# METAPHOR IN THE HOLY QURAN: A RHETORICAL AND ARGUMENTATIVE APPROACH

**Kahla Hadjira**
**University of Eloued (Algeria)**
**Corresponding Author: kahla-hadjira@univ-eloued.dz**

***Submission date: 03/04/2026*** ***Acceptance date: 24/06/2026*** ***Publication date: 30/06/2026***

❖❖❖❖❖❖❖❖❖❖❖❖

***Abstract:***

This article aims to examine the responsiveness of metaphor in the Holy Quran to the rhetorical-argumentative approach. How does this approach reveal the merits of Quranic metaphor, establish its argumentative power, and highlight its persuasive elements?

To answer these questions, the study adopted a descriptive methodology, supported by comparative and historical analyses at the theoretical level, and an argumentative-argumentative methodology at the applied level. The study concluded with a significant finding: the argumentative power of Quranic metaphor and its ability to fulfill persuasive and influential functions, demonstrating its superiority over ordinary speech through the interaction between the subject and predicate.

***Key words****:* Qur'anic metaphor; argumentative approach; argumentativeness of metaphor; persuasive and influential function.

## Introduction:

Metaphor occupies a central place in human thought, as human imagery is based on metaphorical representation. Consequently, it has been the subject of study in numerous fields of knowledge, such as philosophy, rhetoric, linguistics, and cognitive science. Various approaches have been developed to analyze its construction, interpretation, and mechanisms of operation. In this article, we have chosen the rhetorical-argumentative approach, which has restored to metaphor and other stylistic devices their pragmatic dimension, a dimension they lost due to the reduction and narrowing of rhetoric in the 16th century. Some neo-rhetoricians have removed metaphor from its aesthetic domain and returned it to the argumentative domain, considering it to have a persuasive argumentative function. Others have

criticized the exclusion of its stylistic aspect, which generates pleasure and contributes to the communication and facilitation of arguments. They see metaphor as a linguistic pillar of argumentation or a means of conveying arguments.

While the first view is widely held, the second view also has its place, as it balances the aesthetic dimension of the image with its argumentative dimension. Thus, in the rhetorical-argumentative approach, metaphor finds functional argumentative interpretations through an analysis of the communicative context in which it was produced, the interaction of the parties involved, its purpose, and how it was employed.

Given the importance of this approach and its alignment with the Arabic rhetorical tradition, we have chosen to analyze Quranic metaphors using their mechanisms, with some adjustments appropriate to the context. How does this approach reveal the merit of Quranic metaphor, establish its argumentative power, and highlight its persuasive elements? To answer these questions, we select samples and examples from Quranic metaphors, apply these analyses to them, and observe the results.

## First – Definitions and Limits:

Metaphor is shrouded in ambiguity and obscurity, prompting scholars and philosophers to explore its intricacies and delve into its depths, resulting in numerous definitions.

So, what is metaphor in language and terminology?

### 1- Metaphor in language:

Derived from the verb "ista'ara," meaning to borrow something.

According to Ibn Manzur, "ista'ara" comes from: "ta'awwara and ista'ara: to request a loan, and ista'ara al-shay'a and ista'ara minhu: to ask someone to lend it to him "...(Ibn Manzur, No date, p. 4/618) ‹The word "borrowing" is related to the concepts of lending, borrowing, and exchange. Exchange is similar to circulation, and circulation occurs between two parties .(Ibn Manzur, No date, p. 4/618) Therefore, metaphor is a language that carries connotations of: borrowing and lending.

### 2- Metaphor in terminology:

Al-Jurjani (d. 471 AH) defines metaphor by saying: “Metaphor, in general, is when a word has a known origin in the linguistic usage, and evidence indicates that it

was specifically used for that purpose at the time of its creation. Then the poet or someone other than the poet uses it in a different context, and it becomes like a loan there -".(Al-Jurjani, 1991, p. 30) Al-Jurjani means by this that a borrowed word is not originally intended for its metaphorical meaning, but rather for a specific, known meaning, as evidenced by the context. The creator of the metaphor is the one who borrows it and transfers it to himself, thus becoming like a loan; that is, a borrowed item.

