مجلة الدراسات المستدامة
P-ISSN(Print) : 2663-2284
E-ISSN(online): 2663-7413
السنة (٨) المجلد (٨) العدد (٤) تشرين الأول . لسنة ٢٠٢٦م - ١٤٤٨ هـ

A Study of the Argumentation Schemes in Some Verses of the Holy Quran

Researcher.Intidhaar Khairy Jassim Mohammed Al-Mayahi
Prof. Dr. Amin Ukaal Ghailan (Ph.D)
University of Basrah / College of Education for Humanities / Department of English Language
intidhar.jassim@uobasrah.edu.iq
amin.ghailan@uobasrah.edu.iq

Abstract

This study investigates argumentation schemes used in selected verses of The Holy Quran,specifically the discursive verses related to the narrative of prophet Moses.The research centers on how Quranic discourse formulates persuasion through argument ,dialogue,and argumentation schemes.To argue effectively,by demonstrating conversations between the prophet Moses and Bani Israel,the study reveals several argumentaion schemes such as argument from authority ,sign,ignorance,questioning,and others.

Keywords: (argumentation patterns, authority argumentation, consequences argumentation).

دراسه انماط الاستدلال الحجاج في بعض آيات القرآن الكريم

الباحثة. انتظار خيري جاسم محمد المياحي
أ.د امين عگال غيلان
جامعة البصرة / كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية / قسم اللغه الانكليزية
intidhar.jassim@uobasrah.edu.iq
amin.ghailan@uobasrah.edu.iq

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة تحليل انماط الحجاج المستخدمة في أيات مختارة من القرآن الكريم، مع التركيز على الخطاب القصصي المتعلق بقصة النبي موسى عليه السلام. وتعتمد الدراسة على تحليل كيفية تقديم الخطاب القرآني للمواقف الحوارية والحجاجية، وكيفية توضيفه لانماط متعدده من مخططات الحجاج في سياق الحوار بين النبي موسى عليه السلام وبني اسرائيل.

الكلمات المفتاحيه: (انماط استدلال الحجاج،الاستدلال بالسلطه، الاستدلال بالعواقب).

1. Introduction

Argumentation is one of the essential rhetorical elements in The Holy Quran that is employed to deliver guidance,reasoning,and moral messages.The story of Prophet Moses and Bani Israel involves many arguments that illustrate various configurations of argumentation .To talk in a more accurate way,through these schemes,Moses utilizes reasoning,warning,and divine guidance to instruct his people ,while Bani Israel often reply with fear,doubt, and opposition.That is to say,this study identifies the argumentation schemes adopted in these arguments to exhibit the persuasive and rhetorical nature of Qur'anic discourse.

2.Argumentaion Schemes

The study of argumentation schemes outlines a systematic framework for examining how arguments are constructed and analyzed in various contexts. Since the 1980s ,Douglas Walton has generated important contributions to this area through a group of publications that evolved and refined the notion of argumentaionschemes (Walton,1989;1995;1996;1997;2005;Walton&Reed,,2001;Walton,Reed , &Macagno ,2008;Walton &Sartor ,2013) . These works have promoted to arranging forms of arguments into identifiable structures that can be employed for the investigation of argumentative discourse. Among these inputs, Walton,Reed,and Macagno (2008) supply an extensively utilized and systematic categorization of argumentation schemes.

Argumentation schemes are organized and stereotypical patterns of reasoning that are extensively applied in everyday discourse as well as in technical fields such as science,law,and public communication.In contrast to formal deductive logic,these schemes are mainly defeasible ,which means that their conclusions can be contested when new evidence appear. To state more accurately,each scheme is connected

with a collection of critical questions that facilitate examine the strength and acceptability of an argument by evaluating its sufficiency,consistency,and relevance. As stated by Douglas Walton,Chris Reed,and Fabrizio Macagno (Walton et al .,2008),argumentation schemes
demonstrate common forms of natural reasoning that incorporate logical structure with contextual and semantic relationships,establishing them essential for examining argumentative discourse.

