



Rhetorical and Ideological Strategies in Hani bin Qabishah's Khutbah: An Integrative Aristotelian–Faircloughian Approach

الاستراتيجيات البلاغية والأيدولوجية في خطبة هاني بن قبيصة:

مقاربة تكاملية أرسطية–فركلافية

Dinnan Nadiyah Fairuz^{1*}, Zaqiatul Mardiah²

^{1,2}Universitas Al-Azhar Indonesia, Jakarta

*Corresponding E-mail: dinnannadia@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Although Aristotelian rhetoric and Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) have each been applied to Arabic oratory, prior studies have rarely combined the two frameworks, and none has done so for the pre-Islamic khutbah of Hani bin Qabishah. This article addresses that gap by examining the rhetorical and ideological strategies embedded in the khutbah of Hani bin Qabishah through an integrative framework combining Aristotle's rhetorical theory (ethos, pathos, and logos) and Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). As one of the most well-known pre-Islamic Arabic orations, the khutbah serves not merely as a pre-battle motivational speech but as a discursive practice that constructs social values and legitimizes tribal authority. Employing a qualitative descriptive method, this study analyzes the data in three interconnected stages following Fairclough's three-dimensional model – the textual (micro) dimension, discourse practice, and social practice – with each identified rhetorical unit further classified according to Aristotle's categories of ethos, pathos, and logos. The primary data are derived from the text of Hani bin Qabishah's khutbah as compiled by Ahmad Zaki Safwat in *Jamharatu Khutabi al-'Arab fi 'Uṣūr al-'Arabiyyah al-Zāhirah* (vol. 1, p. 37). The analysis demonstrates that pathos plays a dominant role in mobilizing collective emotions through moral oppositions, heroic metaphors, and imperative constructions. Ethos is established through the speaker's moral and military authority as a tribal leader, while logos operates through a form of fatalistic reasoning characteristic of pre-Islamic Arab worldview. From a critical discourse perspective, the khutbah functions as an ideological instrument that reinforces values of courage, honor, and tribal solidarity. This study contributes to Arabic discourse studies by highlighting the analytical potential of integrating classical rhetoric with critical discourse analysis in the study of pre-Islamic Arabic texts. It further underscores the continuity of Arabic oratorical traditions in shaping religious and political discourse in later periods.

Keywords: Rhetoric, critical discourse analysis, ideology, classical Arabic khutbah, Hani bin Qabishah.

مستخلص البحث

على الرغم من أن البلاغة الأرسطية وتحليل الخطاب النقدي عند فيركلوف قد طُبِّقَ كُلُّ منهما على الخطابة العربية، فإن الدراسات السابقة نادرًا ما جمعت بين الإطارين، ولم يُطَبَّقَ هذا الدمج من قبل على خطبة هاني بن قبيصة الجاهلية. وتعالج هذه المقالة هذه الفجوة من خلال دراسة الاستراتيجيات البلاغية والأيدولوجية الكامنة في خطبة هاني بن قبيصة من خلال إطار تكاملي يجمع بين نظرية أرسطو البلاغية (الإيثوس والباثوس واللوغوس) وتحليل الخطاب النقدي عند نورمان فيركلوف. وبوصفها واحدة من أشهر الخطب العربية في العصر الجاهلي، لا تُعدّ هذه الخطبة مجرد خطاب تحفيزي قبل المعركة، بل ممارسة خطابية تُسهم في بناء القيم الاجتماعية وإضفاء الشرعية على السلطة القبلية. وباستخدام المنهج الوصفي الكيفي، يحلّل هذا البحث البيانات عبر ثلاث مراحل مترابطة وفق نموذج فيركلوف ثلاثي الأبعاد -- التحليل النصي، وممارسة الخطاب، والممارسة الاجتماعية -- مع تصنيف كل وحدة بلاغية وفق مقولات أرسطو: الإيثوس والباثوس واللوغوس. وتُستمدّ

Citation:

Fairuz, D. N., & Mardiah, Z. (2026). Rhetorical and Ideological Strategies in Hani bin Qabishah's Khutbah: An Integrative Aristotelian–Faircloughian Approach. *Al-Muyassar: Journal of Arabic Education*, 5 (3), 696–726.

البيانات الأساسية من نص خطبة هاني بن قبيصة كما جمعه أحمد زكي صفوت في كتابه جمهرة خطب العرب في عصور العربية الزاهرة (المجلد الأول، ص. ٣٧). ويكشف التحليل أن البائوس يؤدي دورًا مهمًا في حشد المشاعر الجماعية من خلال المفارقات الأخلاقية والاستعارات البطولية والصيغ الأمرية، بينما يتأسس الإيغوس من خلال السلطة الأخلاقية والعسكرية للمتحدث بوصفه زعيمًا قبليًا، في حين يعمل اللوغوس عبر ضرب من المنطق القدري المميز للتصور الجاهلي للعالم. ومن منظور تحليل الخطاب النقدي، تعمل الخطبة بوصفها أداة إيديولوجية تعزز قيم الشجاعة والشرف والتضامن القبلي. ويسهم هذا البحث في دراسات الخطاب العربي من خلال إبراز الإمكانيات التحليلية لدمج البلاغة الكلاسيكية بتحليل الخطاب النقدي في دراسة النصوص العربية الجاهلية، كما يؤكد استمرارية التقاليد الخطابية العربية في تشكيل الخطاب الديني والسياسي في العصور اللاحقة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: البلاغة، تحليل الخطاب النقدي، الإيديولوجيا، الخطبة العربية الجاهلية، هاني بن قبيصة.

INTRODUCTION

Language plays a fundamental role in shaping social consciousness, constructing collective identity, and legitimizing power relations within a society. In the pre-Islamic Arab tradition, eloquence (*faṣāḥah*) and effective speech were regarded not merely as aesthetic skills but as markers of leadership, wisdom, and social authority (Al-Jahiz, 2003), and classical Arabic rhetoric has since been examined as a discursive practice that is at once aesthetic, ideological, and persuasive (Rahmawati, 2025). Public oratory such as the *khutbah* therefore occupied a strategic position as a communicative medium capable of stirring emotion, shaping moral outlook, and directing collective action (Ajmal & Zainab, 2024).

Aristotelian rhetoric has been widely applied to the Arab tradition as more than an aesthetic device: studies show it functions as a rhetorical system carrying cognitive and ideological dimensions that shape meaning and audience influence (Aristotle, 2007; Tantowi et al., 2025), with *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* forming the foundation for examining how persuasive effect is constructed in speech. Metaphor and simile, as elements of lexis within this framework, demonstrate that classical Arabic possesses a complex expressive structure for representing social reality and cultural values (Charteris-Black, 2021), while diction in classical Arabic oratory often reflects strategies that are ideological as well as aesthetic, particularly in constructing semantic opposition and reinforcing values such as honor and courage (Astuti & Ningrum, 2025; Rahmawati, 2025), consistent with modern stylistic research confirming that such devices carry ideological and persuasive functions beyond mere linguistic beauty (Effendi et al., 2025; Kusuma et al., 2026). The framework's applicability beyond Arabic has likewise been confirmed in analyses of *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* in Indonesian political speeches (Riesardhy & Suryatini, 2024) and in studies of Arabic argumentation that integrate classical logical traditions (Al-Sharafi et al., 2025), consistent with the long-standing attention Arab scholars have paid

to persuasion and argumentative effect since the third century AH (Ajim, 2024).

In contemporary scholarship, critical discourse analyses of Arabic texts show that language systematically reproduces social structures and ideology (Karim, 2024). In pre-Islamic Arab society, particularly during the late Jahiliyyah period (roughly the late sixth to early seventh century CE), khutbahs were frequently delivered at moments of social and military crisis, such as on the eve of war. One of the most celebrated is that of Hani bin Qabishah al-Shaybani, leader of the Bakr bin Wa'il tribe, delivered before the Battle of Dhi Qar (c. 604–611 CE) – a battle regarded as a pivotal moment in pre-Islamic Arab history, marking the first Arab victory over the forces of the Sassanid Persian Empire (Al-Tabari, 1990; Dayf, 1986). In this context, Hani's khutbah served as a moral and ideological call that roused courage, solidarity, and tribal loyalty (Ajmal & Zainab, 2024), consistent with the broader role of *khiṭābah* (public oratory) as an instrument of intertribal negotiation, dispute resolution, and leadership legitimation within pre-Islamic Arab oral tradition (Bijli, 2026; Nur & Hamzah, 2025).

