Abstract
This research deals with the dialogue rules set by (Grace), which are usually violated while preserving the principle of cooperation, which ensures the continuation of the understandable process between the two pillars of the deliberative process, and then the ambiguity in the dialogue or ambiguity in ideas is eliminated. Debates for (Abdullah bin Abbas with Omar bin Al-Khattab) will serve as a template for this research, as it violates the principle of cooperation, while at the same time maintaining mutual understanding between the speaker and the recipient.
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I. INTRODUCTION
A- The Principle of Cooperation and Its Subsidiary Rules:
Paul Grice set four rules in what he called "talk show," which was built on "that people in their dialogues may mean more than they say, and they may mean the opposite of what they say, so he made all his concern to clarify the difference between what is said." What is meant is what the words and phrases mean with their verbal value, and what is meant is what the speaker wants to inform the listener indirectly (1),
Assuming the recipient knows the intention of the speaker, and for this reason the meaning is required. As for the speaker, it depends on the meaning of the following:
1. Linguistic language proficiency: relates to the grammar of the language in which the speech is made. Therefore, this competence must be achieved by the addressee, as well as by the speaker.
2. Encyclopedic competence: It is one of the competencies that gained great importance from the ancient linguists, and it is defined as "a large reservoir that includes external expressive performance information regarding the context, or as a group of knowledge and beliefs, and the system of representations of the reference world, its interpretations and calendars (2).
3. Logical competence: It is the one that “the speaker also uses when he builds his logical evidence” (3).
4. Communicative, communicative competence: It is waving the phrase instead of declaring it, i.e. the metaphor instead of the truth in saying.

These competencies are essential pillars - from our point of view - because they stimulate the speaker on the freedom to express intentionality with implicit deeds, and they are not new to Arabic, but they are from their core and common in them, but most of the language is metaphor, and most speakers conspire behind their sayings, Ibn Jani says: Know that most language with its contemplation is a metaphor, not a fact, and that is the general verbs towards the rise of Zaid and the age of Omer and set out for human beings and the summer came and defeated the winter. Do you not
see that the verb is benefiting from the meaning of nationality? All do and how it is, which is gender and sex all apply The past and all the present and all the coming creatures from everyone who was found to be resurrection and it is known that he does not meet for one person (at one time) nor in a hundred thousand years the multiplication of all resurrection under the illusion.

This is impossible for everyone who has a core. No truth, but rather it is the position of the whole subject of some to widen and exaggerate and likened a little to a lot "(4). Dialogue is a deliberative principle that helps the speaker to say more than he means, or means other than what he speaks literally (5); And it is through dialogue principles that establish the process of making a successful speech based on conveying the intention that the speaker wants to the recipient without confusion or ambiguity that would mistake the recipient and provide him with what does not mean the speaker. We have to know that the text that the speaker is writing is subject to many considerations that the reader must take into account, and these considerations may be available in the linguistic context, and may be in the external context.

The focus of this research will be on the external context, which is a major reason why it is difficult to unveil the meanings that the speaker deliberately thumbs down for a number of reasons, including what is personal, including what is fear, or flattery, because some people are naturally inclined to flattery, for a need they want to fulfill. Among the reasons is a principle that the speaker adheres to, in order to violate the rules of dialogue for him. And we will represent the dialogue rules that (Grace) put in the debates of Ibn Abbas, to be more clear and upright, and away from the confusion in which the reader may fall. They are four rules that violate a lot, while preserving the principle of cooperation, which ensures the continuation of the conceptual process between the two pillars of the deliberative process. So, as long as the speaker maintains the principle of cooperation and violates one of the rules branching from the principle of cooperation, there is no ambiguity in the dialogue or confusion in the ideas, understanding and intention of the speaker. As for Abdullah bin Abbas, the distant and prostrate testified with his knowledge, morals and attributes, and it is sufficient for him that the Messenger of God said in it: “And the nation’s inking of this servant is Abdullah Bin Abbas” (6). And he called him, saying: “Oh God, understand it in religion, and teach it to interpret” (7).