In general,argumentation schemes contain a main premise,a minor premise ,and a conclusion that are related through a logical form of reasoning.As reported by Douglas Walton and colleagues,each scheme has a particular structure that reveals how a claim is confirmed by reasoning. Furthermore , argumentation schemes involve critical questions that are employed to evaluate the strength of an argument .That is to say,these elements generate argumentation schemes efficient tools for analyzing argumentation discourse.

It is important to mention that argumentation schemes cover fundamental questions for establishing the strength or weakness of arguments.To be more precise,these questions are essential for both creating a scheme and generating applications built on schemes (Walton,2002b).Most schemes have a structure that corresponds to a defeasible inference in which the primary claim can be challenged (Freeman,1991).

To sum up, this model provides an effective framework for the purpose of understanding how different forms of arguments function in both formal and informal contexts,involvingargument from authority,sign,consequences,example ,ignorance ,and questioning .

3.Methodology

This study employs a qualitative textual approach of selected verses from The Holy Quran emphasizing on the argument between the Prophet Moses and Bani Israel.The data consists of ten verses that demonstrate key instances of argument within the story of Prophet Moses and Bani Isreal.The analysis emphasizes on examining the types of argumentation schemes employed within the selected verses.The study further reveals the role of these schemes in forming the persuasive function of argumentation.

3.1 Data Analysis

" .وَإِذْ قُلْتُمْ يَا مُوسَىٰ لَن نَّصْبِرَ عَلَىٰ طَعَامٍ وَاحِدٍ فَادْعُ لَنَا رَبَّكَ يُخْرِجْ لَنَا مِمَّا تُنبِتُ الْأَرْضُ مِن بَقْلِهَا وَقِثَّائِهَا وَفُومِهَا وَعَدَسِهَا وَبَصَلِهَا ۖ قَالَ أَتَسْتَبْدِلُونَ الَّذِي هُوَ أَدْنَىٰ بِالَّذِي هُوَ خَيْرٌ ۚ اهْبِطُوا مِصْرًا فَإِنَّ لَكُم مَّا سَأَلْتُمْ ۗ وَضُرِبَتْ عَلَيْهِمُ الذِّلَّةُ وَالْمَسْكَنَةُ وَبَاءُوا بِغَضَبٍ مِّنَ اللَّهِ ۗ ذَٰلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ كَانُوا يَكْفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَيَقْتُلُونَ النَّبِيِّينَ بِغَيْرِ الْحَقِّ ۗ ذَٰلِكَ بِمَا عَصَوا وَّكَانُوا يَعْتَدُونَ" (البقرة: ٦١)

The verse describes how the people of Prophet Moses became dissatisfied with the blessings they were given and demanded different, more ordinary types of food. In response, they were reminded that they were exchanging something better for something inferior. As a consequence of their ingratitude and disobedience, they were subjected to humiliation, poverty, and divine displeasure. The verse under examination stresses the moral lesson that challenging divine blessings and direction leads to harmful outcomes. In the realm of argumentation, this can be interpreted as an argument from consequences, where the unfavorable consequences operate as evidence that the preliminary attitude and measures are wrong. For this reason, the verse deploys consequences to facilitate ethical judgment and belief.

1.2 Argument Schemes (Walton, Reed & Macagno)

1.2.1 Application Example

Major Premise	Ingratitude and disobedience → lead to humiliation and divine anger
Minor Premise	The people showed ingratitude and disobedience
Conclusion	Therefore, their behavior is wrong and leads to punishment

Table 1:Applied example of Argument from Consequences

1.3 Critical Questions

CQ1: Are the detrimental effects unequivocally produced by the responses depicted?

CQ2: Is the interrelation between ingratitude and punishment persistently consistent?

CQ3: Are there alternative practicable factors that give rise to the consequence besides the function itself?

The verse under analysis elucidates the form of an argument from consequences as fabricated by Walton, Reed, and Macagno. To substantiate the point ,It commences with the major premise, which reinforces that actions are deconstructed based on their end results.In simpler terms, If an act causes harmful or problematic consequences, it is appraised in a negative manner. The minor premise specifies the aforementioned consequences emerge in the case under consideration. Arising from these findings, the conclusion connotes that the initiative should be overlooked. Subsequently ,the critical questions play a role in determining whether the contributing factor between practice and impact is reliable and justified.

