Evaluative Argumentation Techniques in al-Jāḥiẓ's Kitāb al-Ḥayawān

al-Ṭayyib Ḥamāmah[1]*; Maḥmūd Ṭalḥah[2]
and Languages, Department of Arabic Language and Literature, Laboratory of Pragmatic Linguistics and Literary Discourse Analysis , Ammar Thlidji University, Laghouat, Algeria — t.hamamma@lag-univ.dz
[2] Faculty of Letters and Languages, Department of Arabic Language and Literature, Laboratory of Pragmatic Linguistics and Literary Discourse Analysis, Ammar Thlidji University, Laghouat, Algeria — m.talha@lag-univ.dz

Date of submission: 03/05/2026 *Date of acceptance: 20/07/2026* *Date of publication: 10/10/2026*

Abstract

This article aims to highlight the manifestations of evaluative argumentation (al-ḥijāj al-taqwīmī) in Kitāb al-Ḥayawān by al-Jāḥiẓ, considering it one of the most powerful forms of persuasion and influence. This is because it incorporates anticipated objections from the addressee into the discourse and addresses them in advance, thereby granting the text a high degree of pragmatic force and dialogical interactivity.

The study begins by examining the presence of argumentation in al-Jāḥiẓ's corpus, as well as the cultural and intellectual factors that contributed to its formation. It focuses on the linguistic mechanisms that serve as salient markers of evaluative argumentation in Kitāb al-Ḥayawān, such as the frequent use of the second-person pronoun, imperative expressions of the type "Know that…" (iʿlam anna), and implicit dialogical structures like "he said… I replied" and "if it is said… we say."

The analytical reading shows that al-Jāḥiẓ does not merely advance a claim and support it; rather, he constructs within the text a presumed adversary and engages in an anticipatory dialogue with him that balances assertion and objection. In doing so, he employs a range of argumentative strategies, including causal reasoning, exemplification, negation, exception, and analogy. The article concludes that evaluative argumentation in Kitāb al-Ḥayawān reflects a high level of intellectual and epistemological maturity associated with the Abbasid milieu, the debates of the theologians (mutakallimūn), the influence of Greek logic and philosophy, and al-Jāḥiẓ's Muʿtazilite background, which accords a privileged status to rational inquiry and inferential reasoning.

Keywords:

Evaluative Argumentation; Al-Jāḥiẓ; Kitāb Al-Ḥayawān,

dialogue structures , Classical Arabic argumentation , al-Jāḥiẓ's rhetorical strategies . Dialogical monologue

1.Introduction:

The human sciences are characterized by a cumulative nature that is renewed whenever the methods of reading and the tools of analysis are renewed. Among the most important developments created by contemporary linguistics, in its intersection with rhetoric, logic, and pragmatics, is the emergence of argumentation theory as an approach that studies how utterances are constructed in order to direct conviction, shape positions, and influence the receiver. This development has enabled researchers to reread the classical Arabic heritage in a new way, moving beyond traditional rhetorical description toward uncovering mechanisms of persuasion, strategies for managing objection, and ways of constructing discursive authority within the text.

Al-Jāḥiẓ's Kitāb al-Ḥayawān (d. 255 AH) is one of the most significant Arabic corpora that can accommodate this type of analysis. It brings together linguistic knowledge, natural observation, theological disputation, and cultural exemplification. It also reveals a dialectical mind inclined to demonstration and the establishment of proof, and one that is skilled in addressing the reader and gradually leading him toward assent. From this point of departure, the article addresses the following main questions:

- To what extent was al-Jāḥiẓ aware of the logic of argumentation and its mechanisms?
- What intellectual contexts contributed to the formation of his argumentative discourse?
- What are the features of evaluative argumentation in Kitāb al-Ḥayawān? What are its most prominent linguistic tools?

To answer these questions, the study adopts a descriptive and analytical approach that interrogates the linguistic and pragmatic structures within the text and traces the markers that point to implicit dialogue and the anticipation of objection. Particular attention is given to specific techniques that recur in the book and contribute to raising the degree of persuasion. some previous studies have been found that addressed the argumentative discourse of Al-Jahiz". Among these is the study by Abdallah El-Bahloul, *Dialectical Argumentation: Its Artistic Characteristics and Generic Formations in Models from Greek and Arabic Heritage*, in which he addresses the characteristics of debate1(Abdallah El-Bahloul,2013 :191-194); however, his primary application was on one of Al-Jahiz's epistles, namely *The Boasting Match Between Maids and Youths* (Al-Mafakharah bayna al-Jawari wa al-Ghilman). Other previous studies focused specifically on Al-Jahiz's epistles, such as Mohamed Mechbal's *The Discourse of Ethics and Identity in Al-Jahiz's Epistles (A Rhetorical-Argumentative Approach)* 2(Mohamed Mechbal, 2015). Similarly, Omar Bouchenna and Ahmed Hafidi explored an aspect of argumentation as a persuasive

strategy in an article titled *Discourse Pragmatics and Communication Strategy in Al-Jahiz Through the Book of Animals (Kitab al-Hayawan)* 3(Omar Bouchenna and Ahmed Hafidi,2022 :74-90). Among the older studies that sought to uncover the features of Al-Jahiz's dialectical argumentative style is Victor Chelhot's book, *The Scholastic Tendency in Al-Jahiz's Style*4(Victor Chelhot,2007). Although the author's primary aim was to extract the stylistic characteristics that distinguished Al-Jahiz and reflected the theological (*Kalam*) trends of his era, the researcher's work was broad in scope and not confined solely to *Kitab al-Hayawan*.

