Translation of Prophets' Prayers in the Quran:
A Pragmatic Approach

ترجمة أدعية الأنبياء في القرآن: منظور برجماتي

Dr. Hala Tawfik Sorour Maklad
Associate Professor of Linguistics Department of Languages
Sadat Academy for Management Sciences

د.هالة توفيق سرور مقلد
أستاذ اللغويات المساعد قسم اللغات
أكاديمية السادات للعلوم الإدارية

Abstract

The paper attempts to develop a descriptive tool of translation products to reveal the aspects of approximation between source utterance acts and translated ones through the analysis of the illocutionary force components of speech acts in both source and target languages. The selected illocutionary act is the requestive prayers of prophets in the Qur'an (Source Text) and two translations (Target Texts). The proposed pragmatic-based tool, referred to as Illocutionary Force Components Analysis (IFCA), works on the assumption that if the components that constitute the illocutionary force of the prayer illocutionary act in the target language approximate those in the source language, the illocutionary acts are similar in both languages. After analyzing the Qur'anic prayers of Zechariah, Moses, Jonah, Adam and Eve, Lot, Job, and Joseph using the IFCA, it is found that the translated prayer illocutionary acts are successful and approximate to the source acts as far as the illocutionary point and propositional content are concerned; however, non- approximation tends to occur in preparatory condition, sincerity condition and mode of achievement which produce defective acts.

Keywords:

Speech Acts; Illocutionary Logic; Qur'an Translation; Illocutionary Force Components; Explicitation and Implicitation Shifts.

I. Introduction:

This study is an attempt to develop a descriptive tool that may help reveal the extent of approximation between source utterance acts and translated ones through the analysis of the illocutionary force components of speech acts in both source and target languages. The selected illocutionary act is the requestive prayer/*Du'aa* of prophets in the Qur'an (Source Text or ST) and two translations (Target Texts or TTs). Abdul-Raof (2010) describes the tenor of Qur'anic discourse as context-sensitive, i.e. it is "influenced by context of situation; stylistic variations, and use of repletion of a given lexical item are all motivated by the relationship between the speaker and the addressee" (p.100). One main variable in the tenor of praying discourse is asymmetrical power, where Allah, the Addressee, is the most powerful and omnipotent, and Prophets, addressors, are the powerless and helpless, which would affect the components of sincerity condition and mode of achievement. It is assumed that the descriptive tool may help in accounting for the intricate prayer utterances and their translations.

1.1. Pragmatics and Translation:

Several scholars have used pragmatic theories to address translation problems and issues. Emery (2004), who examined 'translation, equivalence and fidelity' by means of pragmatics tools, maintains that "[pragmatics] can be expected to make continuing and increasing contributions to the discipline of translation studies" (p.166). Pragmatic notions including speech act, implicature, illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect, presupposition, contextualized meaning, and politeness maxims have been used to detect problems in translation (Abdel-Hafiz, 2003; Farghal & Borini, 1997; Hassan, 2011; Hatem &Mason, 1997). In Hickey (1998), topics relating to pragmatics in translation have been dealt with from different perspectives, including illocutionary function and its translatability, politeness equivalence, deixis, presupposition, cooperation with readers, implicatures, and hedges.

In relation to translation, the notion of speech acts stand out as a key theoretical concept that refers to the fact that speakers do things by using language (Austin, 1962). As stated by Porozinskay (1993,p.187), translation as a communicative theory is related to the theory of speech acts or illocutionary acts, and "pragmatic components such as an illocutionary force of an utterance, a propositional content, a locutionary organization and a perlocutionary effect, are units that can perform identical communicative functions in source and target language texts". Using pragmatic terminology to account for utterance acts, Porozinskay refers to Searle and Vanderveken's components of illocutionary force and assumes that when "all the components forming the illocutionary force of the utterance in the target language are equal to those in the source language, the illocutionary acts are equal in both languages" (p.188).

1.2. Illocutionary Act and Force

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985, p.1), when a speaker makes an utterance in an appropriate context having certain intentions, he performs one or more illocutionary acts, which are the "minimal units of human communication" and consist of "an illocutionary force F and a propositional content P". Illocutionary verbs can be considered indicators of the illocutionary forces of utterances, since illocutionary verbs are usually connected with illocutionary acts: the promising act ties up with word *to promise,* and the praying act with verbs implying prayers. Illocutionary acts –as any human act - can succeed or fail since each act has conditions of successful and non-defective performance (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). Hence, there are three possibilities for a speech act: (a) unsuccessful, (b) successful but defective, and (c) successful and non-defective. It is maintained that for each illocutionary force are seven interrelated components that "serve to determine under what conditions that type of speech act is both *successful* and *non defective...*": Illocutionary point, Propositional

content, Preparatory condition, Sincerity Condition, Mode of Achievement, Degree of Strength of Sincerity Condition and Degree of Strength of Illocutionary Point" (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, pp.13-20)

As stated by Searle and Vanderveken (1985), the success and non-defectiveness of an illocutionary act of the form F(P) performed in a context of utterance depends on the speaker's:

- success in achieving the illocutionary point of F on the proposition P with the required characteristic mode of achievement and degree of strength of illocutionary point of F.
- expression of the proposition P, and that proposition satisfies the propositional content conditions imposed by F;
- expression of the psychological state determined by F with the characteristic degree of strength of the sincerity conditions of F.

1.3. Payer/*Du'aa:* Theoretical Background

1.3.1. Prayer/*Du'aa* in the Quran

According to Oxford English Dictionary, a prayer is a solemn request to God; a supplication or thanksgiving addressed to God… "the action, act, or practice of praying". It also refers to religious worship, especially, "of a public nature or which praying forms a principal part." In Islam, there are two main forms of prayer: liturgical or worship prayer (S*alat*); and personal prayer (*Du'aa*), which is voluntary and additional to the five times daily *Salat* prayers (Campo, 2009). The second form of prayer, personal prayer or *Du'aa* is the focus of this study where the words *Du'aa* and prayer have the same meaning and may be used interchangeably.

According to Nasr (2010), scholars' definitions of *Du'aa* denote that the *Du'aa* in the Qur'an has two inter-related aspects: psychological and linguistic. The psychological aspect has to do with man's intense desire to have something done – or undone – or to be saved from something evil. The linguistic aspect is the utterance act that can be

realized by a need statement or a request. The senses of *Du'aa* in the Quran include (a)*'ibada*/worship, and (b) *mas'alah/*request(Nasr, 2010). Worship/*'ibada* is a generic term for every word man/woman says or every act s/he does, whether of the heart or the body, which Allah loves and approves of. It includes, inter alia, prayer and invocation, loving Allah and His prophet, turning to him in repentance, putting trust in His help, hoping for His mercy, seeking His forgiveness, and fearing His punishment (Ibn Taymiyyah, 2000). Integral parts of *'ibada* (worship) are love, humbleness, and submissiveness.

Highlighting differences between worship prayer and request prayer, Nasr (2010) states that in worship prayer, the worshipper (a) refers to Allah not to him/herself, (b) does not wait for his/her prayer to be answered, (c) tends to show his/her helplessness, and destituteness, (d) recognizes Allah's omnipotence, and (e) uses a statement that refers to the condition of the invoker or the invoked or both. In request prayer, the supplicant (a) refers mainly to his/her request and needs, (b) starts his prayers with the vocative "*Rabb"*as well as *Allhum, Rabbna/Lord* with attached grammatical suffix, and (c) uses the explicit imperative.

1.3.2. Quranic Prayer/*Du'aa* Sentential Types:

According to Ibn Tayimmyah (2000) and Nasr (2010), the mood of requestive *Du'aa* utterance is either imperative or indicative:

1- Imperative Mood is used to make the *Du'aa* in a direct way:
   a. *Do* Pattern used to pray Allah (a) to bring benefits, or (b) to keep away evil and damage;
   b. *Do not do* Pattern.

2- Indicative Mood: Prophets used statements to describe their conditions, or admit their guilt or seek refuge in Allah or seek His forgiveness and mercy. Using the indicative mood, the Prophet may (a) describe his condition; (b) refer to Allah; or (c) describe his condition and refer to Allah.

1.3.3. Prayer/*Du'aa* as an Illocutionary Act

In broad terms, the *Du'aa*/prayer falls under the category of Directive speech act (Vanderveken, 1990, 126):

> primitive directive illocutionary force has the directive point (that the speaker attempts to get the hearer take a certain course of action), the neutral mode of achievement and degree of strength, the conditions that the propositional content represents a future course of action of the hearer, the preparatory condition that hearer can carry out the actions, and the sincerity condition that the speaker desires or wants the hearer to carry it out. The primitive directive force is realized syntactically in English in the *imperative* sentential type.

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) state that directives display differences in degree as to the status that the speaker must have for performing them (from orders, which require the speaker's higher status, to entreaties, which require the speaker's lower status), and these differences tend to affect the mode of achievement of the illocutionary point rather than the illocutionary point itself.

The illocutionary verbs *supplicate, beseech, implore, entreat, conjure,* and *pray* are "requestive". However these verbs differ from 'request' "in three respects: (a) they express a great intensity of desire; (b) for that reason, they have a greater degree of strength of illocutionary point; and (c) the illocutionary acts they express are performed in a more humble manner" (Searle &Vanderveken, 1985,p.204). In other words, the increased strength of illocutionary point comes from a higher intensity of desire expressed, and the humble deferential manner in which the speaker addresses the hearer. The great intensity of desire in Quranic prayers is achieved through several devices including, inter alia, repetitive pleas and prayers in different contexts, over-stating physical and psychological

suffering and distress, repeating the vocative '*Rabb'*(Lord), and having unshakable belief that Allah would answer the prayer (Nasr, 2010).

