

ADEL SHAKOUR

Al-Qasemi Academy
adsh2007@gmail.com

ABDALLAH TARABEIH

Al-Qasemi Academy
a_t@qsm.ac.il

Abstract

The article discusses the rhetorical strategies of the Palestinian poet Mahmoud Darwish (1941-2008) and the politician and Israeli Parliament member Ahmed Tibi with regard to Holocaust remembrance. The article compares the rhetorical strategies that these writers use to express messages linked to the Holocaust. The main questions examined in the article are: How should we characterize the construction of the ethos and different types of topoi in their rhetoric, and is there a difference between their rhetorical strategies in the context of Holocaust remembrance, bearing in mind that both are considered anti-Zionists?

Key words: *rhetorical strategies, Mahmoud Darwish, Ahmad Tibi, Holocaust remembrance, target audience*

1. Introduction

This article presents a rhetorical and linguistic analysis of references to the Holocaust by the politician and Israeli Palestinian member of parliament, Ahmed Tibi, and the Palestinian poet, Mahmoud Darwish. We believe that the anti-Zionist positions of Tibi and Darwish justify special attention to the rhetoric of their statements regarding the Holocaust, insofar as one would expect to see a rhetorical conflict or persuasive challenge of some kind. This is especially true in the case of Darwish. The late Palestinian poet harshly criticized Arabs and Palestinians who accept the Holocaust as a criterion for many of their political, cultural, and artistic decisions, and repeat ‘Zionist lies in order to win world sympathy’ by describing the suffering of the Palestinian people in terms invented by the Jews, such as ‘Holocaust’, ‘slaughter’, ‘victims’, ‘Diaspora’, and ‘memory’. Darwish believes that the adoption of these metaphors reflects Israeli’s success in controlling Palestinian identity (Litvak and Webman 2009: 313).

The article compares the rhetorical strategies of Darwish and Tibi when referring to the Holocaust; in other words, the rhetorical vehicles they use to convey certain messages about the Holocaust, and what characterizes the ethos and different topoi in their rhetoric. The article examines the rhetorical vehicles resources used by Tibi and Darwish. Our goal is to show how those resources have served them to express a dual message of empathy and identification with Jews as victims of the Holocaust, coupled with harsh criticism of Jewish racism and hatred against Palestinians.

The principle finding of the article is that Darwish and Tibi use keywords (topics or commonplaces accepted by the audience) to establish strong feelings of identification in their Jewish audience, while at the same time endowing them with critical content. Their goal is to weaken their Jewish audience's preconceived resistance to their militant anti-Zionist ethos.¹ We should clarify that in using keywords, the speaker aims to connect with the audience and present his subject in a positive and noncontroversial way. For example, it would be ineffective for Tibi to begin by calling his Jewish audience 'fascists' or 'racists', as we explain below.

The corpus is composed of examples taken from Mahmoud Darwish's written and verbal political discourse — including media interviews, articles, speeches, and books — and from Ahmad Tibi's speech before the Israeli Parliament on International Holocaust Remembrance Day, February 3, 2010.

After collecting, selecting, and classifying many examples of their written and spoken political discourse, we analyzed Darwish's and Tibi's rhetorical strategies. It should be mentioned that this is necessarily an impressionistic approach. In no other serious political situation has an Arab Israeli politician discussed the Holocaust, and Darwish himself does so very rarely. It was almost impossible to compile a wider corpus and identify further examples. Therefore, the conclusions of the study reflect our personal impressions and should be considered accordingly and, as such, more comprehensive studies are needed.

This article refers to the concepts of 'ethos' and 'topos'. The article uses the terms: early ethos; discursive and pre-discursive, ethos construction, topos, and different types of target audience. Given that Darwish and Tibi directly or indirectly compare Israel's treatment of the Palestinians to the Nazis' treatment of the Jews, we will also explore Holocaust denial in the Arab world and its comparison between Zionism and Nazism. We will attempt to explain how Tibi and Darwish construct their ethos in the eyes of their Jewish audience, a part of the universal audience, even though they directly or indirectly compare Israelis' treatment of Palestinians to the Nazis' treatment of Jews.

The speech by Ahmad Tibi examined below was delivered before the Israeli Parliament on International Holocaust Remembrance Day. This memorial day was instituted following Resolution 60/7 of the United Nations Security Council on November 1, 2005. The day chosen for Holocaust Remembrance Day was January 27, the day that the Auschwitz extermination camp was liberated by the Red Army. It deserves noting that this is not the same date as the Israeli national Holocaust and Heroism Remembrance Day, legislated by the Israeli Parliament as the 27th of the Hebrew month of Nissan, which

marks the beginning of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. However, the Israeli Parliament does not ignore International Holocaust Remembrance Day, which it marks with speeches on the Holocaust (Gitay 2010: 129).

The most striking difference between the two speakers is the extraordinary context of Tibi's speech: the Israeli Parliament, a rhetorical situation that warrants special attention. We should emphasize that the choice of Ahmed Tibi was no accident. Tibi, an Arab member of the Israeli Parliament and a known anti-Zionist, addressed the assembly on Holocaust remembrance and expressed identification with the Holocaust's victims. This is a special rhetorical situation of particular interest. There are no other speeches by Tibi or any other Arab political figures in Israel dealing with the remembrance of Holocaust victims. Additionally, the choice of an Israeli-Arab politician to deliver a speech on International Holocaust Remembrance Day in the Israeli Parliament, rather than a Jewish politician, is itself remarkable; it is only logical that a Jewish politician would deliver the speech and talk about the suffering of his own people.

However, Mahmoud Darwish and Tibi do have a common denominator that makes this a fruitful analysis. Like Tibi, Darwish is a graduate of the Israeli educational system, and is very familiar with Hebrew literature and culture and Jewish history. His poems include references to Biblical figures such as Noah, Lot, Joseph, Jesus, and Mary. For him, to be able to pertain to a historical event, it requires being competent in all details.

We will begin our analysis with the concept of 'ethos'. Constructing his ethos is Tibi's basic communicative test: for an anti-Zionist politician to establish personal reliability is no simple matter if he is talking about 'the victim of the victim' being treated inhumanly. Darwish, too, was a militant anti-Zionist Palestinian, and it is intriguing to see how he tries to establish the communicative function between himself and his wider audience, especially the Jewish audience.

The figurative rhetorical devices reflect Darwish's implicit identification with the victims of the Holocaust. To emphasize this point, we will turn to a presentation and analysis of the topic, followed by examples.

It is natural for an analysis of figurative rhetorical devices to focus on Darwish rather than Tibi, since Darwish's identification with the victims of the Holocaust is mostly implicit. Unlike Darwish, Tibi always identifies explicitly with the victims.

We will also refer to the traditional critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach. We will show how this approach can be applied in the analysis of statements by Tibi and Darwish, and how they try to construct their message, contribute to social change, promote their ideological views, influence the actions and discourse of the Israeli government towards the Palestinian people, and oppose Israel's repression of the Palestinian people. In this context, we will also address the classification of speech acts suggested by John Searle.

We will first provide some background information on the subjects of the study, Mahmoud Darwish and Ahmed Tibi.