Therefore, a metaphor is a word placed in a sense other than its original meaning due to a similarity, with a contextual clue preventing the intended original meaning, as in the verse: "And they found therein a wall about to collapse, so he repaired it" (Al-Kahf 18:77). The wall has no will; rather, the will belongs to the source of the metaphor (the human being). The meaning is transferred from the source to the target (the wall), and the person claims it for himself. (Al-Jurjani, n.d., p. 437) This is due to a similarity, and the comparison is forgotten, resulting in a merging where the subject becomes part of the object of comparison .(Al-Maraghi, Without a printout, p. 239) ‹The contextual clue preventing the intended meaning (human will) is its association with the wall.

Therefore, metaphor is essentially a simile with one of its elements omitted, and this has become a common practice among Arabs in their speech ..(Al-Jurjani, 1991, p. 320) Metaphor always relies on simile ..(Al-Jurjani, 1991, p. 55).

As for al-Sakkaki (d. 628 AH), he considers metaphor to be a branch of simile . (Al-Sakkaki, 1983, p. 331)‹ He divides them into five categories according to their types :.(Al-Sakkaki, 1983, p. 388)

1. Metaphor of a concrete object for another concrete object in a sensory sense.
2. Metaphor of a concrete object for another concrete object in an intellectual sense.
3. Metaphor of an abstract concept for another abstract concept.
4. Metaphor of a concrete object for an abstract concept.
5. Metaphor of an abstract concept for a concrete object.

This is the rhetorical aspect of metaphor. As for its argumentative aspect, we will first define argumentative rhetoric, and then analyze how it is treated argumentatively in modern rhetoric.

**3- Definition of argumentative rhetoric:**

While literary rhetoric deals with the study of rhetorical figures (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, irony, etc.) in terms of their concept and mechanisms of operation, and uncovering the rules governing their structures and regulating their relationships, argumentative rhetoric undertakes the study of discourse in its function and effectiveness; that is, it studies the utterance produced by the speaker in a specific communicative situation, in order to influence the listener, change their perception and belief, and compel them to act . .(Mishbal, 2017, p. 19).

Therefore, the rhetoric of argumentation deals with discourse as a verbal activity that aims to exert a practical influence on the other, using the speaker's ethics (ethos), the listener's passions (pathos), and the arguments of the discourse (logos) in the process of persuasion ..(Mishbal, 2017, p. 19).

**4-The new rhetorical approach to metaphor:**

As previously mentioned, rhetoric, especially after regaining the pragmatic component it had lost for a considerable period in its history, became concerned with answering questions such as: How is persuasion achieved in a specific communicative context? And what rhetorical devices are used? Among the devices used in persuasion is metaphor. Persuasion and conviction are the two poles of argumentation for Perlman and Tytica, who consider metaphor a means of argumentation, and its argumentative power stems from its being a condensed representation ‹.(Sawla, p. 342) Obtained from the blending of one of the elements of the predicate (the borrowed term or the object of comparison) with one of the elements of the subject (the borrowed term or the object of comparison (.((Sawla, p. 342) ‹The predicate must be more well-known than the subject matter because the former's function is to clarify the structure of the latter or to prove its value .(Masmoudi, 2017, p. 340) He emphasized that representation, with its underlying structure, achieves argumentation in its two forms: conviction and persuasion. It is based on the similarity of relationships, not on the relationships of analogy (specific to simile (.((Sawla, p. 301).