In the context of utterance, the illocutionary verb *Da`ā, to pray*, has the directive force with the addition of propositional content that the hearer is God; the speaker is in a lower status and suffering from a helpless situation. The mode of achievement of the illocutionary point differs from the primitive directive force (represented by the verb *to direct*) in that the speaker performs the act in a way that shows humbleness, deference and submissiveness. Nasr (2010) states that deference and submissive politeness – in pragmatic terms the prayer mode of achievement - tend to be realized by (a) attributing all that is good to Allah and all that is evil to oneself; (b) starting the prayer by the vocative *Rabbana, Rabb* , Our Lord or Lord, deleting the vocative particle to imply closeness to Allah and absence of mediator between Allah and prophet (Al'Ousy, 1988), (c) seeking religious spiritual demands rather than world materialistic ones, (d) extolling Allah, and (e) lowering one's voice following Allah's command in the Quran "Call upon your Lord humbly in subservience, and quietly, in secret" (7: 55).

1.4. Purpose and Questions of the Study:

The paper attempts to account for selected Qur'anic prayer acts and two translations through analyzing the components of the illocutionary force of the utterance in the source and target languages. The proposed pragmatic-based tool, to be referred to as Illocutionary Force Components Analysis (IFCA), works on the assumption that if the components that constitute the illocutionary force of the prayer/*Du'aa* illocutionary act in the target language approximate those in the source language, the illocutionary acts are similar in both languages (Porozinskay, 1993).

The study attempts to find an answer to the following question: Can the Illocutionary Force Components Analysis (IFCA) be used as a descriptive analytical tool for translated utterance acts?

To answer this question, the study addresses the following sub-questions:

1. To what extent can the IFCA determine the approximation of the prayer acts illocutionary force in the ST and TTs?

2. To what extent can the IFCA be used to substantiate the success and non-defectiveness of the translated illocutionary acts?

3. How did the explicitation/implicitation techniques operated by translators affect the components of the Illocutionary Force of the translated illocutionary acts?

2. Methodology:

2.1. Data:

The data is representative rather than exhaustive. Selected prayers of Zakariya (Zechariah), Musa (Moses), Yunus (Jonah), Adam and Eve, Lut (Lot), Ayyub (Job), and Yusuf (Joseph) represent the data of the study. According to Abdul-Raof, (2010, p.21), there are two major types of Qur'an translation: the first is semantic translation where archaic language and some literal word order dominate, while the second type is communicative translation. The literal approach to translation "allowed the source language to have dominance over the target language" (Welch as cited in Abdul-Raof, 2010), while the second approach "introduces the Qur'an in a communicative contemporary English". Accordingly, two translations of the Qur'an are selected to represent the two approaches:

1- "Interpretation of the Meanings of the Noble Qur'an in the English Language", (Khan& Al-Hilali, 2007),is referred to as TT1. The translation is source language-oriented and adopts a semantic approach. Widely disseminated throughout the English-speaking world, the translation refers to classical sources of commentaries namely At-Tabari, Al-Qurtubi, and Ibn Kathir.

2- "The Qur'an"(Abdel Haleem, 2005) which represents the communicative approach is referred to as TT2. In the introduction,

Abdel Haleem states that the translation is written in a contemporary, easy style, avoiding the use of vague language or archaisms that tend to obscure meaning.

For transliteration of Arabic Qur'anic prayers, reference is made to the following website:
http://transliteration.org/quran/WebSite_CD/MixPure/Fram2E.htm.

2.2. Procedures and Data Analysis:

1- Setting the context of utterance of the Prophet's prayer. A context of utterance "consists of five distinguishable elements and sets of elements: a speaker, a hearer, a time, a place and other various features … that are relevant to the performance of the speech acts such as psychological state, desires, beliefs of the speaker and hearer" (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985,p.27).

2- Segmenting the utterance act into head prayer act and supportive moves that may precede or follow the head act, as well as internal modifiers, including boosters or mitigators. Both parts – head act and supportive move(s) – are tackled as representing the prayer illocutionary act with the illocutionary force of pray. Illocutionary verbs, as potential indicators of illocutionary force, mark the beginning of the utterance act.

3- Analyzing the illocutionary force of the Prayer act as performed in the Source language (Arabic) into its components by referring to exegesis and revealing semantic-syntactic features, including the illocutionary verb. The components that determine the conditions of successful and non-defective performance of the *Du'aa*/prayer's illocutionary act can be summarized as follows:

   a. Illocutionary Point of prayer is to make an attempt to approach God about doing a future course of action;

   b. Propositional Content represents a future course of action to be carried out by God only; such course of action could be

bringing benefit, or preventing harm or providing sustenance or providing support or help or victory over the infidels;

c. Preparatory Condition is that the course of action is possible and achievable by God only in a context of utterance where the speaker suffers distress and pain.

d. Sincerity Condition is the strong desire of the speaker that the course of action be done;

e. Mode of Achievement is that the illocutionary point is made humbly, politely and submissively. In this respect, reference is made to the Maxims of the Politeness Principle (Leech,1983, p.132) namely: Tact Maxim: Minimize cost to other / Maximize benefit to other; Generosity Maxim: Minimize benefit to self / Maximize cost to self; Approbation Maxim: Minimize dispraise of other / Maximize praise of other; Modesty Maxim: Minimize praise of self / Maximize dispraise of self; Agreement Maxim: Minimize disagreement between self and other/ Maximize agreement between self and other; Sympathy Maxim: Minimize antipathy between self and other / Maximize sympathy between self and other.

Since there is a relation between the Degree of Strength of Illocutionary Point and the mode of achievement of an illocutionary force and the Degree of Strength of Sincerity Condition, reference is made to these two components whenever necessary.

4- Analyzing the illocutionary force of the Prayer act in TT1 and TT2 (English) into its components by examining the Translators' choices of semantic-syntactic resources, which may include the illocutionary verbs;

5- Comparing the components in both Source Text and Target Texts;

6- Evaluating the translators' explicitation and implicitation shifts that may affect any of the components of the illocutionary force when

rendering the prayer illocutionary acts. Explicitation is "[a] stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation." (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995, p.342). On the other hand, 'Implicitation' is "a stylistic translation technique which consists of making what is explicit in the source language implicit in the target language, relying on the context or the situation for conveying the meaning" (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995,p.344). As shown in Table (1), labels are given, for descriptive purposes, to the occurrences of explicitation and implicitation techniques (Pym 2005).

Table (1): Explicitation and Implicitation Techniques:

Explicitation Techniques	Implicitation Techniques
Specifying: a source-language (SL) unit of a more general meaning is replaced by a target-language (TL) unit of a more specific meaning;	**Generalizing**: a SL unit of a more specific meaning is replaced by a TL unit of a more general meaning
Supplement: complex meaning of a SL word is distributed over several words in the TL.	**Reduction**: SL units consisting from two or more words are replaced by a TL unit consisting of one word;
Addition: new meaningful elements appear in the TL text;	**Omission**: meaningful lexical elements of the SL text are dropped;
Expansion: one sentence in the SL is divided into two or several sentences in the TL;	**Contraction**: two or more sentences in the SL are conjoined into one sentence in the TL;
Extension: when SL phrases are extended into clauses in the TL.	**Cutback**: SL clauses are reduced to phrases in the TL.

3. Qur'anic Prayers of Prophets: Results and Discussion

Prayers are classified according to the type of action that the prophet requested:

- Worldly demands;
- Forgiveness;
- Help and Support.

3.1. Praying Allah for Worldly demands:

3.1.1.Prayers of Prophet Zakariya (Zechariah):

In this context of utterance, the one who makes the prayer is Zakariya, a prophet of Israelites. As narrated in the Quran (Ibn Kathir), though he was aged and his wife was barren and stricken with years, he wanted Allah to grant him an offspring to inherit his knowledge and Prophethood. In the Quran are three prayer acts made by Zakariya to Allah:

- **Prayer I: The Family of 'Imran (*Al-'Imran)*3:38:**

  ST: *Hunālika Da`ā Zakarīyā Rabbahu QālaRabbi **Hab Lī Min Ladunka <u>Dh</u>urrīyatan Ţayyibatan** 'Innaka Samī`u Ad-Du`ā'i*

  TT1: At that time Zakariyâ (Zachariya) invoked his Lord, saying**:** "**O my Lord! Grant me from You, a good offspring.** You are indeed the All-Hearer of invocation"

  TT2: There and then Zachariah prayed to his Lord, saying, **'Lord, from Your grace grant me virtuous offspring:** You hear every prayer.**'**

- **Prayer II: Mary (*Mariam*) 19: 2-6:**

  ST: <u>Dh</u>ikru Raĥmati Rabbika `Abdahu Zakarīyā; 'I<u>dh</u> Nādá Rabbahu Nidā'an <u>Kh</u>afīyāan; Qāla Rabbi 'Innī Wahana Al`Ažmu Minnī Wa A<u>sh</u>ta`ala Ar-Ra'su <u>Sh</u>aybāan Wa Lam 'Aku<u>n</u> Bidu`ā'ika Rabbi <u>Sh</u>aqīyāan; Wa'Innī <u>Kh</u>iftu Al-

*Mawāliya Min Warā'ī WaKānati Amra'atī Āqirāan **Fahab LīMinLadunka Walīyā**an; Yarithunī WaYarithu Min 'ĀliYa`qūba Wa Aj`alhu Rabbi Rađīyāan.*

TT1:When he called out his Lord (Allâh) a call in secret. He said: "My Lord! Indeed my bones have grown feeble, and grey hair has spread on my head, and I have never been unblest in my invocation to You, O my Lord! "And verily I fear my relatives after me, and my wife is barren. **So give me from Yourself an heir,** "Who shall inherit me, and inherit (also) the posterity of Ya'qûb (Jacob) (inheritance of the religious knowledge and Prophethood, not of wealth.)….And make him, my Lord, one with whom You are Well-Pleased!"