Mahmoud Darwish (1942-2008) is considered the Palestinian national poet and one of the greatest poets of the Arab world. He was born in the village of

al-Birwa in the Lower Galilee, which was completely destroyed in 1948. During the war, he and his family fled to Lebanon. The family clandestinely returned to Israel a year later and lived in the village of Deir al-Asad, refugees in their own country. After high school, he moved to Haifa. In the early 1960s, he joined the Israeli Communist Party, which fostered Arabic identity and Arab national cultural, and played a respected role in the party's newspapers. He was a member of the editorial board of the Israeli Arabic-language communist party newspaper *Al-Ittihad* and edited the literary supplement *Al Ġadīr*, as well as literary journals, including *Al Fajr* and *Shu'ūn Falastīniyyah* (Stavi and Schwartz 2014: 321).²

Ahmad Tibi is an Israeli Parliament member from the Joint Arab List. He is a prominent public figure, familiar to all Israeli television viewers. The Israeli-born Tibi was an outstanding student at the Hebrew University School of Medicine in Jerusalem, a gifted physician, a loyal spokesman for Israeli Arabs, a former advisor on Israel to Palestinian Authority chairman Yasser Arafat, and a spokesman for the Palestinian Authority during the Wye Plantation negotiations. He is a diplomat who speaks with unaccustomed, total honesty (Ben Porat 1999: from the preface).

2. The Holocaust in Israeli Political Discourse

Prior to the 1967 war, the Holocaust was not part of the everyday reality in Israel. It was not taught in schools and was rarely mentioned in survivors' homes. The decision by Egyptian ruler Gamal Abed al Nasser to close the Suez Canal and blockade the Straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping, coupled with the feeling that the country's survival was in jeopardy, led to tensions, mainly among the families of survivors. However, Israel's decisive and total victory in the war offered certain proof that the only way of ensuring the Jewish people's survival in Israel was a strong army. Israel would guarantee that there would never be another Shoah (Holocaust). Since then, almost every politician repeatedly uses the Holocaust in demands regarding the borders of Israel and its enemies, and in all negotiations over the occupied territories under Israeli army control (Keren 2015: 173).

In the period between 1967 and the 1973 war, Israelis' sense of security regarding the country's future and their feeling that Israel was morally in the right grew stronger. The threat posed to Israel's existence by these two wars only reinforced the belief held by many, including Holocaust survivors and the soldiers who fought in these wars, that Israel had a right to hold the occupied territories and to control their populations (Keren 2015: 174).

In the wake of these wars, the subject of the Holocaust arose whenever there were discussions or arguments about the control of the territories. For example, plans to enter into negotiations were termed, 'boarding the train to Auschwitz'. At the same time, strong criticism developed regarding the conduct of IDF soldiers towards Palestinian populations in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and Professor Yeshayahu Leibowitz even compared their behavior to that of German soldiers during the Nazi era (Keren 2015: 174).

The most important event, in terms of the everyday use of the images and symbols of the Holocaust, at the beginning of the twenty-first century was the

removal of Jewish settlers from their homes in the Gaza Strip during the Disengagement from Gaza in 2007. During this contentious event, Jewish settlers employed symbols from the Holocaust, such as yellow stars, and the security forces were referred to by Holocaust-era terms, including 'Nazis' and '*kalgasim*' (a derogatory Hebrew word meaning 'troopers', cruel soldiers of an oppressive regime). The settlers also stated that they were Holocaust survivors or the children of Holocaust survivors, and sought to use this aspect of their identity as a reason for halting the Disengagement. Since then, the use of the Holocaust for every political purpose has proceeded unstoppably. This includes Israeli diplomacy, ranging from taking all high-ranking foreign diplomats to visit the Yad Vashem Holocaust Museum as the preamble to policy discussions with Israeli leaders, to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's speeches to the United Nations.

Many on Israel's left have criticized Israeli political culture's emphasis on the uniqueness of the Holocaust as excessively focusing on Jewish victimhood. They believe that it has been exploited to justify Israel's aggressive policies towards the Arab world, and Israelis' moral blindness to the wrongs carried out against the Palestinians in their name (Margalit 1998: 61). In this context, the *Syrian Times* argued that 'a country that continually uses, and too often manipulates, Holocaust imagery to justify its policies of self-defense and "never again", cannot complain when the rest of the world uses those same standards to make judgments concerning its own policies' (Litvak and Webman 2009: 325).

Renowned Israeli Holocaust scholar Yehuda Bauer contends that the term 'Holocaust' has become flattened in the public mind because any evil that befalls anyone anywhere becomes a Holocaust: Vietnamese, Soviet Jews, African-Americans in American ghettos, women suffering inequality, and so on (Litvak and Webman 2009: 325).

It is true that Tibi and Darwish are far from denying the Holocaust. They are Arabs who are known for their anti-Zionist agenda, and as such they are not expected to identify with Holocaust victims. There is a phenomenon of Holocaust denial in the Arab world especially among anti-Zionists, and we believe that identification with victims of the Holocaust by known anti-Zionists calls for particular rhetorical scrutiny.³

While no politician has based his or her entire campaign on Holocaust denial, a number have used it when it was in their interest to do so. Croatian president Franjo Tudjman wrote of the 'biased testimonies and exaggerated data' used to estimate the number of Holocaust victims, and in his book *Wastelands: Historical Truth*, he always places the word 'Holocaust' in quotation marks. Tudjman has good historical reasons for doing so: during World War II, Croatia was an ardent Nazi ally, and the vast majority of Croatian Jews and non-Jews were murdered by their fellow Croatians, not by the Germans. Tudjman obviously believes that one of the ways for his country to win public sympathy is to diminish the importance of the Holocaust (Lipstadt 1993: 7).

Van Dijk (1984: 13, 40) focuses on the 'rationalization and justification of discriminatory acts against minority groups'. He designates the categories used to rationalize prejudice against minority groups as 'the 7 D's of

Discrimination'. They are dominance, differentiation, distance, diffusion, diversion, depersonalization or destruction, and daily discrimination. These strategies serve in various ways to legitimize and reinforce the difference of 'the other': for example, by dominating minority groups, by excluding them from social activities, and even by destroying and murdering them (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 22).

Tibi and Darwish believe that overtly or covertly identifying with the victims of the Holocaust serves their interests and can lead to change in the Israeli government's treatment of Palestinians as shown later in the article.

3. Conceptual Frame

3.1 Classifying Speech Acts

The most famous classification of speech acts was proposed by philosopher John Searle.⁴ Searle classifies speech acts according five groups:

- A. Assertive speech acts —the speaker is committing to the reality of something. Examples include: describing, arguing, concluding, denying, confirming.
- B. Directive speech acts — the speaker tries to cause the addressee to do something. Examples include: ordering, demanding, recommending, warning, asking.
- C. Commissive speech acts — commit the speaker to doing something in the future. Examples include: promising, threatening, proposing, agreeing.
- D. Expressive speech acts — express the speaker's psychological state. Examples include: apologizing, condemning, thanking, welcoming, offering condolence.
- E. Declarative speech acts — the speaker causes an immediate change in the world. Examples include: declarations of war, names, court sentences, bans, marriages.

