

The Argumentative Power of the Rhetorical Language in '*All Quiet on the Western Front*': A Pragmatic Study

BY

NAGLAA MUHAMMED EL SAYED KOTB

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF

PROF. AHMED SALAH EL-DIN

PROFESSOR OF LIGUISTICS, FACULTY OF ARTS, ZAGAZIG UNIVERSITY

Abstract

This paper investigates the practice of writing implicit argumentation in political narratives by discussing a corpus consisting of some selected dramatic passages of Erich Maria Remarque's 'im westen nichts neues' commonly translated with unrivaled reputation by Arthur When Fawcett Crest's 'all quiet on the western front'. The purpose of this study is to help appreciate and advance the skill of writing implicit rhetorical argumentation by examining how it is employed and defined by Remarque in this novel. Advancing rhetorical argumentation requires implicit arguments that require specific logical procedures such as inferential licensing for interpretation. Therefore, the research here is qualitative relying on observation and falls into the area of pragmatics: the analyses of the passages help the reader to interpret the writer's implicit politically dangerous messages.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Rhetorical argumentation, Conversational implicature.

The objective of the study

This study aims at analyzing some selected dramatic passages of Remarque's "All Quiet on the Western Front" by applying a pragmatic approach based on the use of Grice's theory of maxims, i.e. conversational implicature. The importance of the Grecian analysis for the pragmatic interpretation of utterances lies in the exploitations of the maxims. In other words, the maxims, the floutings, and the inferences they bring to bear constitute several forms of saying and conveying meanings and messages. These messages differ according to the maxim that is exploited by the speaker in his text. The exploitations of the maxims function as anchors directing the reader to specific figures of speech in the novel or specific implied messages. Thus, these inferences enable the writer to advance his argumentation.

Tracing the rhetorical argumentative tier of the writing of this novel enables the researcher to achieve the academic goal of the research. The academic goal of this paper is to assist in the development of the argumentative scope of writing by describing how it is employed and defined by the author through the use of the inferential mechanism or the rhetorical argumentation.

Scope and research questions

"Arguing" means asserting a specific claim by backing up reasonable arguments, either explicitly or implicitly. It is a distinctive activity that requires a certain amount of intelligence. In spite of the research presented for understanding the argumentative function of the language, the factors affecting the composition of an argumentative text varies according to several linguistic features. Thus, this study deals with the act of arguing in a political narrative from a pragmatic perspective employing Grice's theory of maxims that enables us to detect the inference that leads us to investigate the intended message that the writer aims to convey. Just so, this study attempts to answer two main

questions that have the same scope: (1) What are the pragmatic realizations of the rhetorical argumentation in narratives? And (2) What is the significance of the use of the rhetorical language, i.e. several figures of speech, in advancing argumentation in written texts? In answering the study questions, it is hypothesized that (1) the act of arguing in written texts, more specifically in political narratives (during critical events), usually takes the form of implied argument, (2) a great coherent communicative force is best viewed in the illocutionary force of this implicit argument that leads to effective perlocutionary effects especially during severe political arrogances such as wars. In order to reach convincing results proving the hypothesis, a qualitative descriptive approach is developed for the analysis of the data relying on observation and introspective reading.

Introduction

Arthur When Fawcett Crest, the translator, is an English soldier who participates in WW1 and suffers the same suffering as Remarque (a German soldier and the author). Both are advocated anti-war soldiers deceived by the misleading propaganda of their parties. Therefore, they try to do the right duty and perform the virtuous responsibility toward their fellows and their nations. As he says in the preface, Remarque tries to "tell of" that means "to inform" the reader through the rhetorical argumentation (using various figures of speech) with the right truth of the war. Similarly, Fawcett Crest tries to translate Remarque's thought content that is, in fact, his own.

Remarque tries hard to show how his interpretive linguistic procedures might work in developing the argumentative sense of his text. He tries to make the reader keep track of the most influential events that support his main claim. He employs a distinctive feature that adds to the argumentative appeal of the novel concerning the constellation of arguments. This significant feature entails "the use of rhetoric".