TT2:This is an account of your Lord's grace towards His servant, Zachariah, when he called to his Lord secretly, saying, 'Lord, my bones have weakened and my hair is ashen grey, but never, Lord, have I ever prayed to You in vain: I fear [what] my kinsmen [will do] when I am gone, for my wife is barren, **so grant me a successor—a gift from You**—to be my heir and the heir of the family of Jacob. Lord, make him well pleasing [to You].

- **Prayer III: The Prophets (*Al-Anbiya*) 21: 89:**

ST: *WaZakarīyā 'Idh Nādá Rabbahu Rabbi **Lā Tadharnī Fardāan** Wa 'Anta Khayru Al-Wārithīna*

TT1**:** And (remember) **Zakariya (Zechariah), when cried to his Lord: "O My Lord! Leave me not single (childless),** though You are the Best of the inheritors. .'

TT2**:** Remember Zachariah, when he cried to his Lord, **'My Lord, do not leave me childless,** though You are the best of heirs

The context of utterance of Prayer I is that whenever Zakariya, the Guardian of Mary, entered her chamber, he found that she had out-of-season fruit. He then realized that the one who is capable of providing such sustenance is indeed capable of granting him an offspring despite his age, so Zakariya invoked Allah. Prayer II is preceded by a reminder of Allah's mercy upon his prophet Zakariya, and an account of his own physical and mental state and of his wife's physical condition, where Zakariya supplicates Allah in secret and refers to his weakness, old age, fear of his succeeding relatives and his wife's infertility (Quran Tafsir Ibn Kathir). As for prayer III, a very shortened reference to the story of Zakariya is made since it has been given in detail in the Sura of The Family of 'Imran (Al-'Imran 3:38) and the Sura of Mary (Mariam 19: 3-6) (Quran TafsirIbn Kathir).

Syntactically, the prayer force of Prayers I and II is realized by the imperative sentential type, while Prayer III is realized by a prohibitive. In this context of utterance, the illocutionary verbs used in ST: *Da`ā* (Prayer I),and *Nādá* (Prayers II and III) have the meaning of 'to pray' (Nasr, 2010, pp.18-19; Al Damghani, 1983, p.450). However, the verb *Nādá* may have an additional sense: to utter or say aloud the words of prayer (Nasr, 2010, p.18), which tends to boost the illocutionary force.

The illocutionary verb *Da`ā* (Prayer I) inTT1 is rendered *invoked*, and in TT2 *prayed*, to name the illocutionary force. The additional sense in the verb *Nādá* in Prayers II is rendered *call out* in TT1:*he called out his Lord (Allâh) a call…*to denote two senses: saying aloud and asking for help at times of difficulty (COBUILD, 2000, pp.228-229), to mark explicitation shift (Addition), while translated *call to* in TT2: *he called to his Lord* to indicate that the words of prayer are uttered. In Prayer III, *Nādá* is rendered *cried* (TT1 and TT2) which denotes the sense of saying the prayer aloud (COBUILD, 2000, p.228).

The Illocutionary point of the three prayers is that Zakariya approaches Allah about granting him an offspring, and an heir, not

leaving him alone and childless. Both translations, TT1 and TT2, have the same illocutionary point. The illocutionary point of Prayer II is strengthened by the supportive move **"** *Yarithunī Wa Yarithu Min 'ĀliYa`qūba" - an heir that inherits me, and inherit (also) the posterity of Ya'qûb (Jacob).*According to Tafsir al-Jalalayn, the verb – *inherits me* – may be "read *Yarithnī* in apocopate form as a response to the imperative statement 'grant me', or read *yarithunī* as an adjectival qualification of 'a successor'". TT1 translates this move as a modifying adjectival clause "*who shall inherit me, and inherit (also) the posterity of Ya'qub (Jacob)*". In this case it is not counted as a supportive move for the illocutionary point. In TT2, this move is translated as a non-finite adverbial clause indicating purpose "*to be my heir and the heir of the family of Jacob",* which makes it a supportive move for the illocutionary point.

With respect to the propositional content, it represents the future course of action: granting Zakariya an heir, an act realizable by Allah only, given the condition of Zakariya and his wife. The verb in the imperative mood is *Hab* which means *grant without expecting any compensation,* an action which is possible and obtainable by God only but intolerable for man to carry out. It also indicates that since it is a grant, Zakariya must have been aware that he had no entitlement to this request (Al-Sha'rawy, 1998). In TT1 and TT2, the propositional content of prayer force represents the same future course of action stated in ST: granting Zakariya an heir and not leaving him with no child. The verb in the imperative mood *grant* means" to bestow … in an answer to a request" (Oxford English Dictionary) which approximates the Arabic verb. While TT1 shows implicitation shift (Generalizing) by using "*give*", TT2 translates it "*grant"* to approximate the ST.

Preparatory condition of Prayers I and II is that granting Zachariah an offspring is achievable by Allah only, realized by the propositional phrase *Min Ladunka*: "*by means of Your divine law and power" (*Al-Sha'rawy, 1998), which would allow him to have a child

despite his feebleness, old age and his wife's infertility. In TT1, the preparatory condition is not fulfilled since *Min Ladunka* is translated as "*from You*", to employ the implicitation technique of Generalizing. TT2 does not either fulfill this condition by translating it "*from Your grace*" (Prayer I), and *"a gift from You"* (Prayer II).'*Grace '*in scriptural and theological language means "The free and unmerited favour of God as manifested in … the bestowing of blessings; The divine influence which operates in men … to inspire virtuous impulses, and to impart strength to endure trial and resist temptation" (Oxford English Dictionary).In both renderings, there is failure in conveying the religious shades of meaning of *Min Ladunka.*

As for the sincerity condition, Zakariya's desire to have his prayer answered is expressed and enhanced by:

1- Using the vocative *Rabb* in each of the three prayers. The word 'Lord' is used as the nearest to *Rabb*. Abdel Haleem (2005) comments on the vocative stating that: "the Arabic root *r–b–b* has connotations of caring and nurturing in addition to lordship…" (p.3). According to Khan and Al-Hilali (2007, p.869), "there is no proper equivalent for *Rabb* in English language. It means the One and the Only Lord for all the universe, its Creator, Owner, Organizer, Provider, Master, Planner, Sustainer, Cherisher, and Giver of security…". In both TT1 and TT2, the vocative "*Rabb*" is translated "*Lord*".

2- Stating the reasons for his prayer where Zakariya (Prayer II):

   (a) describes his internal feebleness: ST: *Innī Wahana Al-`AžmuMinnī;*TT1:*Indeed my bones have grown feeble;* TT2:*my bones have weakened;* and external signs of age: ST: *WaA*s*hta`alaAr-Ra'su*S*haybāan*;TT1: *and grey hair has spread on my head;* TT2*: and my hair is ashen grey*;

   (b) expresses his fear from his relatives:ST :*Wa 'Innī* K*hiftu Al-Mawāliya Min Warā'ī*; TT1: *verily I fear my relatives after*

me;TT2: *I fear [what] my kinsmen [will do] when I am gone*. Both TT1 and TT2 use respectively the explicitation techniques of Supplement (*verily*) and Extension (*when I am gone*);

(c) refers to the infertility of his wife: ST: *Wa Kānati Amra'atī `Āqirāan*; TT1: *and my wife is barren;* TT2: *for my wife is barren* which explains the reason for his fear.

3- Expressing his unshakable belief that Allah would not let him down (Prayer II), enhancing his main act of praying by means of an indirect act of prayer: ST: *Wa Lam 'Akun Bidu`ā'ika Rabbi Shaqīyāan*; TT1: *And I have never been unblest in my invocation to You, O my Lord!*; TT2: *but never, Lord, have I ever prayed to You in vain"* (TT2). According to Al-Sha'rawy (n.d.), this assertive can be interpreted as a prayer by inferences: 'Since I invoked Allah before and Allah always answered my prayers which made me pleased, so I pray now: do not let me down and make me pleased and happy again by answering this prayer'. In TT1, the adjective *Shaqīyāan* is rendered as unblest – unblessed - that is deprived of blessing, meaning that *I have always been blessed in my invocation to You,* while in TT2 it is interpreted as "in vain" or unsuccessfully, meaning that *I have always prayed to you successfully, so make prayer successful again.* Despite the implicitation shift made at semantic level, both renderings tend to approximate the ST as an indirect act of prayer, which intensifies the desire of Zakariya to have his prayer answered.

4- Using the supportive move of praise: ST: *Innaka Samī`u Ad-Du`ā'I*; (Prayer I) : *You are indeed the All-Hearer of invocation*, that is "*You are the One Who answers supplication*" as interpreted in Tafsir al-Jalalayn. By this assertive and expressive act of praise, Zachariah tends to boost the sincerity condition, intensifying his desire and reiterating his belief and trust that Allah would answer his prayer. In TT1 the collocation *Samī`u Ad-Du`ā'i*, a nominative

singular noun + genitive masculine noun, is translated literally *the All-Hearer of invocation,* which tends to increase the strength of sincerity condition by the use of emphasis and nominalization:*"You are indeed the All-Hearer of invocation"* , which identifies Allah with the attribute of being the *All-Hearer.* TT2turns the noun 'All-Hearer,* an attribute of Allah, into a verbal phrase "*You hear..",*to use the implicitation technique of Omission.