It is noteworthy that Ibn Abbas was not one of the politicians who was interested in her request, and even rejected a position offered to him by the Caliph Omar bin Al-Khattab (8). This matter helps us in explaining what we will go to in the meanings required in his debates, just as his status that he enjoys may be of assistance to him in responding to those who are superior to him, it is not possible for a person like Ibn Abbas to change the truth of the truth declared or waved by it, and waving It is what concerns us in this research. Emphasis will be placed on his debates with Caliph Omar bin Al-Khattab to reveal the necessities it contains, relying in this on the linguistic context consisting of structural and lexical components and everything that helps lift the veil on one of the meanings, and the external context if the need arises (9). As for the methodology used in these debates, it is to supply the entire debate, then what was required of the meanings, what was violated in the rules.
II. THE FIRST DEBATE:

Omar ibn al-Khattab said: "O Ibn Abbas, do you know what to prevent Qomkm them after Muhammad - peace be upon him -? I hated to answer him I said that I did not know the Commander of the Faithful Adrini! Umar said: they hated to collect your prophecy and succession, Vtbjhawwa on Qomkm Bjuha Bjuha, Quraish chose for themselves, hitting and reconciled it. I said: O Commander of the faithful, if authorized to speak to me and anger me Tmt spoke. He said: spoke. I said: As you say, O Commander of the Faithful: chose Quraish for themselves wounded and reconciled, if that Krisha chose for themselves when God chose her to the right hand not return nor Mehsud. As you say, they refuse to be our prophecy and the caliphate, God - Ezz-ul-Jazz - describing people with hatred, he said: “Do that because they hate what Allah has revealed, so their actions are frustrated” [Muhammad: 9]. Omar said: Hehee, and God, O son of Abbas, she was telling me things about you that I used to hate if you agreed to them.

So I said: What is the Commander of the Faithful? If it is true, then it should not remove my home from you, and if it is void, the same is the case of falsehood for itself. Omar said: I heard you say: Rather, I spent it on you with envy, prostitution, and injustice. I said: As for your saying, O Commander of the Faithful: Unfortunately, it has been revealed to the ignorant and the dreamer, but to God, and to God. Omar said: Hehee heehee! Father, and God, your hearts, O children of Hashem, but envy will not go away. I said: Hey, O Commander of the Faithful, do not describe the hearts of the people of God go about them uncleanness and cleanse them with envy and cleansing of fraud, the heart of the Messenger of Allah - peace be upon him - from the hearts of Bani Hashim. Umar said: Ibn Abbas, to you. So I said: Do. When I went to live, he was ashamed of me, so he said: O son of Abbas, your place! By God, I am a shepherd of your truth, who loves what he has secreted. So I said: O Commander of the Faithful, I have a right for you and for every Muslim, so whoever memorizes it, his luck will be bad, and he will lose. Then he rose up and went (10). The text is of a political and religious nature that raises an issue that is not as easy as allowing the book to express its rhetoric, and we must go on with extreme caution and accuracy.

Rhetoric is abundant in general with the meanings required that come to attain or fear or for the sake of all; a push for any emergency that would affect the person of the speaker, and in this debate the meanings required had a significant presence. As for its topic, it concerns the place of the caliphate after the Messenger of God, and the argument of the two parties in weighting his statements in what he goes to. It is known that there are letters in which the peace of the analogues differs, and in this speech the caliph rises. As for what this debate necessitated from meanings, according to Ibn Abbas: (I hated that I would answer it) which is a news sentence that necessitated the meaning of rejection, but rejection in this context is not actually possible, as it is not possible to declare it, because it will be like disobedience Who does not think he turns a blind eye, so the statement came after the end of the debate. And we note the strong rejection in the caliphs answers to Ibn Abbas, in his saying: (He is the God and O son of Abbas) he strongly and strongly rejected; evidence that he threatened him after this saying by saying: (speak to me that you say: but he is your voice).