In order to know the type of rhetoric used for the dialectical purpose, we should enumerate the types of rhetorical uses or perspectives as defined by the linguists

"Rhetoric" as a concept has more than one perspective or discipline. All these disciplines share with rhetoric an interest in language in use. First, according to Fahenstock (2011), it is the state of learning how to care and attach special importance to the use of the words in a structured style. Second, according to Taboado (2002), Mann (2006), and Kitteredge (1991), it is a specific technique for studying the linguistic use of the words, structures, styles, and expressions in a new way. Third, according to literary studies, it is the rhetorical taxonomy of literary figurative genres. Fourth, according to van Eemeren (2007), it is the performative dimension of language, i.e. focus on argumentation.

In this study, the kind of rhetoric is "persuasive rhetoric". We find that the persuasive rhetorical rituals used and employed by the writer in his text combine and compile language rhetorical features of the style with argumentative manifestation.

The reader might ask the question: "why the rhetorical rituals employed by the writer in his specific context compile the language rhetorical features of the style with argumentative manifestations?"

In fact, "argumentative rhetoric" or "the rhetorical manifestation employed in the light of the aim of persuasion" is called "rhetorical argumentation". In rhetorical argumentation, the rhetorical images turn from being a mere tool of aesthetic description to a powerful mechanism whose activity is argumentative. Rhetoric, in this range, merges and accommodates what is said with what is communicated. So, what is said becomes –by integrating with what is communicated- genuine, authentic, and veritable.

The theory used to analyze this strategy or to analyze the argumentative persuasive dimensions or the rhetorical images is the information theory (Grice's theory of maxims).

The theoretical framework

In a series of papers, the philosopher H.P.Grice (1957, 1968, 1969 and 1989) distinguishes between two aspects of meanings: the implicit and the explicit. The implicit meanings require specific logical procedures for interpretation. Through this theory, the inference can be implicated by searching for several indicators provided by the writer in his text. These indicators are evidentiary requirements. These evidentiary requirements enable the reader to trigger the inference and contrive the message of the writer. These evidentiary requirements extend to include all the information that is delivered in the speech in terms of words, hints, and rhetorical features.

The practical analysis

The first example: the irony (from chapter one)

"We are the iron youth" (Crest, 1991) [Chapter, 1]

This sentence contains unexpressed, i.e. implicit, argument. It is made unexpressed for the purpose of rhetorical argumentation. Rhetorical argumentation is a linguistic device used and employed by the writer to advance his implicit argumentation against the war, its misleading propaganda, and the misconceptions of the older generation. With the aid of the communication principle and the communication rules, this unexpressed argument can be made explicit. So we have to illustrate two things: 1- how it is done, 2- why it is done.

First, concerning 1- how it is done, the abovementioned argument is a part of the following **situation** from chapter one:

The situation:

Kropp, Muller, and Paul make a mockery of Kantorek's term "the iron youth". They repeat this argument looking superstitiously at each other. In peace time, Kantorek (the school master) always urges the young soldiers, under his shepherding, to enlist and volunteer in this war. He always says: "*won't you join comrades, you are the iron youth*". In this situation, the term does not commensurate with the actual experience of the young soldiers. This term or expression suggests the opposite of its meaning. 'Iron' suggests rigidity, durability, and above all hardness and strength, while 'youth' suggests future and all its connotations (work, duty, culture, progress, production, and happiness). In contrast, after confronting the agony and the torture of the front line, the young soldiers lose all these qualities. The war has swept them away from the peaceful stream of life. Instead, they become old folk. This argument explains their realization of the invalid credibility toward Kantorek and others. They no longer trust the older generation.

The Grecian analysis of the argumentative irony:

The speaker has deliberately and intentionally failed to observe the maxim of quality. The maxim of quality states "Do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence." (Peccei, 1999. P.27). Black (2006) states that "this maxim has to do with the truth or falsity of an utterance. Characters will lie, or exaggerate, or conceal, and, as we have seen, narrators do too." (P.30). Thomas (1995) noted that the maxim of quality is exploited when the speaker says something which is not true or for which he lacks adequate evidence. And above all, Levinson (1983) and Grice (1975 / 1989) noted that the maxim of quality is exploited in metaphors, ironies, and other figures of speech.

The writer pretends to be untruthful and uninformative because he wants to form the unexpressed premise that enables him to advance his implicit argumentation. This premise functions as evidence that supports the general

standpoint stated in the preface, which is the brutality and futility of the unjust war.