The khutbah of Hani bin Qabishah is widely cited in classical Arabic literature and historiography as an ideal representation of the pre-Islamic heroic ethos; expressions such as *al-maniyyatu walā al-daniyyah* ('death is more fitting than disgrace') recur as a rhetorical formula across classical Arabic literary, historical, and rhetorical texts (Al-Jahiz, 2003; Dayf, 1986; Safwat, 1960). Its enduring popularity suggests that the text carries not only literary value but also represents a living system of values and social ideology (Charteris-Black, 2021). From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, in which language is understood as a social practice that reproduces ideology and power, the khutbah can accordingly be read as a hegemonic discourse that constructs consent-based power – power voluntarily accepted by the audience through internalization of shared moral values, rather than imposed through coercion (Fairclough, 2015; Gramsci, 1971).

Studies of classical Islamic oration show that a khutbah's persuasive power lies not only in its rhetorical beauty but also in its capacity to transform audience attitudes and actions, as seen in numerous influential orations across the classical Islamic tradition (Qutbuddin, 2023), including the Prophet's Farewell Sermon (Khan et al., 2021) and the battle speech of Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād during the conquest of al-Andalus (Atiya, 2025). Recent work on the rhetorical continuity between pre-Islamic poetry and the Qur'an further

confirms that devices such as semantic opposition and concrete imagery remain defining, and still under-examined, features of classical Arabic discourse (Yazar, 2025). Yet research that specifically integrates Aristotelian rhetoric with critical discourse analysis in pre-Islamic khutbah texts remains limited: most existing studies treat stylistic features – including metaphor and diction (Dikwan et al., 2025; Nurfazri & Ardiansyah, 2025; Mahyudi & Qodri, 2021) – descriptively, without connecting them to their ideological function within power or social practice. Fairclough's CDA, which allows the integration of micro-linguistic analysis with macro social context (Fairclough, 2015), has recently begun to be combined with Aristotelian rhetoric in the study of contemporary religious discourse, such as persuasion strategies in multicultural Friday sermons (Aldahmani, 2026) – and in related work on rhetoric within the Islamic tradition (Hasanah, 2021), religious sermons (Razzaq, 2023), and sermon delivery more broadly (Palangyos & Ulla, 2025) – but its application to classical pre-Islamic khutbahs has yet to be undertaken. The khutbah of Hani bin Qabishah itself has received only single, non-integrative attention: a stylistic study of its lexical choices and sentence structures (Al-Musahiri, 2020), and a thesis analyzing it through classical Arabic rhetoric (*balāghah*) alongside six other pre-Islamic orations (Al-Jubeh, 2022), neither of which addresses its ideological function or its role in constructing leadership legitimacy. This gap, combined with the tendency of CDA-based studies to focus on post-Islamic and contemporary religious texts, leaves the integrative analysis of pre-Islamic Arabic khutbahs such as Hani bin Qabishah's open for investigation.

This study therefore addresses that gap by integrating Aristotelian classical rhetoric (ethos, pathos, logos) with a CDA approach to reveal how the rhetorical devices in the khutbah of Hani bin Qabishah function not merely as aesthetic ornamentation, but as instruments for constructing ideology and social legitimation within pre-Islamic Arab society.

The novelty of this integration becomes clear when the strengths and limits of each framework are compared. Aristotelian rhetoric alone excels at identifying a text's persuasive function at the level of ethos, pathos, and logos, but – being fundamentally textual-normative and rooted in the classical Greek tradition – it is not designed to reveal relations of power or connect persuasion to its broader socio-historical context. Fairclough's CDA already encompasses the three dimensions such an analysis requires, including the textual (micro) dimension, yet that dimension is sharpened when

integrated with Aristotle's more precise categories for identifying persuasive strategies at the micro level. Aristotle therefore does not replace Fairclough's textual dimension but strengthens it, while Fairclough's dimensions of discourse practice and social practice remain the primary framework for revealing relations of power and ideology within pre-Islamic Arab society. This mode of integration — rather than reliance on either framework in isolation, as in previous research — constitutes the novelty of the present study.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a descriptive-interpretive qualitative design that integrates Aristotelian classical rhetorical analysis — encompassing ethos, pathos, and logos — with Norman Fairclough's model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This design was chosen because the aim of the research is not to statistically measure the frequency or distribution of linguistic features, but to gain an in-depth understanding of how the rhetorical structure of the khutbah text constructs meaning, generates persuasion, and represents the collective ideology of pre-Islamic Arab society. The descriptive-interpretive approach allows the researcher to read the text in layers, from its lexical and grammatical elements through to the social and ideological content embedded within it.

Operationally, this study follows Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis, comprising the textual dimension (micro-level lexical, grammatical, and rhetorical features), discourse practice (the production, distribution, and consumption of the text), and social practice (the ideological context and power relations the text reflects and reproduces) (Fairclough, 2015). At each of these three dimensions, the rhetorical strategies identified are further classified according to Aristotle's categories of ethos, pathos, and logos, so that the analysis captures not only how the text persuades linguistically but also how that persuasion functions discursively and ideologically within pre-Islamic Arab society.

The data source for this study is the text of the khutbah delivered by Hani bin Qabishah al-Shaybani before the Battle of Dhi Qar. The text is drawn from the version compiled by Ahmad Zaki Safwat in *Jamharatu Khutabi al-'Arab fi 'Uṣūr al-'Arabiyyah al-Zāhirah* (Vol. 1, p. 37). Although this text has undergone transmission and recodification within the Arabic literary tradition, and is thus philologically more accurately classified as a secondary source, Safwat's version retains authoritative value owing to its

established status as an academic reference in the study of classical Arabic literature and rhetoric. Within a discourse-studies framework, the use of a well-documented text remains a legitimate object of analysis, since the focus of this research lies in the linguistic structure and meaning represented in the text, rather than the verbatim historical authenticity of its original utterance. Quantitatively, the khutbah text analyzed is short: a single paragraph occupying one page (p. 37) of the primary source, consisting of eight rhetorical sentences totaling approximately 45 words in Arabic.

Data were collected through documentation and library research techniques. The khutbah text was traced and copied directly from the printed edition of *Jamharat Khutab al-'Arab*, then transcribed and provided with Latin transliteration to facilitate analysis. Each unit of the khutbah was read repeatedly to identify relevant rhetorical units, such as antithetical structures, concise formulas, fatalistic expressions, metaphors, and imperative forms, which were then recorded along with the context of their occurrence within the text as a whole.

In this study, a single data unit is defined as one clause or rhetorical sentence containing one complete, independently analyzable persuasive strategy – rather than being defined by general paragraph or sub-theme divisions, given that the khutbah text physically consists of only a single paragraph (see the quantitative data in the preceding paragraph). Through repeated reading, seven data units were identified and classified into four major rhetorical strategies: (1) moral antithesis, comprising two data units (Data 1–2); (2) fatalistic rationality, comprising two data units (Data 3–4); (3) heroic metaphor, comprising two data units (Data 5–6); and (4) collective imperative, comprising one data unit (Data 7). These seven data units are numbered sequentially in the Result and Discussion section to facilitate tracing and cross-referencing.

Data analysis was conducted by combining the Aristotelian rhetorical framework with Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis. In the first stage, the identified rhetorical units were analyzed at the textual dimension, encompassing lexical choice, grammatical structure, and sound patterns, in order to determine their rhetorical function as ethos, pathos, or logos. In the subsequent stage, these findings were analyzed at the dimension of discourse practice by tracing the context of production, distribution, and consumption of the khutbah as an oral utterance later codified within the Arabic literary tradition. In the final stage, the analysis was

directed toward the dimension of social practice, to reveal how these rhetorical strategies reflect and reproduce the values of honor, courage, and tribal solidarity within the social structure of pre-Islamic Arab society. These three stages were carried out continuously, so that findings at the textual level were consistently connected to the broader discourse context and social structure, before being drawn together into conclusions regarding the overall ideological function of the khutbah.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The khutbah reads as follows:

يَا مَعْشَرَ بَكْرٍ، هَالِكٌ مَعْدُورٌ خَيْرٌ مِنْ نَاجٍ فَرُورٍ، إِنَّ الْحَذَرَ لَا يُنْجِي مِنَ الْقَدَرِ، وَإِنَّ الصَّبْرَ مِنْ
أَسْبَابِ الظَّفَرِ، الْمَنِيَّةُ وَلَا الدَّنِيَّةُ، اسْتِقْبَالُ الْمَوْتِ خَيْرٌ مِنْ اسْتِدْبَارِهِ، الطَّعْنُ فِي ثَغْرِ النُّحُورِ أَكْرَمُ
مِنْهُ فِي الْأَعْجَازِ وَالظُّهُورِ، يَا آلَ بَكْرٍ، قَاتِلُوا فَمَا لِلْمَنَآيَا مِنْ بُدٍّ.