A threat that Ibn Abbas considers the caliphate to be illegitimate except for Bani Hashem, which is apparent in words, because Ibn Abbas did not deny
these words after the caliph told him. Among the strengths of achievement is the invocation of the Qur’anic reading in the Almighty saying: “Do that because they hate what Allah has revealed, so their actions are frustrated” [Muhammad: 9] and it strengthens the achievement in the verbal action that the legitimacy of the Quraysh caliphate is intended to be illegal. Resorting to the Qur’anic argument protects the speaker from the consequences of saying. The oath after the last verb represents a depiction of the severity of the rejection on which the caliph is subject. And repeating the name of the past tense in his saying: (Hehahat Hehehat). Emphasis on the already word-like letter is an accomplishing force of news.

The weaknesses of the achievement force were limited to the words of Ibn Abbas, as he repeated his saying: (O Commander of the Faithful) more than once in launching his arguments, and this is a strategy that demonstrates the intelligence and sophistication of Ibn Abbas in releasing his statements without causing harm. This strategy shows the prohibition outside the alert in its saying: (Do not describe), it was preceded by his saying: (Hey) who brought the prohibition to the alarm, just as the call stopped this indication of the alert. In the words of Ibn Abbas what shows the greatness of this man, his status and his determination, thanks to him and his knowledge, rejecting falsehood before he said, knowing that he is right. When the caliph said: (You would have told me things about you that I used to hate if you approved them and remove your status from me.

Ibn Abbas answered him: “Then I said: What is the Commander of the Faithful? If it is true, then what should I remove my house from you, and if so long?” and this answer contains meanings that show his confidence in himself, and in it necessitates a meaning that lies in alerting the caliph to something, which is that it is not Ibn Abbas who is attributed to him in the presence of false accusations. As for the dialogue rules related to the principle of cooperation, they were violated in places of this debate. The first rule concerns the required amount of information, which the speaker can only violate with linguistic and external contextual considerations, and this rule was violated in the words of Ibn Abbas: (It was revealed to the ignorant and the dreamer). He suffices with insufficient information, and he is guarded against the wrath of the caliph, who made Ibn Abbas more cautious in his statements.

In the words of Ibn Abbas: (If Quraysh had chosen for themselves, when God chose them, then the right people would have no hand in hand.) This is a hadith on the legitimacy of the caliphate, which is for the family of the noble Messenger (peace be upon them), and shows the amount of information he intended intentionally, which he seeks, using the communicative competence in determining that identity, “The ability to comply with the grammar and restrictions of the language, or to breach or manipulate it is a communicative competence, And when the sender uses communicative competence to influence the behavior of others ... we are talking about subtle, subtle effects, and the sender achieves these effects by manipulating and exploiting the rules and exceptions, and choosing from stored materials (11) to achieve the desired without exposing himself to consequences that affect him, and he is thus Manipulation saves his face from th Anger, or threatening, or planning to plot it, because the addressee - by political rank - is inferior to the caliph. Perhaps the authority of the speaker to the addressee is a reason to aggregate the information in full, and to be satisfied enough to the extent that
he considers that he will be able to communicate his intention to the addressee.

In the caliph’s statement, there is a breach in the base of the quantum, which is his saying: (I have heard you say: Rather, I spent it on you with envy, prostitution, and injustice). And the conscience in spending it is due to the caliphate. There is no doubt that the breach of this rule came to political and religious considerations, as it is not Ibn Abbas who is authorized to say destruction or threat, and the saying came as a threat to Ibn Abbas to this extent.

We notice in this debate a clear difference between the sayings of Ibn Abbas and Umar ibn al-Khattab, the statement saying without attaining - most of the time - the caliph enjoyed because he is the ruling authority. As for Ibn Abbas, he does not enjoy that freedom in his sayings, until he softens his statements before answering, and this kindness weakens the accomplishing power of the utterances, such as the repeated call that necessitated the meaning of kindness, and it is only a prelude to his statements in which we see remarkable facts, as in his saying (O Commander of the Faithful, do not describe the hearts of a people, for whom God has gone against the abomination and cleansed them with envy and envy President and the reason why Ibn Abbas not to declare his words shown in the words of Ibn Abbas himself in this debate: "O Commander of the Faithful, said to me you really on every Muslim, it is saved hit, and wasted made a mistake. He then so he went.