The article is organized into sections dealing with al-Jāḥiẓ and Kitāb al-Ḥayawān, the concept of argumentation and its types, and then the components, techniques, and examples of evaluative argumentation in the corpus.

2.Al-Jāḥiẓ and His Corpus Kitāb al-Ḥayawān:

2.1.The Concept of Argumentation:

- **Lexical Meaning:**

In Lisān al-ʿArab, it is stated: "Speech and ḥujjah mean proof; and it is said that a ḥujjah is that by which an opponent is resisted." Al-Azharī says: "The ḥujjah is the aspect by which victory is achieved in disputation." It is also said: "He is a miḥjāj man," that is, a disputatious man; taḥājj means mutual disputation; the plural of ḥujjah is ḥujaj and ḥijāj; "he argued with him" means that he contended with him by means of proof; and "he overcame him in argument" means that he defeated him by his proof. In the ḥadīth, "Adam defeated Moses in argument" means that he overcame him by proof.5(Ibn Manẓūr,2003:228)

In al-Ṣiḥāḥ, it is stated: "The ḥujjah is proof. He argued with him and defeated him, from the pattern of radda, meaning that he overcame him by proof. In the proverb: 'He insisted and so he prevailed in argument'; and a man described as miḥjāj is a disputatious man. Taḥājj means mutual disputation, and al-maḥajjah, with two fatḥahs, means the main road."6(Al-Rāzī,1986:52)

In the Dictionary of Definitions (Muʿjam al-Taʿrīfāt), the ḥujjah is defined as "that by which the validity of a claim is indicated"; it is also said that ḥujjah and dalīl, proof or evidence, are one and the same7(al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī,2003:23)

It has become clear from the preceding material that argumentation revolves around three meanings: contention, overcoming through proof, and disputation or controversy by means of evidence and demonstrations.

In the Noble Qurʾān, the meaning of ḥijāj differs from that of jadal. In the verse, "Have you not considered the one who argued with Abraham concerning his Lord…," Ibn ʿĀshūr holds that ḥājja means "he disputed," and that it most often denotes dispute in falsehood. Jadal differs from it in that mujādalah means verbal disputation and the presentation of proof against the other. It may occur in a good sense, as in the verse "he argues with Us concerning the people of Lot" (Sūrat Hūd, verse 74), and it may occur in an undesirable sense, as in the verse "there shall be no dispute during the pilgrimage" (Sūrat al-Baqarah, verse 197). Thus, ḥijāj is broader

than jadal: every jadal is ḥijāj, but not every ḥijāj is jadal.8(ʿAbd Allāh Ṣawlah,2001:16)

In French, the term argumentation, according to Le Grand Robert, points to several meanings, the most prominent of which are:9(Le Grand Robert'1989:535)

the act of using arguments; a set of arguments directed toward one result; the art of using arguments. defending by means of arguments from the verb 'argumenter'.

In English, the verb "to argue" indicates the existence of a disagreement between two parties and the attempt of each to persuade the other of a point of view by presenting reasons that constitute an argument for or against an idea, opinion, or course of conduct.10(Cambridge,2004:19,20)

- **Technical Meaning:**

Argumentation is one of the complex terms whose definitions have multiplied and varied from one field to another. It has undergone various transformations from Aristotle's age down to the present time. These developments may be summarized as follows.11(ʿAbd Allāh Ṣawlah,2001:15)

1. Argumentation as a common ground between dialectic and rhetoric. This position is represented by Aristotle, who attempted to subject rhetoric to the rules of formal logic. Both rhetoric and dialectic rely on argumentation in Aristotle, although their structures differ. Rhetoric is the art of persuasion through discourse; its concern is therefore with what makes discourse persuasive. Dialectic, however, is the science of logical inference, which means that it proceeds by more rigorous and precise methods. Argumentation in rhetoric is directed by the speaker to a particular group in a particular situation; its aim is emotional effect, the arousal of feelings and passions, the satisfaction and winning-over of the audience, even by fallacy.12(Abd Allāh Ṣawlah,2001:18)

   As for argumentation in dialectic, it is a means of interaction with a strong demonstrative and inferential outcome. It requires an integrated method and depends heavily on logic.13(al-Ṭalabah,2008:45)
2. Argumentation as synonymous with dialectic. Ibn Wahb connected argumentation with dialectic when he explained that what is meant by dialectic is "the establishment of proof concerning that over which the beliefs of disputants differ in purpose. It is used in doctrines, religions, rights, disputes, and in freeing oneself through excuses, and it enters into both poetry and prose."14(ibn Wahb,1969:176)

   He also clarifies the value of the argument among scholars when he says: "The scholars and rational men of old were unanimous in honoring whoever expressed his proof clearly…''15(ibn Wahb,:177)
3. Argumentation as an independent philosophical and linguistic field, distinct from dialectic and from the craft of rhetoric. In the modern period, researchers' interest in argumentation increased in light of pragmatic approaches, especially in the part concerned with persuasion and influence.

> For them, argumentation is a set of premises, arguments, and techniques capable of leading minds to assent to what is presented to them. It aims to win receivers over to the issues presented to them, or to increase the degree of their adherence to those issues.16(Khalīfah Būjādī,2009:106), Argumentation includes both rational and emotional persuasion. In this way, it brings together the two forms of effect and becomes independent through its basic aim, namely "acting upon the receiver in a manner that pushes him toward action or prepares him to act."17(Sāmiyah Drīdī,2007:21) It thus frees itself both from the rigidity of formal inference and from rhetoric's manipulation of the receiver's emotions.