"وَإِذْ قَالَ مُوسَىٰ لِقَوْمِهِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَأْمُرُكُمْ أَنْ تَذْبَحُوا بَقَرَةً ۖ قَالُوا أَتَتَّخِذُنَا هُزُوًا ۖ قَالَ أَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ أَنْ أَكُونَ مِنَ الْجَاهِلِينَ" (البقرة: ٦٧)

The verse cited above interprets an event in which Prophet Moses imparts a command from God to his followers, steering them to butcher a cow. Rather than instantly complying, they engage with ambiguity and suspicion, questioning whether Moses is showing contempt for them. Moses evidently institutes that he would not conduct in ignorance and that the instruction set follows from divine power. More precisely ,this underlines the contribution of relying on legitimate authority, predominantly when it is embedded in divine revelation. From an argumentative perspective , this can be regarded as an argument from authority, in situations where an argument is extensively accepted in the light of the reliability and authority of its origin. As the directive originates from God, the greatest and most reliable power, it allocates a strong explanation for acceptance and compliance.

2.1 Argument Scheme (Walton, Reed & Macagno)

2.1.1 Application Example

Major Premise	Commands from God → must be accepted as true and obeyed
Minor Premise	God commands to slaughter a cow
Conclusion	Therefore, the command should be accepted and followed

Table 2: Applied example of Argument from Authority

2.2 Critical Questions

CQ1: Are the negative effects immediately induced by the behavior portrayed?

CQ2: Is the link between ingratitude and punishment always coherent?

CQ3: Are there other potential factors that lead to the consequence besides the activity itself?

The verse illustrates the structure of an argument from authority as constructed by Walton, Reed, and Macagno. It starts with the major premise, which demonstrates that statements coming from a credible authority are broadly accepted as true. The minor premise establishes that the authority in question is highly reliable and has made the claim. In light of this, the conclusion implies that the claim should be approved. The critical questions corroborate that when the authority is reliable, acceptance of the claim is logically needed. The organization evidently reveals how reliance on a trustworthy source constitutes the basis of reasoning in this type of argument.

"قَالُوا أَتَتَّخِذُنَا هُزُوًا ۖ قَالَ أَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ أَنْ أَكُونَ مِنَ الْجَاهِلِينَ" (البقرة: ٦٧)

This excerpt of the verse underscores the reaction of the people of Moses when they were received a divine command. In place of responding with trust, they supposed that Moses was mocking them. Their response indicates a lack of knowledge and understanding, guiding them to make an unfounded judgment. Moses refutes this implication by pursuing refuge in God from being among the ignorant. To construct a more effective argument , this indicates the form of ignorance, in cases where a conclusion is obtained based on an absence of evidence or comprehension rather than reliable evidence. The people supposed ridicule simply because they did not understand the wisdom behind the command, clarifying how ignorance can contribute to incorrect conclusions.

3.1 Argument Scheme (Walton, Reed & Macagno)

3.1.1Application Example

Major Premise	If no clear explanation is known → assume the claim is false or mocking
Minor Premise	The people did not understand the

	command
Conclusion	Therefore, they assumed Moses was mocking them

Table 3: Applied example of Argument from Ignorance

3.2 Critical Questions

CQ1: Is the lack of comprehension real or just supposed?

CQ2: Does absence of clarification support drawing a adverse conclusion?

CQ3: Are there variant explanations for the instruction that were overlooked?

The above verse presents the structure of an argument from ignorance as designed by Walton, Reed, and Macagno. It initiates with the major premise, which depends on the absence of evidence as a foundation for reasoning. The minor premise determines that such absence of knowledge occurs in the particular case. on this basis, a conclusion is derived, even though it is not effectively justified. The organization plainly confirms how lack of knowledge can contribute to weak or fallacious reasoning.