/Yā ma'shara Bakr, hālikun ma'dhūrun khayrun min nājin farūrin, inna al-ḥadhara lā yunji mina al-qadar, wa inna aṣ-ṣabra min asbābi az-ẓafar, al-maniyyatu wa lā ad-daniyyah, istiqbālu al-mawti khayrun min istidbāriḥ, aṭ-ṭa'nu fi thaghri an-nuḥūr akramu minhu fī al-a'jāzi wa az-ẓuhūr, yā āla Bakr, qātilū fa-mā lil-manāyā min budd./

'O people of Bakr...

to die with just cause is better than to live in flight; indeed, caution cannot save one from destiny, and steadfastness is among the causes of victory; death (with honor), not disgrace; to face death is better than to flee from it; a wound to the front of the throat is nobler than one to the back; O family of Bakr, fight, for there is no escape from death.'

Table 1. Data Excerpts, Translations, and Rhetorical Strategies in the Khutbah of Hani bin Qabishah

No.	Original Text (Arabic)	Translation	Rhetorical Strategy	CDA Dimension Emphasized
1	هَالِكٌ مَعْدُورٌ خَيْرٌ مِنْ نَاجٍ فَرُورٍ	'One who perishes with just cause is better than one who is saved by fleeing.'	Moral Antithesis	Text, Discursive Practice & Social Practice (all three)
2	الْمَنِيَّةُ وَلَا الدَّنِيَّةُ	'Death (with honor), not disgrace.'	Moral Antithesis	Text, Discursive Practice & Social Practice (all three)
3	إِنَّ الْحَذَرَ لَا يُنْجِي مِنَ الْقَدَرِ	'Indeed, caution cannot save one from destiny.'	Fatalistic Rationality	Text, Discursive Practice & Social Practice (all three)
4	وَإِنَّ الصَّبْرَ مِنْ أَسْبَابِ الظَّفَرِ	'And indeed, steadfastness is among the causes of victory.'	Fatalistic Rationality	Text, Discursive Practice & Social Practice

				(all three)
5	استقبال الموت خير من استدباره	'To face death is better than to flee from it.'	Heroic Metaphor	Text, Discursive Practice & Social Practice (all three)
6	الطعن في ثغر النحور أكرم منه في الأعجاز والظهور	'A wound to the front of the throat is nobler than one to the back.'	Heroic Metaphor	Text, Discursive Practice & Social Practice (all three)
7	يا آل بكر، قاتلوا فما للمنايا من بدّ	'O family of Bakr, fight, for there is no escape from death.'	Collective Imperative	Text, Discursive Practice & Social Practice (all three)

Source: Processed by the researcher (2026) based on the analysis of the khutbah text of Hani bin Qabishah.

This section presents the results of the rhetorical and ideological analysis of Hani bin Qabishah's khutbah, following the three-dimensional procedure outlined in the Methods section above. At the level of discourse practice, the khutbah is understood as a text produced amid a crisis on the eve of war, delivered orally by a tribal leader to the members of his collective, and consumed as a form of moral legitimation that spurred collective action. The production and reproduction of this text continued through its codification in classical literary works such as *Jamharat Khuṭab al-'Arab*, which made it part of a discursive tradition that continues to be transmitted.

At the level of social practice, meanwhile, the khutbah reflects the value structure of pre-Islamic Arab society, which placed honor (*'ird*), courage (*shajā'ah*), and tribal solidarity (*'aṣabiyyah*) at the center of social life. The discourse constructed in the khutbah is not neutral; rather, it functions as an ideological instrument that legitimizes acts of war and reinforces power relations grounded in tribal leadership. The analysis of the text's rhetorical structure thus reveals not only linguistic features but also how language shapes and reproduces the social order and collective ideology of that period (Fairclough, 2015; Khan, 2025). Recent research on pre-Islamic and early Islamic Arabic poetry further confirms that *'aṣabiyyah* is not merely a sociological backdrop but directly shapes the thematic and rhetorical structure of a text, including in the context of the *Ayyām al-'Arab*, such as the Battle of Dhi Qar that occasioned Hani bin Qabishah's khutbah (Aslan & Araz, 2026).

Based on this text, several major rhetorical strategies were identified.

Moral Antithesis as the Dominant Structure

The opening of the khutbah (Data 1):

هَالِكٌ مَعْدُورٌ خَيْرٌ مِنْ نَاجٍ فَرُورٌ

At the textual level, the expression *hālikun ma'dhūrun khayrun min nājin farūrin* displays a non-neutral choice of diction, particularly in its use of the words *hālik* (هَالِكٌ) and *nājin* (نَاجٍ). Lexically, *hālik* does not simply mean 'one who has died,' but carries a nuance of total destruction or ruin, giving it a negative semantic connotation. *Nājin*, by contrast, refers to 'one who is saved,' which in ordinary usage carries a positive connotation.

To ensure that this interpretation is not merely the researcher's intuition, the lexical meaning of both words was further verified through the dictionary *Al-Mu'jam al-Wasīṭ*. In this dictionary, *hālik* (هَالِكٌ), as an *ism fā'il* from the root *h-l-k*, is defined as 'the one who is damaged' (Majma' al-Lughah al-'Arabiyyah, 1960), while *nājin* (نَاجٍ), as an *ism fā'il* from the root *n-j-w*, is defined as 'the one who is saved' (Majma' al-Lughah al-'Arabiyyah, 1960). At this level, the meaning of both words remains literal, appearing as a simple binary pair: one denoting destruction, the other denoting safety.

This lexical meaning, however, cannot be separated from the context of its utterance. This khutbah was delivered by Hani bin Qabishah before the Battle of Dhi Qar, at a moment of collective crisis demanding his people's readiness for battle. In such a context of war, *hālik* no longer simply means 'to perish' in a general sense, but refers specifically to a body destroyed, gravely wounded, or fallen in battle. In other words, the meaning of this word is contextual rather than purely lexical: the dictionary provides its base meaning, while the situation of war lends it a concrete referent — death or physical destruction on the battlefield.

Outside the context of this khutbah, both words carry clear and opposing values under ordinary logic. *Hālik* (perishing) carries negative value, associated with defeat and non-existence, while *nājin* (being saved) carries positive value, associated with success and survival. Were this ordinary logic to prevail among the audience, safety would always be considered preferable to destruction.

In this construction, however, a reversal of value occurs (*semantic inversion*), whereby *hālik* is in fact legitimized through the attribute *ma'zūr* (معدور), while *nājin* is discredited through the attribute *farūr* (فرور). The opposition constructed is thus not simply between 'death' and 'safety,' but between two subjects who have been assigned contradictory evaluative weight.

This choice of diction shows that the text does not operate at the level of literal meaning, but at an evaluative level that actively shifts audience perception. The word *hālik*, inherently negative, is reconstructed as positive through moral legitimation, while *nājin*, inherently positive, is instead degraded through its association with flight.

This reversal of value operates concretely through the function of two adjectives attached to each noun. The adjective *ma'dhūr* (معدور) reinforces the legitimacy of *hālik*: the destruction in question is not a futile death, but an honorable one, accompanied by a just cause — the struggle to defend one's people. *Farūr* (فرور), conversely, assigns negative weight to *nājin*: the safety in question is not honorable safety, but a disgraceful survival obtained by fleeing from battle, which within the value system of pre-Islamic Arab society was tantamount to cowardice.

By tracing the five stages above — lexical meaning, contextualization within the situation of war, the ordinary value of these meanings, the reversal of value at the discourse level, and finally the function of the accompanying adjectives — it can be concluded that, within the context of this khutbah, 'perishing' is in fact construed as more honorable than 'being saved,' so long as that destruction occurs through a struggle grounded in just cause. This is the form of semantic inversion: a reversal of the ordinary lexical value hierarchy, built up gradually and contextually, rather than resting on the personal opinion of either the orator or the researcher.

From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, this strategy reflects a non-neutral practice of representation, in which language is used to construct a particular social reality through the manipulation of lexical value. In this way, the text does not merely convey a message, but also guides the audience toward accepting a particular moral frame as something natural.

The comparative structure '*khayrun min*' narrows the audience's choice to two opposing poles of value. This strategy foregrounds a binary pattern in constructing an ethos of courage, known in rhetorical studies as an oppositional technique for reinforcing persuasion (Aristotle, 2007; Charteris-Black, 2021). This kind of oppositional pattern is consistent with the principle of antithesis in Aristotelian rhetoric, which reinforces the persuasive force of logos through the contrast of meaning and opposing propositions (Aristotle, 2007; Rahmawati, 2025).

From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, this antithetical structure functions not only as a rhetorical device at the textual level, but also carries dimensions of discourse practice and social practice. At the level of discourse practice, this binary opposition cannot be separated from the processes of production, distribution, and consumption of the text, as proposed by Fairclough. This khutbah text was produced within a context of persuasive communication demanding high rhetorical effectiveness, making the strategy of simplifying meaning through extreme opposition a functional choice.

