because he did not distinguish between words and judgments, that is, between meanings and structures. Evidently, it is a very difficult thing to maintain what is right by assuming meanings which need no structures. In another place al-Sīrāfī al-Tawhīdī speaks about the way by which al-Sīrāfī put into silence when the former asked a strong argumentative question that made the latter implicitly convinced of his lack of competence, this happened when said: "leave this; I ask you about one letter (and) , which is circulating in the speech of the Arabs, and its meanings are distinguished among the people of reason, so extract its meanings from Aristotle's part, which you show brag about its magnificence, and this letter (conjunction) is: "and", what are its rules? What about its locations or uses? And does it have one form or many?" (Abū Hayyān 2011) in this questioning text, the movement of

argumentation clearly manifests by inserting the recipient Abū Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus al-Qunnā'ī as an active participant in the dialogue and debate, because the question is a tool of stimulation that prompted him to announce his position, or at least to recognize his lack or limit of tools. It is well-known that al-Tawḥīdī is a philosopher of the question who speaks here in al-Sīrāfī language, especially in his question: What is the meaning of "and" and its rules? This confirms the limitations of the logical connections and their inaccuracy, and the legitimacy of language and its fertility through grammatical rules. This means the position of this letter of expression, which is no more than linking or conjuncting in the language of Aristotle, which is unable to determine its function in the judgments and issues such as (with), and expressing circumstance. This is the result that was not authorized and is a second argument for the first assertive statement that relates to the "and" and its different functions, in addition to the function of conjunction. In my estimation, the question of Abu Sa'id Sīrāfī is very important if we draw it on symbolic logic, which is very popular in the formalization. Hence, do they have different symbols for "and". So, what was concealed by the questioner was revealed by Abū Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus al-Qunnā'ī when he said: "this is grammar, and I am not into grammar field" (Abū Hayyān 2011). This result, which was concealed by Abu Sa'id Sīrāfī and stated by Abū Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus al-Qunnā'ī. Yūnus al-Qunnā'ī is a pillar of his argument about the shortcomings of logical knowledge in the field of grammar. For this reason, "the argument is not an argument for the speaker, unless it is added to the conclusion. However, the conclusion may be expressed explicitly, and it may remain in other words (Shehri.B 2004) the questioning in Serafī's speech represents an argument for the benefit of an implicit conclusion which is: Logicians many of them do not know the rules of grammar. Therefore, Abu Sa'id said "I want to show that your overstatement of logic does not make any difference to you, if you are ignorant of a single letter (conjunction) in the language that you use to call for the Greek wisdom, and the ignorance of one letter can mean the ignorance of many letters, and the ignorance of letters can mean the ignorance of an entire of the language and the rules of grammar, morphology and rhetoric (Abū Hayyān 2011) in the debate, there are many cases of this kind of questioning, which cannot be mentioned all here. But I have recorded its involvement in the connection of the argument to the conclusion, as well as to the fact that it is a product of the words, because the debate is a challenge to knowledge, and intellectual construction always mimics the mobility of questioning, as "only the question can feed the research" (M. Michel, 1994)

C - Imperative and Negation

In grammatical language, the origin of imperative is a form of present simple, so it is difficult to separate the negative imperative from the imperative in the discourse, and they are often used in the presence of cognitive authority that guides the listener." The imperative is a formula that calls for action, or a

statement that preaches the call to act” (Jackson,R,1985) and it may come in many forms, as stated in the debate such as the imperative verb (Do), the imperative name, the negated present simple, must, ought to and confirmed statements from a sender of an authority. If these forms never be used the result would be disastrous and create animosity. However, negative imperative is often issued by a sender from a higher position, following the example of the imperative, to which is added the negation sign "Not" or "Don't" used to direct the listener and the third person (he/she/they). This is what we find in the text of the debate, used by Abū Sa‘id Ḥasan al-Sīrāfī, on the one hand, and Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus al-Qunnā‘ī in the argumentation and persuasion.