"قَالُوا ادْعُ لَنَا رَبَّكَ يُبَيِّن لَّنَا مَا هِيَ ۚ قَالَ إِنَّهُ يَقُولُ إِنَّهَا بَقَرَةٌ صَفْرَاءُ فَاقِعٌ لَّوْنُهَا تَسُرُّ النَّاظِرِينَ"
(البقرة: ٦٩)

In this excerpt ,the verse provides an extension of the dialogue between Prophet Moses and his people regarding the instruction to slaughter a cow. In the initial section, the people seek further clarification about the nature of the cow, exhibiting a process of questioning to reduce uncertainty. In the second section, Moses delivers a clear distinction based on divine revelation, characterizing the cow as bright yellow in color. In terms of argumentative

structure, the first section uncovers an argument from questioning, in situation where analysis is employed to pursue clarification and decline ambiguity before endorsing a claim. The next section represents the form of authority, as the reaction is drawing on an argument from an accurate and ultimate power—God—generating the description expert and verifiable.

4.1 Argument Scheme (Walton, Reed & Macagno)

4.1.1 Application Example

Major Premise	Unclear command → requires clarification
Minor Premise	The people did not know what kind of cow
Conclusion	They asked for clarification

Table 4 : Applied example of Argument from Questioning

4.1.2 Application Example

Major Premise	Divine statement → must be accepted
Minor Premise	God describes the cow as yellow
Conclusion	The description is accepted as true

Table 5: Applied example of Argument from Authority

4.2 Critical Questions

CQ1: Is the ambiguity genuine or generated through exorbitant questioning?

CQ2: Does this provide further clarification essential for inferring the action?

CQ3: Does the power advance a final and sufficient reaction to clarify uncertainty?

As shown in the previous verses, the results depict a combined type of argument from questioning and argument from authority as designed by Walton, Reed, and Macagno. In essence ,it begins with the

questioning part, where ambiguity leads to inquiry in order to extract more precise information. This is superseded by the authority part, where the explanation is issued by a dependable and reliable evidence.Thereafter , the critical questions stress whether the questioning is vital and whether the authoritative rejoinder is appropriate.

"وَإِذِ اسْتَسْقَىٰ مُوسَىٰ لِقَوْمِهِ فَقُلْنَا اضْرِب بِّعَصَاكَ الْحَجَرَ فَانفَجَرَتْ مِنْهُ اثْنَتَا عَشْرَةَ عَيْنًا ۖ قَدْ عَلِمَ كُلُّ أُنَاسٍ مَّشْرَبَهُمْ ۖ كُلُوا وَاشْرَبُوا مِن رِّزْقِ اللَّهِ وَلَا تَعْثَوْا فِي الْأَرْضِ مُفْسِدِينَ" (البقرة: ٦٠)

The sacred text outlines a miraculous case in which Prophet Moses queried for water for his followers, and God mandated him to hit a rock with his staff, provoking twelve springs to pour forth. In simpler terms,this event stands as an influential sign of divine capacity and provision, confirming that what appears impossible in spontaneous terms can materialize by God's will. In the process of argument construction, this can be acknowledged as an argument from sign, where the exceptional case works as a sign highlighting a more profound reality—specifically, the existence and involvement of divine strength. In consequence, the miracle is not only an actual event but also proof intended to facilitate conviction and comprehension.

5.1 Argument Scheme (Walton, Reed & Macagno)

5.1.1 Application Example

Major Premise	Water from rock → sign of divine power
Minor Premise	Water flowed from the rock
Conclusion	Indicates the power of God

Table 6 :Applied example of Argument from sign

5.1.3 Critical Questions

CQ1: Does the sign suggest a credible signal of divine ability?

CQ2: Do alternative methods exist for the identified event?

CQ3: What Is the connection between the sign and divine contribution effective enough to expound the conclusion?