From an interdiscursive standpoint, the use of antithesis in this way demonstrates a connection to the classical rhetorical tradition as formulated by Aristotle, which relies on semantic contrast (antithesis) as a tool of logos-based persuasion. This indicates that the text does not stand autonomously, but adopts and reproduces discursive practices that were already well established.

Intertextually, meanwhile, the construction of opposition between destruction (*hālik*) and safety (*nājin*), now evaluatively redefined, shows how the text draws on associations of meaning already familiar within society, then modifies them for persuasive purposes. This process shows that meaning is not created from nothing, but negotiated through an existing network of texts and discourses.

Within the framework of ideational function, this binary opposition represents social reality in a simplified and polarized form, thereby limiting the range of possible audience interpretation. This representation is not neutral, but directed toward shaping a particular worldview that supports a specific orientation of collective action.

At the level of social practice, meanwhile, the antithetical construction in the expressions *hālikun ma'dhūrun* and *nājin farūrin* both reflects and reproduces the value system of pre-Islamic Arab society, which placed honor as the central principle of its

social structure. The use of the *ism fā'il* form in the words *hālik* (هالك) and *nājin* (ناج) indicates that the subject in the text is represented not as a momentary action, but as an inherent identity.

In this context, an individual is not simply 'dead' or 'saved,' but constructed as 'the one who is damaged' (*hālik*) or 'the one who is saved' (*nājin*) as social categories bearing evaluative consequences. When *hālik* is attached to the attribute *ma'zūr*, it is morally rehabilitated, while *nājin*, paired with *farūr*, instead undergoes delegitimization.

This construction reflects the social condition of pre-Islamic Arab society, in which the identity of courage and honor was collective in nature, attached to the individual as part of the tribe's honor. In the context of intertribal warfare, retreat or self-preservation was viewed not merely as an individual choice, but as a failure to safeguard the honor of the group.

The opposition constructed through this *ism fā'il* form is thus not descriptive but ideological, since it establishes social categories that sharply distinguish subjects worthy of honor from those who are discredited. Within this framework, language functions as a mechanism for reproducing collective values that normalizes courage and stigmatizes the avoidance of conflict, while simultaneously reinforcing the honor-based power structure of that society (Fairclough, 2015; Khan, 2025).

From the perspective of Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis, the antithetical structure in this text does not stop at representing a linguistic choice, but works as a mechanism for restructuring meaning that actively narrows the audience's horizon of interpretation. The opposition between *hālikun ma'dhūrun* and *nājin farūrin* does not merely present two possibilities, but constructs social reality in an already-polarized form, such that alternatives outside that frame become discursively excluded.

At the level of discourse practice, this form reveals a strategy of meaning production that is reductive yet effective, whereby the complexity of the situation of war is reduced to an evaluatively charged binary choice. This reduction is not a weakness, but an ideological strategy for closing off the space for negotiating meaning, so that the audience is directed not to deliberate, but to immediately take a side.

At the level of social practice, meanwhile, this kind of construction functions as a mechanism for internalizing values through symbolic pressure. The individual is

confronted not merely with a choice, but with a consequence for identity: becoming the legitimized *hālik*, or the stigmatized *nājin*. Within this framework, language does not merely reflect an ideology of courage, but produces a subject who submits to the logic of collective honor, such that courage ceases to be an ethical choice and instead becomes a social imperative.

This oppositional pattern is reinforced through a concise formula (Data 2):

المنية ولا الدنية

At the outset, the analysis must carefully distinguish between the phonological and semantic aspects, since the two operate differently yet mutually reinforce one another in producing the discourse's effect.

Phonologically, there is a striking resemblance in sound between *al-maniyyah* (المنية) and *al-daniyyah* (الدنية). Both share an almost identical rhyme pattern, particularly in the shared suffix *-niyyah*, as well as similar syllabic rhythm. The only difference lies in the initial consonants /m/ and /d/, while the remaining sound structure runs parallel. This resemblance creates a euphonic effect while also facilitating memorization and oral reproduction, both of which are crucial in an oral communicative context such as a khutbah.

This phonological similarity is not merely aesthetic, but also functions as a rhetorical strategy: by bringing two words phonetically closer together, the text implicitly 'pairs' two concepts that are in fact opposed. In other words, this closeness in sound is used precisely to underscore a difference in meaning.

Turning to the semantic aspect, the two words occupy opposing semantic fields. *Al-maniyyah* refers to death as an existential inevitability, while *al-daniyyah* refers to disgrace, or the debasement of one's worth within the social order. This difference is not only lexical but also evaluative, since each word carries a weight of value within the community's cultural system.

What is crucial, however, is that the text does not merely present two different meanings, but connects them through the negating structure *wa lā*, which explicitly rejects *al-daniyyah* as an option. The semantic relation thus constructed is not neutral but hierarchical: death is accepted as a legitimate possibility, while disgrace is eliminated as a choice.

Viewed from a discourse perspective, this combination of phonological proximity and semantic opposition produces a powerful persuasive effect. The audience does not merely understand the difference in meaning rationally, but also ‘feels’ this contrast through a repeated and easily memorable sound pattern.

Only at this point can it be seen that this structure functions to build an ideological frame: not by directly asserting that honor outweighs life, but by conditioning the audience to accept that relation as something that feels natural, through the fusion of sound and meaning.

Fatalistic Rationality as Logical Justification

The expression (Data 3):

إن الحذر لا ينجي من القدر

Before turning to a more technical grammatical analysis, this expression should first be explained simply so that its meaning is easily grasped. Literally, *al-ḥaḍar* means ‘caution’ or ‘being careful,’ *al-qadar* means ‘destiny,’ and *yunjī* means ‘to save.’ Put simply, then, this sentence means: ‘caution alone will not save a person from their destiny.’

In the context of this khutbah, this sentence is addressed to warriors who might feel hesitant or afraid to advance into battle. The orator wishes to convey: there is no use hiding or avoiding battle out of fear of death, for if it is indeed one’s destiny to fall, caution will not change that. In other words, the justification for avoiding war for the sake of ‘safety’ is dismantled from the outset.

This statement is then followed by the next sentence, *wa inna aṣ-ṣabra min asbābi aṣ-ṣafar* (‘indeed, steadfastness is among the causes of victory’). If caution is declared useless, then what is offered in its place is *ṣabr* – not merely ‘patience’ in the passive sense of waiting, but firm endurance in confronting the enemy. The arrangement of these two sentences forms a simple line of reasoning: since being cautious (avoiding) is useless, what is useful is instead the opposite – enduring and confronting.

This mode of argumentation, within Aristotelian rhetoric, falls under the element of *logos*: persuasion through reasoning that appears logical (Aristotle, 2007). The line of reasoning may be simplified as follows: (1) caution cannot prevent destiny, so avoiding battle will not make a person any safer; (2) steadfastness or endurance, conversely,

becomes the cause of victory. Although the first premise is in fact a cultural belief rather than a demonstrable fact, the text presents it as though it were incontrovertible logic, so that the audience is guided toward accepting the conclusion that advancing into battle is a rational choice. This mode of thought is consistent with recent research on the philosophy of pre-Islamic Arab society in confronting death, which shows that acceptance of the inevitability of death became the very foundation for an active and courageous stance toward life, rather than passive resignation (Talaḥfa et al., 2025).

Put simply, the message the orator wishes to convey to his troops is: ‘There is no need to fear or avoid battle, for caution alone will not save you from destiny. It is precisely by enduring and remaining steadfast against the enemy that you stand a chance of victory.’ With this line of reasoning, advancing into battle no longer feels like a reckless decision, but like a sensible and justified choice.

The analysis of this expression should begin with its grammatical aspect before proceeding to its semantic and discursive dimensions.

At the linguistic level, the use of the particle *inna* (إن) functions as an emphatic marker (*ḥarf at-tawkid*) that lends weight to the proposition being conveyed. The presence of *inna* signals that the statement which follows is not mere information, but a claim whose truth the speaker wishes to assert before the audience. From the outset, then, this structure is framed as an authoritative statement.

Furthermore, the construction *lā yunjī* employs a negative form with the particle *lā*, which negates the possibility of the act of ‘saving’ taking place. The verb *yunjī* (ينجي) itself derives from a root associated with safety or rescue, so that this negation does not merely reject one possibility, but forecloses the entire potential for safety arising from the act of *ḥaḍar* (caution).

The relation between *al-ḥaḍar* and *al-qadar* also reveals an important semantic relationship. *Al-ḥaḍar* represents a rational and preventive human effort, while *al-qadar* refers to a determinative force beyond human control. By positioning *ḥaḍar* as a subject ‘unable to save’ one from *qadar*, the text constructs a hierarchical relation between human agency and the determination of destiny.