In the words of Sirafi: "Tell me about the logic .Say in this sign “Yes”, wipe your face with the saliva. Let this...extract its meanings as brought by Aristotle, which you show and boast of their splendor ,tell me about someone who said something...Tell me about the “and” and its rules... Abu Said, ask him about another matter...Tell us whether you have ever used logic to distinguish two differences or raise the difference between two (AbūHayyân 2011). a closer look at these acts makes one discovers a kind of influence and an attempt to stimulate others to use power that differs in purpose, sometimes for guidance and other times for correction, "and for yelling, discipline (.Ducrot,O,1983. pp.514-517). The idea involved in those various texts respectively is the influence and persuasion by the victor’s strength which leads to the appreciation of the opponent, otherwise, why can we not find imperative verbs and their contexts of Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus al-Qunnā‘ī debate? The deficit is manifested in the presence of a weak argument. We went through the answers of Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus al-Qunnā‘ī the comments of al-Sīrāfī to extract a dialogue between a student and a teacher.

As for negative imperative and negation as two techniques for argumentation, we find the words of the al-Sīrāfī for example, when he says: "Ibn al-Furat said: can't anyone of you accept to debate with Mattā in the debate of logic for he says: there is no way to know the truth from false and honesty from lying only what we get from logic" (Anscombe and Ducrot,1983)it is clear from this text that there is an argumentative genre used to confront the persuasion by deceiving the views of the opponent in order to change his position and his belief, and to incite the audience against the supporter of logic to create a disregard for his opinion, and this is called 'controversial negation'. And in another saying : "Not all things in the world are weighed" which is in response to the way Mattā limits logic when he linked it to its function and purposes likening it necessarily to life necessity. It is known by the experimental scientists or empiricists as the limited inference.

The core of the argument lies in a generalization that was not rationalized by the logician Mattā. He also says -arguing against Mattā: "And he is not the creator of the logic of Greece as a whole but is one of them who took the same from those before him and those after him and he is not an argument against all these people”

(Abû Hayyân 2011), then he said to “you are not calling us to know Logic, but to learn the Greek language, yet you do not know the Greek language” (Abû Hayyân 2011), Mattâ said: “no, but they are among the nations who care about wisdom concerning the exterior of this world and its meaning” (Abû Hayyân 2011), this is grammar, and I am not into it, because there is no need for the logician to know grammar (Abû Hayyân 2011), in these texts, we find that Abu-Bishr has an argument that negates the necessity of grammar for logic, and this is a conclusion for a previous introduction in which he links grammar to structure and logic to meaning; that is between the tongue and the mind. And Abu Sa'id al-Sirafi continues to put Mattâ ibn Yûnus into silence in front of the audience by saying: “What we have found for you is only what you have learned from the language of the Arabs and you are in your logic of apparent lack, because you did not read books of language, (Abû Hayyân 2011). Sirafi tried to convince the audience to respond to Abu Bishr under the pretext that the logic he uses is limited and incomplete and this is the result of his ignorance of books, poetry and science. In the method of negation and negative imperative lies the impact of argumentation which covers most texts of the debate between grammatical and logical, this is enough what we have discussed, it is sufficient what we discussed, due to the nature of the subject and the presentation. In spite of the fact that refutation is not always true, it may be false, because the person who presents the objection tries to show, not that the argument is complete, but that it is not necessary (Aristotle's 1982), and this is putting in argumentative dialogue which performs the function of persuasive argumentation.

3. Linguistic Argumentative Links:

If arguing is the creation of conclusive sequences within the discourse, which is no more than successive statements, the text of the speech tightens only the structures by the use of linguistic links that form the structure of statements between the two arguing parties' arguments and conclusions, therefore, what are these linguistic links and how the two debaters used them?