In Prayers I, II and III, the mode of achievement of the illocutionary point is deference realized by:

1- Deleting the vocative particle *ya* (O), and supplicating Allah directly by the vocative Rabb*Lord.* As previously stated, deleting the vocative particle implies closeness to Allah and absence of mediator between Allah and prophet (Al'Ousy, 1988). While TT1 inserts the vocative particle and pronoun (*O, My Lord*) to mark an explicitation shift of Addition, TT2 does not and renders the vocative literally.

2- Invoking Allah in a low voice and in secret *'Idh Nādá Rabbahu Nidā'an Khafīyāan* :*When he called out his Lord (Allâh) a call in secret* (Prayer II). The word *Khafīyāan* which literally means 'in secret" implies that he was invoking Allah in a low voice, indicating submissiveness. TT1 and TT2 fail to reflect such mode, by translating *Khafīyāan* literally and ignoring the implied meaning – the implicitation technique of Omission.

3- Asking Allah for an heir to inherit his religious knowledge and prophethood and that of the family of Jacob and not his wealth or property (Prayer II), which is another supportive move that boosts his main Prayer act. The notion of inheriting religious knowledge and prophethood is ignored in TT2 "*to be my heir and the heir of the family of Jacob.* TT1 uses the explicitation technique of Addition "*Who shall inherit me, and inherit (also) the posterity of*

Ya'qûb (Jacob) (inheritance of the religious knowledge and Prophethood, not of wealth.)".

4- Using an indirect act of prayer by asking Allah not to leave him childless *LāTadharnī Fardāan* (Prayer III). TT1 makes an explicitation shift of Addition "*Leave me not single (childless)";* TT2 uses the explicitation technique of Specifying "*do not leave me childless"*.

5- Performing praise acts that tend to serve the purpose of submissiveness: ST: *Wa 'Anta Khayru Al-Wārithīna*;TT1 "*though You are the best of the Inheritors*"; TT2 "*though You are the best of heirs*" (Prayer III). Both renderings tend to show such submissiveness by explicitating the *W-* a circumstantial particle – and translate it into *though* - the subordinating conjunction – to mean "but it is also true that" (Carter & McCarthy, 2006, p.45), hence admitting submissively that Allah is the one who inherits after everything perishes. The Maxim of Approbation is observed as Zakariya tends to maximize praise of Allah.

3.1.2 Prayer of Prophet Musa (Moses):

Musa's escape from Egypt's Pharaoh and his people is the context of utterance of this prayer act. Musa was advised by a man to run away lest he would be executed. So he headed for Maddyan, the city of the people of Shu'aib. Narrating the incident, Ibn Kathir said that Musa arrived at an oasis in the desert. He was very exhausted and travel worn; his mind was full of anxiety and uncertainty because of his experience in Egypt. He reached a well or a spring where he found shepherds watering their flocks. He noticed two young women waiting with their flocks which they had brought to water. They told him the whole story: their father was a very old man, and he could not come to water the flocks, so they had to do the job but they could not thrust themselves among men. Hence, Musa voluntarily watered the flocks for them, then he took his place under the shade and prayed Allah for sustenance:

ST: ***Rabbi 'Innī Limā 'Anzalta 'Ilayya Min K̲h̲ayrin Faqīrun*** (Al-Qassas, (The Story), 28: 24).

TT1: So he watered (their flocks) for them, then he turned back to shade and said: **"My Lord! Truly, I am in dire need of whatever good You bestow on me**."

TT2: He watered their flocks for them, withdrew into the shade and prayed, "**My Lord, I am in dire need of whatever good thing You may send me."**

According to Ibn Taymiyyah (2000), Musa, Peace be upon him, describes himself as being in need of any good that Allah would send down to him. In his need statement is a request to Allah to send him food and sustenance. In ST, this is a direct prayer act performed by way of an assertive act. Syntactically, the act is realized by an indicative: *'Innī Limā 'Anzalta 'Ilayya Min K̲h̲ayrin **Faqīrun***, literally "*indeed I am, for whatever good You would send down to me, **in need***. In this prayer, the illocutionary verb *qāla* "*said*" does not indicate the illocutionary force of the act; however, the context of utterance and the use of vocative *Rabb* imply the force of prayer.

The main head act is "I am … in need", and the supportive move is "for whatever good You would send down to me". This Qur'anic structure shows a marked word order where the word *Faqīrun* - in(desperate) need) is "backgrounded at the end of the structure" (Abdul-Raof, 2010,p.44). The unmarked word order would be: *'Innī **Faqīrun** Limā 'Anzalta 'Ilayya Min K̲h̲ayrin*, literally "*I am **in need** for whatever good you would send down to me"*. It is argued that such marked word order tends to have a pragmatic function related to the mode of achievement.

According to **Ibn'Ashur**, Musa, by his utterance, performs three acts: thanking, extolling and praying Allah. By uttering *Limā 'Anzalta 'Ilayya Min K̲h̲ayrin* - *the Good you have sent down to me*, Musa (a)

thanks Allah for the blessings He bestowed on him throughout his life, and (b) extols Allah for being the one who provides sustenance.

The illocutionary verb in ST is *qāla / said* , which does not indicate the illocutionary force. While TT1 rendered the verb literally *said*, TT2 named the illocutionary force by using the illocutionary verb *prayed* – the explicitation technique of Specifying. In ST, the illocutionary point is achieved on the propositional content in the context of utterance where Musa, addressing Allah, asserts his need for sustenance. Similarly, the prayer force of the illocutionary point in TT1 and TT2 is derived from Musa's statement of need.

The propositional content represents Musa's current state of affairs: desperately in need for worldly sustenance realized by the need statement. It is a desiderative by which Musa expresses his desire to have his needs fulfilled. The word <u>*Khayrin*</u> means all the things that bring benefit to man in this world and the Hereafter. Given Musa's condition – tired and starving - the word refers to food and other worldly needs and sustenance. The propositional content of TT1 "*I am in need of whatever good that You bestow on me!*"and TT2 "*I am in dire need of whatever good thing You may send me* approximates to a great extent that of ST, since both express a need statement. However, both translations overlook the context of utterance and do not specify the kind of '*good*' requested by Musa. The explicitation technique of Supplement or Substitution would have described the desperate status of Musa.

The preparatory condition of ST is fulfilled since the utterance act refers to Allah as the one who has always been capable of providing sustenance *'Anzalta 'Ilayya Min <u>Khay</u>rin (to descend good to me)*. Both TT1 "*whatever good that You bestow on me*" and TT2 "*whatever good thing that You may send me*" convey the same preparatory condition. However, two pragmatic meanings tend to be lost:
  1- the exalted position of Allah, implied by the verb *'Anzalta* which means "*to descend/send down*";

2- the continuous action of descending despite the use of the past tense of the verb *'Anzalta.* In Qura'nic discourse, the past tense often signifies "a future reference" (Abdul-Raof, 2010, p.92). In this context, the verb form indicates that that the action of descending good has be end one in the past and will be done in the future, an action attainable by Allah only. While this notion is rendered in TT1: *bestow*, used in simple present which may "represent a marked future aspect of unusual definiteness" (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1992, p. 88), it is lost in TT2: *may send* for using a modal of possibility to modify the main action.

As for the sincerity condition in ST, it is expressed by (a) the vocative *Rabb(Lord),* (b) desiderative *'Innī ...... FaqīrunI am in need of ...,* and boosted by the use of emphatic particle *'Innī*, i.e. *verily I ...* . In TT1, sincerity condition is fulfilled by using the vocative *My Lord* , and a need statement and intensifying the desire using "*truly*". As for TT2, it partially fulfills the sincerity condition: while using the vocative and a need statement that is boosted by an internal modifier "*in dire need*", TT2 overlooks the emphatic particle *'Innī* which acts as an internal booster – implicitation technique of Omission.

The mode of achievement of the illocutionary point is deference through (a) refraining from the use of imperative (Ibn Taymiyyah, 2000);(b) using the vocative *Rabb - Lord* -without the vocative particle*;* and (c) using *Limā* which literally means *to anything* (Saleh, 1993) to observe the tact maxim by minimizing the cost. By extolling and thanking Allah ('Ibn Ashur), Musa submissively admits that what Allah has granted him is everlasting good sustenance, to observe the maxim of approbation. TT1 and TT2 approximates the ST mode of achievement through the use of need statement instead of imperative, use of vocative with no particles (*My Lord)* and cost minimizer (*whatever).*

The relative clause *Limā 'Anzalta 'Ilayya Min K͟hayrin* "*for whatever good You send down to me"* that follows the subject *'Innī* is

foregrounded, while the predicate *Faqīrun* is backgrounded. Such marked word order tends to serve a pragmatic function: showing deference through foregrounding the acts of approbation and thanks, and backgrounding the statement of need and destitution. Such acts of praise and thanks implied by the marked word order are lost in both translations. This is perhaps due to the inability of the target language to produce the same pragmatic effect through such marked word order.