Argumentation continued to develop during the 1950s, and its types multiplied according to various criteria. Scholars' views of it also differed.

Arabic rhetoric had a considerable share in this development. In the light of argumentation, it came to be understood through two kinds of rhetoric: a rhetoric of persuasion and a rhetoric of delight. Al-Jāḥiẓ had already paid attention to argumentation and its persuasive strategies through his definition of bayān, when he said:

"Bayān is a comprehensive name for everything that removes the veil from meaning and tears away the screen before what lies in the conscience, until the hearer reaches its reality. For the axis of the matter, and the goal toward which both speaker and hearer proceed, is understanding and making understood. Therefore, by whatever means you attain the making-understood and clarify the meaning, that is bayān in that context."18(al-Jāḥiẓ,1998:76)

This definition shows that the concept of bayān is governed by two functions: an explanatory function related to the elements and characteristics of the communicative situation, a persuasive argumentative function governed by eloquence, proof, and knowledge of the conditions of the addressees.19(al-Ṭalabah,2008:213)

Through this definition, al-Jāḥiẓ surpassed the basic communicative function of language and moved toward its argumentative function. He thereby laid down a theory of the rhetoric of argumentation and persuasion through his defense of dialogue and its culture, focusing on linguistic discourse and on the gestural, symbolic, verbal, and non-verbal indications that may accompany it. The foundation of this rhetoric is the consideration of the circumstances of the addressees:

"For the first condition of eloquence is the gathering of the instrument of eloquence: that the orator be firm of heart, still of limb, sparing in gesture, selective in wording, and that he not speak to the master of the affair with the speech of common folk, nor to kings with the speech of the marketplace…"20(al-Jāḥiẓ,1998:92)

Through this definition and others, many features of argumentation in al-Jāḥiẓ have become visible: his concern with oral discourse and with its aim, namely persuasion through the medium of language; his focus on the requirements of the communicative situation; his attention to the conditions of the orator, his linguistic competence, his comportment, and his qualities. Whoever contemplates al-Bayān wa-l-Tabyīn "will

be convinced that al-Jāḥiẓ represented a civilizational position: an attempt to establish a rational society whose members are bound by relations of persuasion through logic, or by attraction through the various forms of signification and social expression, relying on a selected stock of inherited oratorical and poetic sayings that rise to the level of wisdom and proverb."21(al-ʿUmarī,2010:210)

The features of argumentation in al-Jāḥiẓ also appear in another work no less important than al-Bayān wa-l-Tabyīn, namely Kitāb al-Ḥayawān. An example is his response to the books of the zindīqs, where he says:

"If the books of the zindīqs were books of wisdom, books of philosophy, books of syllogisms, methods, clarification and exposition… they would be among those of whom it might be permissible to think that they honored bayān. But they took in them the path of religion and the path of exalting the creed."22(al-Jāḥiẓ,1965:56)

He thus rejects their books, and his argument is that they are books of religion and not books of bayān. They are based on the exaltation of religion, not on exposition.

Al-Jāḥiẓ, then, was aware of argumentation and its types, as these are manifested in most of his writings. This is what the present study seeks to examine through Kitāb al-Ḥayawān, focusing on one prominent type: evaluative argumentation. Before doing so, however, it is necessary to define the principal types of argumentation.

2.2.Types of Argumentation:

Aristotle divided argumentation into two categories:

4. **Rhetorical argumentation:** This is "argumentation directed to audience with particular conditions in particular situations. Argumentation here does not aim merely at theoretical and rational effect; it goes beyond that to emotional effect, to the arousal of feelings and passions, and to satisfying and winning over the audience, even if this is done by misleading it, deceiving it, or making it imagine the validity of reality in such a way that rhetoric appears, at least from this angle, to belong to the domain of imaginative representation."23 (Abd Allāh Ṣawlah,2001:18)

It is therefore an argumentation whose field is the direction of action, the confirmation of belief, or the production of belief. It is directed to crowds.

- **Dialectical argumentation:** This is an argumentation belonging to a special intellectual field, and it usually takes place between two persons, each of whom tries to convince the other of a particular point of view. "Its axis is the discussion of opinions in a purely theoretical manner for the sake of abstract rationality."

Argumentation may be divided into other types on the basis of different criteria. The speaker may construct his discourse while taking into account the arguments that the addressee may use against him; or he may not consider such arguments. According to this criterion, argumentation may be classified into three types: abstract argumentation, directive argumentation, and evaluative argumentation.