At the beginning, I would like to point out that the issue of language links one language to another. Therefore, in this research, I shall be referring to Arabic language, as the text of the debate is written by Abû - Hayyân al-Tawhîdî in Arabic, which contains large number of factors and links that can be only defined by reference to its argumentative value. We mention as examples these tools: “but, yet, then, even, especially, because, for, though, perhaps, almost, but what, so, except, and,” (Azzawi.A, 2006)

1. And

Abû-Hayyân al-Tawhîdî used “and” in the texts of the debate as an argumentative mechanism to link the premises with the conclusion, and sometimes to connect several sequences of arguments and which serves the same purpose. I shall try to pick up only some of texts for their multitude and for the way they overlap with other links. For example: when he says in defense of grammar and

its importance: "The need is heightened for those who lack this skill to learn the grammar and to know its uses, rules and conditions, in the nouns, prepositions, and verbs of Arabic", (Abû Hayyân 2011) the argumentative linguistic link "and" turns out so that it performs two functions, the first is to connect between one argument and another, while the second is to arrange the arguments in sequence in the extent which strengthens the conclusion and stimulates the interlocutor to accept the necessity of learning grammar for those who lack the eloquence and are not first language Arabic. In my estimation, al Tawhidi wanted to take the "and" out of the grammatical circle to the argumentative function in order to defend of the logic of grammar. In another text, Mattā ibn Yūnussaid: "true speech can be distinguished from the false, and corrupt meaning from the righteous. It helps me to distinguish between the complete and the limited, and the ill of the delinquent. Then comes the saying of Abu Said: You are mistaken, because the true speech can be distinguished from the poor one by the known expression and familiar language grammar" (Abû Hayyân 2011) in the words of Abū Bishr Mattā "and" links between the two arguments to convince the opponent with a conclusion that cannot be disregarded to have a straight thinking, and we understand from this sequence on which he insists in the context, and devotes it to the method, that he uses the argumentation in order to influence the others, because he relies on the order of the arguments according to their strength to serve well the final conclusion, be it explicit or implicit. therefore, if we dismantle Mattā's saying, we find that his arguments are connected by a single thread, which is the logical necessity that he supports, and if we dismantle al-Sīrāfi's speech, we will find his arguments connected to prove the logic of language (grammar), and for both al-Tawhīdī and Sirafi, the greater the link is, the stronger the argument (the conclusion) will be, increasing both influence and persuasion. This is why we find the "and" link more commonly used in "The Enjoyment and Conciliation" and in The interviews "in order to facilitate the combination of issues and opinions, and to strengthen them with some kind of power to achieve attraction. This is because some of the characteristics of "and" are efficiency, continuity, and flexibility, therefore he found what he was looking for in "and", which is the most voluntary letter; to perform meanings without conditions (Hassan, A 2000, p.35), thus we can say that use al-Tawhīdī the "and" for its argumentative dimension besides its linking characteristics.

Link "Then" in the debate between logic and grammar

"And" is not different from "then", i.e. it comes to associate between words (prepositions, verbs, nouns,) sentences or statements. It also arranges them in order to strengthen the argument to be used for persuasion and influence. It has frequently been mentioned in the texts of the debate that Mattā ibn Yūnus said: "it is sufficient for me from your language the noun, the verb, and the preposition, because I am thus attuned to the purposes that the Greeks have given me al-Sīrāfi said that the meanings are not Greek or Indian. The languages can be Persian,

Arabic or Turkish, however, you claim that the meanings are obtained by the mind, the examination and the thought, so there is nothing left but the rules of the language, why do you discard Arabic and you use it to translate and to explain Aristotle's books?" (Abû Hayyân 2011) linguistic link came to answer a question already posed by al-Sîrâfî "what is the logic? and out of necessity, you have to employ many of them to achieve translation because obligation and requirements are the extracts of argumentation and persuasion, thus, this method of argumentation, in which the arguments intensify to strengthen the thread of the conclusion, lies in the linguistic link that leads to the function of persuasion, so the dialogue does not stop, and the discourse entreats and strengthens thanks to it.