To clarify , the verse demonstrates the structure of an argument from sign as formulated by Walton, Reed, and Macagno. It starts with the major premise, which creates a general rule that if a certain sign (A) is observed, it generally reveals a particular conclusion or underlying reality (B). The minor premise then states that this specific sign (A) is indeed present in the given case. Based on these two premises, the argument contributes to a conclusion that (B) is likely true. The critical questions facilitate evaluate whether the signal is strong and reliable enough to corroborate the conclusion that divine authority is responsible for the situation. The arrangement of the table, moving from the general rule to a specific observation and then to a conclusion, clearly demonstrates how the sign is used to support an inference about something not directly observed.

"قَالُوا ادْعُ لَنَا رَبَّكَ يُبَيِّن لَّنَا مَا هِيَ ۚ إِنَّ الْبَقَرَ تَشَابَهَ عَلَيْنَا ۖ وَإِنَّا إِن شَاءَ اللَّهُ لَمُهْتَدُونَ"
(البقرة: ٧٠)

In the cited verse, this line proceeds the exchange between Prophet Moses and his people as they remain in asking for additional clarification about the cow. They support their request by arguing that the cows seem similar to them, which generates confusion and uncertainty. This demonstrates a reasoning process established on ambiguity, where lack of distinction guides them to seek more precise data.Within the framework of argumentation , their statement reveals a form of argument from questioning, as they urge for the sake of clarity due to their inability to differentiate between options. By contrast, the predicted response from Moses is rooted in argument from authority, as he offers clarification derived on divine revelation. This contrast emphasizes the difference between human uncertainty and dependence on divine and authoritative knowledge.

6.1 Argument Scheme (Walton, Reed & Macagno)

6.1.1 Application Example (Questioning Phase)

Major Premise	Similar things → create confusion → need clarification
Minor Premise	The cows appear similar
Conclusion	The people ask for more details

Table 7 :Applied example of Argument from Questioning

6.1.2 Application Example (Authority Phase)

Major Premise	Divine explanation → must be accepted
Minor Premise	God clarifies through Moses
Conclusion	The final answer is authoritative

Table 8 :Applied example of Argument from Authority

6.2 Critical Questions

CQ1: Is the observed similarity a valid explanation for further questioning?

CQ2: Does the uncertainty sincerely prevent action, or is it excessive ambiguity?

CQ3: Is the authoritative elaboration acceptable to resolve the ambiguity entirely?

The above verse indicates a combined structure of argument from questioning and argument from authority as formulated by Walton, Reed, and Macagno. It introduces with a situation of ambiguity, where similarity between options produces to confusion and the need for further investigation. This is applied by dependence on an authoritative source to solve the uncertainty. The critical questions demonstrate whether the uncertainty is grounded and whether the authoritative reaction is sufficient to solve it. The organization evidently indicates

how human doubt and lack of knowledge are examined through authoritative clarification, contributing to a justified conclusion.

"وَلَقَدْ آتَيْنَا مُوسَى الْكِتَابَ وَقَفَّيْنَا مِن بَعْدِهِ بِالرُّسُلِ وَآتَيْنَا عِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ الْبَيِّنَاتِ وَأَيَّدْنَاهُ بِرُوحِ الْقُدُسِ ۗ أَفَكُلَّمَا جَاءَكُمْ رَسُولٌ بِمَا لَا تَهْوَىٰ أَنفُسُكُمُ اسْتَكْبَرْتُمْ فَفَرِيقًا كَذَّبْتُمْ وَفَرِيقًا تَقْتُلُونَ" (البقرة: ٨٧).

Within this verse,it underscores the ongoing sequence of divine revelation dispatched through Prophet Moses and the messengers who emulated him, including Jesus. It highlights that these messages were corroborated by clear signs and divine authority. In spite of this, many people reacted with arrogance, refusing or even opposing the messengers when their teachings clashed with personal desires.From an analytical standpoint , this sacred text illustrates an argument from authority, denoting the idea where the reality of the message is rooted in its source—God, transmitted through his prophets. The constant sending of messengers upgrades the credibility of the idea, yet the rejection by people typifies a failure to precisely recognize legitimate power.