A sentence can contain more than one speech act, which can belong to different categories. For example, the sentence, 'Study hard for your exam!' might be an order, a piece of advice, or a threat. The sentence, 'Excuse me, I didn't hear your name' might be an apology, a request to the addressee to repeat his name, or both acts combined.

John Austin identified three types of acts that are present in every utterance (Austin 2006: 127-128):⁵

- A. The locutionary act — this is the statement itself, producing certain sounds which have meaning. The locutionary act employs language to convey content.
- B. The illocutionary act — the act that takes place when the utterance is said, namely an action with the power to perform a certain act. For example:

warning, reporting, apologizing, etc. The speech act is expressed in the illocutionary act.

- C. The perlocutionary act — when a locutionary act, and hence also an illocutionary act, takes place, our words often affect others' emotions, thoughts, and actions as well as our own. An extra-linguistic result can be caused through speech. This result is called a perlocution.

It is known that we can distinguish between direct and indirect speech acts. Direct speech acts are acts wherein the locutionary act testifies directly to the illocutionary act. That is, the utterance content directly expresses the speaker's intention. Conversely, in an indirect speech act, the utterance content only hints indirectly at the speaker's intention and the action he wishes to perform through the utterance. For example, the utterance, 'I want you to pass me the salt please' is a direct speech act of request, while the utterance, 'Can you pass me the salt?' is an indirect speech act of request. Indirect speech acts reflect what Searle meant when he said that speakers often wish to express more than they say (Livnat 2014b: 169-173).

3.2 Target Audience

The new rhetoric defines the target audience of the argumentation process as everyone whom the speaker wishes to influence through his or her arguments (Perelman 1994: 17). The starting point is therefore the goal of the speaker and his intentions: every speaker thinks, either consciously or unconsciously, about those he wishes to persuade, and they in turn create the audience whom the speaker has in mind.

When the speaker assumes the task of persuading a certain audience, he builds a picture in his mind of the audience he will be addressing, and chooses his arguments accordingly. Naturally, it is very important for this picture to be as near to reality as possible, since an incorrect picture of the audience could produce undesirable consequences. We should also consider that a person's views do not exist in isolation from his social environment, i.e., from the people around him, those with whom he is in contact. All social circles can be characterized by the dominant views of their members and their underlying beliefs and assumptions. Therefore, anyone wishing to persuade a given group must adapt their arguments to take these factors into account (Livnat 2009: 65-66; Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969: 19-20).

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969: 30) note three types of audiences, a division that can help us judge the rhetorical nature of arguments: the first type consists of the entire human race, or at least all 'normal' adults. They refer to this group as 'the universal audience'. The second type is a single interlocutor whom the speaker addresses in a dialogue. The third type is the subject himself, when he engages in deliberation or gives himself reasons for his own actions.

Tibi is addressing the Jewish Israeli audience, that is the particular audience. As for Darwish, Jewish Israeli citizens are not part of his audience, given the fact that very few read Arabic. As a target audience, Jews have a complex status. We see this from the two divergent discourse patterns used by Darwish and Tibi: the pattern of publically or implicitly recognizing the tragedy that

the Jewish people suffered in the Holocaust, and the pattern of harshly criticizing the Israelis, which, as we will see, is reflected in the comparison of Israeli policy towards Palestinians to Nazi crimes against the Jews.

Tibi is not expected to demonstrate good faith just because he is an Arab member of the Israeli Parliament. He should do so only if he wishes to be heard by Jewish Israelis. Tibi is speaking in a media situation in front of a Jewish audience. In contrast, Darwish's references to the Holocaust are extremely callous, since he sometimes compares Israeli behavior towards Palestinians with the Nazis' behavior towards Jews. Our opinion is that this is something we would expect from someone identified as an anti-Zionist, who criticizes any Arabs and Palestinians who believe 'Jewish lies about the Holocaust'. Darwish also speaks the way he does because of the media situation he is in. That is, Darwish refers to the Holocaust in interviews with the Arab press and/or speaking on Arab satellite channels, and it is important for him to be consistent in his views regarding the Holocaust to the Arab audience. Since Darwish's audience is also the universal audience, he sometimes identifies with the victims of the Holocaust, but does so through very indirect allusion, reflecting rhetorical vagueness. In other words, Darwish can be cautious and restrained when referring to the Holocaust as well as being sometimes callous. He adapts his ethos and tailors his rhetorical strategies to his different audiences.

3.3 The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) Approach

CDA is a multidisciplinary approach that is used in discourse analysis. It focuses on how social and political power is created and maintained through language. CDA seeks to expose a discourse's biases and manipulations that serve political interests and advance controversial ideological positions, and highlights the methods or stratagems through which the discourse produces or maintains an unequal balance of power in a society. CDA aims to expose the linguistic, cultural, and historical roots that support the practices — the modes of action — that preserve the balance of power. The approach's basic premise is that discourse has the capacity to shape social identities and establish relations between groups of people and individuals. Discourse can help maintain the social status quo, but it can also contribute to social change. The CDA approach focuses on the way in which social structures embody the existing balance of power and control in the society through discourse: how does the discourse produce them, approve them, challenge them, or legitimize them. CDA seeks to understand, expose, and ultimately oppose social inequality (Livnat 2014a: 361; Hart 2010: 13-14; Wodak 2001a: 10; van Dijk 2001: 352; Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 32; Meyer 2001: 15).

The term 'power' is the main concept in critical discourse analysis, the discourse mechanism being seen as a central way to actualize power in social contexts. This premise is nourished by the thinking of social philosophers such as Marx, Foucault, Gramsci, Habermas, Bourdieu, and others who drew attention to the central role of language in constructing social reality (Livnat 2014a: 361; Hart 2010: 13-14; Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 32; Meyer 2001: 15).

For Michel Foucault, discourse is a representation of knowledge about a certain subject. Discourse is linked to knowledge production through language. Foucault argues that the term 'discourse' not only relates to

language, but also to action modes (practices), rules, and regulations. Discourse constructs and defines the objects of our knowledge. It controls how we talk about a subject or act towards it; it determines the accepted ways to talk about it, and thus also limits other possibilities for knowledge construction about the same subject. A discourse will never consist of one statement, one text, one act, or one source; it will appear in a variety of texts and different institutional contexts in the society (Livnat 2014a: 362).

According to Foucault, 'words/things' have meaning and can be called real only in a specific historical context. For example, 'mental illness' is not an 'objective' object with the same meaning in every era and every culture. Foucault and his followers argue that the connection between signifier and signified is far more complex than implied by semiotics: 'a simple combination between an idea and the sequence of sounds that expresses it'. Thus the term 'mental illness' does not signify something objective in the world. The object it represents is an outcome of the construction of knowledge that occurs within a certain discourse. The object is constructed by all that is said about it in a certain culture and in a certain period, by the way it is described, explained, judged, classified, etc. (Livnat 2014a: 362; Meyer 2001: 15). In other words, discourse constructs objects, instilling them with significance and meaning in a particular social and cultural context. Discourse determines how people see things and creates a picture of their world and their outlooks, thus influencing their actions as well. According to Foucault, the discourse on mental illness during the Enlightenment led to people with mental illnesses being incarcerated in institutions and mistreated (Livnat 2014a: 362). According to van Dijk (1984: 13), prejudice is not merely a characteristic of individual beliefs or emotions about social groups. Such ethnic attitudes have social functions, e.g., to protect the interests of the in-group. The cognitive structures of prejudice and the strategies of its use reflect these social functions (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 21-22).