The two conjunctions "but" and "rather" are conjunctions of argumentative contradiction, we find them in affirmative and in negative statements, and were widely used by Abû Hayyân al-Tawhîdî in *Enjoyment and Conciliation and Interviews*, as well as the importance given to them by contemporary linguistic theories. "But" "lies between two speeches because of the negation and affirmation. it mediates between two heterogeneous speeches; negation is understood through confirmation, in which the denial of negation is affirmative, and the affirmation is rejected" (Al-Zu'bi, J. Al-Hamad, A1992), making the statement lying after stronger than the persuasion of the statement that came after. This is illustrated by the practical application of the texts of the debater. For example: Tawhîdî says: "This is what Ibn Yâ'ish said that it is not unjust or untrue, and if it is difficult and enormous and a factor, but not everyone has this excessive power, and this emerging characteristic" (Abû Hayyân 2011), what we conclude from this text is that "but" overrides the function of connecting between the argument and the conclusion to the task of directing, that is, directing the first sentence to serve the second one to be the most powerful and persuasive without departing from the context of the reasoning that the grammarians spoke about. In another example: al-Sîrâfî said: "the ignorance of some letters (linking conjunctions) may mean the ignorance of the entire language. If not ignorant of the entire language, but ignorant of some of it, you may not know what you need, and do not benefit from the knowledge of what you do not need it" (Abû Hayyân 2011), this text tries to prove to the opponent Abû Bîshr Mattâ the need to know the language and its rules (logic of language) from the characters and functions so that the understanding is correct and thinking is straight. In practice, we find that the first saying includes the following argument, the ignorance of the language results from the ignorance of the letter. Abû Bîshr Mattâ has proved that he does not know the function of "and", he even admitted that, and the second statement shows the outcome of those who do not know the letters (prepositions) of a language, and this second argument is stronger than the first in scale and influence.

The linking adverb "rather", in addition to its connecting function, it has a function of arguing, linking two argumentative relationships, where any sentence after it is not alone, a transfer, appeal or arrangement. It is useful to bring attention and boast the attraction and persuasion of al-Tawḥîdî has a lot in his writings, like he saying "but when he said in the beginning of his speech: The people repelled the road and threw thorns in it, and took the dissemination of wisdom as a trap for the urgent prostration, and Abū Bishr Mattā was dictating papers by a Muqtadiri dirham which was drunk and unaware and mocking, and he thinks himself in profit, but rather is one of the losers" (Abū Hayyân 2011), in this text, we find that it serves the combination of two arguments, one strengthens the other, or what is known among the scholars of grammar as the transitional strike in which occurs the transition from one purpose to another when the end of the first argument resumes moving to a second argument stronger than the first. putting thorns in the road and taking the spread of wisdom as a trap (the first saying), serves to denigrate philosophy and logic, and we can conclude from it to beware of the path of philosophy and logic. Rather, he used to dictate papers by a Al-Muqtadir and he was drunk and unconscious (second saying) (logical behavior of Abū Bishr Mattā is contrary to our Islamic ethics). But if we look at the "rather" in this case, we find it serves the coherence of the arguing and benefits it more than the contradiction between the two. In another statemental-Sīrāfi: "Not everything in the world is weighed, rather there are things that can be weighed and things that can be measured." (Abū Hayyân 2011). The second statement is an objection to the first one, includes a stronger argument.

4- Reasoning Conjunctions ("because", "if" the conditional and "even" that signifies reasoning)

The reader of the texts of Abū Hayyân al-Tawḥîdî in general, and of Enjoyment and Conciliation -Kitāb al-imtā and Interviews in particular, faces a wide range of reasoning links widely used and expressed in every paragraph. In my opinion, the philosopher's talk prevails over the answers, and the answers are colored by arguments, because he wants to influence the other, and try to convince, and to arrange the speech to confirm the result. therefore, we find that the conjunctions of reasoning come first in the speech such as (because), "so that not" and because no or lest. We try, from the argumentative discourse and the linguistic argumentation, to identify the applications of conjunctions in the corresponding texts. We begin with a statement of the value of the debate in the case of Minister Ibn al-Furat, who was quoted by Abū Hayyân al-Tawḥîdîs saying: "he told me to write this debate in its whole, because something is going on in that council between these two sheikhs with the presence of those scholars, which should be listened to very well to know its benefits, and do not underestimate anything from it" (Abū Hayyân 2011), in this text, two linked voices are connected by "because", and the second is an explanation and confirmation that the debate should be written for people to know and that there is a problem between the logicians and