As for the treatment of metaphor in argumentative rhetoric, it involves considering the context of the utterance, the interaction between its elements, its purpose, and its delivery—in other words, everything that reveals the argumentative power of the metaphor, as follows:

The recipient moves from the metaphorical utterance (which condenses the argument of similarity) to the conclusion, passing through the principle of convergence, which represents a shared opinion between the interlocutors. This opinion is the argument upon which the metaphor is based in conveying its meaning and persuasive function ..(Mishbal, 2017, p. 313)

## Secondly - Analyzing Qur'anic metaphors according to the rhetorical-argumentative approach:

Metaphor is one of the most eloquent styles among Arabs because of the profound argumentative evidence it carries; it is a claim supported by evidence ، .(Al-Sakkaki, 1983, p. 413) It is a tool of persuasion and influence, as we have seen in both the Arab and Western perspectives. Therefore, analyzing it at the level of production and interpretation requires understanding the metaphorical structure, how it was produced, the context in which it was produced, and the argumentative path leading to the result. We chose as a field to implement and apply some models of Qur'anic metaphors, in which we test the extent of their responsiveness to the rhetorical argumentative approach:

**1-**The metaphor in the Almighty's saying: "And the head has become white with age" (Maryam/4) is according to the types of metaphor according to Al-Sakkaki: a metaphor of a sensory thing for a sensory thing for a sensory thing, so the burning is sensory, the head is sensory, the face is sensory: light.

This is because the spread of gray hair on the head is like the burning of dry grass, or the brightness of gray hair on the head is like the brightness of a fire when it is lit. Thus, the metaphorical object (fire), the metaphorical object (gray hair), and the metaphorical element (burning) all form an intensive argument for similarity, which, along with the guaranteeing argument or the law of passage (which is an argument from the context), constitutes inferential premises that end with a conclusion as follows:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The source (fire) is borrowed from. The target (gray hair) is borrowed from. The act of igniting is borrowed from.<br>**********<br>A compelling argument for analogy:<br>Gray hair spreads like fire. | ➡ | The Guaranteed Argument ( The Law of Transition)<br>**********<br>All that is burning spreads (a universally accepted fact between the parties involved). | ➡ **Result**: Gray hair is ablaze. Proof of the claim. |

Reasoning (Argumentative Path): Part 1: First Introduction, Part 2: Second Introduction

The inferential process of metaphor is as follows:

M1: Gray hair spreads like fire (a powerful argument based on analogy).

M2: Everything that is burning spreads (a shared understanding between the two parties).

N: Gray hair is burning (the head has turned white with age). Conclusion.

The argumentative purpose of this reasoning is to emphasize Zechariah's advanced age and his inability to have children.

This metaphorical statement was uttered by Zechariah: “Indeed, my bones have weakened, and my head has turned white with age” (Maryam 4), in the context of his supplication to his Lord, asking Him to grant him a son to inherit from him (the inheritance of prophetic knowledge), after he saw Mary, peace be upon her, being blessed with children while praying in the sanctuary.

The metaphor of gray hair, in the communicative context we mentioned (the context of supplication and intimate prayer to the Creator), aims to convince the reader that the physical limitations of procreation make it unlikely, but God's will prevails even in its absence. Thus, the Quranic metaphor serves as an argumentative tool to persuade the recipient of this truth through three arguments:

• The argument of ethos: This is what the Quranic discourse mentions through the words of Zechariah: “He said, ‘My Lord, indeed my bones have weakened, and

my head has turned white with age'" (Maryam 4). The weakness of his bones and the spread of gray hair on his head represent the ethos of weakness and submission.

• The Pathos Argument: This argument evokes pity for Zechariah's plight, revealing his helplessness and simultaneous desire to have a child to inherit his knowledge and succeed him. The metaphor, through its exaggeration of this helplessness, weakness, old age, and the whitening of his hair, stirs the recipient's emotions and sympathy.

• The Logos Argument: This argument is based on the reasoning established by the metaphor, comprised of:

a. Argumentative premises: - The compelling argument of similarity - The argument based on shared knowledge between the interlocutors

b. Conclusion: This confirms the claim.

What gives the metaphorical meaning its advantage and superiority over the literal meaning (the widespread and visible appearance of gray hair) is the interaction between the subject (the metaphorical object: gray hair) and the predicate (the metaphorical source: fire). The predicate's influence on the subject is more pronounced and profound. The literal burning of fire becomes more evident and profound in gray hair. This is because the literal burning of fire is familiar, while in gray hair it is more visible and has a deeper impact. Therefore, the metaphor achieved its intended purpose, which is to influence the recipient and change his convictions after he has been convinced.