CDA scholars regard themselves as ideologically motivated and committed, and their research is a kind of intervention in the life of society and social relations. Many researchers from this school are also active in movements against racism, feminist movements, peace movements, and so forth. They state their ideological intentions openly and stand with weaker social groups against more powerful ones. The quality of their research is not measured by 'objectivity' and academic remoteness, but by preserving the norms of systematic, rigorous, cautious analysis that are accepted in all scientific research (Livnat 2014a: 371; Meyer 2001: 15).

CDA is not a school of linguistics or discourse research. While the stated goal of traditional scholars of discourse is to reveal and describe the linguistic system's structure and laws, critical discourse scholars tend to argue that the academic description they offer is sterile and has no social and ideological implications (Livnat 2014a: 371).

While analyzing texts and 'linguistic events' requires some analytical method, CDA on principle is neither based on nor prefers a single theory or a uniform analytical method. Instead, CDA offers a kind of tool box for the researcher, a list of linguistic and textual characteristics that can be examined when one wishes to analyze a text critically (Livnat 2014a: 366; Wodak 2001b: 64).

3.4 Ethos

According to Aristotle, the ethos (character, reliability, professionalism) of the speaker is the way that he presents himself, his intentions, and his beliefs to his audience. Character-driven persuasion entails speaking in a way that makes the speaker seem worthy of the audience's trust. A speech without ethos will miss its mark. Character (ethos) is practically the strongest method of persuasion (Aristotle 1973: 1356a; Livnat 2009: 72; Gitay 2010: 132-133). The discourse itself should reveal the speaker's character. Often, it is not the speaker's ideas that affect and change his audience, but rather the speaker's character or image. In other words, the speaker's qualities and reliability are key factors in persuasion that carry more weight than different rhetorical strategies. Persuasion by means of one's character, says Aristotle, is effective when the speaker speaks in a manner that appears credible. We assume that the stronger the researcher's ethos, the greater the chances that his arguments will be favorably accepted (Livnat 2014b: 126).

The definition of ethos varies in different disciplines. Following Aristotle, pragmatists such as Ducrot (1984) and Maingueneau (1999) view the image of the orator as being built by the discourse itself. For them, ethos 'is constructed within verbal interaction and is purely internal to discourse' (Amossy 2001: 5). In sociology, however, ethos is not considered a purely discursive construction. According to Bourdieu (1991), the power of language and its ability to 'act' are determined by social circumstances and power relations (Amossy 2001: 2). The force of discourse is not dependent on the image of the self that the orator produces in speech, but on his or her social position and 'the access he [or she] can have to the language of the institution' (Bourdieu 1991). Amossy thus proposes a distinction between 'discursive ethos' and 'prior ethos', the latter defined as the image the audience has of the speaker before he takes the floor.⁶

Tibi and Darwish both seek to establish their ethos within the discourse. Yet we cannot ignore that all speakers, especially prominent ones, join the discourse with a pre-existing ethos. Tibi and Darwish are prominent anti-Zionist figures, and they certainly enter the discourse with an already constructed ethos.

4. *Analysis and discussion*

4.1 Ethos

We think that it important to begin the analysis with ethos since the circumstances of Tibi's speech, in front of a Jewish audience on International Holocaust Remembrance Day, is an extremely complex communicative situation, especially since Tibi is an overtly anti-Zionist politician. The ethos that Tibi needs to build is his basic communicative test, since for an anti-Zionist politician to establish personal reliability is no simple matter if he is talking about 'the victim of the victim' being treated inhumanly. Darwish, too, was a militant anti-Zionist Palestinian, and it is intriguing to see how he tries to build the communicative function between himself and his wider audience, especially the Jewish audience.

Tibi builds his ethos via open identification with the Jews as victims of the Holocaust. He seeks to establish the feeling among his listeners that he unequivocally identifies with Jewish suffering. Tibi thus creates a firm communicative channel between himself and Jewish listeners. In particular, Tibi uses several strongly relatable keywords.

In his references to the Holocaust, Tibi uses keywords that reflect a style of *dugri* speech ('straight talking' in Hebrew) (Katriel 2016: 747). His existing ethos confronts the ethos that his speech establishes. His aim is for his listeners to sense his identification with the sensitivity of their values and to induce an identification and agreement with what he himself is saying.

The following are several quotations from Tibi's speech on Holocaust Remembrance Day, 3 February 2010:

- (1) 'There is nothing more natural than for all the factions of the Israeli Parliament to join together to mark International Holocaust Remembrance Day. The day that the Auschwitz extermination camp was liberated'.
- (2) 'I have complete empathy with the victims of the Holocaust'.
- (3) 'I live with you'.
- (4) 'I need to understand what makes you happy, and what makes you sad, what makes you feel good and what makes you feel bad. Just as I expect you to know me'.
- (5) 'How could I not feel empathy for suffering'?
- (6) 'I say again that I am full of empathy for the families of the victims of the Holocaust whoever and wherever they may be [...] including those who I live with in the same country'.
- (7) 'This is the moment when a person has to take off his national or religious hat, shed any difference, and wear just one form: that of humanity'.
- (8) 'One must be sensitive to the bereaved mother's cries. The bereaved mother whose home is destroyed and buries her children'.
- (9) 'One must be sensitive to the pain and weeping of the doctor who lost his daughters in Operation Cast Lead'.⁷

Tibi's statements in sentences 1-9 are indirect speech acts. Their content indirectly hints at Tibi's intentions and the act that he aims to perform through them. The sentences reflect illocutionary speech acts that go beyond the utterance itself, and through which Tibi produces more than one speech act.

In sentence 1, Tibi uses an expressive speech act in which he welcomes the fact that the Israeli Parliament has convened all its factions to mark International Holocaust Remembrance Day. Sentence 1 is also an assertive speech act: Tibi declares that this event is an excellent opportunity to consider the suffering of others (the Palestinians), implying that the Israeli government is not ignoring the suffering of the Palestinian people. In sentences 2-6, Tibi refers to himself through an expressive speech act, and explains how he personally exemplifies

someone who is full of empathy and feeling for the victims of the Holocaust, as he lives among the Jewish people and is committed to understanding their happiness and sadness, just as he expects the Jews to know him – in other words, to know the Palestinian people and the Arab population of Israel and to show empathy and sensitivity towards them. Sentences 7-9 contain commissive speech acts in which Tibi offers to take off his political hat and relate as one human being to another. He also includes more detail, mentioning the specific situation of the Palestinian mother whose house was destroyed with her children inside the house and the doctor who lost his daughters.

Sentences 1-9 hint at assertive speech acts: Tibi indirectly compares Nazi aggression towards the Jews to the aggressive treatment of the Palestinians by the Israeli government.