Following Grice's reasoning, we developed the following inference or irony: if the soldiers are 'iron youth' as Kantorek says, then they should have a great hope for happy future. Unfortunately, they are powerless to have or get any hope for better future because they are no longer youth; they are old folk. Another rhetorical argumentative metaphor supports their powerless condition is what mentioned in chapter four about the nature of the whirlpool. The metaphor of the whirlpool suggests or refers to the danger caused by the meeting of several opposed conflicting currents. The writer resembles the battle, which is actually made and managed by man, with a mysterious whirlpool, i.e. supernatural power, that cannot be resisted and its consequences cannot be restored. It is a metaphor for the inability, weakness, and powerless of the soldiers to resist, since there is no escape from death. Moreover, the writer continues his discussion of the idea of disability, i.e. powerless, asking implicitly and rhetorically, how can they resist such miraculous power that even nature did not last long; " *An indigent, i.e. very poor, looking wood receives us*".

In brief, instead of *iron*, they are *powerless*, and instead of *youth*, they are *old folk*.

The second example: Circus ponies (from chapter two)

"*We had fancied our task would be different, only to find we were to be trained for heroism as though we were circus-ponies.*" (Crest, 1991) [Chapter, 2]

First, concerning 1- how it is done, the above-mentioned argument is a part of the following **situation** from chapter two.

In this situation, the writer mocks the teachings and the traditions taught in the war. These ridiculous teachings make the war like a circus theatre and soldiers like small ponies. In the parody of this irony, the writer makes fun of

the war because it is worthless like a circus. Moreover, the circus is held for a series of tricks, and the war depends on deceit. Just as the aim of the circus is to entertain people, the war is meant for entertainment too. But it is fun only for certain group of people who do not share in it and who deceive their ponies that the price is "heroism" and "fatherland" (while the real price is their ironic death). The relationship between the ridiculous teachings "*we were trained in the army for ten weeks*" and the writer's ironic attitude by saying "*circus ponies*" is implicitly stated in this passage from chapter two.

The Grecian analysis of the argumentative irony

The speaker has deliberately and intentionally failed to observe the maxim of quality. He pretends to be untruthful and uninformative because he wants to form the unexpressed premise. This premise functions as evidence that supports the general standpoint, which is the brutality and futility of the unjust war.

Following Grice's reasoning, we developed the following inference or irony: the writer wants to say that the unjust war is comic for several reasons. Intellectually, morally, humanly, it is worthless; it has no value. According to Grice, the writer exploits the maxim of quality. He pretends to be precisely uninformative. This intended lack of sufficient and related information helps to save him from any charge or accusation of using politically offensive language. Instead of explicitly saying that war teachings and its pettifogging (trivial) details are worthless and non valuable like the circus ponies performances, the writer refers to "*what they have learned in the army for ten weeks*". Again, in this irony, the writer returns to the general idea or 'the sub-standpoint' that he discusses in this particular chapter (when there is no will there is no way)

The third example: the irony (from chapter three)

" *Give 'em all the same grub and all the same pay and the war would be over and done in a day*". (Crest, 1991) [Chapter, 3]

First, concerning 1- how it is done, the abovementioned argument is a part of the following **situation** from chapter three:

The situation

In a short rest, the soldiers sarcastically discuss the failure of one of them to do (perform) military salutes in a proper manner. They want to say that these salutes are kind of cynicism. They support their view with the fact that this kind of activity does not commensurate with the harsh and severe conditions of the front. Then the writer mentions Kropp's view. Kropp, the thinker who employs his mind in thinking, resembles war battlefield to bull fight and he wishes that the war leaders fight each other. These people must pay the price. In this view, there is a considerable clarification to the use of the language of reason and logic instead of the language of appearance and body (such as military salutes).

The Grecian analysis of the rhetorical irony:

The people who sacrifice themselves patriotically for the war are not the people who plan and prepare rudely for it. Kat ironically refers to this fact when he says this argument; this argument expresses an implicit irony. Using Grice's reasoning '*if p then q*', this implicit irony can be made explicit. Kat wants to say that if the leaders of destruction and the professional professors of the science of killing who strategically and politically plan and prepare unfairly for wars were forced to enlist the same way as the young boys were as well as to experience the disastrous and the devastating conditions of the front line the same way the young boys endure or experience "*the same grub and the same pay*", then they would think carefully and critically enough before exposing themselves to this atrocity, i.e. the vicious activity of war.