It is not thought that the base of the question is doubtful for its violation in the context of the debate, and the base of the qualification concerns the news in terms of its truth and falsehood, and the addressee must release the news about the evidence (12). Perhaps the caliph’s saying: (a crowd, and deceit) that Bani Hashim described as a violation of the rule of qualification without any doubt, and there is no need to deviate from the context and provide evidence of the lack of credibility in this news, because Ibn Abbas himself responded this news by saying: (No It describes the hearts of a people). So, there is no doubt that the norm of how to violate the reasons for a multiplicity of multiple contexts. As for the third rule that relates to the essence of the article with the station, the rags are located in it from the person of the caliph, because the sons of Hashem cannot be described as cheating, with evidence of the Almighty saying: But God wants the Argas to go away from you, the people of the house and wash away. It is not a crime that anyone was not entitled to make these charges. There is nothing to say about intolerance, as there are many sayings in the family of the Messenger of God, and the Messenger of God Sadiq Amin and his family are described as described by the Messenger of God.

The Caliph's having the authority of the Caliphate and the seat of judgment is truly - in his view - to say anything, because he is the caliph, and the caliph is the director of Muslim affairs in general. As for the fourth rule, four recommendations fall under it, and what concerns us is what violates these recommendations. The first of these is the summary in detail, as Ibn Abbas has violated it in the areas of his answer, due to reasons related to caution and the fear of provoking sedition in the presence of the caliph, as it is not allowed socially to roughen the dialogue with the person of the caliph. The debate included synthetic elements that would highlight meanings, including the caliph's saying: (boast), as the summer (activation) indicates multiplication, and this is what the morphologists approved in their compilations. Resorting to this formula shows the speaker’s horror about Bani Hashem regarding the caliphate. We may say: The suspicion is a major
factor in the establishment of this debate, which contained striking rhetorical meanings.

Were it not for the Caliph to be interested in the issue of the caliphate, and doubted that Quraish would not be entitled to it, he did not call for this debate. We are not in the process of going into political accumulations, but are in line with the debate, and what we declare from the womb of words, and what we see in it of language analyzes and nothing but. We look at the text an abstract look from every restriction that would lead us to strip off the objectivity of objectivity; therefore, the focus on language as an element of impoverishment in the meanings required that liberate the speakers from the restrictions of the statement that draw them to what they cannot tolerate, and this inclusion has always tasted the skillful of the speakers in the circumstances Those who see the declaration as social and political prohibitions, and in the eyes of their listeners, are religious. As for the second recommendation: (Do not say what you do not know is correct), it is - and away from blind fanaticism - was violated by the caliph, and evidence of history testifies to the legality of the caliphate of Bani Hashem, authorized by the Messenger of God in front of the public, and violating the rule supports the suspicion that we went to, which is The reason for this debate. The sudden shift in the speech from a positive statement to another state contrary to it represents a compelling meaning, which is fear of what will be after what was before the speaker said, Ibn Abbas stated after the caliph asked permission and within the security statements in which harm was caused to the fearful person, and what explains This damage is the sudden shift in the discourse by which the caliph wanted to reduce the severity of the speech and occupied the son with another incident, and this is a rhetorical strategy that guarantees the speaker to limit the addressee's statements and the freedom of the statement on his part. The social taboos are a major reason for the absence of the offensive speech by saying on both sides of the speech.

As for the rhetoric of rhetoric, it is a language that portrays us rhetoric from both sides. It is worth noting that the eloquence of saying is one of the Arab ancestors at the time.