- **Abstract argumentation:** is a form of inference in which the argumentative relation is based on producing evidence for the claim in the manner of the people of demonstration, given that demonstration is the form of inference

concerned with the ordering of forms of expressions in relation to one another regardless of their contents and uses.24(Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān,1998:226) It may also be defined as the inference in which the arguer imitates technical demonstration.25 (,The same reference, 1998:228)

- **Directive argumentation:** is higher in rank than abstract argumentation. It means establishing proof for a claim on the basis of the act of direction proper to the inferer. Direction here means the inferer's act of conveying his argument to another. The inferer may be occupied with his own utterances insofar as he delivers them. The sender does not take into account the listener's objection to his claim. For this reason, the directed argument is characterized by its sufficiency with the speaker's intentionality alone and its neglect of the listener's intentionality. This appears in the speaker's concentration on delivering the argument without considering the receiver's reaction.
- **Evaluative argumentation:** is the highest degree of the two preceding types. Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān defines it as follows:

"What is meant by evaluative argumentation is the establishment of the claim by relying on the inferer's capacity to abstract from himself a second self which he places in the position of the objector to his claim. Here the inferer does not confine himself to considering the act of delivering the argument to the addressee, stopping at the limits of the controls it imposes and the conditions it requires. Rather, he goes beyond that to consider the act of reception, insofar as he himself is the first receiver of what he delivers."26 (The same reference,1998:228)

In this type, the arguer differs from the preceding type. He builds his discourse according to the objections he expects from the receiver; he anticipates the receiver's reaction and summons counterarguments and answers to his questions. In this way, he combines the act of claiming with the act of objecting27(Al-Lisān wa-l-Mīzān, previous reference,1998:228)

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān also defines it as "the inference in which the arguer adopts the point of view of the objector, in addition to his own point of view as claimant."28 (The same reference,1998:229)

Evaluative argumentation rests on the speaker's consideration of two matters in his discourse: the aim to be achieved, namely persuasion, and the arguments by which the addressee may oppose him. In other words, the speaker summons these opposing arguments before the addressee himself puts them forward. This kind of argumentation is based on double interaction and prior negotiation with counterarguments. The speaker places himself simultaneously in the position of "defender" and "attacker," by summoning the opponent's arguments and responding to them in advance. This is what gives the discourse its strength in defending its point of view.

The process surrounding this kind of argumentation is called by Van Eemeren and Grootendorst "implicit dialogue," whose purpose is to ward off the doubt expected from the recipient.29(al-Shahrī,2004:473) That is, the sender takes into

consideration the arguments by which the recipient may oppose him, incorporates them into his discourse, and works to refute and answer them.

The types and ranks of argumentation are not limited to this point. They extend further, as one type may include several subordinate ranks. The elements inferred may be equal, in which case the type is called an equal argument; they may differ by way of superiority, in which case it is called a higher argument; or they may differ by way of inferiority, in which case it is called a lower argument.30 (Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān,1998:229) Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān regards the last type as the best form, because it is an inference that reviews different points of view and because "the arguer adopts the point of view of the objector in addition to his own point of view as claimant."31 (The same reference,1998:229)

It therefore takes into account both the act of reception and the act of claiming.

2.3.Features and Techniques of Evaluative Argumentation in Kitāb al-Ḥayawān

Before identifying the manifestations of this type of argumentation, it is necessary to introduce this corpus and the environment in which it was written.

Kitāb al-Ḥayawān is one of al-Jāḥiẓ's books that achieved great fame and enjoyed wide esteem among both common people and the elite. In Ibn Khallikān's expression, it is among his finest and most entertaining works. It is the first book in Arabic that is comprehensive in the science of animals, even though al-Aṣmaʿī, Abū ʿUbaydah, Ibn al-Aʿrābī, and others preceded him in this field. Al-Jāḥiẓ's treatment of the subject differed from theirs. Their interest was primarily linguistic rather than scientific, whereas al-Jāḥiẓ's interest, alongside language, extended to research into the natures, instincts, habits, and conditions of animals.32(Ṭāhā al-Ḥājjirī,1969:410)

Al-Jāḥiẓ's cultural sources in this book were diverse as a result of his contact with neighboring cultures: Greek sciences, Persian literature, Indian wisdom, in addition to his own scientific experiences, observations, and personal remarks. These sources reflected the subjects he addressed in the book. He did not limit himself to what the title alone suggests; he also dealt with philosophical and natural knowledge, discussed the politics of individuals and nations, addressed the disputes between the people of kalām and religious sects, and spoke about subjects related to geography, medicine, Bedouin customs, and some legal questions, in addition to the poetry and humor with which the book is filled. He divided all this material into seven parts that agree in their general subject but differ in their introductions from one part to another. Many ancient and modern scholars wrote about it: some praised it, some attacked it, some borrowed from it and cited its material, and some summarized it with skill in both summary and description.33(aadel azwati,1945:91)

The issues treated in Kitāb al-Ḥayawān may be summarized under three main headings:34(Ḥammādī Ṣammūd,1981:150)

1. expansion, al-Jāḥiẓ's views on these issues, the acquisition of language, and the relation between linguistic ability and the speaker's position in the social hierarchy. These are numerous and diverse issues to which he alluded in this book in general terms and which he discussed in more detail in al-Bayān wa-l-Tabyīn.

2. His theory of speech, in which he pointed to the elements of the communicative process and the complexity that may affect it, highlighting the role of each participant in determining the characteristics of discourse and the nature of its style.
3. The properties of discourse and the stylistic and critical standards that make speech clear and eloquent.

As for the reasons for composing this book, researchers do not mention direct reasons. Rather, they offer personal interpretations, some of which may be summarized as follows:35 (Ṭāhā al-Ḥājjirī,1969:400,401)

- Attention to the counterpart of the human being, namely the animal, after al-Jāḥiẓ had devoted much of his literary effort to knowledge concerning the human being.
- The important place occupied by animals in human life. Animals had great significance in Iraqi life because of their connection with human sentiments such as religion and group solidarity.
- The stimulation of the natural tendency in the human being toward knowledge.