The sarcastic and ridiculous attitude toward warfare is obviously clear in the minds of the fighting young boys. They all agree that "an arrangement such

as that suggested by Kropp would be much simpler and more just than this arrangement where the wrong people do the fighting". (ibid)

The fourth example: The metaphor (from chapter four)

" *I hear some aspirants for the frying-pan over there*" (ibid) [Chapter, 4]

With the aid of the communication principle and the communication rules, the unexpressed premises can be made explicit. So we have to illustrate two things: 1- how it is done, and 2- why it is done.

First, concerning 1- how it is done, the abovementioned argument is a part of the following **situation** from chapter four:

Comment

In this situation, Paul and his company move to the front line. They predict that there will be a bombardment that night. After a hard work of climbing, marching and trudging, the bombardment begins. During the few hours, passed distinctly, before the beginning of the bombardment and during the hard work of climbing, marching, picking, and collecting wires, Paul utters this sentence. In addition, he utters this sentence while seeing some geese over a visible wall which belongs to a house which lies there on the side of the road.

The context of the situation:

In the context of this particular situation, the writer describes the enthusiastic attitude of the young soldiers. He wants the reader to detect their ambition, i.e. their high zest. They sacrifice themselves not only on the front line, but also in their way to the front line. They are climbing and trudging, avoiding shell holes, avoiding trenches, and avoiding acrid air with the smoke of the guns, until the front line is immediately in front of them. They have no time to sleep because they have to crawl a way in order to confront a terrified new bombardment. This situation is similar to a situation in which some geese are running faster and faster to reach the crucible of their death without intellectual

desire. Again this brings us to the main argument of the novel, i.e. the adventure of death.

The rhetorical metaphor:

In literal terms, the speaker – bitterly in a ridiculous way- compares the geese to the young soldiers. According to the world animal foundation, one of the most distinguishing characteristics of geese is that they form a giant enthusiastic group or formation (known as gaggle, i.e. herd or troops that are kept together as livestock or cattle). This means that geese have very strong affections for each other without intellectual desire. This is a ridiculous psychological nature and it characterizes geese only. Literally, the writer wants to say that the young soldiers are aspirants in the same way as geese.

The argumentative function of the metaphor:

Following Grice's reasoning, we developed the following inference or metaphor:

The speaker has deliberately and intentionally failed to observe the maxim of quality. He pretends to be untruthful and uninformative because he wants to form the unexpressed premise. This premise functions as evidence that supports the general standpoint, which is the brutality and futility of the unjust war. By calling geese aspirants, the speaker speaks ironically in a sarcastic ridiculous way. Obviously, the psychological nature of the geese indicates that their enthusiasm their eagerness is deprived of any intellectual desire. In a similar vein, this feature attributes to the young soldiers; their enthusiasm is deprived of any intellectual desire. Again, the war deprived them of all rights. The most important right in life is to have a desire to decide your way in it. When one denies the possession of using and employing this desire, he is no longer a human being. Instead, he is "a goose" climbing ardently to the frying-pan.

Example from chapter five: 'merry-go-round' (the talent of death)

"The last one props itself on its forelegs and drags itself round in a circle like a *merry-go-round*" (ibid) [Chapter, 5]

The writer continues his bitter series of ironies. In the former chapter "the Tabernacle", the writer mocks the religious traditions when he makes them parallel to the military traditions. In this example "merry-go-round", the writer makes death (by suffering severe unbearable pains) in parallel with happy life habits and talents.

The abovementioned sentence contains unexpressed, i.e. implicit, argument. It is made implicit for the purpose of rhetorical argumentation; the writer wants to argue or to prove his claim rhetorically. With the aim of the communication principle and the communication rules, this unexpressed argument can be made explicit. So we have to illustrate two things: 1- how it is done? , and 2- why it is done?

First, concerning 1- how it is done, the abovementioned argument is a part of the following **situation** from chapter five.

Comment

In literal terms –the writer bitterly in a ridiculous way- compares the wounded horse dying in pain to a merry-go-round, i.e. a revolving horse which children ride for amusement or excitement. Through this analogical comparison, this premise functions as evidence that supports the writer's claim, which is the brutality and futility of the unjust war.

According to Grice's theory, the speaker has deliberately failed to observe the maxim of quality. The maxim of quality measures the quality of information offered by the writer or the speaker within a written or a spoken text. According to the form of the maxim of quality, speakers or writers may offer true or false, sufficient or insufficient sum of information. What is important here is the writer's intention. Actually, when the writer intends to exploit the maxim, he intends to direct the reader's attention to a remarkable point. But he hides this

remarkable point behind his exploitation for significant reasons or purposes. In this case, his exploitation bears the burden of an ironic attitude.