At this stage, it can be seen that the sentence structure does not merely convey

information, but constructs a particular frame of thought: that rational human effort holds no effectiveness against destiny. It is important to note, however, that this conclusion is never stated explicitly, but instead emerges through the interaction of emphasis (*inna*), negation (*lā*), and the semantic relation between its elements.

At the level of discourse practice, this kind of construction can be understood as a strategy that shifts the audience's rational orientation. Rationality is not eliminated, but redirected: from an effort to avoid risk toward an acceptance of consequence. In other words, the logic being constructed is not anti-rational, but rather a redefined rationality.

This construction is reinforced by (Data 4):

وإن الصبر من أسباب الظفر

As with the preceding structure, the renewed use of the particle *inna* signals that this proposition, too, is positioned as a claim carrying argumentative force.

The phrase *min asbābi az-ẓafar* establishes an explicit causal relation. The word *asbāb* (causes) indicates that victory (*ẓafar*) does not arise randomly, but through a mechanism intelligible within a cause-and-effect framework. The text thus presents a different model of rationality from before: not the preventive rationality of *ḥaḍar*, but an endurance-based rationality of *ṣabr*.

The word *ṣabr* here does not simply mean passive patience, but in the context of war is closer to firmness, endurance, and consistency under pressure. By linking it to 'the cause of victory,' the text lends rational legitimacy to the stance of holding one's ground in a high-risk situation.

Read in sequence, these two expressions reveal a systematic logical shift. The first negates the effectiveness of caution as a strategy for safety, while the second offers a rational alternative in the form of steadfastness as the path to victory. This structure not only forecloses one option, but simultaneously opens another that better aligns with the desired orientation of action.

From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, this pattern shows how language is used to restructure the audience's frame of rationality. What might previously have been considered the logical choice (avoiding risk) is redefined as ineffective, while the desired action (enduring and confronting) is constructed as rational and justified. Persuasion, therefore, does not operate through emotion alone, but through the

reconstruction of a seemingly objective logic. At the level of social practice, this fatalistic reasoning reflects and reinforces the cosmological worldview upheld by pre-Islamic Arab society, in which risk-taking in battle is naturalized as the rational and honorable course of action rather than a reckless one.

Heroic Metaphor and the Visualization of War

The khutbah also employs a concrete visual metaphor (Data 5):

استقبال الموت خير من استدباره

Before turning to a more detailed lexical and morphological analysis, this expression is first explained simply. Literally, *istiqbāl* means ‘to welcome’ or ‘to face forward,’ while *istidbār* means ‘to turn one’s back.’ Put simply, then, this sentence means: ‘to face death (from the front) is better than to turn away from it (flee from it).’

Imagine two men on the battlefield. The first stands facing the enemy, ready to fight — he is the one who ‘faces’ death. The second turns and runs — he is the one who ‘turns his back’ on death. Through this sentence, the orator asserts that the position of the first man is the better one.

In the war culture of pre-Islamic Arab society, the orientation of the body in combat served as a marker of whether a person was valiant or cowardly. To face the enemy meant readiness for open confrontation, while to turn one’s back on the enemy meant an attempt to avoid or flee. The idea that ‘facing is better than turning away,’ therefore, is in fact the orator’s way of speaking about courage without stating the word ‘courage’ directly.

This image of the body facing forward versus turning away constitutes a metaphor, and within Aristotelian rhetoric, metaphor is a stylistic device that evokes pathos (emotion), since it allows the audience to picture the scene directly, rather than merely grasping it as an abstract concept (Aristotle, 2007).

The analysis of this structure should begin with its lexical and morphological aspects. The words *istiqbāl* (استقبال) and *istidbār* (استدبار) derive from roots denoting bodily direction: *q-b-l* (to face forward) and *d-b-r* (to turn away). Both are formed in the *istifʿāl* pattern, which denotes an action carried out consciously and with intent.

This shared morphological pattern creates a structural parallelism, such that the two actions appear formally equivalent, yet differ in orientation. The opposition

constructed thus arises not from a difference in the type of action, but from the direction of the action itself.

Semantically, *istiqbāl al-mawt* (facing death) conveys direct confrontation, readiness, and active engagement, while *istidbār al-mawt* (turning one's back on death) conveys avoidance, withdrawal, or an effort to distance oneself. It is important to note, however, that these two expressions are not merely descriptions of physical action, but symbolic representations of a mental stance in the face of war.

At this stage, it becomes apparent that the text does not directly name 'courage' or 'cowardice,' but constructs them through the metaphor of bodily direction. The body becomes a medium for representing value: the position of facing is associated with openness to risk, while the position of turning away is associated with a refusal of confrontation.

At the level of discourse practice, this opposition functions as a visualization strategy that activates the audience's collective imagination. The audience does not merely grasp the concept abstractly, but mentally 'sees' the scene. This visualization strengthens persuasive force, since meaning is processed not only cognitively, but also imaginatively.

This idea is made more explicit through (Data 6):

الطعن في ثغر النحر أكرم منه في الأعجاز والظهور

Put simply, this sentence means: 'to be stabbed in the front of the throat/chest is nobler than to be stabbed in the back (buttocks and back).' The word *nuḥūr* refers to the front of the throat/chest, while *zuhūr* refers to the back.

This sentence extends the idea that 'facing is better than turning away' with a more concrete image: no longer merely the general direction of the body, but specifically which part of the body is actually wounded. If a person is wounded at the front (throat/chest), this is a sign that he was facing the enemy while fighting — and is thus regarded as valiant. If he is wounded at the back, this is a sign that he had turned his back on the enemy, that is, that he was fleeing — and is thus regarded as disgraceful.

Together with the preceding sentence, this bodily metaphor functions as an element of pathos within Aristotelian rhetoric: by making listeners imagine a wound to the front of the body (honorable) as against a wound to the back of the body (disgraceful),

the orator emotionally compels them to choose to advance and face the enemy, rather than turn and flee (Aristotle, 2007). Put simply, the message is: face your enemy, do not flee, for the direction in which you face danger is precisely what will determine whether you are remembered as a hero or a coward.

The analysis should begin with the highly specific lexical choice concerning parts of the body. The phrase *ṭa'n fī thaghř an-nuḥūr* refers to an attack directed at the front of the throat or chest, while *al-a'jāz wa az-zuhūr* refers to the rear of the body.

Lexically, the word *nuḥūr* (plural of *nahr*) relates to the exposed part of the body that faces an opponent, while *zuhūr* (the back) is inherently tied to a posture of turning away. The opposition constructed is thus once again grounded in bodily orientation, but this time in a more concrete and physical form.

The sentence structure also displays explicit evaluation through the word *akram* (أكرم), which signals a comparison of value. This evaluation, however, does not stand alone, but is grounded in the location of the wound. That is, the value of honor is attached not to the outcome of the battle, but to how the body was positioned during it.

At this stage, the body ceases to be merely a biological entity and becomes a sign carrying social meaning. The front of the body represents openness, courage, and readiness to face an opponent, while the back represents avoidance and a refusal of confrontation.

Read in sequence, these two expressions display a consistency in how the text constructs meaning: bodily direction (front versus back) is used as the basis for constructing value (honorable versus disgraceful). In other words, the bodily metaphor functions as a bridge between physical experience and moral judgment.

Only from the perspective of social practice can this representation be linked to the context of pre-Islamic Arab society, in which tribal honor depended heavily on individual conduct on the battlefield. In that context, the position of the body in battle was seen not merely as a military strategy, but as a direct indicator of honor and social reputation.

The bodily metaphor in this text, therefore, does not merely depict a scene of war, but establishes a normative standard for how the body ought to be present in conflict. Language does not merely reflect the value of courage, but regulates how that value is

to be physically enacted by the individual.

Within a Critical Discourse Analysis framework, this shows that visual representation is not neutral, but functions as a symbolic mechanism that instills and normalizes a collective norm. Through the repeated opposition of the front and back of the body, the text systematically shapes the audience's outlook on honor, such that this value appears natural and beyond question (Fairclough, 2015; Khan, 2025).

The Imperative as Collective Mobilization

The closing of the khutbah (Data 7):

يا آل بكر، قاتلوا فما للمنايا من بدّ

Before turning to a technical analysis of the address structure and imperative form, this closing sentence of the khutbah is first explained simply. *Yā Āla Bakr* means 'O family/people of Bakr' — a call to the entire tribe, not to a single person. *Qātilū* means 'fight!', a command directed at many people at once. And *fa mā lil-manāyā min budd* means 'for there is no escape from death,' or in other words: death will surely come, and there is no way to truly avoid it.