CDA theory is reflected in sentences 1-9, insofar as Tibi constructs his assertive meaning through these illocutionary speech acts and decides how he wants to perceive the behavior of the Israeli government towards the Palestinians, and his own opinion on the subject. He shows how one should relate to the Israeli government's behavior towards Palestinians, thus restricting alternatives for knowledge construction in this regard.

Tibi tries to influence the Israeli government's treatment of the Palestinians through his illocutionary speech acts. He expects that Jews, who themselves suffered in the Holocaust, should show more compassion and sensitivity towards Palestinians and be considerate of the suffering of others.

In contrast, Darwish tries to construct his ethos through a generally implied identification with the Jewish people as victims of the Holocaust. In order to persuade the universal audience that he identifies with what happened to the Jews during the Holocaust, uses words associated with the Holocaust, such as the word 'ghetto' or 'Holocaust' itself. In other words, the fact that Darwish does not deny the Holocaust (though he criticizes the Arabs and Palestinians who believe the lies of the Jews about its scale) can rehabilitate his ethos in the eyes of the universal audience and soften his anti-Zionist image, even though this is only hinted at, without having recourse to overt declarations of empathy and identification. Darwish's main objective is not to express his identification with the Jewish audience (as we will see in part 9, which addresses 'topos' as an element of political speech) but to lambast Israel for racism against the Palestinian people. The following examples illustrate Darwish's implied identification with the Jewish people as the victim of the Holocaust as a rhetorical strategy for reinforcing his own ethos.

4.2 Topos

Topos is a term borrowed from classical Greek rhetoric that literally means 'commonplace', and refers to a standardized way of constructing an argument; an intellectual theme found in a 'stockroom' of topics. The speaker searches in the topos for persuasive rhetorical devices. The topos contains a treasury of social or ideological conventions that are meant to elicit the mental acceptance of a given topic by an audience. The topos is the 'glue' that creates a common denominator between the speaker and the target audience based on a social consensus (Aristotle 2002: 28-32). If a leader or speaker who wants to be

particularly effective addresses the nation, he or she must base his or her statements and appeal on what is commonly accepted by that society; in other words, on 'the truth' of the society, its ideological narrative, collective memory, and cognitive patterns (Gitay 2010: 135-136).

A speaker who is concerned about the effectiveness of his or her speech must adopt the views of his or her audience (Gitay 2010: 137). According to Perelman, the speaker must not start with his or her own truth, but with the accepted consensus of the public he or she wishes to address. In other words, the speaker must make the consensus and accepted patterns of his or her audience the starting point, because if he does not he loses his audience (Perelman 1982: 21). According to Eco and van Dijk, it is advisable for the speaker to open by adjusting to the views of his or her audience, and obviously not to mock or annoy it. The speaker must aim to connect with the audience and present the subject in a positive, noncontroversial way. For example, it would be ineffective for Tibi to begin his address by calling his audience in the Parliament 'fascists' or 'racists' (Eco 2006: 44-65; van Dijk 2008: 189-190).

Tibi and Darwish both have a dual message: empathy and identification with Jews as victims of the Holocaust, coupled with harsh criticism for racism against and hatred of Palestinians. However, their approaches to conveying this message vary. Darwish, for his part, sometimes avoids a direct comparison between Israeli treatment Palestinians and Nazi behavior, as in examples 12-16. In other situations, he makes very direct and bald comparisons between Israel's behavior towards Palestinians and that of the Nazis during the Holocaust, saying that Israel believes Jewish victimhood gives it the right to murder, as in examples 10 and 11.

In contrast, Tibi's topos is characterized by the fact that he always avoids direct comparison between Israel's treatment of Arabs in Israel and the Nazis' treatment of Jews, although this is his allusive intention. When Tibi says, 'This is the moment when a person has to take off his national or religious hat, shed any difference, and wear just one form: that of humanity', he is ostensibly speaking as a human being and not as a politician. But his intention is to convey his view that the lesson of the Holocaust is that Jews must assume the values of humanity and stand beside the weak and the downtrodden, the depressed and the exiled; in other words, beside Arabs, the victim of the victims.

Tibi devotes an entire section at the end of his speech to the thesis of the dispossession of the other (Gitay 2010: 135-136). This thesis makes clear the analogy between the Holocaust and contemporary Israeli society: 'When one is the victim of this terrible death, which is the result of the abuse of power, one must be sensitive to the bereaved mother's cries'. Tibi does not stop with this analogy alone. He provides further details: 'The bereaved mother whose home is destroyed and buries her children, the pain and weeping of the doctor who lost his daughters'. Tibi criticizes the victims who victimize the other, namely the Arabs, and his words imply a comparison between Israel's treatment of Arabs and the Nazis' treatment of Jews, but he hints at this indirectly without actually saying it. Thus Tibi does not preach his thesis directly, namely: 'You are fascists', 'You are racists'.

4.3 Darwish's Explicit Identification with the Victims of the Holocaust

It is natural for the analysis of figurative rhetorical devices to focus on Darwish rather than Tibi. While Darwish's identification with Holocaust victims is mostly implicit, Tibi always identifies explicitly with the victims of the Holocaust.

Darwish's attitude to the Holocaust reflects a rhetorical vagueness: he identifies with the suffering of the Jewish people, albeit by means of allusion. In other words, what Tibi says openly, Darwish usually says vaguely. This is to be expected as Darwish is an anti-Zionist who criticizes Arabs, who repeat 'the lies of the Zionists' regarding the Holocaust and describe the suffering of the Palestinian people using concepts invented by the Jews, as we saw earlier:

- (10) 'We are not chauvinists. We are the victims of chauvinism. On the other hand, the executioner **who was the victim of the Nazis** is not a source of our wisdom and inspiration because this executioner has learned nothing from his cruel experience during the Holocaust apart from copying his murderers by murdering other people' (Darwish 2001: 225).
- (11) 'We did not invent the slogan, "We will not forgive and we will not forget." We are the victims of people who have assumed a monopoly on victimhood and **the event which made them the victim gives them the right to become our murderer who cannot be brought to justice**' (Darwish and Al-Kassem 1989: 104).

In examples 10 and 11, Darwish explicitly mentions that the Jews were the victims of the Holocaust and does not deny it. This identification, by a poet who is perceived as anti-Zionist and who criticizes any Arabs and Palestinians who believe 'Jewish lies' about the Holocaust, is enough to strengthen his ethos.

In a conflictual context, the act of establishing ethos can become a central issue and the focus of the conflict between the rival parties. In particular, this act may turn out to be a reciprocal act: Attacking the other's ethos may be used as an indirect means of establishing the speaker's own (Livnat 2014b: 128). Darwish attacks the ethos of the Jews, because the event that made them victims gives them the right to become murderers who cannot be brought to justice.

It is noteworthy that examples 10 and 11, as well as the previous examples, contain a dual message. Darwish both hints at identification, usually with the Jews as victims of the Holocaust, but also criticizes Israel for its racist policy towards the Palestinians. His underlying argument is that a people who endured suffering and torture should be extra sensitive to the distress of others.