Concerning the ironic attitude, the writer holds an analogical comparison between two completely different situations. The expression "merry-go-round" is a famous expression which denotes happiness and excitement. It is a continuous cycle of activities, especially when regarded as a kind of excitement. In fact, this sense of excitement is not the sense that is intended here. It is a kind of excitement, but it is neither gay nor cheerful because of the tormented dying animal; the writer describes the horse as propping itself on its four legs and dragging itself round in a circle for dying.

The writer introduces the expression "merry-go-round" in a situation that is totally opposite to the actual reference of the word. In this scene, the writer combines two completely different situations. In the first situation, the writer depicts the fatal military event occurred during the war, i.e. the death of the horses. In the second situation, the writer depicts one of the traditions of a happy festival where people ride horses for amusement and excitement.

The reader's detection of the writer's technique of combining contradictions enables him (the reader) to identify the purposeful irony and its intended meaning or message. In an ironic way, the writer compares the activity of dying to the activity of playing. In fact, the writer does not want to make fun of the pains of this animal. However, the writer wants to convey to the reader the fact that war does not have mercy for any object whatsoever. Life as a being is stable. In a stable life, playing and entertainment can occur or take place. War as a being is also stable, but it is a stable entity in which only death can occur or take place. In brief, the writer wants to mock all those who stood silently in front of the violation of the sanctity of the right of "being a life".

Rhetorical argumentation from the last chapter (chapter ten)

"All Quiet on the Western Front"

[The title and the last sentence in the novel]

The situation:

In this last chapter, the writer ends his argumentation about the miserable circumstances of the war by using another impressive irony. Paul Boumer (the narrator and the hero), the last survivor of the seven members of his class, feels very alone and without hope even though he knows that an armistice is about to come. Paul dies on October 1918 only a month before the armistice of November 1918. His death is marked by the sentence "*all quiet on the western front*".

The Grecian analysis of the irony

"*All quiet on the western front*" denotes two meanings. First, it denotes the silence that comes before the hurricane, i.e. the bombardment. The writer makes this sentence the title of his novel to criticize the folly (stupidity and imbecility) of those who say it. This sentence was often repeated in the novel before and after the bombing of the bombardments without giving any considerations to those who died as flocks in large numbers. And after presenting the details which support and prove his general claim to the reader, the writer scoffs as if to say "how can everything be quiet on the altar". Second, it denotes an ironic touch intended deliberately by the writer to communicate the following fact: "no one wise man can imagine that in spite of all the mentioned miserable and devastating details and actions that take place in this war, there remains all quiet on the western front! (Which means nothing happens at all!!).

In this final one-page chapter, the writer sums up the claim of his novel which entails that the death of a single individual (like Paul Baumer) does not evoke feelings and emotions, does not constitute a fatal crime, does not make sense to the wise men, does not awake the world conscience, does not blame the universal culture and philosophy, does not satisfactorily enable the people to take revenge from each other, does not put the war to its end, does not settle the debate over the "*no man's land*", does not give the right to its people even if it is

a matter of confusion –particularly in this unjust war- to decide or declare what is the right and who owns it, and finally it does not prevent the devil from taking place. In other words, the death of a single individual in the unjust war is invaluable. The writer ironically wants to say that the unjust war degrades the value of the human being. The unjust war is only a vicious institution for committing crimes because it does not consider the death of the human being to be the worst crime forever. In brief, "*all quiet on the western front*" implies an ironic criticism of the unjust war; it is only an adventure of death for its members as well as for its victims.

After presenting the significance of the rhetorical images in advancing argumentation, it is now the way to explain why the writer chooses the rhetorical language to advance his argumentation specifically in narratives written during critically political times such as this narrative.

Second, concerning 2- why it is done, the abovementioned arguments or premises are made implicit because of several reasons. Van Eemeren et al (2008) highlight three kinds of reasons behind phrasing unexpressed premises or arguments: 1- some strategic reasons concerning the writer, 2- specific background information concerning the crowd of readers, and 3- reasons concerning it to be a well-defined context.