**1-** The metaphor in the verse: "And when the anger subsided in Moses" (Al-A'raf 7:154) is a metaphor of the intelligible for the intelligible, according to Al-Sakkaki's classification. The intelligible (submission) is used metaphorically for the intelligible (anger).

The components of this metaphor are as follows:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The source (human being)<br>The target (anger)<br>The borrowed element (silence)<br>**********<br>A powerful argument for analogy: Anger in its calm and stillness is like a human being in their silence. | ➡ | The Guaranteed Argument (The Law of Transition)<br>**********<br>Silence is the stillness of movement, and silence is the stillness of sound (a universally accepted principle between those communicating). | ➡ | **Result**:<br>Silence of anger<br>Proof of the claim |

The inferential process of the metaphor is as follows:

M1: Anger in its stillness is like a person in their silence (a condensed argument for analogy)

M2: Calmness is the stillness of movement, and silence is the stillness of sound (a mutually accepted understanding between the interlocutors)

N: Anger is silenced (affirming the claim).

The argumentative direction of this reasoning: to emphasize the calmness and stillness of Moses' anger after his intense reaction to his people's worship of the golden calf. The metaphorical expression "the stillness of anger" appears in the aforementioned context of his people's worship of the calf in his absence, his anger, and his regret for what they had done.

Thus, anger is portrayed as a seductive figure .(Ashour, 1984, p. 9/122) Sometimes he speaks, showing emotion, and at other times he remains silent, so the anger subsides. This metaphor worked to convince the recipient of what Moses, peace be upon him, had reached in terms of anger at the actions of his people, then the

calming of his anger and his silence about it, and it left an effect on him, which is asking forgiveness from God for what appeared from him in terms of anger, and he asked forgiveness for his brother for neglecting what he had been entrusted with.

The metaphor of "silence is anger" was used to practically influence and persuade the recipient through three arguments:

• The Ethos Argument: The ethos of anger and sorrow (sadness) experienced by Moses (peace be upon him) upon learning of his people's actions after his departure, and then finding them still in the same state upon his return, followed by the cessation of his anger and his seeking forgiveness from God Almighty.

• The Pathos Argument: The response of Moses' people to God Almighty's blessings by worshipping the golden calf in his absence evokes feelings of resentment in the listener towards the ingratitude of the Benefactor.

- The listener's empathy with Moses's (peace be upon him) position due to his people's betrayal and their poor conduct towards him.

- The effect of anger on Moses (peace be upon him) caused him to throw down the tablets, and the cessation of his anger caused him to regain his composure and pick them up again. The practical lesson: Do not be angry.

• The Logos Argument: This argument is based on the reasoning established by the metaphor, consisting of argumentative premises and a conclusion, as explained elsewhere. What makes the metaphorical meaning stronger, clearer, and deeper than the literal meaning (the calming and subsiding of anger) is the interaction between the subject and predicate. Silence is common for humans, but in the case of anger, it is more pronounced, profound, and impactful. Therefore, this metaphor achieved its intended purpose, which is to influence the recipient, persuade him, and then convince him.

**1-** The metaphor in the Almighty's saying: "Rather, We hurl the truth against falsehood, and it crushes it" (Al-Anbiya/18). This is a metaphor of the tangible for the intangible, because the hurling and crushing are for the stone, and they are tangible metaphors for an abstract thing, which is truth and falsehood. Thus, the condensed argument of similarity is formed from:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The source of the borrowing (the stone)<br>The target of the borrowing (truth, falsehood)<br>The borrowed element (slander, accusation)<br>**********<br>A powerful argument for analogy:<br>Truth hurls its evidence at falsehood, just as a stone hurls something harmful. | ➡ | The Guaranteed Argument (The Law of Passage)<br>**********<br>Throwing a stone at a harmful object constitutes hurling and branding (a mutually accepted understanding between the parties involved). | ➡ | **Result**:<br>Truth refutes falsehood and crushes it. Proving the claim. |

**Argumentation:**

M1: Truth hurls its proofs at falsehood, just as a stone hurls something harmful.