3.2. Praying Allah for Forgiveness:

3.2.1 Prayer of Yunus (Jonah):

The context of utterance of Yunus' prayer is narrated in three Qur'anic Suras: Al-Anbiya' (The Prophets) 21: 87-88; As-Safat (Those Ranged in Ranks) 37: 139-45; and Al-Qalam (The Pen) 68: 48-49. Yunus was sent to a people, who refused to listen to his call. He departed angrily aboard a heavily laden boat, "thinking God would not hold him to account", and in other commentaries thinking that Allah would not restrict or punish him (Al-Sha'rawy, n.d.). Selected by the drawing of lots, he was thrown overboard and swallowed by a great fish, as one "deserving blame" (37:139-42). Within the fish where he was trapped in the triple darkness of fish, sea and night, he called out, *Lā 'Ilāha 'Illā 'Anta Subĥānaka 'InnīKuntu Mina Až-Žālimīna* "There is no God but You, Glorious beyond compare are You" (21: 87), and he declared that he was one of those who had done wrong:

ST: "***Lā 'Ilāha 'Illā 'Anta Subĥānaka 'InnīKuntu Mina Až-Žālimīna***" (Al-Anbiya (The Prophets), 21: 87).

TT1: "***La ilahailla Anta*** [none has the right to be worshipped but You (O, Allah), **Glorified (and Exalted be You [above all that (evil) they associate with You]! Truly, I have been of the wrongdoers.**"

TT2: **"There is no God but You, glory be to You. I was wrong."**

As indicated by Ibn Taymyahh (2000), prophet Muhammad (PBUH) referred to the prayer of Yunus as *da'wah* that is *call* because it implies the two senses of prayer: worship and supplication. When uttering "there is no God but You", Yunus acknowledges monotheism which implies one of the two senses of *Du'aa,* because the only one who should be called upon in worship as well as in supplication is Allah, and there is no god except Him. By the utterance act, "I was indeed wrong" or "I have been a wrongdoer", Yunus admits guilt, which implies repentance and a request for forgiveness.

Searle and Vanderveken (1985, pp.10-11)state that:

> The explicitly performed act is used to convey another speech act; and the speaker relies on background knowledge and mental capacities that he shares with the hearer in order to achieve understanding…Such implicit acts are called *indirect speech acts.* The speaker may convey indirectly a different illocutionary force or propositional content from what is directly expressed; hence in one utterance act he may perform one or more non-literal indirect illocutionary acts.

To perform the indirect speech act of prayer, Yunus uses an assertive with the force of 'admit', that is "to assert with the additional preparatory condition that the state of affairs represented by the propositional condition is bad (e.g. to admit an error) and in some way related to the speaker" (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985,p.189). Yunus performs the act of Prayer to seek Allah's forgiveness and ask Him to deliver him from distress. Because of his sense of guilt and of his belief that what he is suffering is a self-inflicted distress, Yunus uses a statement, describing his state of affairs, to seek forgiveness (Ibn Taymyahh, 2000).

The illocutionary force is named by the illocutionary verb *Nādá* which denotes the sense of saying aloud the words of prayer. The

renderings: *cried… saying* (TT1), and *cried out* (TT2) introduce this sense to enhance the illocutionary force. In addition*,* the illocutionary force of the ST utterance act *'InnīKuntu Mina Až-ŽālimīnaI have been a wrongdoer* is derived from the illocutionary point that Yunus approaches Allah to admit guilt, indirectly seeking His forgiveness to end his distress. The word *Až-Žālimīna* refers to the one who does the wrong deed. Similarly, the prayer force of the illocutionary point in TT1:*Truly, "I have been of the wrong-doer"* and TT2: *"I was wrong"* is derived from Yunus' statement of guilt.

The propositional content represents Yunus' declaration of being a wrong-doer. Both TT1 and TT2 represent the same propositional content of ST.

In ST, the preparatory condition is fulfilled by two utterance acts: (a) *Lā 'Ilāha 'Illā 'Anta*(*there is no God but You*); and (b) *Subĥānaka* (*Glory be to You*), which implies that no one has the right or deserves to be prayed or supplicated save Allah because He, and only He, is the one who has the ability to answer the prayer, and is far from being unjust. Hence, before admitting being a wrong-doer, Yunus:

(a)proclaims his belief in *Tawĥid*, i.e. Monotheism by uttering *Lā 'Ilāha 'Illā 'Anta*, explicitly stating his belief in one God "or in a god's essential oneness" (Campo, 2009, p. 664) which is clearly expressed in the first part of the Islamic testimony of faith, the Shahada *"There is no God but Allah"*.

(b)glorifies Allah by uttering *Subĥānaka*, a pattern of glorification, praise and thanks made of two parts: accusative masculine noun *Subĥāna* + 2nd person masculine singular possessive pronoun -*ka*(addressing Allah). By such utterance, Yunus indicates that Allah is far above injustice and inflicting punishment unjustly (Ibn Taymyahh, 2000).

In TT1 "*Lâilâhaillâ Anta* [none has the right to be worshipped but You (O, Allâh)], Glorified (and Exalted) be You [above all that (evil)

they associate with You]!", the translators use (a) transliteration *"Lâilâhaillâ Anta",* perhaps out of their belief that the monotheism-indicating pattern is untranslatable and should be uttered in the source language; and (b) the explicitation technique of Addition. As for the glorification pattern, the explicitation techniques of Supplement and Addition are used. Both utterance acts fulfill the preparatory condition and serve the same pragmatic function of ST. TT2"There is no God but You, glory be to You" suffers implicitation, and is pragmatically defective.

The desire of Yunus to be forgiven is not explicitly revealed, yet he tends to show extreme repentance and sorrow by using the emphatic particle *'Innī*:*Indeed I*: an accusative particle + 1st person singular object pronoun (Quranic Arabic Corpus). TT1 rendering "Truly" tends to intensify Yunus' statement of guilt, while TT2 ignores the emphatic article it.

The mode of achievement of the illocutionary point is complete submissiveness to God and absolute deference, realized by: (a) expressing belief in monotheism by uttering *Lâilâhaillâ Anta - there is no god but You -* to indicate that no one is worthy of worship and prayer except Him; and (b) using glorification pattern *Subĥānaka* (*Glory be to You*). Both acts tend to observe the Approbation Maxim to the highest degree. TT1 tends to show the same mode of achievement: submissiveness and reverence. As for TT2, "*There is no God but You, glory be to You*", the mode of achievement seems to be lost in translation. Though the word glory according to Oxford English Dictionary, means praise, honour, and thanksgiving offered in adoration, the monotheism and glorification patterns are translated literally without referring to the inferred implications associated with the mode of achievement.

Further, Yunus tends to show, in sorrow, extreme modesty, or rather a sense of shame, by admitting guilt for referring to himself as one of the wrong-doers. In this context of utterance, the word *Až-Žālimīna*

indicates that Yunus did wrong to himself when he departed his people without Allah's permission observing, thus, the negative pole of the Modesty Maxim "maximize dispraise of self". Both TT1 and TT2 tend to refer to Yunus as a "*wrong-doer*" or as being "*wrong*", overlooking the fact that he wronged *himself* in the first place not anyone else. This mode of achievement is lost in both translations, to miss a significant aspect: maximizing "dispraise of self", to show implicitation at the pragmatic level – Omission technique.

3.2.2. Prayer of Prophet Adam and Eve:

The context of Adam and Eve's prayer: is narrated in the verses that precede the prayer (7: 19-22).According to Tafsir Al-Jalalayn, Allah ordained Adam and his wife Eve to dwell in Paradise and eat whatever they want but prohibited them from eating the fruits of a specific tree lest they would wrong themselves or become evil-doers. However, Satan, Iblīs, whispered to them and led them astray by delusion and deception; and when they tasted and ate of the tree, their shameful parts were manifested to them, and they began to stick, onto themselves, some of the leaves of the Garden, to cover themselves up. Hence, their Lord called them: '*Did I not prohibit you from this tree, and say to you that verily Satan is a manifest enemy to you?*' In response, Adam and Eve made their prayer:

ST: Qala" **Rabbanā Žalamnā 'Anfusanā Wa 'In Lam TaghfirLanā Wa Tarĥamnā Lanakūnanna Mina Al-Khāsirīna**" (Al-Araf, (The Heights) 7:23)

TT1: They said: **"Our Lord!** We have wronged ourselves. **If You forgive us not, and bestow upon us Your Mercy, we shall certainly be of the losers."**

TT2: They replied**, "Our Lord,** we have wronged our souls**: if You do not forgive us and have mercy, we shall be lost."**

Syntactically, the prayer utterance act is realized by the declarative sentential type in both ST and TTs. The prayer is made of two segments: admitting guilt + asking for forgiveness and mercy. The first segment is a repentance supportive move that precedes the main act, by admitting one's wrong deeds. The second segment is the prayer act that is realized by a conditional clause, composed of two clauses, the condition and the result, or the protasis and the apodosis respectively. In this utterance act, the apodosis is also *Jawab Qassam*, that is a vow clause. The utterance act could be reinterpreted as: *I swear by God, if He does not forgive us, we would certainly be of the losers*(Saleh, 1993; Al-Andalusi).

In ST *'In Lam Taghfir Lanā Wa Tarĥamnā Lanakūnanna Mina Al-Khāsirīna,* the illocutionary point is that Adam and Eve make an attempt to approach Allah about granting them forgiveness and mercy. In TT1 *"If You forgive us not, and bestow not upon us Your Mercy, we shall certainly be of the losers"* and TT2*"if You do not forgive us and have mercy, we shall be lost'*, the prayer illocutionary point is similar to that of ST.