7.1 Argument Scheme (Walton, Reed & Macagno)

7.1.1 Application Example

Major Premise	Messages from God through prophets → must be accepted
Minor Premise	Moses, Jesus, and other prophets delivered God's message
Conclusion	Therefore, their message is true and authoritative

Table 9: applied example of Argument from Authority

7.1.3 Critical Questions

CQ1: To what extent are the prophets generally accepted as credible and legitimate sources of divine power?

CQ2: How do the signals and proofs appropriate to display their credibility?

CQ3: Does personal refusal founded on desire weaken the authority of the message?

The preceding tables illustrate the structure of an argument from authority as created by Walton, Reed, and Macagno. It commences with the major premise, which confirms that reliable authorities furnish trustworthy data. The minor premise supports that the prophets are such authorities, reinforced by divine revelation and evident signs. On this basis, the conclusion ensues that their message should be approved. The critical questions emphasize the power of prophetic authority and the challenge of rejecting it founded on personal preference. The organization obviously illustrates how authority, especially when consistent and divinely corroborated, functions as a strong framework for reasoning and belief.

" يَا بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ اذْكُرُوا نِعْمَتِيَ الَّتِي أَنْعَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ وَأَنِّي فَضَّلْتُكُمْ عَلَى الْعَالَمِينَ" (سورة البقرة: ٤٧).

The current verse is a divine address guided to Bani Israel, recalling them of the advantages and blessings awarded to them by God, covering their special status among other countries. To put it differently ,the verse creates a reminder based on divine authority, highlighting that their advantaged position is not internally derived but granted by God. In terms of argumentation, this reveals an argument from authority, where the notion of superiority and blessing is supported by the greatest possible authority. Because the statement derives from divine revelation, it conveys binding authority , requires recognition and reflection.

8.1 Argument Scheme (Walton, Reed & Macagno)

8.1.1 Application Example

مجلة الدراسات المستدامة
P-ISSN(Print) : 2663-2284
E-ISSN(online): 2663-7413
السنة (٨) المجلد (٨) العدد (٤) تشرين الأول . لسنة ٢٠٢٦م - ١٤٤٨ هـ

Major Premise	Statements from God → are unquestionably true
Minor Premise	God states He favored the Children of Israel
Conclusion	Therefore, their special status is acknowledged as true

Table 10 :applied example of Argument from Authority

8.1.3 Critical Questions

CQ1: Is the authority (God) deemed infallible and completely reliable?

CQ2: Is the statement obviously offered as divine affirmation rather than judgment?

CQ3: Does endorsement of authority demand any additional reasoning beyond revelation?

The present tables represent the structure of an argument from authority as formulated by Walton, Reed, and Macagno. It opens with the principle that claims from a supreme and unquestionable authority are approved as true. The minor premise verifies that the statement in this instance originates from God. On this basis, the conclusion ensues that the claim must be recognized without doubt. The organization plainly confirms how divine authority serves as the strongest possible foundation for justification and belief.

".وَإِذْ أَخَذْنَا مِيثَاقَكُمْ وَرَفَعْنَا فَوْقَكُمُ الطُّورَ خُذُوا مَا آتَيْنَاكُم بِقُوَّةٍ وَاسْمَعُوا قَالُوا سَمِعْنَا وَعَصَيْنَا وَأُشْرِبُوا فِي قُلُوبِهِمُ الْعِجْلَ بِكُفْرِهِمْ قُلْ بِئْسَمَا يَأْمُرُكُم بِهِ إِيمَانُكُمْ إِن كُنتُم مُّؤْمِنِينَ"

(سورة البقرة: ٩٣)

The cited verse illustrates the breaking of a religious covenant by Bani Israel, despite the apparent command and warning provided to them. Namely ,they were directed to obey and admit what had been indicated, yet they replied with disobedience and variation. As a result of their rejection, their hearts became included to falsehood, represented by the calf, revealing the moral and spiritual outcomes of

turning away from divine instruction.within argumentative discourse, this indicates an argument from consequences, where the negative spiritual result is applied to examine and condemn the action. The verse also indirectly conveys an argument from authority, since the commands arise from God, creating obedience obligatory and disobedience unsupported.