grammarians about the criterion of honesty, health and safety of speech as if the minister wanted to say: If it were not for the value of the debate, he would not have ordered to be written down. This is the reasoning. In another text, we find Abu Saidal-Sīrāfiwas arguing with Abū Bishr Mattā a bout the shortcomings of the Greek logic and linguistic incompetence, he said:”And if you have emptied your mind and directed it to know this language, in which we talked, and argued, and explained the books of Greek in the language of its owners, to know that you are not in need for the meanings of the Greek, as you are not above the language of Greece” (Abū Hayyân 2011), in this text, we find two statements that are connected by the reasoning “to” which connect between the argument and the conclusion. The first statement "what if you emptied your mind" is a conditional, and the second statement which begins with the reasoning “to” in saying: "So that you would have known that you are not in need for the meanings of Greek, as you are above the language of Greek" is regarded as an argument that proves of the conclusion of which he wanted to convince his logician opponent . this is why the saying is very solid and tied by “what if”, "a preposition of abstention for not achieving abstention implying the meaning of the subjunctive” (M.A. al-Jabri,.1986,pp.13-80).and it is effective in the discourse because it carries out effectively the persuasion and necessity. In the same context, we find many links with the function of reasoning used byAbū Hayyânal-Tawhîdî the two debating sides, such as "if not", "so", "if" which always linking between the argument and the conclusion to support and confirm it, even strengthening it to get convinced. And not far from this we find another conjunction of the same role; used by the debaters in their arguments, which“ even , until, so that” which has multiple functions, including reasoning. al-Tawhidi said "Ibn al-Furat said to Abu Sa'id: finish your words to explain to us the matter so that the people of the council can benefit, and the silencing is a human habit”(Abū Hayyân 2011), so, the conjunction in this statement has a reasoning function for what is before. It is a reason for what comes after. The understanding is as follows: the benefit becomes clear for the people of the Council provided that the speech is completed, and this is the first statement that the son of Ibn al Furrat has called to urge the Council to testify on the defeat of the man of logic.

From this brief reading, the quick glance at the texts of the debate, and the linguistic conjunctions that hold its words, we conclude that the speech does not harmonize and does not perform the mission of argumentation and persuasion unless the communicator, sender or receiver can use the conjunctions properly, and realize their functions within the discourse and within the linguistic structures, as an argumentation, or as a link between the arguments to meet the goal of persuasion and influence in others.

The texts of the debate are a series of logical quotations, linking their units (semantics) by linguistic links intersecting with logical connections in many places. WhatAbu Saidal-Sīrāfi calls a condition is called a necessity byAbū Bishr

Mattā, but the difference in matter only; but in terms of the imagery, it is difficult to separate between them regarding the degree of harmony of the image and speech models, which have become new opportunities for new logical orientations and modern linguistic studies.

The logical reading of the debate reveals that the grammarians defended the linguistic tendency and its language arguments, but were not exempt from logic and its images in reasoning. It was an early call to establish the logic of the language, because Ibn al Furrat and Abu Saidal-Sīrāfi were grammarians in action and logicians in presentation. And a reflection on the composition explains their knowledge of the Organon, and the practice is strong because Sirafi's question about logic, and his response to Abū Bishr Mattā's answer confirm that he is well grounded. As far as Abū Bishr Mattā is concerned, despite the inferiority of his knowledge in grammar and Arabic – in the semantics of Abu Saidal-Sīrāfi- he fell into the problems of rhetoric and its ornaments, the arguments of eloquence were occasionally drawn to him, despite his competence in proof and its strict rules.

because of this, the field of possibilities was fertile for practicing the types of argumentation. The field of possibilities is dominated by argumentation, rhetorical and deliberative, and this is what we see in politics and social life today, and in the necessities prevail proof and strict logic.

With these flashes, we can say that, Abū Hayyān al-Tawhīdī as a philosopher of the question, and a leader in Arabic rhetorical and linguistic argumentation. Furthermore, he has great insights in logic and its problems, as he has a taste and good reasoning in his texts.