The propositional content of the prayer act represents the future course of action: granting Adam and his wife Eve forgiveness and mercy. In TT1 and TT2, the propositional content of prayer force represents the same future course of action. As for, the preparatory condition of ST it is fulfilled by the use of:

1- the conditional clause which implies that the end of Adam and Eve's distress is determined by Allah's forgiveness and mercy only;

2- verbs "*forgive and have mercy*", actions performed by Allah only.

Both TT1 and TT2 fulfill the same preparatory condition of ST.

Adam and Eve's desire to have their prayer answered is realized by admitting guilt *Žalamnā 'Anfusanā - we have wronged our souls*.

According to Al-Sha'rawy (n.d.), the word *'Anfus* refers to man's soul and heart, which indicates that their wrongdoing has not affected their bodies only, but also their soul and heart. Although this shade of meaning is lost in TT1 "*We have wronged ourselves*" and retained in TT2 "*We have wronged our souls*", both renderings tend to meet the sincerity condition. Adam and Eve's desire to be forgiven is syntactically and semantically intensified by referring to the consequences of not being forgiven: *Lanakūnanna Mina Al-Khāsirīna -we shall certainly be among the losers:*

1- the use of two emphatic particles in a single word *Lanakūnanna:* emphatic prefix *lām* + 1st person plural imperfect verb + emphatic suffix *nūn (surely we will be)* (Quranic Arabic Corpus). According to Al-Andalusi, the prefix *lām* is also a vow particle meant to maximize the emphasis to refer to the consequences for not being forgiven. While the emphatic aspect is rendered in TT1 *certainly*, the vow particle is not. In TT2, both emphatic and vow features are omitted – implicitation shift.

2- the use of the prepositional phrase *Mina Al-Khāsirīna - among the losers*–which has several implications including being among those who are punished, or have wronged themselves, as indicated by Al-Damghani (1983, p.158), or being deprived of Allah's mercy (Al-Sha'rawy, n.d.). When rendering this phrase, TT1 provides a literal translation "*be of the losers*" that makes it open to different interpretations and approximates to some extent the ST, while TT2is confined to a single interpretation:*"be lost"*, that is being led astray, to make an implicitation shift (Reduction).

In this prayer, the mode of achievement is deference, realized by the use of (a) the indicative, conditional clause, instead of an imperative; (b) negation to down tone the force of the prayer: instead of saying " *if You forgive us and bestow mercy on us, ...",* Adam and Eve use the negation form. Such mode of achievement is detected in TT1 and TT2.

3.3. Praying Allah for Help and Support:

3.3.1 Prayers of Prophet Ayyub (Job):

The context of the prayers is that Ayyub was a very rich man who had a lot of cattle, sheep and lands. He had many children. As stated in Tafsir al-Jalalayn, "after he had been afflicted with the loss of all of his possessions and children, the laceration of his body" and deserted by all except his wife, for a very long period of time, Ayyub called out to Allah:

- **Prayer I (The Prophets (*Al-Anbiya'*) 21: 83)**

ST: *Wa 'Ayyūba 'Idh Nādá Rabbahu **'Annī Massanī Ađ-Đurru Wa'Anta 'Arĥamu Ar-Rāĥimīna***

TT1: And (remember) Ayyub (Job), when he cried to his Lord: "**Verily, distress has seized me,** and You are the Most Merciful of all those who show mercy."

TT2: Remember Job, when he cried to his Lord, "**Suffering has truly afflicted me,** but you are the Most Merciful of the merciful."

- **Prayer II, (Sad (*Sad*) 38: 41):**

ST: *Wa Adhkur `Abdanā 'Ayyūba 'Idh Nādá Rabbahu**'Annī Massanī Ash-Shayţānu Binuşbin Wa `Adhābin.***

TT1: And remember Our slave Ayyub (Job), when he invoked his Lord (saying): **Verily *Shaitan* (Satan) has touched me with distress (by ruining my health) and torment (by ruining my wealth)!**"

TT2: Bring to mind Our servant Job who cried to his Lord, '**Satan has afflicted me with weariness and suffering'**.

In the prayers, Ayyub performs implicitly the illocutionary act of prayer by way of performing explicitly two illocutionary acts: complaint

and extolling. Represented by the verb '*complain'*, a complaint (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p.191):

> has both an assertive and an expressive use. In the assertive use to complain about P is to assert that P with additional sincerity condition that one is dissatisfied with P and the additional preparatory condition that the state of affairs that P is bad. In the expressive sense to complain that P is simply to express dissatisfaction that P.

Given the context of utterance, Ayyub's complaints do not imply dissatisfaction although the state of affairs is appalling. In this paper, it is maintained that the complaint of Ayyub is both assertive and directive, not expressive, since there is an attempt to refer to harm, with a view to ending such harm, which implies a request to Allah, the only one who can end such mischief. Commenting on Prayer I, IbnTaymiyyah (2000) maintains that it is "an assertive that implies a request. Ayyub describes his condition, asking Allah for mercy to end his pain and suffering... The use of an assertive (instead of an imperative) indicates reverence" (p.245). To extol is to "laud in the highest terms, generally religious (propositional content condition), and with deep humility and adoration (mode of achievement)" (Vanderveken, 1990, p.215).

In ST (Prayers I and II), the illocutionary force is represented by the illocutionary verb *Nādá* which, as previously stated, means both to pray for help and to utter the words of prayer aloud. Both TT1 and TT2 render the illocutionary verb in Prayer I '*cried'* to approximate the ST in naming and boosting the force of the act. As for Prayer II, TT1translates *Nādá* into *invoke* to name the act, but shows implication shift (Reduction) and fails in enhancing the illocutionary force, while TT2 renders the verb *cried* to approximate the ST. Hence, it is maintained that Ayyub is describing aloud his state of affairs not to complain as much as to ask Allah for help to end his suffering.

Syntactically, the prayer illocutionary force is realized by an indicative in which Ayyub describes his condition and extols Allah describing Him as the Most Merciful of the Merciful.

In Prayers I, and II, the Illocutionary point is that Ayyub makes an attempt to approach Allah about putting an end to his suffering by referring to his affliction and seeking Allah's mercy. TT1 and TT2 convey the same illocutionary.

The Propositional content of Prayers I and II does not represent a future course of action, but it rather represents a current state of affairs which Ayyub attempts to end. The same propositional content is conveyed in TT1 and TT2. It is realized by statements:

- *'Annī Massanī Ađ-Đurru -'Indeed harm, adversity, has befallen me*, as interpreted by Tafsir al-Jalalayn. Ayyub describes his condition by asserting that harm has afflicted him.

- *'Annī Massanī Ash-Shayṭānu Binuṣbin Wa `Adhābin - Satan has afflicted me with hardship, harm, and suffering'* by which Ayyub attributes his suffering and hardships to Satan. It is an explicit direct complaint, but an indirect prayer.

The Preparatory condition of Prayer I is that Ayyub's current state of affairs will not be ended except by the mercy of Allah, the Most Merciful. TT1 and TT2 convey the same preparatory condition.

Although the sincerity condition of Prayer is to express a greater intensity of desire than asking or requesting, in Prayers I and II, the desire to have the suffering ended is not stated explicitly. However, such a desire is implied by Ayyub's description of his physical and psychological suffering and illness, using the lexical items:

1- *Ađ-Đurru - the disease that afflicts the body and soul of man* (Al-Sha'rawy (n.d.)), to refer to his illness, and to the adversity that he suffers since the harm that afflicts the body and soul of man truly needs Allah's mercy to end it. In TT 1 and TT 2, the word is

translated "*distress*": "The sore pressure or strain of adversity … sickness, pain, or sorrow; anguish or affliction affecting the body, spirit …" and *suffering*: serious physical or mental pain (Oxford English Dictionary). Such renderings tend to approximate the ST.

2- *Nuşbin Wa `Adhābin*   -*fatigue and torment*–to describe his suffering, and maximize the cost he is paying for his illness, so as to increase the sympathy or mercy he deserves. TT1 over-translates these items into *distress (by ruining his health) and torment (by ruining his wealth)*, to mark explicitation shift (Addition). TT2 renders them into *weariness*: "…extreme tiredness or fatigue resulting from exertion, continued endurance of pain…" (Oxford English Dictionary); and *suffering* where implicitation shift (Substitution) occurs, since *suffering* is not an equivalent to *torment* but a result of it.

In the utterance acts, the mode of achievement of illocutionary point determines the illocutionary force of the acts. When addressing Allah, Ayyub does not ask Him to end his torment or make any requests; this is attributed to Ayyub's reverence and deference (Ibn Taymiyyah, 2000; Qutub, 1985). All that he does is to describe his state of affairs. Even when describing his condition, Ayyub tends to soften his assertive description of his illness and state of helplessness by rhetorical lexical choices:

1- *Massanī - touched me*. Despite his suffering and pain, Ayyub said *harm touched me*, not *harm afflicted me* (Nasr, 2010). The verb *touch* is less forceful than *afflict*. Both renderings "*seized me*" - took hold of me -and *afflicted me* - affected me badly and made me suffer– (COBUILD) are more forceful than *touched me*. In this respect, there is explicitation that negatively affects the pragmatic purpose of *touched me*.

2- *Massanī Ash-Shayţānu- Satan has afflicted me*. According to Tafsir al-Jalalayn, Ayyub "attributes all this to Satan, even though

all things are from God, to show reverence [in his call] to Him". Both TT1 and TT2 approximate the ST.