8.1 Argument Scheme (Walton, Reed & Macagno)

8.1.2 Application Example

Major Premise	Divine command → must be followed
Minor Premise	The people were commanded to obey but disobeyed
Conclusion	Therefore, they fell into moral and spiritual corruption

Table 11 :Applied example of Argument from Authority

8.1.3 Critical Questions (Walton et al., 2008)

CQ1: Is the authority (God) dependable and lawful for delivering commands?

CQ2: Was the command obviously conveyed to the audience in this verse?

CQ3: Does the noncompliance ("we hear and disobey") influence the strength of the argument from authority?

In the given example , the table depicted a combined structure of argument from authority and consequences. It introduced with the principle that divine commands carry obligatory force due to their authoritative source. It then illustrates that violating these commands leads to negative consequences. The critical questions emphasize the strength of divine requirement and the causal correlation between disobedience and misconduct. The organization clearly demonstrates how authority establishes what should be done, while consequences explain the result of failing to comply.

"وَقَالَ لَهُمْ نَبِيُّهُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ قَدْ بَعَثَ لَكُمْ طَالُوتَ مَلِكًا ۚ قَالُوا أَنَّىٰ يَكُونُ لَهُ الْمُلْكُ عَلَيْنَا وَنَحْنُ أَحَقُّ بِالْمُلْكِ مِنْهُ وَلَمْ يُؤْتَ سَعَةً مِّنَ الْمَالِ ۚ قَالَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفَاهُ عَلَيْكُمْ وَزَادَهُ بَسْطَةً فِي الْعِلْمِ وَالْجِسْمِ ۖ وَاللَّهُ يُؤْتِي مُلْكَهُ مَن يَشَاءُ ۚ وَاللَّهُ وَاسِعٌ عَلِيمٌ" (البقرة: ٢٤٧)

This verse offers a disagreement between the Bani Israel and their prophet regarding the installation of Saul as a king. The people refuse his leadership because he does not satisfy their social criteria, especially wealth and position. Their judgment is grounded on personal norms rather than divine choice. The prophet replies by explaining that kingship is informed on God's choice, not human priority, and that Saul has been conferred superiority in knowledge and physical power.

9.1 Argument Scheme (Walton, Reed & Macagno)

9.1.2 Application Example

Major Premise	If God selects a ruler → his authority is valid and must be accepted
Minor Premise	God has selected Saul as king
Conclusion	Therefore, Saul's leadership is valid

Table 12 :Applied example of Argument from Authority

9.1.3 Critical Questions

CQ1: Is God regarded a reliable and undeniable authority?

CQ2: Does the verse unambiguously exhibit that the designation is divine rather than human choice?

CQ3: Is there any accurate reason to refute divine selection founded on social standards?

To begin with,this verse clarifies a clear conflict between human thinking and divine authority. Bani Israel refute Saul's kingship derived on wealth and social condition, while the prophet verifies that leadership is established by God's choice. In Walton, Reed, and Macagno's (2008) structure, this is an argument from authority, where the validity of a claim dependent on the authority of the source. That is to say,the critical questions affirm that divine authority is considered as

absolute, and that social attitude is not a accurate basis for dismissing God's decision. Hence, the argument confirms the conclusion that legitimate authority is recognized through divine choice rather than human evaluation.

"كُلُّ الطَّعَامِ كَانَ حِلًّا لِّبَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ إِلَّا مَا حَرَّمَ إِسْرَائِيلُ عَلَىٰ نَفْسِهِ مِن قَبْلِ أَن تُنَزَّلَ التَّوْرَاةُ ۗ قُلْ فَأْتُوا بِالتَّوْرَاةِ فَاتْلُوهَا إِن كُنتُمْ صَادِقِينَ" (آل عمران: ٩٣)

The cited verse explains that food was primarily permissible for Bani Israel, except for what Prophet Jacob (Israel) had directly forbidden to himself before the disclosure of the Torah. This reveals that the restriction was not element of divine legislation, but a personal activity that was later misinterpreted as religious law.Hence, the verse modifies this misunderstanding by differentiating between divine instruction and individual application.