As for the value of the book, Dr. Ṭāhā al-Ḥājjirī considered it "a teeming world, turbulent with the various forms of life, in which the different colors of thought in that age are represented, in which the tendencies of Islamic society are displayed, and in which al-Jāḥiẓ's precise and penetrating mind appears."36(The same reference,1969:422)

A corpus of this size must necessarily have accommodated many types of argumentation in order to achieve its aims. This is what the study examines by tracing the features of one of these types, namely evaluative argumentation.

The features of evaluative argumentation in Kitāb al-Ḥayawān appear through a set of linguistic techniques used by al-Jāḥiẓ, techniques which clearly indicate that he abstracts from himself a second self to whom he directs his discourse in an attempt to persuade it. Among these techniques are the following.

1. The Second-Person Pronoun:

The first thing that confronts us in this book, beginning with its introduction, is al-Jāḥiẓ's evocation of the receiver, who appears as though present before him. He addresses him directly. This is manifested through his striking use of the second-person pronoun in its various forms, which is one of the techniques of evaluative argumentation. He says:

"You blamed me for relating the views of the ʿUthmāniyyah and the Ḍirāriyyah, while you hear me saying at the beginning of my book: 'The ʿUthmāniyyah and the Ḍirāriyyah said,' just as you heard me say: 'The Rāfiḍah and the Zaydiyyah said.' You judged me to be a Nāṣibī because I related the statement of the ʿUthmāniyyah. Why, then, did you not judge me to be a Shīʿī because I related the statement of the Rāfiḍah? And why was I not, in your view, among the extremists because I related the arguments of the extremists…?"

In this manner and by this method, al-Jāḥiẓ continues to anticipate the arguments of his opponent and to answer them before they are advanced. He even refutes them when he says in the same context:

"…and you saw that I weakened the right of your allies to the extent that I strengthened the falsehood of your enemies. If that were so, your witness from the book would be present, and your proof for what you claimed would be clear."37 (al-Jāḥiẓ,1965:13)

Another example appears in his discussion of the merit of the book. He says:

"The book is the companion who does not flatter you, the friend who does not tempt you, the comrade who does not weary of you, the solicitor who does not delay you, the neighbor who does not make you wait, and the companion who does not seek to extract what you have by flattery, nor deal with you through cunning, nor deceive you by hypocrisy, nor plot against you with lies. The book is that which, if you look into it, prolongs your enjoyment, sharpens your nature, expands your tongue, improves your pen, ennobles your expressions, gladdens your soul, fills your breast, grants you the esteem of the common people and the friendship of kings, and enables you to know in a month what you would not know from the mouths of men in an age, while keeping you safe from expense, from the hardship of seeking, from standing at the door of one who earns by teaching, and from sitting before someone who is inferior to you in character and less noble than you in lineage, and while preserving you from the company of the hateful and the association of fools."

When one reflects on statements such as these, one feels as if an opponent is standing before al-Jāḥiẓ and that he is arguing with him through a sequence of arguments constructed on the basis of the objections that he assumes will issue from that opponent. In responding to his opponent's claim that he is a Nāṣibī merely because he spoke of the ʿUthmāniyyah, al-Jāḥiẓ replies with many successive and persuasive arguments indicating that the claim is false. Their substance is that speaking about a particular sect or doctrine does not mean that the speaker belongs to it. The proof is that al-Jāḥiẓ spoke about many sects and doctrines, some of which are mentioned in the example, not out of affiliation but out of a cognitive and documentary purpose.

2. The Formula "Know That…" (iʿlam anna):

Among the techniques and manifestations of evaluative argumentation is "addressing the recipient as though he were present, through the use of the imperative verb in formulas such as 'Know that…,' in order to refute any argumentation that is not attributed to a specific sender but is rather expected argumentation."38 (al-Shahrī,2004:474,475)

An example is al-Jāḥiẓ's statement when discussing the need of some people for others:

"Then know, may God have mercy on you, that the need of some people for others is a necessary quality in their natures and a created disposition existing in their essences… Their need for what is absent from them… is like their need for cooperation in knowing what harms them… The need of the absent is connected to the need of the present, because the nearer needs knowledge of the farther… He did

not subject all His creation to them except because they need to make use of all His creation…"39(al-Jāḥiẓ,1965:34)

In establishing this argument—namely, people's need for one another—al-Jāḥiẓ makes use of a set of argumentative connectors, such as causal particles like the lām, and a set of argumentative operators such as negation, exception, and exemplification through simile.

Another example appears in his comparison between the child and the book:

"Know that the rational person, if he is not one who examines carefully, often finds that from his child there appears beautiful in his own eye what is ugly in the eye of another. Let him know, then, that his wording is closer to him in kinship than his son, and that his movement is more intimately joined to him by womb-tie than his child; for his movement is something from himself, by his own essence, and from the very substance of his being it proceeded, and from himself it came. The child, however, is like mucus that he expels or phlegm that he spits out. There is no equality between your expelling from your part something that was not truly from you and your manifesting a movement that did not exist until it came from you. For this reason, you find a man's infatuation with his poetry, and his infatuation with his speech and his books, to exceed his infatuation with all his blessings."40 (The same reference,1965:61)

To persuade the reader of this comparison, al-Jāḥiẓ uses a set of techniques in addition to the technique of evaluative argumentation with which he begins his discourse. These include balancing by using comparatives such as "closer," causal devices such as "because," and similes such as "like mucus." All this variety in argumentative techniques serves two aims: persuasion and the provision of the arguments suitable for that persuasion while confronting the addressee.