By the use of the superlative form *You are the Most Merciful of the merciful'*, Ayyub maximizes approbation to show deference. Both TT1: *You are the Most Merciful of all those who show mercy*, which shows explicitation (Extension) to boost the act, and TT2: *you are the Most Merciful of the merciful* tend to observe the maxim of approbation.

3.3.2. Prayers of Prophet Yusuf (Joseph):

The story of Yusuf as narrated in the Qur'an is presented in a sequence of episodes or scenes. Of these is the scene of seduction and temptation. According to Ibn Kathir, "(T)he Quran raises the curtain on the scene of this fierce and devouring love on the part of the lady", the wife of the Chief Minister of Egypt (Joseph (Yusuf) 12: 23-34). In this scene, the wife of Egypt's Chief Minister sought to seduce Yusuf, so she closed the doors and came on him. But Yusuf fought the temptation, and made his first prayer (Prayer I, Yusuf (Joseph) 12: 23):

ST: *Qāla **Ma`ādha Al-Lahi'** Innahu Rabbī ' Aĥsana Mathwāya 'Innah uLāYufliĥu Až-Žālimūna*

TT1: He said: "**I seek refuge in Allah (or Allah forbid)!** Truly, he (your husband) is my master! He made my living in a great comfort! (So I will never betray him). Verily, the *Zalimun* (wrong and evil-doers) will never be successful.

TT2: he replied, '**God forbid**! My master has been good to me; wrongdoers never prosper'.

In a subsequent scene, the wife of the Chief Minister planned to subject the women to the same temptation she faced. So, she invited them to a lavish banquet. The Quran narrated the scene of the banquet in detail (12:31-33). At the end of this scene, Yusuf made his second prayer seeking again Allah's help (Prayer II, Yusuf (Joseph) 12: 33):

ST: *"Qāla Rabbi As-Sijnu 'Aĥabbu 'Ilayya Mimmā Yad`ūnanī 'Ilayhi Wa***'IllāTaşŗif `Annī Kaydahunna 'Aşbu 'Ilayhinna Wa 'Akun Mina Al-Jāhilīn***a.*

TT1: He said: "O my Lord! Prison is dearer to me than that to which they invite me**. Unless You turn away their plot from me, I will feel inclined towards them and be one (of those who commit sin and deserve blame or those who do deeds) of the ignorant".**

TT2: Joseph said: "My Lord! I would prefer prison to what these women are calling me to do. **If You do not protect me from their treachery, I shall yield to them and do wrong**."

Prayer I *Ma`ādha Al-Lahi-I seek refuge in Allah,* is a direct speech act; the syntactic structure of the head act is an indicative, made of an accusative masculine noun and a genitive proper noun. According to **Quranic Arabic Corpus**, the word *Ma`ādha* is a cognate accusative used to add emphasis, by using a verbal noun derived from the main verb. In this prayer the main verb is deleted and the only part left is the cognate accusative.

Prayer II is made of two segments: a refusal of orders and a request for Allah's help.

1- *As-Sijnu 'Aĥabbu 'Ilayya Mimmā Yad`ūnanī 'Ilayhi - Prison is dearer to me than that to which they are urging me*. This segment is a chastity-declaration supportive move that precedes the main act, by preferring prison to adultery. The force of the assertive act is refusal (to obey the orders).

2- *Wa 'Illā Taşŗif `Annī Kaydahunna 'Aşbu 'Ilayhinna Wa 'Akun Mina Al-Jāhilīna - And if You do not fend off their wiles from me, then I shall tend, I shall incline, towards them and become of the ignorant, the sinful".*

This segment is the prayer act, realized by a conditional clause made of the *condition* and the *result*. By this utterance act, Yusuf admits his fallibility as a human being who may fall victim to temptation unless Allah saves him.

In Prayer I *Ma`ādha Al-Lahi*, the illocutionary force is derived from the illocutionary point that Yusuf makes an attempt to approach Allah about saving and protecting him from being seduced and from committing a sinful act. Renditions of TT1 "*I seek refuge in Allâh (or Allâh forbid)*" and of TT 2 *God forbid* have the same illocutionary point. In Prayer II,ST: *Wa 'Illā Taşrif `Annī Kaydahunna 'Aşbu 'Ilayhinna Wa 'Akun Mina Al-Jāhilīna;* TT1*: "Unless You turn away their plot from me, I will feel inclined towards them and be one (of those who commit sin and deserve blame or those who do deeds) of the ignorant";* andTT2*: If You do not protect me from their treachery, I shall yield to them and do wrong, '*the illocutionary point is that Yusuf attempts to approach Allah to protect him by warding off the evil plots of women so as not to fall for them.

In Prayer I, the propositional content of the ST does not represent a future course of action but it represents the stance taken by Yusuf which is 'seeking refuge in Allah'. TT1 has the same propositional content, while TT2:*God forbid* provides a different content. According to Oxford English Dictionary, the phrase is a deprecatory "expressive of a strong wish, chiefly for the benefit or injury of some person". According to COBUILD, *God forbid* expresses one's hope that something will not happen. Hence, the propositional content is under-translated for employing the implicitation technique of Generalizing. In Prayer II, the propositional content represents a future course of action which is warding off women's cunning plot. Both TT1 and TT2 have the same propositional content.

Referring to Allah as the only one in whom Yusuf can take refuge and the only one who can protect Yusuf fulfills the preparatory condition

of Prayer I and II. TT1: *I seek refuge in Allâh (or Allâh forbid); Unless You turn away their plot from me*, and TT2: *God forbid; If You do not protect me from their treachery* tend to approximate the ST in fulfilling the preparatory condition since it refers to Allah only.

In Prayer 1, the sincerity condition, that is the psychological state of Yusuf while seeking refuge in Allah, is fulfilled by two supportive moves realized by assertive acts with the forces of 'remind' and 'negate' (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985) respectively:

1- S : *Innahu Rabbī 'Aĥsana Maṯhwāya*; TT1: *"Truly he (your husband) is my master! He made my living in a great comfort;* (TT 2):*My master has been good to me,* by which Yusuf provides a grounder for his Prayer and for his refusal to betray his master. By this act, Yusuf reminds the master's wife of her husband's good deeds to him. While TT1 uses explicitation shift (Addition) to boost the translated act, TT2 shows implication (Omission) to tone the act down.

2- ST: *'Innahu Lā Yufliĥu Aẑ-Ẓālimūna - Truly, evildoers, fornicators, never prosper"(*Tafsir al-Jalalayn), which is another grounder for his prayer. By this utterance, Yusuf asserts the truth functional negation of the proposition that a sinner would be successful, which is another reason for his prayer to Allah. While TT1: *"Verily, the Zâlimûn (wrong and evil-doers) will never be successful"* transliterates the lexical item *Zâlimûn*, explicates, and uses emphatic adverb to approximate the ST, TT 2: *"Wrongdoers never prosper"* shows implication (Omission) at the pragmatic level, to underrepresent the sincerity condition.

In Prayer II, the sincerity condition is fulfilled by Yusuf's strong desire to be protected by Allah, reflected in:

1- expressing his determination on chastity even if the price is to go to jail, realized by the first segment of the prayer *As-Sijnu 'Aĥabbu 'Ilayya Mimmā Yad`ūnanī 'Ilayhi,* an utterance Yusuf

made in response to the threat of the wife of Egypt's Chief Minister "*La'in Lam YafʿalMā 'Āmuruhu Layusjananna*"(Joseph (Yusuf) 12: 32)"*if he does not do what I bid him, he verily shall be imprisoned*" (Tafsir al-Jalalayn). Defying her threatening order, Yusuf foregrounds *As-Sijnu/ prison* to instantly spotlight his choice and decision. Such word order tends to intensify the sincerity condition. While TT1:"*Prison is dearer to me than that to which they invite me*" approximates ST in foregrounding prison, TT2:"*I would prefer prison to what these women are calling me to do*" makes a syntactic and pragmatic shift by foregrounding Yusuf and backgrounding his prompt defiance and decision, which may affect the strength of the sincerity condition.

2- maximizing the dangers he may have to face, realized by the second part of the conditional clause – the apodosis or the result of the conditional:*'Aşbu 'Ilayhinna Wa 'Akun Mina Al-Jāhilīna-I shall incline, towards them and become of the ignorant, the sinful* (Tafsir al-Jalalayn). TT:"*I will feel inclined towards them and be one (of those who commit sin and deserve blame or those who do deeds) of the ignorant*" makes explicitation shift (Addition and Extension) to fulfill the sincerity condition, while TT2"*I shall yield to them and do wrong*" shows implicitation (Omission and Generalizing) by referring to one aspect of meaning, and making structural and semantic shifts to minimize the hazards encountered by Yusuf.

As for the mode of achievement, prayer I shows a sense of vulnerability and deference which is realized by:(a) seeking and taking refuge in Allah, by which Yusuf shows continuous need for Allah's help and support; and (b) showing gratitude to his master, the chief minister, who provided him with shelter and sustenance "*Truly he, who bought me, is my lord, my master, who has given me an honourable place*" (Tafsir al-Jalalayn). By maximizing praise of his master and minimizing praise of

self, Yusuf observes the maxims of approbation and modesty to place himself in an inferior position.

In TT1, the mode of achievement is fulfilled by translating the utterance literally. As for TT2 the mode of achievement is not rendered for using the routine formula "*God forbid*" which does not reflect man's imperfection and endless endeavors to seek refuge in Allah for His help and support. By translating *'Innahu Rabbī 'Aĥsana Mathwāya/My master has been good to me,* TT2 shows implicitation which does not reflect Yusuf's observance of approbation and modesty maxims.