This sentence closes the khutbah. Having already explained that caution alone is useless and that steadfastness is the cause of victory, and having described why facing the enemy is more honorable than fleeing, the orator now issues a firm command: fight!

By invoking 'Āl Bakr' (the family/people of Bakr) rather than naming individuals one by one, the orator makes every listener feel that this command is not for himself alone, but for his entire group. This makes anyone who fails to advance feel ashamed, since the whole tribe is being summoned together.

The reason 'there is no escape from death' is appended immediately after the command 'fight!', so that the command does not feel arbitrary, but comes with justification: death will come sooner or later regardless, so there is no point in avoiding battle.

Within Aristotelian rhetoric, this closing sentence operates by combining all three elements at once: ethos (the command carries authority because it comes from the tribal leader), pathos (a sense of togetherness and shame at being summoned as one people), and logos (the reasoning that death is inescapable regardless) (Aristotle, 2007). Put simply, this closing sentence is the culmination of the entire khutbah: having built up

various reasons beforehand, the orator finally issues a direct command accompanied by a brief justification, so that listeners feel they have no choice but to advance into battle together.

The analysis of this section should begin with the structure of address before proceeding to the imperative form.

The phrase *yā āla Bakr* is a form of *nidā'* (vocative address) that directly summons a specific group, namely Āl Bakr. The use of the word *āl* indicates that the party addressed is not an individual, but a collective entity bound by tribal ties. From the outset, then, the audience has already been positioned as a collective subject rather than as autonomous individuals.

This address serves a function beyond merely capturing attention. In the context of oral communication, *nidā'* functions to open a space of interaction while simultaneously establishing who is implicated in the discourse. By naming the tribal identity explicitly, the text activates a collective consciousness grounded in social affiliation.

Turning to the next element, the form *qātilū* is a *fi'l amr* (imperative verb) marked for the plural. This plural marking is significant, since it indicates not only that the command is directed at many people, but also constructs the action as a shared activity. The act of 'fighting' is thus represented not as an individual choice, but as a collective obligation. Recent syntactic research on imperative constructions across Arabic varieties further shows that the imperative form serves not merely a grammatical function, but also carries complex discursive weight at the level of speaker-addressee interaction (Shormani & Alhussen, 2024).

Morphologically, the imperative form in Arabic does not always simply convey a command, but also carries a strong illocutionary dimension, particularly when combined with a situational context such as a war khutbah. In this context, *qātilū* functions not merely as an instruction, but as a trigger for action.

It is important to note, however, that this imperative does not stand alone. It is immediately followed by the construction:

فما للمنايا من بدّ

The analysis of this section should proceed step by step. The particle *fā-* indicates a causal or consequential relation with the preceding command, such that what follows functions as a reason or justification.

The phrase *mā lil-manāyā min budd* is a construction asserting the absence of any alternative. The word *budd* (بُدّ) carries the meaning ‘a way out’ or ‘another option,’ while the negative structure *mā... min* reinforces a total negation. This sentence, then, does not merely state that death cannot be avoided, but forecloses every possible alternative to it.

The word *al-manāyā* (plural of *maniyyah*) also merits attention. The use of the plural form conveys the impression that death is present across a range of possibilities and situations, reinforcing a sense of universality and inevitability. Death is positioned not as a single possibility, but as an all-encompassing reality.

Read in sequence, these two parts reveal a systematic relation: a command to act is followed by an assertion that there is no alternative but to face the same consequence regardless. In other words, this structure not only commands, but also removes any rational basis for refusing that command.

At this stage, it can be seen that the text does not coerce directly, but instead constructs a condition in which compliance becomes the only reasonable choice. The imperative works in tandem with the fatalistic construction to close off any space for negotiation.

Only within the framework of discourse practice can this structure be understood as an effective mobilization strategy. Meaning is produced not merely through the command form, but through the combination of collective address, plural imperative, and fatalistic justification. This combination moves the audience from a position of listening toward a readiness to act.

At the level of social practice, meanwhile, this construction is closely tied to the structure of tribal-based society, in which individual identity dissolves into collective identity. In that context, a call to the group is not merely rhetorical, but carries direct implications for social action. An individual who fails to respond to the collective call risks delegitimization within his social structure.

The imperative in this text, therefore, does not merely reflect power relations, but produces a social condition in which collective action becomes an imperative in itself.

Language does not merely direct action, but regulates the range of possible choices, such that mobilization occurs not through explicit coercion, but through the construction of a logic that appears unavoidable (Fairclough, 2015; Khan, 2025).

The findings above — encompassing moral antithesis, fatalistic rationality, heroic metaphor, and collective imperative — do not stand as a collection of separate rhetorical devices, but are interconnected, forming a single coherent and layered strategy of persuasion. Each strategy operates at a different level while mutually reinforcing the others: moral antithesis and heroic metaphor mobilize the audience's emotional dimension (pathos) through value opposition and bodily visualization; fatalistic rationality constructs the argumentative dimension (logos) through a seemingly objective cosmological logic; while the speaker's authority as tribal leader grounds the ethical dimension (ethos) underlying the entire utterance. These three rhetorical dimensions should further be read not merely as devices of linguistic aesthetics, but as ideological mechanisms operating at the level of text, discourse practice, and social practice, as proposed within Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis framework. Reading across these frameworks allows us to reveal how the four rhetorical strategies simultaneously construct, reinforce, and transmit the values of courage, honor, and tribal solidarity as the collective ideology of pre-Islamic Arab society.

The results of the analysis show that the khutbah of Hani bin Qabishah displays a systematic rhetorical structure that is not only aesthetic, but also functions as an ideological instrument for instilling the value of collective courage within the war culture of pre-Islamic Arab society. This systematicity is evident in the recurring and organized pattern of rhetorical strategies — moral antithesis, fatalistic rationality, heroic metaphor, and collective imperative — appearing in sequence to build a persuasive arc. The ideological dimension, meanwhile, is reflected in how each strategy not only conveys a message, but also guides the audience toward internalizing particular values, such as courage, honor, and tribal solidarity, while normalizing war as a socially legitimate choice.

The khutbah text consistently displays the pattern of moral antithesis, fatalistic rationality, concrete heroic metaphor, and collective imperative form. These four strategies work simultaneously to construct psychological mobilization and social legitimation on the eve of battle. In modern discourse studies, this kind of combination

of rhetorical strategies is understood as a form of discursive orchestration aimed at achieving total persuasion of the audience (Ajmal & Zainab, 2024).

The dominance of moral antithesis, as seen in the expression *‘hālikun ma’dhūrun khayrun min nājin farūr’* and the concise formula *‘al-maniyyatu wa lā al-daniyyah,’* shows that pathos is the most prominent rhetorical element. The binary oppositional structure not only constructs a contrast of values, but also narrows the audience’s spectrum of moral choice to two extreme poles: honor or disgrace. Within Norman Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis framework, this pattern functions as a mechanism of moral framing that normalizes courage as the only legitimate choice, while simultaneously discrediting flight as a social deviation. Within the three-dimensional framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, this strategy can be understood not only at the level of text, but also as a discursive practice that reproduces value through the repetition of rhetorical formulas, and as a social practice that reinforces the ideology of courage as a collective norm within a pre-Islamic Arab society that upheld honor (*‘ird*) and regarded retreat from battle as a social disgrace (Fairclough, 2015). This ideology did not emerge in a neutral space, but is rooted in the tribal social structure of pre-Islamic Arab society, which upheld the values of honor (*‘ird*) and tribal solidarity (*‘aṣabiyyah*). Within this social context, the individual was viewed not as an autonomous entity, but as a representation of his group’s honor. Courage in facing the enemy, particularly in the context of war, therefore became the moral standard determining a person’s social standing within the group.

Conversely, avoiding conflict or retreating from battle was perceived as a form of moral failure that not only demeaned the individual, but also tarnished the tribe’s collective reputation. Within social conditions marked by intense intergroup competition and the threat of conflict, the discourse of courage constructed in this khutbah functioned as a mechanism for preserving social cohesion while ensuring members’ loyalty to their leadership and group. This oppositional strategy is also consistent with findings in modern rhetorical studies showing that extreme dichotomies are effective in accelerating collective decision-making (Charteris-Black, 2021).