3. The Formula of the Verb "Said" and It's Derivatives:

Among the features of evaluative argumentation are formulas such as "he said… I replied," "if you say… we say," and "if it is said… it is said." These formulas confirm that the speaker anticipates the opponent's arguments, objects to them, and answers them before they are actually advanced. Examples of this are numerous in al-Jāḥiẓ's book. One of them appears in his discussion of the evil eye:

"If a speaker says: 'How far does the matter of this separating quality reach…?' it is said to them: 'You know the measure of the poison of the jarārah…'"

Another example is the following:

"If you say: 'Are not the fang of the viper and the sting of the scorpion merely in the position of the point of a spear?' We say: 'If the camel were to become corrupted merely because of the scorpion's thrust with its sting, that would not reach from it even the measure of a simple prick. Rather, it must be due to one of two things: either that the scorpion emits into it something from its sting, whose nature, though slight, dissolves the elephant and the zandabīl; or that the nature of that blood, when it encounters the nature of that fang and that sting, congeals and kills by congealing, or

melts and kills by melting. Whichever of the two it is, the matter is contrary to what you placed at the head of the question…'"

This is a style for which al-Jāḥiẓ and his contemporaries of that age were known, especially those who adopted Muʿtazilite thought. It serves rational disputation because it is based on hypothetical questions attributed to an unnamed speaker and answered by the actual speaker. It is also a form of dialogue, and dialogue is the basic pillar upon which al-Jāḥiẓ built this discourse, because it is the channel through which the sender studies the arguments and positions of his addressees. It may therefore be called argumentative dialogue, since the study of argumentation takes dialogical discourse as its foundation for extracting the structures upon which it is built.

Researcher Muḥammad al-Amīn al-Ṭalabah said of it that it "is the most effective path adopted by the sender of discourse in order to study the arguments and positions of his addressees in an acceptable manner that ultimately grants his argumentation force of penetration and credibility."41 (al-Ṭalabah,2008:119)

Findings of the Study

A reading of Kitāb al-Ḥayawān in light of evaluative argumentation has led to the following results:

1. The argumentative dimension predominates over the informational dimension. Al-Jāḥiẓ does not merely narrate information or describe a phenomenon. Rather, he transforms it into a dialectical situation in which he presents the claim, strengthens it, and tests it through presumed objections.

2. Evaluative argumentation is the most prominent type within the corpus. In many passages, the discourse is built on the mechanism of "evaluation" through the insertion of the receiver's possible objections into the text and the answering of them before they are explicitly raised.

3. "Implicit dialogue" functions as a mechanism that organizes argumentation. This appears in formulas such as:

"he said… I replied";

"if it is said… we say";

"if you say… we say."

These formulas transform the text into an internal debate that tightly controls the path of reception.

4. The second-person pronoun operates with a persuasive pragmatic function. Directing discourse to "you" does not merely achieve communication; it creates an actual presence for the receiver and makes him feel that he is a party to the argumentation, thereby increasing the degree of interaction and effect.

5. The formula "Know that…" functions as both a directing and an evaluative device. It prepares the ground for establishing premises intended to be fixed in the reader's mind, and it implicitly suggests that there is an expected doubt or objection that calls for alerting and assertion.

6. Supporting argumentative tools cooperate within evaluative argumentation. These include causal reasoning, through "because" and the causal lām; exemplification,

through simile and comparison; negation and exception; and comparatives. Together, they strengthen the claim and tighten the construction of inference.

7. Argumentation is linked to the intellectual frame of its age. The mechanisms of evaluation reflect the atmosphere of theological debates, the influence of logic and philosophy, and the traits of Muʿtazilite thought based on proof and the exercise of rational consideration.

8. Al-Jāḥiẓ shows awareness of the communicative context and of the properties of the audience. Argumentation for him is not a single uniform pattern; rather, it varies according to the topic and the addressee, and balances rational effect with stylistic effect.

Research Implications and Recommendations

This topic may be developed and expanded through the following research paths:

1. Expanding the textual sample to include other works by al-Jāḥiẓ, such as al-Bayān wa-l-Tabyīn, al-Bukhalāʾ, and al-Radd ʿalā al-Naṣārā, in order to test whether evaluative argumentative techniques remain stable or change according to purpose.

2. Comparing evaluative argumentation in al-Jāḥiẓ with the argumentation of writers of his age or those who came after him, such as Ibn Qutaybah, Qudāmah ibn Jaʿfar, and al-Jurjānī, in order to reveal the differences between "the argumentation of the theologians" and "the argumentation of the rhetoricians."

3. Studying argumentative connectors and operators in Kitāb al-Ḥayawān through a statistical and linguistic approach, such as the frequency of "if," "but," "rather," "because," "until," and "except," and connecting them with their persuasive functions in context.

4. Applying contemporary argumentative models, such as the pragma-dialectical model, Toulmin's model, or the theory of argumentation in language, to selected texts from Kitāb al-Ḥayawān, in order to produce a methodological reading that is generalizable and comparable.

5. Investigating the relation between argumentation and scientific knowledge in Kitāb al-Ḥayawān: How does argumentation serve the construction of "knowledge" in al-Jāḥiẓ? How does it balance observation, experience, report, narration, and analogy?

6. Working on the dimension of the receiver and historical reception: Who is the "addressee" constructed by the text? What forms of objection does the text presume? How is the "authority of the author" formed within the discourse?