(1) Some strategic reasons concerning the writer:

First, van Eemeren et al (2008) states that writers who do express their premises or standpoints indirectly, i.e. implicitly, "may think it more strategic not to express their intentions too openly" (p. 55). They continue to say that "whatever the reason, what they say has an indirect meaning. This meaning will only be understood if speakers ensure that their violation of the communication rules is noticed and correctly interpreted by the listeners" (ibid). Particularly, in these arguments, since the writer's violation of the communication rule, i.e. the maxim of quality, is noticed and correctly interpreted by the listener, the

indirectness of the writer's intention behind these arguments is solved. In other words, with the aid of the communication rules, the implicit premises became expressed or explicit.

(2) Specific background information concerning the crowd of readers:

Second, van Eemeren et al (2008) indicate that those writers who do express their premises or standpoints indirectly, i.e. implicitly, may think it because these premises or arguments touch specific critical background information concerning the crowd of readers at the time. For this reason, they indicate that writers who do this "should choose the standpoint that in the light of the context and background information is most noticeable" (ibid). In these arguments, since the writer's violation of the communication rule is noticed by using or employing the unexpressed premises, the writer's indirect intention behind these comparisons became expressed or explicit.

(1) Reasons concerning it to be a well-defined context:

Third, van Eemeren et al (2008) states that "for the context to be so well defined...it demands a specific phrasing of the unexpressed premise" (p. 58).

The conclusion is, "with the aid of the communication principle, the communication rules, and logic, unexpressed premises can be made explicit. This is why it is done" (p. 57). The reasoning as a whole then comes from the application of the logically valid principle of the information theory or Grice's theory of maxims.

Conclusion

This paper deals in particular with rhetorical or persuasive argumentation. Rhetorical argument denotes several things. First, "arguments which are both heavily based on the audience's perception of the world with finding what will persuade in given circumstances, and concerned more with evaluative judgments than with establishing the truth of a proposition" (Grasso,

2000, P. 53). Second, "discursive techniques allowing us to induce or to increase the mind's adherence to the thesis presented for its assent" (Preleman and Olbrechts, 1971, P. 54). Third, a rhetorical argument is "a way to pass value from one topic to another...it expresses something like 'if x has value, and y is related to x, then y has value'" (ibid), i.e. the logical validity principle. In brief, we define a rhetorical argument as "the act of putting forward the evaluation of a concept, on the basis of relationship existing between this concept and another concept, and by means of a rhetorical schema" (Grasso, 2002, P.54)

In verifying the hypothesis of the research, we arrive at the following conclusion. There is some kind of correlation between rhetoric and eloquent arguments. The meaning of this correlation is that an argument cannot be an argument without the addition of rhetoric, i.e. figurative language. This addition is implicit, and, in fact, this is rhetorical argumentation.

The writer employs rhetorical argumentation using several figures of speech such as irony and metaphor for persuasive and argumentative manifestations. In this novel, we find several eloquent figures of speech. We do not include all these figures, because we do not aim to enumerate or calculate the number of figures used in this novel. We aim to make strategic thinking about the phenomenon (rhetorical argumentation) and its benefits in advancing argumentative writing. For example, in the first figure of speech "*we are the iron youth*", the writer advances his argumentation against the ideology of the war and the misconceptions (deceit) of the older generation such as Kantorek, the school master. In the second figure of speech "*circus ponies*", the writer advances his argumentation against the ideology of the war and its teachings. In the third figure of speech "*the same grub and the same bay*", the writer advances his argumentation against the war and the military actions that do not commensurate with the harsh and severe conditions of the front line confrontations. In the fourth figure of speech "*aspirants for the frying pan*", the

writer advances his argumentation against the war and its attitude. In the fifth figure of speech "*merry-go-round*" the writer advances his argumentation against the war and its unmerciful, remorseless, and brutal actions. In the last figure of speech "*all quiet on the western front*", the writer ends his argumentation showing that the war is the most heinous crime on the earth: it degrades the value of the human being. All these figures direct the reader to the general claim of the novel; the war has no value (it is only an adventure of death). Furthermore, the sequence of these figures and their logical interpretation constitutes the novel's recitative claim. By employing these figures of speech, the writer manages to put the reader incidentally with his claim.