The political discourse is one of the discourses that lurk us with linguistic flexibility during it, because in most cases it is speeches in which the ranks of speakers differ, and we have seen what this discourse contained of the necessity of inclusion, and the shift in the discourse from naturally powerless to a discourse in which the threat emerged. The way of breaching it is one of the necessities of communication with the different addressees in the political and social rank, so the speakers observe “exemplarily, that is, consequently unsteadily in the exchange of words, conversational rules. And the phrase inconsistently means that these rules are in fact violable” (13). Because there are instances where the sender is obliged to violate the rules, if "it is obligatory for the speakers to respect all of them, they will find themselves in a permanent dual obligation mode, and we all know the bad consequences that it entails for the people who are subject to it (14); therefore the ancient linguistic heritage is a field to apply these rules to it" Because the speaker is deft, experienced in writing matters, and formulating speech in the manner in which he is certain that it will not create unsatisfactory consequences for him. The deficient speaker puts his words in the required position, declares them in positions, and obliges himself to appear in other places. Dialogue in authority letters is an issue Common to sell me and
speak eloquent. The debate between our hands did not read agreed in all the sources quoted, it has increased to that debate Ibn Abi iron something in its conclusion, the words of the Caliph: "aha Ibn Abbas! I had never seen anyone but his opponent "(15).

In this text, there are compelling meanings that the reader observes with an eye for consideration, since his reflection from the verb to the present tense verb (waha) is a bug that lies in the power of exclamation upon which the caliph, and the grammaticalists have proven this reversal from the verb to the verb’s name, Ibn Yaish says: The purpose Including "conciseness, abbreviation, and a type of exaggeration. Otherwise, the verbs for which these words are names have a first place in them. The meaning of "shut up", as well as the rest "(16). He benefited from him in intimidating the event and giving it importance in himself, and then, in the same session.

Examination of consideration and research suggests that the use of the verb (meaning) has a meaning that can be reached by activating communicative competencies, as it was stated in the hadith of the Messenger (may God’s prayers and peace be upon him and his family): “I was forbidden to bear men’s attention” (17). Ibn al-Jawzi interpreted it by saying: “His prohibition was prohibited from the barking of men, the barking of rivalry, and controversy” (18). And navigation is the source of the verb (immediate) on the measurement, because the source is from (an actor) (reactive, and effective), and it is a measurement for the morphologists. The implication in resorting to this strategy is to attempt to overthrow the arguments of Ibn Abbas, which eventually upset the caliph. It is clear to us through the previous reading Quraysh’s hatred of the divine order, that is, the hatred of gathering the divine will, the prophecy and the caliphate of the honorable family. Also, in the words of the caliph, Quraysh disliked the divine arrangement, because Bani Hashem was a belly of Quraysh's stomachs. And the violation of the rule of qualification is that what the caliph went to that the deprivation of the family of Muhammad from the caliphate was success and rightness. As for the speech as a whole, it represents the intention of the caliph to represent a role for the interests of the Quraysh and her stomachs, and the role of the official spokesman for her stomach. We conclude by saying: The text relied on several rhetorical strategies that had the effect of alternating methods and their differences.

III. THE SECOND DEBATE:

Omar bin Al-Khattab said: "O bin Abbas, the worker of Homs perished and was one of the people of goodness, and the people of goodness are few, and I have something from you that I have not seen from you and I am aware of that. So, what do you think about work? He said: I will not work until you tell me what is in yourself?” He said: And what He said: I want him, and if it is something I am afraid of myself for myself, I fear him for it, which I feared, and if I was innocent like him, I knew that I am not one of his family, so I accepted your work there, then I say what I saw or thought anything but I saw him. I was afraid that the one who is coming while you are at work will come to me and say: Come to us, and do not come to you without anyone else. I saw the Messenger of God [may God’s prayers and peace be upon him and his family] used people and left you. He said: By God, I have seen that, but you did not see him doing that? He said: By God, I do not know that I will support you from work, so are you people? Or are you afraid that you will be sold in your place of it, and the punishment will be
imposed on you and you must repent, and I have finished with you, so what do you think? I said: Show me that I do not work for you? He said: Why? He said: I said that if I worked for you and in what you have in it, I did not leave an injury in your eyes. He said: Then he pointed out to me, I said: I see that you use a correct one that is correct for you (19). Al-Maroudi added to this debate the caliph's saying: “You are that man. He said: Do not benefit from me with the misfortune of you and your mistake of me (20).