4.4 Darwish's Implicit Identification with Holocaust Victims through Figurative Rhetorical Devices

It is natural for the analysis of figurative rhetorical devices to focus on Darwish rather than Tibi. While Darwish's identification with Holocaust

victims is mostly implicit, Tibi always identifies explicitly with the victims of the Holocaust.

4.4.1 Metaphor

Perelman (1994: 94-95) suggests that a metaphor is simply an analogy: Based on the analogy, 'A is to B what C is to D', the metaphor assumes one of the forms: 'A of D', 'C of B', or 'A of C'. For example, from the analogy, 'old age is to life what night is to day', we obtain the metaphors: 'old age of the day', 'the evening of life', or 'the night is old age'.

Berggren concludes that every truly creative and non-mythical thought, whether religious or metaphysical, will invariably be metaphorical in a manner that is unchanging and without other alternatives (Berggren 1962: 237-258; 1963: 450-472).

Traditionally, metaphors were seen as ornaments: metaphors are words borrowed from one field and used in another field on the basis of similarities between referents.

In contrast to traditional linguists, cognitive linguists do not see metaphors as a rhetorical embellishment but as an essential part of human thought (Abadi 1998: 56-67). Metaphorical expressions are considered expressions that nourish our worldview, shape our thinking, and, hence, our actual behavior (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 3-6). These are metaphors which capture conceptions from one domain — the 'borrowing domain' or 'goal' — using another, lending domain — the 'source'. The names of the two domains create metaphoric identity. For example, the 'time is money' identity allows us to relate to time metaphorically in terms linked to money, such as, waste of time, investing time, time is valuable, etc.

According to Thompson (1996: 185), metaphor's suggestive power is the driving force behind political discourse: for both politicians, image makers, and decision makers, and for the mass audience who view the discourse but are not directly involved in it. The manipulative power of metaphor can be seen in politicians' ability to communicate emotionally on a certain issue and to stir their listeners' emotions, spurring them to action or at least to accepting the message.

This article applies the cognitive theory of metaphor. One of the most influential works of the semantic cognitive school was George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's groundbreaking work on linguistics, which attracted worldwide attention, establishing the foundation for a cognitive theory of metaphors (1980). Lakoff and Johnson wanted to examine the metaphoric nature of human cognition by focusing on our common, habitual, consensual metaphors. Their work makes clear that metaphors are supremely efficient tools for shaping and creating thoughts. Metaphors frame the world for us. Without metaphors, we cannot really think (Livnat 2014a: 368; Gavriely-Nuri 2011: 91). Metaphorical linguistic usages reflect how we perceive reality. George Lakoff took this idea a step further and showed that metaphors not only reflect how we see reality, they also influence our perception of it. In January 1991, on the heels of the First Gulf War, he analyzed the US administration's political discourse and showed how the Bush administration used metaphors to justify going to war. In other words, he demonstrated how

metaphor analysis can be critical analysis exposing discourse manipulations and disclosing normally hidden ideologies (Livnat 2014a: 368-369).

Dalia Gavriely-Nuri (2009, 2011), who has studied metaphors in Israeli political discourse, shows how they help to portray war as a normal part of life. Such war-normalizing metaphors aim to naturalize and legitimate the use of military power by creating a systematic analogy between war and objects that are far from the battlefield. For example, the metaphoric phrase 'Golda's kitchen' was the popular nickname for the most intimate circle of Prime Minister Golda Meir's advisers. This metaphor conceals a secretive and undemocratic decision-making process, even about security matters and other central issues. In other words, the 'kitchen' metaphor hides what was, in fact, often a 'war room' where Israel's burning security matters were decided. Similarly, the metaphoric phrase 'surgical strike' equates war with medicine, while the metaphoric phrase 'target bank' associates war with trade. From a critical perspective, it is clear that these metaphors encourage people to see war as normal, everyday, expected, and commonsensical, exactly like medicine or trade. Thus they conceal the real, terrible, violent nature of war. Such discourse patterns, which recur in statements by political and military leaders, academics, journalists, and Internet response writers, normalize what is an inherently abnormal situation. At the same time, leaders use such metaphors to persuade the public of the logic and necessity of war.⁸

- (12) 'This agreement (the Oslo Agreement); this wording and this analysis, this division of the territories into **cages** and breaking the geographical unity of the land and breaking the unity of the Palestinian people, and splitting it into ethnic groups who are not partners in the same project, is the fruit of the planning of the Labor Party' (The Jordanian daily newspaper, *Ad-Dustour*, 23.5.1997).

In this statement, Darwish hints at identification through the use of metaphor: the word 'cages' is a metaphor for Israel's occupation policy: dividing Palestinian territory into non-contiguous areas to prevent territorial continuity and break the unity of the Palestinian people. This seems paradoxical: How can Darwish strengthen his ethos by in fact harshly criticizing Israel's policy through the use of such a metaphor? We suggest that, in this case, the metaphor is an allusion to the predicament of the Jews under Nazi rule, in particular their concentration in ghettos. Through this metaphor, Darwish wishes to expose the social inequality and injustice of Israeli government policy towards the Palestinians, and ultimately to further social justice via the discourse mechanism.

4.4.2 Hyperbole

Hyperbole is the use of exaggeration as a rhetorical device. Hyperbole is found in the Bible and is frequently employed in medieval poetry. The strong language basically involves the use of lexical values with a strong negative weight (Kedar 1998: 274).

Darwish uses exaggeration to describe the occupation policy and movement restriction on Palestinians.

- (13) 'We cannot meet (the people of) our villages. All our poets and writers are under house detention, which forces them to stay in their location and sometimes prevents them from leaving their homes from sunrise to sunset. **My friends, even love poetry is subjected to military censorship before publication**' (Darwish 2001: 224).

In his formulation, Palestinians are not only subjected to strict security checks, even love poetry must be rigorously scrutinized; these poems too are not exempt from censorship. This hyperbole alludes to the horrors and brutality of the Nazis against Jews. Under Nazi rule, Jews were forbidden to engage in even the simplest activities: to practice their religion in public or to bring food into the ghetto. Even Jewish sacred books were burned. Darwish wants Jews to remember what they suffered in the Holocaust, and hints that these memories should guide them in their policies towards Palestinians. Darwish's allusions to the Holocaust, and the implication that he does not deny the Holocaust, is intended to strengthen his ethos.

4.4.3 Irony

According to the echoic view of irony, an expression (A) is ironic if it echoes another expression (B) — or the content of that expression, or its interpretation as the speaker of expression A understands it — and if it reflects the speaker's distancing from expression B, its content, or the information that it reflects. The speaker's distancing from expression B can range from light ridicule to bitter scorn (Weizman 2000: 238-240). For example, if it began raining while we were on our way to a picnic, and we were to say, 'What nice weather for a picnic', we would be echoing a norm of politeness and an incorrect weather forecast, and distancing ourselves from the statement. In other words, we would be presenting the information in the statement as absurd. The speaker in this case is strongly rather than mildly distancing himself from the statement, 'What nice weather it is for a picnic'.