On the side of logos, the fatalistic rationality reflected in the statement *‘inna al-ḥadhara lā yunjī mina al-qadar’* shows how a logical argument is constructed to eliminate the possibility of alternative action. Logos here does not open a space for deliberation,

but narrows it. By asserting that caution cannot spare a person from destiny, the text ideologically directs the audience toward the conclusion that courage is not only a moral choice, but also a rational one within the pre-Islamic cosmology. From a CDA perspective, this reflects a process of naturalization of ideology, whereby a particular view is presented as incontrovertible truth (Fairclough, 2015; Ajmal & Zainab, 2024). The statement *'wa inna aṣ-ṣabra min asbābi aḏ-ḏafar'* reinforces this dimension by linking steadfastness and victory in an explicit cause-and-effect relation, understood within modern rhetorical analysis as a strategy of legitimation grounded in symbolic rationality (Charteris-Black, 2021). Fatalism in this khutbah, then, is not passive, but functions as an active rhetorical strategy that guides the audience to accept risk as the logical consequence of a believed cosmological order.

The heroic metaphors appearing in *'istiqbālu al-mawti khayrun min istidbāriḥ'* and *'aṭ-ṭa'nu fī thaghri an-nuḥūr akramu minhu fī al-a'jāzi wa aḏ-ḏuhūr'* show that discourse operates not only at an abstract level, but also through concrete physical visualization. The opposition between the front and back of the body constructs an image of offensive courage as a symbol of honor. From a CDA perspective, this kind of visualization functions to shape a collective habitus that exalts aggression as a social ethos (Khan, 2025; Ajmal & Zainab, 2024). Recent studies further show that embodied metaphors carry considerable power to influence perception and social action, given their directness and ease of visualization (Charteris-Black, 2021). This kind of visual representation shows that language not only reflects reality, but also shapes a collective mental disposition that internalizes courage as a standard of social honor.

The heroic metaphors that appear in the text function not merely as linguistic illustration, but also as a rhetorical strategy that reinforces persuasion and constructs an image of courage as an ideal social value (Dikwan et al., 2025; Nurfazri & Ardiansyah, 2025). In this context, language operates as an ideological medium that is not neutral, but laden with social and cultural interest.

Finally, the use of the direct imperative in *'yā āla Bakr, qātilū fa mā lil-manāyā min budd'* marks the peak of discursive mobilization. The command form *qātilū* closes the gap between rhetoric and action, while the phrase *fa mā lil-manāyā min budd* asserts the inevitability of death as the final legitimation for fighting. Within Norman Fairclough's framework, the imperative form represents a power relation legitimized discursively, in

which the leader's authority is accepted without explicit resistance (Fairclough, 2015). At the level of social practice, language functions as an instrument of symbolic hegemony that builds moral consensus without physical coercion, consistent with the notion of *consented power* in the thought of Antonio Gramsci (1971), a concept also widely developed in contemporary discourse studies (Ajmal & Zainab, 2024). This finding is consistent with recent scholarship in Arabic discourse analysis showing that texts do not merely reflect social reality, but actively construct and sustain it (Karim, 2024). This shows that power in this context operates hegemonically, that is, through consent constructed symbolically rather than through direct coercion, as explained within Gramsci's theory of hegemony.

The khutbah of Hani bin Qabishah can thus be understood as a discursive practice that integrates the ethos of leadership, the pathos of emotional mobilization, and the logos of fatalism within a single, complete persuasive structure. The rhetorical beauty evident in the text is not merely stylistic ornamentation, but an ideological device that reproduces the values of courage, honor, and tribal solidarity (*'aṣabiyyah*) within pre-Islamic Arab society. This finding reinforces the view that language, even within classical discourse, functions as a mechanism for constructing social reality and legitimizing power, as affirmed in modern Critical Discourse Analysis scholarship (Khan, 2025; Ajmal & Zainab, 2024). The values of courage and honor represented in the khutbah are also a defining characteristic of pre-Islamic Arabic literature, which emphasizes group solidarity (*'aṣabiyyah*) (Aslan & Araz, 2026). This finding confirms that the rhetorical structure of pre-Islamic khutbahs functions not merely as a device of linguistic aesthetics, but also as a cognitive and social mechanism that systematically shapes a collective frame of thought grounded in the values of honor, courage, and tribal loyalty. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that the rhetorical structure of Arabic texts carries a strong implicit function of meaning, capable of shaping particular patterns of interpretation in understanding the message conveyed (Mabruroh et al., 2025).

Overall, this analysis shows that the khutbah of Hani bin Qabishah represents a form of discourse that simultaneously integrates linguistic, rhetorical, and ideological dimensions. Language is used not merely to convey a message, but also to construct social reality and direct collective action. This khutbah text can thus be understood as a discursive practice that plays a strategic role in the construction of identity and the legitimation of power within pre-Islamic Arab society. From a critical discourse

perspective, this phenomenon shows that language plays a role in reproducing power structures and constructing social consensus through systematic discursive practice (Riyanto & Mulia, 2024). This confirms that the khutbah text functions not merely as verbal communication, but also as a tool for legitimizing collective values and ideology.

These findings further show that the analysis of pre-Islamic Arabic khutbahs cannot be adequately understood as a matter of stylistics alone, but must be situated within a framework of ideological discourse. This study thus extends previous research, which has tended to focus on descriptive stylistic aspects, by showing that the khutbah text also functions as an instrument for the production of social meaning and the legitimation of power. The integration of Aristotelian classical rhetoric with modern discourse analysis thus enables a more comprehensive understanding of language as both an aesthetic instrument of expression and an ideological instrument (Aristotle, 2007; Tantowi et al., 2025). This speech, therefore, functions not only as a rhetorical appeal, but also as an ideological instrument that reproduces the values of courage, honor, and solidarity within the social structure of Arab society at that time.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the khutbah of Hani bin Qabishah represents a form of pre-Islamic Arabic oratorical discourse constructed through a systematic rhetorical and ideological structure. Based on the analysis of the text in *Jamharat Khutab al-'Arab* (p. 37), it was found that the khutbah integrates four principal strategies: moral antithesis, fatalistic rationality, heroic metaphor, and collective imperative. These four strategies operate simultaneously as persuasive devices that not only affect the audience's emotions but also shape their frame of thought and orientation toward collective action.

The moral antithesis evident in expressions such as *'hālikun ma'dhūrun khayrun min nājin farūr'* and *'al-maniyyatu wa lā al-daniyyah'* functions to frame the audience's choice within a binary opposition between honor and disgrace. This strategy narrows the spectrum of moral choice such that courage is constructed as the only legitimate option, consistent with the concept of moral framing within Critical Discourse Analysis. Fatalistic rationality, meanwhile, expressed through the statement *'inna al-ḥadhara lā yunjī mina al-qadar,'* directs the audience toward accepting destiny as the basis for legitimizing courageous action, which from a CDA perspective reflects a process of ideological naturalization.

The khutbah's concrete heroic metaphors, such as '*istiqbālu al-mawti khayrun min istidbārih*' and '*aṭ-ṭa'nu fī thaghri an-nuḥūr...*,' reinforce the visualization of courage as an exalted social value. This visualization is not merely aesthetic but also serves to construct a collective imagination and social habitus that honors courage as a shared norm (Charteris-Black, 2021; Khan, 2025). The use of the imperative in '*qātilū...*,' in turn, affirms the function of language as an instrument of collective mobilization and as a form of discursive power relation that operates through persuasion rather than coercion (Fairclough, 2015; Khan, 2025).

These findings demonstrate that the khutbah of Hani bin Qabishah functions not merely as an act of rhetorical expression, but also as a discursive practice that reproduces the values of courage, honor, and tribal solidarity ('*aṣabiyyah*') within pre-Islamic Arab society. Within the framework of Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony, this discourse can be understood as a form of consented power — power accepted through the internalization of shared moral values (Fairclough, 2015; Gramsci, 1971).

The integration of Aristotelian rhetoric (ethos, pathos, logos) with Norman Fairclough's model of Critical Discourse Analysis in this study offers a theoretical contribution by demonstrating that classical oratorical texts can be analyzed as a medium for the construction of ideology and consensus-based legitimation of power. This study thus opens avenues for further research examining other classical Arabic khutbah texts from a critical discourse perspective, thereby enriching our understanding of the relationship between language, power, and identity within the Arab intellectual tradition (Khan, 2025; Ajmal & Zainab, 2024). By implication, these findings show that language within the classical Arabic tradition played a strategic role in shaping collective consciousness and social legitimation, underscoring the importance of discourse analysis of classical texts for understanding the historical relationship between language and power. These findings further affirm the relevance of modern critical discourse analysis for examining classical texts as discursive practices that continue to hold significance within contemporary Arabic linguistic and literary studies.