10.1 Argument Scheme (Walton, Reed & Macagno)

10.1.1 Application Example

Major Premise	If something is not forbidden by divine revelation → it remains lawful
Minor Premise	Food was only personally restricted by Israel, not by God
Conclusion	Therefore, the food remained lawful for the Children of Israel

Table 13:Applied example of Argument from Authority

10.1.2 Critical Questions

CQ1: Is divine disclosure the only legitimate reference of legal prohibition?

CQ2: Does the verse plainly distinguish between personal limitation and divine law?

CQ3: Can personal activities of prophets be evaluated mandatory law without revelation?

To argue effectively, the above verse institutes a distinction between personal application and divine legislation. Bani Israel improperly supposed that a personal limitation by Prophet Jacob illustrated divine law. Nevertheless , the verse explains that only divine disclosure has authority in establishing what is legal or illegal.Namely, in Walton, Reed, and Macagno's (2008) model, this is an argument from authority, where legitimacy is rooted strictly in divine order. The critical questions support that personal steps do not form binding law, and therefore only what God directly prohibits can be regardeded illegal.

4.Results and Discussion

The types of arguments revealed in the data under study are summarized in Table 14 below :

Argumentatin schemes	Frequency	Percentage
Authority	5	50 %
Questioning	2	20%
Consequences	1	10%
Ignorance	1	10%
sign	1	10%

Table 14: Frequency and Percentage of Argument Types

To sum up ,the preceding table demonstrates that the argument from authority was the most commonly employed type in the examined data,illustrating 50% of the total cases .Questioning arguments emerged second with 20% ,while consequences,ignorance , and sign arguments each indicated 10% .That is to say ,these findings reveal that argument from authority were more predominant than other argument types in the sampled data .

5.Conclusion

Based on the results of the study,the present study has reveald that the argument from authority performs an essential role in the reasoing and discourse .As mentioned previously , the analysis exposed that the

argument from authority were the most frequently employed form in the selectef data , which reflects the significant influence of expert opinion in reinforcing claims and persuading readers.Besides , the study highlighted that the effectiveness of such arguments relies on widely on the credibility and relevance of the authority included.Consequently , while argument from authority may function as reasonable and persuasive types of argumentation , they can also become erroneous when unsupported or employed inappropriately. In general, the findings emphasize the importance of analytically assessing authority _based claims within academic and public discourse.

References

1. Copi, I. M., & Cohen, C. (2009). Introduction to logic (13th ed.). Pearson.
2. Cummings, L. (2015). Reasoning and public health. Springer.
3. Godden, D., & Walton, D. (2007). Advances in the theory of argumentation schemes and critical questions. Informal Logic, 27(3), 267–292.
4. Hurley, P. J. (2008). A concise introduction to logic (10th ed.). Wadsworth.
5. Locke, J. (1996). An essay concerning human understanding. Hackett Publishing. (Original work published 1690)
6. Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2004). A systematic theory of argumentation: The pragma-dialectical approach. Cambridge University Press.
7. Walton, D. (1989). Informal logic: A handbook for critical argumentation. Cambridge University Press.
8. Walton, D. (1995). A pragmatic theory of fallacy. University of Alabama Press.

9. Walton, D. (1996). Argumentation schemes for presumptive reasoning. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
10. Walton, D. (1997). Appeal to expert opinion: Arguments from authority. Penn State Press.
11. Walton, D. (2005). Fundamentals of critical argumentation. Cambridge University Press.
12. Walton, D., & Reed, C. (2001). Argumentation schemes and enthymemes. Synthese, 127(1–2), 93–124.
13. Walton, D., & Sartor, G. (2013). Teleological reasoning in practical argumentation. Artificial Intelligence and Law, 21(2), 151–178.
14. Walton, D., Reed, C., & Macagno, F. (2008). Argumentation schemes. Cambridge University Press.
15. Woods, J., & Walton, D. (1974). Argument from authority. Pennsylvania State University Press.