7. Producing a thematic argumentative index of the sites of evaluative argumentation in Kitāb al-Ḥayawān, that is, building a "map of occurrences" that may help later researchers explore the thematic intersection between Kitāb al-Ḥayawān and argumentation.

Conclusion:

This study has shown that evaluative argumentation is the finest type of argumentation and the most prominent in al-Jāḥiẓ's discourse. It rests on dialogue which is the basic foundation in the construction of this discourse and one of the features of argumentation. It is an argumentation connected with his intellectual background and religious frame of reference. These were derived from the

environment in which he grew up, an environment marked by the predominance of Greek logic and philosophy and by the abundance of disputation and debate that included many fields of knowledge, and by his being influenced by that environment as well as by the Muʿtazilite thought upon which his intellectual formation was based.

Al-Jāḥiẓ's works, including Kitāb al-Ḥayawān, reflect many features of argumentation that contemporary theories later came to affirm. These features may be considered among the first building blocks of such theories, for al-Jāḥiẓ expresses major meanings in this field, made possible by the school to which he belonged. These meanings reveal the value of this book and the aim of its composition. Al-Jāḥiẓ says in this regard:

"Were it not for what I hope for of God's assistance in completing it, since I sought through it nothing except to make you understand the locations of the arguments for God, the transformations of His governance, and the kinds of wisdom He deposited in the kinds of His creation, I would not have exposed myself to this unpleasant matter."42 (al-Jāḥiẓ,1965:209)

Sources and References

1. Ibn Manẓūr, Jamāl al-Dīn. Lisān al-ʿArab. Edited by ʿĀmir Aḥmad Ḥaydar. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1st ed., 2003.
2. Abū al-Ḥasan Isḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Sulaymān ibn Wahb. Al-Burhān fī Wujūh al-Bayān. Edited by Ḥafnī Muḥammad Sharaf. Maktabat al-Shabāb.
3. Abū ʿUthmān ʿAmr ibn Maḥbūb al-Jāḥiẓ. Al-Ḥayawān. Edited and annotated by ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Egypt: Maktabat wa-Maṭbaʿat Muṣṭafā al-Bājī al-Ḥalabī wa-Awlādih, 2nd ed., 1965.
4. Abū ʿUthmān ʿAmr ibn Maḥbūb al-Jāḥiẓ. Al-Bayān wa-l-Tabyīn. Edited and annotated by ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 7th ed., 1998.
5. Ḥammādī Ṣammūd. Al-Tafkīr al-Balāghī ʿinda al-ʿArab: Ususuhu wa-Taṭawwuruhu ilā al-Qarn al-Sādis. Tunis: Publications of the Tunisian University, vol. 21, Official Press of the Republic of Tunisia, 1981.
6. Khalīfah Būjādī. Fī al-Lisāniyyāt al-Tadāwuliyyah maʿa Muḥāwalah Taʾṣīliyyah fī al-Dars al-ʿArabī al-Qadīm. Algeria: Bayt al-Ḥikmah, 1st ed., 2009.
7. Sāmiyah Drīdī. Al-Ḥijāj fī al-Shiʿr al-ʿArabī: Binyatuhu wa-Asālībuhu. Jordan: ʿĀlam al-Kutub al-Ḥadīthah, 1st ed., 2007.
8. Ṭāhā al-Ḥājjirī. Al-Jāḥiẓ: Ḥayātuhu wa-Āthāruhu. Egypt: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1969.
9. Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. Al-Lisān wa-l-Mīzān aw al-Takawthur al-ʿAqlī. Casablanca: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī, 1st ed., 1998.
10. Abdallah El-Bahloul, Dialectical Argumentation: Its Artistic Characteristics and Generic Formations in Models from Greek and Arabic Heritage, Carthage Publishing and Distribution, Sfax, Tunisia, 1st ed., 2013.

11. ʿAbd Allāh Ṣawlah. Al-Ḥijāj fī al-Qurʾān min Khilāl Ahamm Khaṣāʾiṣihi al-Uslūbiyyah. Tunis: Faculty of Letters, Arts and Humanities, 1st ed., 2001.
12. ʿAbd al-Hādī ibn Ẓāfir al-Shahrī. Istirātījiyyāt al-Khiṭāb: Muqārabah Lughawiyyah Tadāwuliyyah. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Jadīdah al-Muttaḥidah, 1st ed., 2004.
13. ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī. Muʿjam al-Taʿrīfāt. Edited and studied by Muḥammad Ṣiddīq al-Minshāwī. Cairo: Dār al-Faḍīlah.
14. Omar Bouchenna and Ahmed Hafidi, "Discourse Pragmatics and Communication Strategy in Al-Jahiz Through His Book Al-Hayawan," Journal of Problems in Language and Literature, Vol. 11, No. 3, 2022, University of Tamanghasset, Algeria.
15. Victor Chelhot, The Scholastic Tendency in Al-Jahiz's Style, Dar El-Machreq, Beirut, Lebanon, 4th ed., 2007.
16. Muḥammad al-ʿUmarī. Al-Balāghah al-ʿArabiyyah: Uṣūluhā wa-Imtidādātuhā. Casablanca: Afrīqiyā al-Sharq, 2nd ed., 2010.
17. Muhammad Sālim Muḥammad al-Amīn al-Ṭalabah. Al-Ḥijāj fī al-Balāghah al-Muʿāṣirah: Baḥth fī Balāghat al-Naqd al-Muʿāṣir. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Jadīdah al-Muttaḥidah, 1st ed., 2008.
18. Mohamed Mechbal, The Discourse of Ethics and Identity in Al-Jahiz's Epistles (A Rhetorical-Argumentative Approach), Dar Kunouz Al-Ma'rifah, Jordan, 1st ed., 2015.