M2: Throwing a stone at something harmful is a hurling and a stumbling block (a mutually agreed-upon understanding between the interlocutors).

N: Truth hurls at falsehood and stumps it.

Argumentative Direction of this Argumentation: The metaphor emphasizes the power of truth in harming falsehood, just as a stone harms and stumps what it hurls.

To convince the recipient of this, the metaphor employs three arguments:

• The Argument of Ethos: The Quranic discourse attributes the act of hurling to the Divine Being to demonstrate power and might. This is an ethos of power, might, and dominion. Then, it attributes the act of stumbling to Truth, for one of God's names is Truth.

The hurling is from Truth with Truth, or it is a shift from the first-person pronoun to the third-person pronoun, which constitutes a shift in perspective. This shift in perspective is also an argumentative device, further demonstrating the power and persuasive effect of the Quranic ethos.

• The Pathos Argument: The metaphorical expression (the hurling of truth, the branding of falsehood) affects the recipient in such a way that the abstract concepts (truth and falsehood) become vividly present before their eyes, stirring feelings of elation at the triumph of truth and the defeat of falsehood, which then retreats, wounded or vanquished by the effects of the branding.

• The Logos Argument: This is manifested in the reasoning established by the metaphor, as previously explained. Furthermore, this metaphor is a metaphor of the concrete for the abstract, meaning it is an argument from the seen to the unseen.

What makes the metaphorical meaning stand out and become more apparent than the literal meaning (we defeat falsehood, we destroy it) is the interaction between the subject and predicate. The hurling and branding are embodied in the metaphorical referent (truth and falsehood), making them more visible and impactful than they are in the stone (they are familiar in the stone).

Thus, this metaphor achieves its intended purpose: to influence the recipient and convince them of the triumph of truth, leading to their acceptance.

**1-** The metaphor of the parable in the Almighty's saying: "God presents an example: a man owned by quarreling partners and a man belonging exclusively to one man. Are they equal in comparison? Praise be to God! But most of them do not know." (Az-Zumar/29)

Before analyzing this metaphor, let's define representation:

Representation: "A simile specific to something where the point of similarity is derived from multiple elements .".(Al-Maraghi, Without a printout, p. 266)

The parable has a place in speech in that it is "at the beginning of speech, so it is an explanatory analogy and an accompanying proof, and it is very common in the Holy Qur'an, such as: "The example of those who spend their wealth in the way of Allah is like a seed [of grain] which grows seven spikes; in each spike is a hundred grains." (Al-Baqarah/261 .((Al-Maraghi, Without a printout, p. 266)

Representation is analogy, because it is a comparison, "and analogy applies to what hearts understand and minds comprehend ." ".(Al-Jurjani, 1991, p. 20)

Therefore, the similarity is based on the similarity of relationships. In the Holy Verse, the relationship of the man and his troublesome partners is similar to the relationship of the peaceful man to the man.

(a) A relationship with (b) and (c) a relationship with (d) are similar in form, but in substance:

(a) A relationship with (b) is not equivalent to (c) a relationship with (d).

The Qur'anic discourse borrowed the relationship of the man and his troublesome partners to the relationship of the peaceful man to another man as a representative metaphor to show the extreme contradiction and clear distinction between the believer who worships one Lord and the polytheist who associates other partners with his Lord.

To prove this, he used one of the argumentative indicators: the question "Are they equal?" in his statement, which is used literally to specify one of two things ، .(Al-Hashemi, 2006, p. 74) But it may be used metaphorically to mean negation ..(Al-Samarrai, 2008, p. 211)

He denies that the state of the believer who worships one God is equal to the state of the polytheist who associates partners with his God, leaving the recipient no room to deny the inequality. It is a negative metaphor, as understood by theorists Sperbrewilson ..(Mzait, 2022, p. 237)

**Argumentation:**

Question 1: Are the relationship between a man and his troublesome associates and a man who is at peace with another man equal?