The context of the debate shows that the words of the caliph have a compelling meaning, which is the fear of what will be, so the caliph said: “It comes to me who is coming.” He wants death, meaning that you, Ibn Abbas, will call the Hashemites to rule without others. And the use of the verb of the command (so on) is for an imperative meaning by which the caliph expresses his fear of Ibn Abbas if he grabs the robe of judgment, and comes in the name of the verb - as we have shown - to exaggerate. And his saying: (The people of goodness) includes following a motivational strategy for the addressee to accept the offer. And please, verbally (Rajut) increases the motivation strategy that the speaker used.

And let's look at his saying at the beginning of the text: “In myself... I see that.” Then, to the end of the text in Ibn Abbas’s statement: “I see that I do not work... it hurts in your eyes.” If we are blessed to look at the text again and again, we find that the offer - if desired - is based on the intention to mention the caliphate, and the caliph's desire to continue it in the arms of Quraish. And his saying: (Asher Ali) apparently sought advice from Ibn Abbas, but it is a result of which the debate ended after a conflict between the caliph and himself, and this struggle ended with the rejection of the caliph, and rejection is inevitable in a context in which fear was in control of the caliph in it. The Caliph’s frankness in revealing what is in itself to Ibn Abbas shows us this great fear of the Caliphate, which is almost evident. And he violated the quantum rule from the person of the caliph, but he was attained, because Ibn Abbas deftly is able to reveal the caliph's intention without a statement to say.

The process of arousing the human impulse is controlled by a subjective or guiding psychological will that creates states of a subconscious feeling that can create unexpected reactions. The absence of a persuasive argument - directly or indirectly - for one of the analogues results in roughness of speech, and this roughness is governed by contextual circumstances beyond the control of the speaker himself. The unity of speech is governed by the rank of the speaker in all respects. Whatever the case, a person is governed by a set of behaviors, and "human behavior is a specific activity of intent, and no matter how many forms and patterns there are, it will still be linked to motives that stimulate it and direct it.” These motivations, which result in individual behaviors, are numerous and multiple, according to the linguistic use conditions of the actions that the speaker calls. It is worth noting that the accumulations of the past push one to a group of social motives, the most important of which is affiliation (21), and affiliation appears on the actual behavior of the individual. As for the study of heritage, it appears during the text, because language is an intellectual product, and it is a group of verbs that depict the individual's tendencies and perceptions towards the outside world (22).

This debate differs from its predecessor in that it is not governed - most of the time - by contexts that call for conciliation and insinuation of allusions.
Therefore, salting and departing from the rules of dialogue disappeared in their context.

IV. THE THIRD DEBATE

Ibn Abbas narrated, may God be pleased with him, said: "I entered upon Omar at the beginning of his caliphate ... He said: How did you succeed your cousin? I thought him meant Abdullah bin Jaafar. I said: I succeeded him playing with his cohorts. He said: I did not mean that, but I mean your great people the household I said: His successor is hiding in the west on palm trees from so-and-so, as he reads the Qur’an. He said: “Abdullah, do you have the blood of the flesh if you suppress it? Is there anything left of the caliphate in itself?” I said: Yes. He said: Do you claim that the Messenger of God - may God’s prayers and peace be upon him and his family? I said: Yes, and I will add to you, I asked my father about what he claims, and he said: He is truthful. Omar said: It was from the Messenger of God - may God’s prayers and peace be upon him and his family - in a climax of a saying that does not prove He did not cut an excuse, and he had been squaring at his command for some time, and he wanted in his illness to declare his name and prevented it from compassion and caution against Islam!

No, he raised this structure that Quraysh would never meet on it? If only its guardian, the Arabs would rise up against him, because the Messenger of God knew - God bless him and his family - I knew what was in himself, so he grabbed, and God refused, except to sign what was necessary (23).