Foreign-Language References

1. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed.
2. Le Grand Robert: Dictionnaire de la langue française. Paris, 1989.

Journal Information

Al-Qāriʾ Journal for Literary, Critical, and Linguistic Studies
Volume 04, Issue 01, March 2021, pp. 00–00

Endnotes

1. Abdallah El-Bahloul, Dialectical Argumentation: Its Artistic Characteristics and Generic Formations in Models from Greek and Arabic Heritage, Carthage Publishing and Distribution, Sfax, Tunisia, 1st ed., 2013**.**

2. Mohamed Mechbal, The Discourse of Ethics and Identity in Al-Jahiz's Epistles (A Rhetorical-Argumentative Approach), Dar Kunouz Al-Ma'rifah, Jordan, 1st ed., 2015.

3. Omar Bouchenna and Ahmed Hafidi, "Discourse Pragmatics and Communication Strategy in Al-Jahiz Through His Book Al-Hayawan," Journal of Problems in Language and Literature, Vol. 11, No. 3, 2022, University of Tamanghasset, Algeria, pp. 74-90.

4. Victor Chelhot, The Scholastic Tendency in Al-Jahiz's Style, Dar El-Machreq, Beirut, Lebanon, 4th ed., 2007.

5. Ibn Manẓūr, Lisān al-ʿArab, vol. 2, p. 228.

6. Al-Rāzī, Mukhtār al-Ṣiḥāḥ.

7. Al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī, Muʿjam al-Taʿrīfāt, p. 73.

8. ʿAbd Allāh Ṣawlah, Al-Ḥijāj fī al-Qurʾān, p. 16.
9. Le Grand Robert, Dictionnaire de la langue française, Paris, 1989, p. 535.
10. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed.
11. See ʿAbd Allāh Ṣawlah, Al-Ḥijāj fī al-Qurʾān min Khilāl Ahamm Khaṣāʾiṣihi al-Uslūbiyyah, p. 15.
12. See the same reference, p. 18.
13. See Muḥammad Sālim Muḥammad al-Amīn al-Ṭalabah, Al-Ḥijāj fī al-Balāghah al-Muʿāṣirah, p. 45.
14. Abū al-Ḥusayn Isḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Sulaymān ibn Wahb al-Kātib, Al-Burhān fī Wujūh al-Bayān, ed. Ḥafnī Muḥammad Sharaf, Maktabat al-Shabāb, p. 176.
15. The same reference, p. 177.
16. See Khalīfah Būjādī, Fī al-Lisāniyyāt al-Tadāwuliyyah, Bayt al-Ḥikmah, 1st ed., 2009, p. 106.
17. Sāmiyah Drīdī, Al-Ḥijāj fī al-Shiʿr al-ʿArabī, ʿĀlam al-Kutub al-Ḥadīth, 1st ed., 2007, Jordan, p. 21.
18. Al-Jāḥiẓ, Al-Bayān wa-l-Tabyīn, vol. 1, p. 76.
19. See Al-Ḥijāj fī al-Balāghah al-Muʿāṣirah, previous reference, p. 213.
20. Al-Bayān wa-l-Tabyīn, previous reference, p. 92.
21. Muḥammad al-ʿUmarī, Al-Balāghah: Uṣūluhā wa-Imtidādātuhā, p. 210.
22. Al-Jāḥiẓ, Al-Ḥayawān, vol. 1, p. 56.
23. Al-Ḥijāj fī al-Qurʾān, previous reference, p. 18.
24. Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Al-Lisān wa-l-Mīzān, p. 226.
25. The same reference, p. 228.
26. The same reference, p. 228.
27. Al-Lisān wa-l-Mīzān, previous reference, p. 228.
28. The same reference, p. 229.
29. Istirātījiyyāt al-Khiṭāb, previous reference, pp. 473–475.
30. Al-Lisān wa-l-Mīzān, previous reference, p. 229.
31. The same reference, p. 229.
32. See Ṭāhā al-Ḥājjirī, Al-Jāḥiẓ: Ḥayātuhu wa-Āthāruhu, Dār al-Maʿārif, Egypt, p. 410.
33. See Jawlah fī Adab al-Jāḥiẓ, p. 91.
34. See Ḥammādī Ṣammūd, Al-Tafkīr al-Balāghī ʿinda al-ʿArab, p. 150.
35. See Al-Jāḥiẓ: Ḥayātuhu wa-Āthāruhu, pp. 400–401.
36. Al-Ḥājjirī, Al-Jāḥiẓ: Ḥayātuhu wa-Āthāruhu, p. 422.
37. Al-Jāḥiẓ, Al-Ḥayawān, vol. 1, p. 13.
38. Istirātījiyyāt al-Khiṭāb, pp. 474–475.
39. Al-Jāḥiẓ, Al-Ḥayawān, vol. 1, p. 34.
40. The same reference, p. 61.
41. Al-Ḥijāj fī al-Balāghah al-Muʿāṣirah, previous reference, p. 119.
42. Al-Ḥayawān, previous reference, vol. 4, p. 209.