In Prayer II, the mode of achievement is helplessness, reflecting man's fallibility and weakness, which is realized by:

(a)*'Aşbu'Ilayhinna -to incline to them (women)* or *to be infatuated by women*. Both TT: *I will feel inclined towards them* andTT2: *I shall yield to them* approximate ST.

(b)*'Akun Mina Al-Jāhilīna -become of the ignorant, the sinful -* describing his status if he were infatuated by women. While TLT1 tends to boost the act by explicitation (Addition) TLT2mitigates it by implicitation (Omission).

Politeness is another mode of achievement realized by the use of negation and conditional protasis :*Wa 'Illā Taşrif `Annī Kaydahunna - if You do not fend off their wiles from me* (Tafsir al-Jalalayn). Instead of using the imperative "fend off their wiles from me", Yusuf uses the conditional clause and the negation which is more tactful. Both TT 1:*Unless You turn away their plot from me,* and TLT2 *If You do not protect me from their treachery,* employ the same tactful devices.

4. Concluding Remarks:

Used as a descriptive tool for studying the translation of speech acts, the Illocutionary Force Components Analysis tends to help in revealing the facets of approximation and non-approximation

demonstrated in the target texts, and determining the extent of success and/or defectiveness of the translated prayer acts.

Regarding the illocutionary point and propositional content of prayers, approximation is likely to be achieved at the pragmatic level despite the use of semantic and syntactic explicitation and implicitation techniques. No pragmatic shifts are detected, i.e. the requestive strategies used in both TTs are equivalent to those in ST: direct strategies in the prayers of Zakariya, Musa, Adam and Eve, and Yusuf, where the force is derived from the (a) imperative mood, (b) desiderative/need statement, and (c) the semantic content of the locution; and indirect strategies in the prayers of Yunus and Ayyub. The translated acts show success and non-defectiveness at these two levels.

With respect to the preparatory condition which denotes that only Allah can make the requested course of action possible and achievable, it has not been given enough attention in both TTs, perhaps because the concept is not acknowledged in the target language and culture – example: *Min Ladunka "by means of Your divine law and power"*. While several translated acts are defective at the preparatory condition level where implicitation shifts prevail in both translations by generalizing the lexical item or omitting significant connotative meanings, a few translated acts are non-defective for being translated literally, or for employing syntactic and semantic explicitation shifts such as addition and extension.

The sincerity condition, the strong desire of the speaker that the course of action be done, strengthens the illocutionary point. It is fulfilled in the prayers under study by the prophets' recurrent use of vocatives, emphatic articles, and desiderative. Other indicating devices include acts of praise, expression of unshakable belief and determination, and reference to suffering and dangers. Noticeably, TT1 tends to fulfill the condition by translating the act literally or employing explicitation shifts,

while TT2 does not fulfill it, using implicitation shifts to render defective acts at this level.

The other component that characterizes the prayer act is the mode of achievement of the illocutionary point. As indicated, when performing a prayer, the speaker is expected to show humbleness and deference. Among the indicators of mode of achievement in the ST are deletion of vocative particle, approbation acts (Approbation Maxim: maximize praise of Allah), confession acts – admitting guilt - (Modesty Maxim: maximize dispraise of self), and minimizing costs (Tact Maxim: minimize cost to other). Foregrounding of approbation act, negation and conditional protasis are notable grammatical devices used for politeness purposes. TT1 tends to preserve the mode of achievement in most of the acts by means of literal translation and explicitation, while TT2 does not take notice of this component as indicated by the implicitation shifts, which disregard and omit several elements of meaning that may contribute to the realization of the mode of achievement.

To sum up, the IFCA tends to verify that the translated prayer illocutionary acts are successful but defective. They may be successful and approximate to the source acts as far as the illocutionary point and propositional content are concerned; however, there are several incidents of non-approximation in preparatory condition, sincerity condition and mode of achievement which produce defective acts.

In conclusion, there is a need to conduct further studies that examine other types of speech acts in different registers and genres to further test the viability of the IFCA as a pragmatic-based descriptive tool of translated utterance acts. The IFCA can be developed to be a tool of translation quality assessment, and may also be of help to translators' training. For a translator seeking pragmatic approximation, s/he should be trained not to transfer the sense of the locutionary act only, but also to retain the illocutionary force including its components to provide successful and non-defective acts.

References

Abdel-Hafiz, A.S.(2003). Pragmatic and linguistic problems in the translation of Naguib Mahfouz's: The Thief and the Dogs: A case study. *Babel*49 (3), 229-252.

Abdel Haleem, M.A.S. (2005). *The Qur'an*. Oxford: Oxford University press.

Abdul-Raof, H. (2010). *Qur'an translation: discourse, texture and exegesis*.London: Routledge.

Al-Andalusi, A. D.A. M. B. Y. *Atafsiralkabir al mossama al bahr al moheit* (The Large Interpretation Named the Surrounding Sea).Retrieved from http://islamweb.net/newlibrary.

Austin, J.A. (1962). *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.

Campo. J. E.(2009). *Encyclopedia of Islam*.New York:Facts on File.

Carter, R. &M. McCarthy(2006). Cambridge grammar of English: A comprehensive guide to spoken and written English grammar and usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COBUILD, Collins COBUILD English Dictionary (2000). Beirut: Libraire du Liban,

Al Damghani, A.H. I. M., (1983).*Qamuus Al Qur'an* (Dictionary of the Qur'an).Beirut: Dar Al 'ilmlilmallayeen,

Emery, P. G. (2004). Translation, equivalence and fidelity: A pragmatic approach. *Babel* 50 (2), 143-167.

Farghal, M.& A. Borini (1997).Pragmareligious failure in translating Arabic politeness formulas into English: Evidence from Mahfouz's AwladHaritna. *Multilingua*, 16 (1), 77-99.

Hassan, B. A.(2011). *Literary translation: aspects of pragmatic meaning*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Hatem, B. & I. Mason (1997). *The Translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.

Hickey, L. (Ed.) (1998).*The pragmatics of translation*. Clevedon/ Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters,

Khan, M. M. &M. T. Al-Hilali (2007). *Interpretation of the meanings of the Noble Qur'an in the English language.* Riyadh: Darussalam.

Ibn 'Ashur, M. E. Z.*Al tahrirwa al tanweer*(Liberation and Enlightenment). Retrieved from http://library.islamweb.net/newlibrary/display_book.php?ID=1& idfrom=1&idto=4690&bk_no=61

Ibn Kathir.*Stories of the Prophets* (Muhammad Mustapha Geme'ah, Trans.).Retrieved   from http://www.islambasics.com/view.php?bkID=80

IbnTaymiyyah, Taqi ad-Din, (2000). *Expounds on Islam: selected writings of shaykh al-islam ibn taymiyyah on islamic faith, life and society*, (Muhammad 'Abdul-Haqq Ansari, Trans.). Retrieved   from http://www.kalamullah.com/Books/ibn_taymiyyah_expounds_o n_islam.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Nasr, W. T. M. (2010). *du'aa al-'anbiyaa' fi al Qur'an Al-kareem* (Prophets' Prayers in the Noble Quran). (MA Thesis, An-Najah National University) retrieved from http://scholar.najah.edu/sites/default/files/allthesis/prophets_sup plication_ in_the_holly_quran.

Al-'Ousy, Q. I. (1988).*'asalib al talab 'ind al nahawyeen*. (Requesting patterns according to grammarians) .Retrieved from http://www. mohamedrabeea. com/books/book1_1196.

Oxford English Dictionary (OED). Retrieved from http://www.oed.com/.

Porozinskaya, G., (1993). Pragmatic analysis of literary translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*. 1 (2), 187-193.

Pym, A .(2005). *Explaining explicitation*. Retrieved from http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/translation/explicitation_web.

Quirk, R, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, & J. Svartvik (1992). *A grammar of contemporary English*. London: Longman.

Quran Tafsir Ibn Kathir. Retrieved fromhttp://www.qtafsir.com.

Quranic Arabic Corpus. Retrieved from http://corpus.quran.com.

Qutub, S.(1985). *fiZilal Al-Qur'an* (In the light of the Qur'an). Cairo: Dar Al-Shuruq.

Saleh, B.A.W.(1993). *'Al 'irab al mufassal li kitaballah al morattal* (Detailed (grammatical) Analysis of the recited Book of Allah). Retrieved fromhttp://waqfeya.com/book.php?bid=1193

Searle, J. R., & D.Vanderveken(1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Al-Sha'rawy, M. M.(1998).*du'aa Al 'anbyaa' wa al Saleheen* (Prayers of Prophets and Righteous People) .http:// ia600408. us.archive.org/29/items/Sharawy Books/doaa-elanbia.pdf

Al-Sha'rawy, M. M. (n.d.)*khawaTer Al shaykh Al-Sha'rawy* (Thoughts of Sheikh Al-Sha'rawy).Retrieved from http://www.elsharawy.com/index.html

Tafsir al-Jalalayn, (Interpretation of al-Jalalayn). Retrieved from http://altafsir.com/Tafasir.asp?tMadhNo=0&tTafsirNo=0&tSora No=1&tAyahNo=1&tDisplay=no&LanguageID=2

Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and speech acts: principles of language Use* (vol. 1). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vinay, J.P.& J. Darbelnet (1995).*Comparative stylistics of French and English*. Retrieved from http: //books. google. com.eg/ books/about/ Comparative_Stylistics_of_French_and_Eng.html?id=I06D6gU 45sC&redir_esc=