REFERENCES

Ajim, M. B. Y. (2024). The Concept of Rhetoric Among Arab Scholars from the Third to

- the Eighth Century AH: A Critical Analytical Study. *Arts for Linguistic & Literary Studies*, 6(2), 494–510. <https://doi.org/10.53286/arts.v6i2.1956>
- Ajmal, M. U., & Zainab, T. (2024). Depiction of Women as Unfair Creatures in John Donne's "Go and Catch a Falling Star": Utilizing Norman Fairclough's Model as a Research Tool in the Critical Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 18–27. <https://doi.org/10.52622/joal.v3i2.177>
- Aldahmani, F. (2026). Language, Religion and Society in Intercultural Contexts: A Discourse-Pragmatic Study of Persuasion Strategies in Friday Sermons at Sheikh Zayed Grand Mosque. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 12(1), 2647493. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2026.2647493>
- Al-Jahiz. (2003). *Al-Bayan wa al-Tabyin*. Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Jubeh, S. M. S. (2022). *Namādhij min al-Khuṭab wa al-Waṣāyā fi al-'Aṣr al-Jāhilī: Dirāsah Balāghiyyah Taḥlīliyyah* [Examples of Speeches and Wills in the Pre-Islamic Era: A Rhetorical Analytical Study] [Master's thesis, Hebron University].
- Al-Musahiri, F. J. I. (2020). Stylistic Characteristics in a Speech: Hani Bin Qabishah al-Shaybani. *Journal of the Faculty of Arabic Language in Cairo*, 38(1), 979–1028.
- Al-Sharafi, A. G. M., Khader, M. M., Al-Sioufy, M. H., Ahmed, M., & Al-Zawqari, A. (2025). Arabic Argumentation. *Informal Logic*, 45(3), 194–228.
- Al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Jarīr. (1990). *Tārīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk*. Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.
- Aristotle. (2007). *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* (G. A. Kennedy, Ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Aslan, R., & Araz, I. (2026). The Thematic and Rhetorical Transformation of 'Aṣabiyya in Early Islamic Poetry. *Religions*, 17(2), 140. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel17020140>
- Astuti, L. P., & Ningrum, A. P. (2025). Gaya Bahasa dan Diksi pada Puisi Kabar Dari Laut Oleh Chairil Anwar: Kajian Stilistika. *Cerdika: Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 5(8).
- Atiya, F. A. W. (2025). Contextual Meaning in War Speeches: The Speech of Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād as a Model. *Thi Qar Arts Journal*, 52(7). <https://doi.org/10.32792/tqartj.v52i7.880>
- Bijli, H. M. T. (2026). Arabic Oratory and its Role in Development of Islamic Civilization in Seventh Century. *Indonesian Journal for Islamic Studies*, 4(1), 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.58723/ijfis.v4i1.623>
- Charteris-Black, J. (2021). *Metaphors of coronavirus: Invisible enemy or zombie apocalypse?* Springer Nature.
- Ḍayf, Shauqi. (1986). *Tārīkh al-Adab al-'Arabī: al-'Aṣr al-Jāhilī*. Dār al-Ma'ārif.
- Dikwan, I., Maghfirah, T., & Haniah, H. (2025). Dinamika Tasybih dalam Retorika Arab sebagai Representasi Imajinatif dalam Wacana Modern. *Jurnal Al-Azhar Indonesia Seri Humaniora*, 10(3), 203–209.
- Effendi, F. R., Ervani, D. A., & Fadillah, Y. N. (2025). Gaya Bahasa dalam Kolom Asal-Usul Karya Mahbub Djunaidi: Kajian Stilistika. *Al-ABSAH*, 1(2), 92–102.
- Fairclough, N. (2015). Textual analysis. In M. Bevir & R. A. W. Rhodes (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Interpretive Political Science* (pp. 186–198). Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (Q. Hoare

& G. N. Smith, Eds. & Trans.). International Publishers.

- Hasanah, U. (2021). Rhetoric in Islamic Tradition: Paradigm and its Development. *Komunika: Jurnal Dakwah Dan Komunikasi*, 15(2), 241–252. <https://doi.org/10.24090/komunika.v15i2.4570>
- Karim, A. (2024). Bahasa dan Ideologi dalam Teks Arab: Perspektif Analisis Wacana. *Studia Arabika*, 12(1), 23–37.
- Khan, L. (2025). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Speech Using Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model. *Journal of Language, Literature & Social Affairs*, 1(3), 18–28. <https://doi.org/10.63056/jllsa.1.3.2025.59>
- Khan, M. A., Syed, A. F., Junaidi, M., Shakir, S. M., & Shahid, S. (2021). Analyzing the Farewell Sermon of the Prophet Muhammad (pbuh): A Critical Perspective. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 1(1), 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijls.2021.1.1.6>
- Kusuma, M. H., Arby, M. F., Andaniya, I., & Afrizal, M. (2026). Analisis Stilistika: Eksplorasi Gaya Bahasa dan Diksi pada Tokoh Gatotkaca dalam Novel Sisi Gelap Gatotkaca Karya Pitoyo Amrih. *Pragmatik: Jurnal Rumpun Ilmu Bahasa Dan Pendidikan*, 4(1), 140–145.
- Mabruroh, H., Yasmin, A. Z., Ardy, N. S., & Athiroh, Z. (2025). Analisis Macam-Macam Istifham dan Maknanya dalam Surat Al-Baqarah Ayat 1–75: Studi Analisis Balaghah. *Jurnal Riset Rumpun Ilmu Bahasa*, 4(3), 145–153.
- Mahyudi, J., & Qodri, S. (2021). Metafora Sufistik dalam Novel Jatiswara Karya Lalu Agus Fathurrahman: Kajian Stilistika. *Kopula: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pendidikan*, 3(2), 1–14.
- Majma' al-Lughah al-'Arabiyyah. (1960). *Al-Mu'jam al-Wasit*. Cairo: Majma' al-Lughah al-'Arabiyyah.
- Nur, C., & Hamzah, A. A. (2025). Pra-Islam dan Bahasa Arab: Bahasa dan Sastra Sebelum Munculnya Islam. *AL-QIBLAH*, 4(2), 107–114. <https://doi.org/10.36701/qiblah.v4i2>
- Nurfazri, N. E., & Ardiansyah, M. L. (2025). Isti'arah At-Tashrihiyyah Wal-Makniyyah, Isti'arah Al-Ashliyyah Wat-Taba'iiyyah: Analisis Konseptual dan Retoris dalam Teks Arab Klasik dan Modern. *Jurnal Intelek Insan Cendikia*, 2(5), 10354–10367.
- Palangyos, A. C., & Ulla, M. B. (2025). Persuasion, Proclamation, and Power: The Role of Language and Rhetoric in Sermon Delivery. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2025.2481756>
- Qutbuddin, T. (2023). Classical Islamic Oration's Art, Function, and Life-Altering Power of Persuasion. *Medieval Sermon Studies*, 67(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13660691.2023.2269065>
- Rahmawati, L. (2025). Struktur retorik dalam khutbah Arab dan Implikasinya terhadap Makna Persuasif. *Arabiyat: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab Dan Kebahasaaraban*, 11(1), 55–70.
- Razzaq, N. (2023). Language and Religious Discourse: An Analysis of the Linguistic Features and Persuasive Strategies in Islamic Sermons. *IQAN*, 5(02), 17–34. <https://doi.org/10.36755/iqan.v5i02.427>
- Riesardhy, A. W., & Suryatini, N. W. (2024). Aristotle's Rhetoric of Megawati

- Soekarnoputri's Political Speech at the Opening of Rakernas II PDIP. *MEDIASI: Jurnal Kajian Dan Terapan Media, Bahasa, Komunikasi*, 5(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.46961/mediasi.v5i1.976>
- Riyanto, A., & Mulia, Y. (2024). Analisis Wacana Kritis Model Fairclough. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v9i2.30856>
- Şafwat, Ahmad Zaki. (1960). *Jamharatu Khuṭabī al-ʿArab fī ʿUṣūr al-ʿArabiyyah al-Zāhirah* (Vol. 1). Maktabat wa Maṭbaʿat Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī.
- Shormani, M. Q., & Alhussen, F. S. (2024). The Syntax of Negative Imperatives in Yemeni Arabic: A Phase Approach. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1), 2291845. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2291845>
- Talafha, A., Farghal, T. M., Al-Dourou, A., et al. (2025). Arabic Philosophy of Pleasure in Confronting Death: An Intertextuality Study of Pre-Islamic Poetry. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(2), 603-626. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i2.8241>
- Tantowi, Y. A., Syihabuddin, S., Sudana, D., & Dawood, M. M. E. (2025). Bridging Classical Arabic Rhetoric and Cognitive Linguistics: A Systematic Review of Kinayah and Conceptual Metaphor Theory. *Ta'lim Al-'Arabiyyah: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab & Kebahasaaraban*, 9(2), 269-287.
- Yazar, S. (2025). Rhetorical Transformation in the Qur'an and Pre-Islamic Poetry: A Comparative Analysis of Space, Animal, and Natural Figures. *Religions*, 16(9), 3-24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16091186>