Tracing the argumentative tier of the rhetorical writing of this novel enables the researcher to achieve the academic goal of the research. The academic goal of this paper is to assist in the development of the argumentative scope of writing by describing how it is employed and defined through the use of the inferential mechanism or the rhetorical argumentation in Remarque's "*all quiet on the western front*"

References

- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Crest, F. (1991). *All quiet on the western front*. (Remarque, M). Retrieved from Amazon.com
- Fahnestock, J. (2011). *Rhetorical Style: The Uses of Language in Persuasion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grasso, F. (2002). *Towards a Framework for Rhetorical Argumentation*. Department of Computer Science: University of Liverpool
- Grice, H. P. (1957). Meaning. *Philosophical review*, Vol. 66 (3), PP. 377-388.
- Grice, H. P. (1968). Utterer's meaning, sentence meaning and word meaning. *Foundations of language*, Vol. 4, (3), PP. 225-242.
- Grice, H. P. (1969). Utterer's meaning and intention. *Philosophical review*, 78 (2), PP. 147-177.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kitteredge, R., Korlsky, T. and Rambow, O. (1991). On the need for Domain Communication Language. *Computational intelligence*. Vol. 7, P: 305-14
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (2001.) Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature. *Computational linguistics*. Vol. 27, No. 3. PP. 462-463.
- Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meaning: the theory of generalized conversational implicature*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Peccei, J. S. (1999). *Pragmatics*. London: Routledge.
- Taboado, M. and Mann, C. W. (2006). Applications of Rhetorical Structure Theory. *Discourse Studies*. Vol. 8 (4). P: 567-588

Thomas, P. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Boston: Addison Welsey Publishing Company.

Perelman, Chaim, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. (1971). *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Trans. JohnWilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame.

Van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., Snoeck Henkeans. (2008). *Argumentation: Analysis, Evaluation, presentation*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates publishers.

Van Eemeren, F. H., Houtlosser, P., & Henkemans, A. S. (2007). *Argumentative indicators in discourse: A pragma-dialectical study* (Vol. 12). Springer Science & Business Media.



القوة الحجاجية للغة البلاغية في رواية "كل شيء هادىء على الجبهة الغربية": دراسة تداولية

من الباحثة

نجلاء محمد السيد قطب

تحت اشراف

الاستاذ الدكتور احمد صلاح الدين عبد الحميد

استاذ اللغويات بقسم اللغة الانجليزية جامعة الزقازيق

نبذة عن البحث

يمكن تعريف هذه الدراسة على انها تضطلع إلى إستكشاف الهيكل الجدلي و التأثير المقنع لمستوى اللغة البلاغية في بعض المقاطع المختارة من رواية إريك ماريا ريمارك "كل شيء هادىء على الجبهة الغربية" و التي ترجمت من الألمانية بواسطة فاوست كريست. نطبق في هذه الدراسة منهج جريس بناء على ما يسميه علماء اللغة "تراخيص الاستدلال". يتيح هذا النهج للقارئ كيفية الاستنتاج لان قاعدة الاستدلال هذه تستخدم كالتذكرة التي ترخص للقارئ الانتقال من فكرة لأخرى عن طريق "القياس"، أو "الإشارة"، أو "التضمن". الدراسة لها هدفان: هدف أكاديمي وهدف يصب في ثراء المعرفة الإدراكية. أولاً: الهدف الأكاديمي لهذه الدراسة يتمثل في المساعدة في تطوير النطاق الجدلي للكتابة من خلال وصف كيف وظف ريمارك هذا النطاق في كتابته الجدلية والإقناعية باستخدام اللغة البلاغية. ثانياً: تصبح هذه الدراسة باستخدام هذا التصميم ذات قيمة إدراكية أو عملية لأنها تساهم في تقديم إضافة جديدة للمعرفة تساهم في حل مشاكل المجتمعات. إن رفض أيديولوجية الحرب الظالمة والارهاب الفكري والقتل هو أحد اهم أركان هذه الرواية وكذلك مشروع البحث. اعتمد البحث على التحليل البلاغي لوسائل الإقناع. في هذا البحث، نتتبع كيفية صياغة الاساليب التي تهيء جمهور المتلقين لإستقبال أفكار الكاتب في إطار إستراتيجية معينة وظفها الكاتب (وهي الاستراتيجية الدينامية النفسية). حيث استعمل الكاتب اساليب معينة حسب ما يقتضيه المقام لإقناع المتلقي. وهذه الاساليب (اساليب الحجاج البلاغي) هي التي تألفت منها مادة الدراسة. باختصار، يحاول الباحث باستخدام منهج التداولية او البرجماسية (نظرية جريس) لتوضيح الطاقة الحجاجية للأساليب البيانية في هذه الرواية مما يعمل على تزويد القراء والطلاب بمفاهيم محددة يمكن ان تمهد الطريق لجدل مثالي مكتوب.