Dascal and Weizman (1987: 31-46) and Weizman and Dascal (1991: 18-30) suggest a model that aims to describe how indirect expressions are interpreted, which takes into account the fact that irony is an implicit expression. The model describes two types, or stages, of contextual information that are necessary for interpreting an indirect message: extra-linguistic information and meta-linguistic information. In the first stage, the listener must recognize that there is some kind of mismatch: he or she needs to understand that the explicit meaning of the utterance was not what was meant by the speaker. In other words, he or she must reject the explicit meaning of the utterance. In the second stage, the listener works out the alternative meaning of the speaker's statement, which is, of course, its implied meaning.

Livnat emphasizes that this model serves as a general framework for analyzing ironic utterances. The model distinguishes between the functions of the contextual information. When that information is used for recognizing a 'problem of interpretation', it is called a 'cue', and when it is used to understand the speaker's implied meaning, it is called a 'clue'. When we want to describe how to interpret ironic utterances we need to identify both those cues that signal the presence of indirect meaning to the listener and those

clues which can guide the listener towards the indirect meaning which the speaker intended, in other words, to fully interpret what the speaker meant (Livnat 2003: 141).

- (14) **‘The question of the Palestinian refugees doesn’t exist. No one discusses it now. There wasn’t a [Nakba] when an entire people was uprooted from its homeland and has been living for more than fifty years in refugee camps. The Israelis don’t permit a discussion of the Palestinian right of return’** (last interview with Mahmoud Darwish, Syrian satellite channel).

When Darwish says the Nakba did not happen and that there is no problem with the Palestinian refugees, these are clearly ironic utterances with an indirect meaning. Knowing that Darwish is an anti-Zionist figure is the ‘cue’ — that is, the contextual information used to recognize the ‘interpretation problem’. This contextual information about Darwish is also the ‘clue’ — the contextual knowledge that is used to expose the speaker’s intended indirect meaning. From the context, Darwish clearly does not mean that there was no Nakba or issue of Palestinian refugees. Quite the opposite: he wishes to highlight their existence.

Darwish also uses irony to draw attention to the paradox arising from Israel’s conduct towards the Palestinians. The paradox is created by making two simultaneous but conflicting assertions. To resolve the paradox, one of the clashing assertions must be sacrificed, or a means sought to reconcile them and resolve the conflict between them (Perelman 1994: 52). A paradox is admissible or true when both its conflicting assertions are true. When one assertion is false the paradox disappears. When the two conflicting assertions are not made at the same time but one is made at a different time, the paradox is apparent. Even if its statements are true it loses its reliability because they were made at different times (Landau 1988: 118-127).

Israel denies the Palestinian Nakba and the plight of Palestinian refugees, while at the same time fiercely fighting anti-Semitism and Holocaust denial. Darwish considers this paradoxical behavior. The fact that Darwish hints at the atrocities committed against the Jews in the Holocaust is intended to rehabilitate his ethos. For the Nakba, as the epitome of Palestinian suffering, was constructed as a founding myth of Palestinian national identity, thus fulfilling, wittingly or unwittingly, a similar role to that of the Holocaust, the epitome of Jewish suffering, in Israeli society (Litvak and Webman 2009: 312).

4.4.4 Allusion

In examples 15 and 16, Darwish uses the word ‘ghetto’ because it was one of the most horrific aspects of the Holocaust. The fact that a person considered to be an extreme anti-Zionist would mention the word ‘ghetto’, and the fact — implicit rather than overt — that he does not deny the Holocaust, is meant to establish a bridge of trust between Darwish and his Jewish audience. Expectedly, this is an indirect reference to the Holocaust. It is inconceivable that Darwish would refer explicitly to the Holocaust to underscore the security threat to Israel’s survival and to voice public support and empathy for Jews as victims. If he did this the Palestinians would brand him a traitor. Thus,

Darwish treads a very thin line and usually only alludes to identifying with Jews' suffering during the Holocaust.

- (15) 'Jerusalem is one of the most complex problems and it is important to stop discussing it based on the historical facts, because in this city there is a people and there are no prophets, there is a people and a society, and this people has suffered a lot of hardship and its existence has become a **ghetto**' (The Jordanian daily newspaper, Ad-Dustour, 23.5.1997).
- (16) 'The Palestinians are in terrible trouble, and not just the leadership. The horizon appears narrow, the future hazy, the past is very distant, and the present is full of **ghetto** projects' (The Jordanian daily newspaper, Ad-Dustour, 23.5.1997).

In contrast to examples 10-11, in which Darwish explicitly mentions Jews as the victims of the Holocaust, in examples 12-16 Darwish allusively identifies with Jews as the victims of the Holocaust. This identification by a poet who is considered an anti-Zionist is enough to strengthen his ethos for a universal audience.

5. Summary

The research presented in this article collected and analyzed many examples of the written and spoken political discourse of Mahmoud Darwish and Ahmed Tibi. After a process of classification, we can identify the rhetorical strategies of Darwish and Tibi. It should be underlined that our approach is impressionistic, as there is no other serious political situation where an Arab Israeli politician pertains to the holocaust and Darwish himself does that very rarely. It was almost impossible to compile a wider corpus and identify further examples. Therefore, the conclusions of the research reflect our personal impressions and constitute a work in progress. Indeed, to obtain more steady, accurate and comprehensive results, wider research should be carried out in the future in this respect.

The most striking reason for the difference between the two speakers is Tibi's extraordinary context of speaking in the Israeli Parliament about the Holocaust, a rhetorical situation that warrants special attention.

In contrast to Tibi, who constructs his ethos through open unambiguous identification, Darwish constructs his ethos by means of allusion, as seen from his use of words such as 'ghetto', and his use of metaphors, hyperbole, irony, paradox, etc. The reason for this is that it would be unthinkable for Darwish, who was regarded as a patriotic Palestinian poet, who was acknowledged as the poet of the Palestinian resistance and a poet of Palestine, to voice open identification and empathy with Jews as victims of the Holocaust. But by expressing identification indirectly, Darwish can try to soften the Jewish audience's resistance to him which they feel due to his pre-existing ethos as an anti-Zionist figure.

Darwish and Tibi are voicing a dual message: empathy and identification with Jews as victims of the Holocaust, while at the same time harshly criticizing Israel for its racism and hatred of the Palestinian people. Implicitly and explicitly, they use key words, topics, and commonplaces with which Jews

identify, while at the same time loading them with critical content. In the case of Darwish, this criticism sometimes entails directly comparing Israeli's treatment of Palestinians with the Nazis' treatment of Jews (examples 10 and 11). In these statements, Darwish is processing reality in a manner that is unacceptable to his audience. We believe that when Darwish chooses to be openly, rather than indirectly, critical, this eclipses the importance of his identification with Jews and emphasizes his principal point, the harsh criticism of Israeli policy.

Compared to Darwish, in his speech Tibi studiously avoids direct comparisons between Israel and Nazi Germany, although this is his allusive intention. This is because Tibi processes reality in a palatable manner for the audience. Tibi always wraps his accusation that Israel is pursuing a racist policy against Palestinians in a gilded envelope; whoever manages to open it and look inside will surprisingly find that it contains censure of Israel.