The originality of this research lies in two points. The first is that this debate constitutes a model for the starting point of the problem of difference between linguists and logicians, from which the debate erupted between meaning and formalism, which extended to the explosion of the issue of artificial intelligence and comprehensive omniscience. Is artificial intelligence able to read philosophical texts and human sciences?

As for the second point, that the House of Wisdom was the meeting place of laws, religious dialogue, human rights, and coexistence between peoples. The dialogue of the Christian logician is the head of the House of Wisdom with the rank of minister (Abū Bishr Mattā) of the Arab Muslim Abu Saidal-Sīrāfi without violence and without exclusion.

References

- Abū Hayyān, T. 1982. *al-Ishārāt-al-ilāhīyah*, eds I2, Dar al-Thaqafa, Beirut Lebanon,
Abū-Hayyān, T., *Kitāb*, 2011, *al-imtā' wal-muānasa*, Distribution, Al-Ansari Publishing Company Library, Saida, Lebanon, pp. 03-108
al-Jabri M, A. 1986. *Takwin al-aql al-ʿarabī*. Center for Arab Unity Studies, pp. 13-80

- Anscombe, J.C. Ducrot, O. 1983. L'argumentation dans la langue, Bruxelles. Mardaga, pp. 514-517.
- Azzawi, A. 2006. Argumentations and Language, The Mayor in the Press, pp. 14-108
- Al-Zu'bi, J. and Al-Hamad, A. 1992. alqamus almawsueiu fi alnawh alearabii, The Encyclopedic Dictionary in Arabic grammar, Dar Al-Afaq Al-Jadida, I, Morocco. p.288.
- Ad-Drydy, S. 2008. alhujaaj fi alshier alearabii alqadim, buniatih w 'asalibih, An Argumentations in ancient Arabic poetry, its structure and methods. <http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=351985&r=0> 23/03/2013 at 23h22
- Al Shehri, B. 2004. 'iistiratijiit alkhitaab -muqarabat lughawiat tadawulia, Discourse strategy - a pragmatic linguistic approach, New book house Beirut, Lebanon, p.380
- Al-Mabkhout, Ch. 2004. alhujaaj fi allughati, 'ahamu nazariaat alhujaaj fi altaqalid algharbiat, Argumentations in Language, The Most Important Theories of Argumentations in Western Traditions Research Group, Rhetoric and Argumentations, Hamadi S., University of Arts and Arts, Tunis 1, Manouba, p.95
- . Aristotle's, 1982. The Art of Public Speaking, Investigated by Abd al-Rahman Badawi, Edition 1, House of Cultural Affairs, Baghdad, Iraq. p.189.
- Al-Asniya Preliminary Reading, University Institution for Publishing and Distribution, Beirut, V I, Ed2, p.91
- Dabb, A. 1980. abu hayaan altuwaydi katib almufakr, the Arab book house, Libya, I 2, pp.29-139
- Jackson, R. 1985. Language Communication and Language Functions, by Michel Zakaria,
- Hamawi, Y. 1980. qamus al'aelam, Dictionary of Writers I 3, Beirut, Lebanon, pp. 05-25
- Hassan, A. 2000. huruf almaeani bayn al'asalat walhadath, study of the publications of the Union of Arab Writers, Damascus, p.35.
- Haitham, K. A. 2011. tasdir kitab al'iimtae walmuaanasa, 'preface of Kitâb al-imtâ wal-muânasa library, Saida, p.03
- Kilani, I. 1980. abû Hayyân al-Tawhîdî, The future of Arab thought, ed4, p.52.
- Karim, I. 1980. Abu hayaan altawhidu, 'adib falasifat w faylasuf al'udaba, Dar El-Masreya for Composition and Translation, Dt, p.53.
- Margoliouth, G. 1905., The discussion between abou Bishr Matta and Abou Said al Sirafi, the journal of that Royal Asiatic of society, pp.79-129
- . Michel, M 1994. De la problématique science et langage, Paris le livre de poche, p.284
- Rabia, A. 2013. balaghat alhujaaj watiqniaat altaathir, the rhetoric of argumentation and the technique of influence <http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=351985&r=023/03/2013> at 23h22