His saying: (Great people of the household) means by Imam Alia. The persuasive arguments in this debate are based on the statement's statement, reinforced by the evidence supporting it. Among the meanings required in the context of the debate is Ibn Abbas’s saying: (He reads the Qur’an) referring to several meanings, which is that the Imam is the owner of the truth, because he mentioned his reading of the Qur’an, and that the Qur’an is the heart of his heart if he becomes aware of it. And the caliph's saying: (You have the blood of the body) divided from the caliph on Ibn Abbas by not concealing anything in himself, and he is out of the doubt, because he has sworn to him, because he thought of it. And his saying: (A alleges ... stipulated it) and the claim: claiming the thing is true or false, and perhaps the claim itself is not valid in the context of the debate against a person like the Imam. Ibn Abbas’s statement (Azadik) strengthened the Hajjaji achievement, and the power of the achievement came by the explicit act.

The breach in the context of the debate, it is located in a misplaced place in the debate, for the caliph's saying: “It was from the Messenger of God - may God’s prayers and peace be upon him and his family - in his command culminating in an argument that does not prove an argument, nor cut an excuse.” It is a violation of Al-Keif rule, which sees the release of evidence on the evidence. The circumstances of the speech, which are represented in the external context, indicate that the release of the news is not based on evidence that corroborates it or an argument supporting it; there is no point in releasing it in this context. And he said: “And he wanted in his illness to declare his name and prevented it from compassion and caution against Islam.” There is a violation of the rule of the party that sees the article as appropriate for the station, and you see that in the caliph’s words intent that he is keen on Islam and is aware of his interest more than the Messenger, and the frank saying does not need an explanation beyond this or closer. And his saying: “No, he brewed this structure, and Quraysh would never agree on it? If only its guardian, the Arabs would rise up against him from his country.”
Violation of the base of the Kaif, because the caliphate later came to the imam and was not intended. And he also said: “Then the Messenger of God - may God’s prayers and peace be upon him and his family - knew that I knew what was in him, so he caught.” He also violated the rule of qualification, because the Messenger has paved a divine order to the legitimacy of the caliphate of Imam Ali, so is it possible that there would be a danger in his mind what the Caliph saw when he was on his crib’s bed, so we say: The individual’s belief in a cause motivated him to include the arguments whatever they were, regardless of how That must be the corresponding speech.

These are the arguments that were made in the context of this debate, and it is based on an idea that must be embedded in the mind of the recipient, and perhaps the existence of this idea is valid in the absence of encyclopedic competence with the reader, because the facts of history contradict this idea, which is contradictory. After a careful reading of this debate, we come out that the speaker in some contexts overlooks or overlooks the availability of evidence that contradicts his statements, and he thus works - knowingly or unknowingly - to tip his words. It is clear to us in the context of this debate that the caliph was a factor in establishing the caliphate throughout the Quraysh.

V. RESULTS

1. The speech strategies in which the rules of discussion are violated are immunity strategies used by the speaker to protect face, the politeness of his speech, or fear and guard against the anger of the addressee.

2. The nature of the speaker is inclined to violate the rules of dialogue in places where he is under a higher authority, and in which he has a creative faculty that distinguishes him from others, as he is more exposed to danger than others.

3. Violation in the context of the debate does not mean falling wrong, but rather is a shift from the explicit meaning to the implicit meanings of the speaker.

4. The breach shall be for the purposes of multiple pluralistic contexts and rhetoric.

5. The context of the debates was characterized by persuasive rhetorical strategies that were based on throwing the argument without looking at the possibility of accepting it. This was motivated by the Hajj’s belief in his idea, belief and what he assigned himself to.

6. We have not seen in the context of the debates that fear that is motivated by the motives for breaching the rules of dialogue, but we found that progress is a major component in breaching the rules of dialogue.

7. The examination of the statements of the debates makes it necessary for the reader, whatever he is to verify the evidence presented in its contexts, and not only the person concerned with studying it.
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