Tibi's identification with Jews had a powerful impact, so much so that his Jewish audience ignored his most important message. This can be seen from the fact that numerous members of parliament and even government ministers like the right-wing Likud's Yossi Peled praised the speech in glowing terms. The power of Tibi's identification with Jews stole the spotlight from the speech's message of censure (Gitay 2010: 129-130).

Notes

- 1 See the explanation in the paragraph on ethos on page 13.
- 2 For further information, see Darwish 2015: 42-49.
- 3 See section 4.3.
- 4 See further, Sevi (2012: 259).
- 5 See further, Livnat (2014a: 158-159); Sevi (2012: 257-258).
- 6 For more information on discursive ethos and prior ethos, see Livnat 2014b: 128-129.
- 7 Operation Cast Lead was a large-scale Israeli military operation in the Gaza Strip that lasted from 27 December 2008 to 18 January 2009.
- 8 The effect of a language's metaphoric structure on consciousness and opinion-shaping is the main theme of the CDA school (Livnat 2014a: 126, 369; Gavriely-Nuri 2009: 153-154; Gavriely-Nuri 2011: 91-92).

References

- Abadi, A. (1998). Source domains of metaphors in political discourse. *Helkat Lashon* 26: 56-67. (Hebrew).
- Amossy, R. (2001). Ethos at the crossroads of disciplines: Rhetoric, pragmatics, sociology. *Poetics Today* 22(1): 1-23.
- Aristotle (1973). *Prior Analytics* (H. Cooke and H. Tredennick, trans.). London: Loeb Classical Library.

- Aristotle (2002). *Rhetoric / Aristotle* (Z. Gabriel, trans.). Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Poalim. (Hebrew).
- Austin, J. (2006). *How to Do Things with Words* (G. Elgat, trans.). Tel Aviv: Resling. (Hebrew).
- Ben Porat, Y. (1999). *Talks with Ahmad Tibi*. Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Poalim. (Hebrew).
- Berggren, D. (1962). The use and abuse of metaphor. *Review of Metaphysics* 16(2): 237-258.
- Berggren, D. (1963). The use and abuse of metaphor. *Review of Metaphysics* 16(3): 450-472.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power* (G. Raymond and M. Adamson, trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Darwish, M. (2001). *Articles and Dialogues*. Kafr Qara: Dar Elhouda. (Arabic).
- Darwish, M. (2015). *Fifty Years of Poetry* (R. Snir, trans.). Tel Aviv: Keshev. (Hebrew).
- Darwish, M. and S. Al-Kassem (1989). *The Letters*. Haifa: Arabesque Publishing House. (Arabic).
- Dascal, M. and E. Weizman (1987). Contextual exploitation of interpretation clues in text understanding: An integrated approach. In M.J. Verschuere and M. Bertucceci Papi (eds.), *The Pragmatic Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 31-46.
- Ducrot, O. (1984). *Le Dire et le Dit*. Paris: Minuit.
- Eco, U. (2006). *Turning Back the Clock: Hot Wars and Media Populism*. London: Vintage.
- Gavriely-Nuri, D. (2009). Friendly fire: war-normalizing metaphors in the Israeli political discourse. *Journal of Peace Education* 6(2): 153-169.
- Gavriely-Nuri, D. (2011). War metaphors as women's business. *Panim* 56: 93. (Hebrew).
- Gitay, Y. (2010). The rhetoric of Knesset member Ahmad Tibi in his International Holocaust Remembrance Day address. *Israel Studies in Language and Society* 3(2): 129-145. (Hebrew).
- Hart, C. (2010). *Critical Discourse and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Katriel, T. (2016). The metapragmatics of direct utterances. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society* 4: 745-766.
- Kedar, M. (1998). *The Public Political Language of the Asad Regime in Syria: Messages and Means of Communication*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Bar-Ilan University, Israel. (Hebrew).
- Keren, N. (2015). Holocaust and politics. *Education and Context* 37: 169-180. (Hebrew).
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Landau, R. (1988). *The Rhetoric of Parliamentary Speeches in Israel*. Tel Aviv: Eked. (Hebrew).
- Lipstadt, D. (1993). *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. New York: Free Press.
- Litvak, M. and E. Webman (2009). *From Empathy to Denial*. London: Hurst & Company.

- Livnat, Z. (2003). Irony and the linguistic structure of the utterance. In Y. Shlesinger and M. Muchnik (eds.), *Studies in Modern Hebrew on the 30th Anniversary of the Israeli Association of Applied Linguistics*. Jerusalem: Tzivonim. pp. 140-151. (Hebrew).
- Livnat, Z. (2009). The anatomy of governmental vagueness: A linguistic-historical look at political speech. In Y. Gitay (ed.), *The Power of Words*. Afula: The Max Stern Academic College of Emek Yezreel. pp. 7-38. (Hebrew).
- Livnat, Z. (2014a). *Introduction to the Theory of Meaning: Semantics and Pragmatics*. Vol. 2. Raanana: The Open University of Israel. (Hebrew).
- Livnat, Z. (2014b). Negotiating scientific ethos in academic controversy. *Journal of Argumentation in Context* 3(2): 126-152.
- Maingueneau, D. (1999). Ethos, scénographie, incorporation. In R. Amossy (ed.), *Images de soi dans le discours. La construction de l'ethos*. Lausanne: Delachaux et Niestlé. pp. 75-100.
- Margalit, G. (1998). The persecution of the Gypsies in the context of the Israeli public debate about the uniqueness of the Holocaust. *Gesher* 138: 60-68. (Hebrew).
- Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage. pp. 14-31.
- Perelman, Ch. (1982). *The Realm of Rhetoric*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University.
- Perelman, Ch. (1994). *L'empire rhétorique*. (J. Ur, trans.). Jerusalem: Magnes Press. (Hebrew).
- Perelman, Ch. and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969). *The New Rhetoric*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University.
- Reisigl, M. and R. Wodak (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and anti-Semitism*. London: Routledge.
- Sevi, A. (2012). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Vol. 3. Raanana: The Open University of Israel. (Hebrew).
- Stavi, Z. and Y. Schwartz (eds.) (2014). *The Heksherim Lexicon of Israeli Authors*. Beer Sheva: Heksherim Institute, Ben Gurion University of the Negev. (Hebrew).
- Thompson, S.A. (1996). Politics without metaphors is like a fish without water. In J.S. Mio and N.A. Katz (eds.), *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 185-201.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, and H.E. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 352-371.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2008). *Discourse and Power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weizman, E. (2000). Irony in news discourse. In O. Schwarzwald et al. (eds.), *Studies in Communication, Linguistics and Language Teaching*. Carmel: Jerusalem. pp. 237-248. (Hebrew).
- Weizman, E. and M. Dascal (1991). On clues and cues: Strategies of text understanding. *Journal of Literary Semantics* 20(1): 18-30.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1984). *Prejudice in Discourse – An Analysis of Ethnic Prejudice in Cognition and Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wodak, R. (2001a). What is CDA about: Summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage. pp. 1-13.

Wodak, R. (2001b). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage. pp. 63-94.