Question 2: It is known from human experience and the logic of things that they are not equal (a knowledge accepted between the interlocutors)

Conclusion: The relationship between a man and his associates is not equal to a man who is at peace with another man.

Therefore, Olivier Poul described the argument from example as going from a specific instance to establishing a rule ..(Hamdawi, 2021, p. 176)

* The argumentative direction of this reasoning is to demonstrate the unequal nature of the two relationships mentioned, and consequently, the unequal nature of what each symbolizes.

* The metaphorical expression appears in the context of illustrating the value of monotheism for the believer (the man who submits to one man) and the polytheist

who is torn apart by rivals. This metaphor, within the context in which it was produced, works to convince the recipient of its content through three arguments:

* The Ethos Argument: The Quranic discourse uses the name of God ("God sets forth an example"). He is the source of the example and the one who establishes the proof of the value of His monotheism and its effect on the monotheistic believer. The use of the name of God has a profound impact on the recipient because of the names and attributes they know of their Creator, thus strengthening the connection between the arguer and the one being argued with.

* The Pathos Argument: The metaphorical expression leaves an emotional and sentimental impact on the recipient, leading to conviction in their Creator as the One Lord, without any partners.

* The argument from logos: The use of the parable in the Almighty's words: {God has set forth a parable...} The parable is a type of inductive reasoning, moving from one specific case to another ‹.(Mishbal, 2017, p. 86) Similarly, the Quranic discourse demonstrates the incompatibility of polytheism and monotheism through a specific case (a man who had partners, and another who submitted to a man) to establish a foundational principle of faith based on the negation of polytheism and the affirmation of monotheism.

* The metaphorical use of simile in the verse: “Indeed, I have relied upon Allah, my Lord and your Lord. There is no creature but that He holds its forelock.” (Hud 56)

* While an example is typically placed at the beginning of a discourse, a metaphor is placed after the complete meaning to clarify and establish it, resembling a proof that establishes a claim, as in the saying of Abu al-Atahiyah: “You hope for salvation, yet you do not follow its paths; indeed, a ship cannot sail on dry land”.(Al-Maraghi, Without a printout, p. 266)

In this verse, there is a similarity in the relationships: the relationship of one who desires salvation but does not follow its paths, and the relationship of a ship to its sailing on dry land.

The source of the metaphor is the second relationship (the ship's sailing on dry land), and the target is the desire for salvation and the failure to follow its path, with the assertion that the image being compared is of the same kind as the image it is compared to.

This representative metaphor is a representation of the abstract (the desire for salvation) using the concrete (the ship and its sailing on dry land).

The metaphor in the noble verse is of this kind; the Quranic discourse represents the abstract (God's control over His servants and His power over them) using the concrete (His holding the reins of the animals on the earth). Because the people of Hud (peace be upon him) were proud of their material strength, the Quranic discourse used a metaphor of the same nature as their pride, to make their minds submit to the majesty of God Almighty. The argument proceeded as follows:

M1: God's control and power over His servants is like the strong seizing the forelocks of those weaker than Him (according to the principle of analogical reasoning).

M2: Every powerful and capable person seizes those weaker than him by the forelocks (a mutually agreed-upon understanding between the two parties).

N: God's control and power over His servants seize them by the forelocks.

The argumentative direction of this reasoning is to emphasize the weakness of humankind, no matter how great their material strength may be, for they are in His grasp and under His control. Establishing this meaning is the advantage of the metaphor, as Al-Jurjani sees it .(Al-Jurjani, 1991, p. 71) ‹This demonstration of meaning, in turn, leads to the acceptance and submission of the recipient. The metaphorical discourse employs three arguments:

•The argument from ethos: The discourse in the verse, spoken by Hud (peace be upon him), demonstrates to his people the power of God Almighty, regardless of their strength, and that He holds them by the forelocks. This is the ethos of faith in the power and control of the Creator.

•The argument from pathos: The metaphorical representation evokes awe and fear in the recipient, leading to submission and acceptance.

•The argument from logos: The metaphor, as previously explained, serves as an argument to establish the meaning of God's power and control over His servants—a complete and absolute control from which nothing escapes. The representation is one of the clearest manifestations of logos, and its representation is confirmed by the fact that the subject is in the spiritual realm (faith in God's power and control over His Creator) while the predicate is in the sensory realm (holding them by the forelocks), as Perelman argues in his argumentation theory ..(Mishbal, 2017, p. 100)

-Thus, we find in the examples of Qur'anic metaphor that we have presented their response to the rhetorical argumentative approach, which proves their argumentative nature, in addition to being a stylistic image with an aesthetic and decorative dimension in the discourse.

***Conclusion***

This study, after reviewing the theoretical framework for proving the argumentative power of metaphor and demonstrating the argumentative power of Qur'anic metaphor at the applied level, arrives at the following conclusions:

1. In argumentative rhetoric, metaphor is an utterance produced by the speaker in a specific communicative context to influence the listener, change their perception and belief, and motivate them to action.

2.Metaphor is a discourse that aims to practically influence the listener to persuade them, using the speaker's ethics (ethos), the listener's desires (pathos), and the arguments of the discourse (logos).

3.Perelman considers metaphor a condensed representation resulting from the merging of the predicate (the source of the metaphor) with an element of the subject (the target of the metaphor).

4.Representation achieves argumentation in its two forms: persuasion and convincing. It is based on the similarity of relationships, not on similarity.

5. For Perelman, representation is based on the divergence of domains, with the subject belonging to the spiritual domain and the predicate to the sensory domain. 6. To establish the argumentative power of metaphor, the recipient moves from the metaphorical utterance (which condenses the argument of similarity) to the conclusion, passing through the law of convergence. This law represents a point of agreement between the interlocutors and constitutes the argument upon which the metaphor is based in conveying its meaning and persuasive function.

7.The argumentative power of Quranic metaphor was established by approaching it with rhetorical argumentative theory through models that analyzed Quranic metaphor within the context of its production (its communicative function). This analysis followed an inferential path that begins with the metaphorical utterance, which condenses the argument of similarity, proceeds through the supporting argument, and concludes with the conclusion.

## Bibliography List

*Al-Hashemi, A. (2006). The Jewels of Eloquence in Meanings, Expression, and Figures of Speech. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al Fikr.*

*Al-Jurjani, A. a.-Q. (1991). Secrets of Eloquence. Jeddah, Saudi Arabia: Dar Al Madani.*

*Al-Maraghi, A. M. (Without a printout). Rhetoric. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Ilm for Millions.*

*Al-Sakkaki, A. Y. (1983). Key to Science. Beirut, Lebanon: Scientific Book House.*

*Al-Samarrai, F. S. (2008). Grammar meanings. Irbid, Jordan: Dar Al Fikr.*

*Ashour, s. (1984). Interpretation of Liberation and Enlightenment. Tunisian Publishing House.*

*Hamdawi, J. (2021). Argumentation in discourse: between theory and practice. Irbid, Jordan: Dar Rakaez.*

*Ibn Manzur, J. a.-D. (No date). Lisan al-Arab. Beirut, Lebanon, Lebanon: Dar Sader.*

*Masmoudi, a. s. (2017). Cognitive approaches and the modernization of rhetorical thought. Amman, Jordan: Dar Kunooz Al-Ma'rifah.*

*Mishbal, M. (2017). In the rhetoric of argumentation, there is a rhetorical-argumentative approach to discourse analysis. Amman, Jordan: Dar Kunooz Al-Ma'rifah.*

*Mzait, M. H. (2022). Issues in cognitive pragmatics. Amman, Jordan: Dar Kunooz Al-Ma'rifah.*

*Sawla, A. Argumentation, its frameworks and premises, through a work on argumentation, "The New Rhetoric" by Perelman, within the book "The Most Important Theories of Argumentation in the Arab Traditions.". Tunisia: University of Manouba Publications..*