

The Functional Use of Imperative in the Translated Chapter of Joseph

Nida S. Omar

Imperative formulas may deviate from their main meanings to provide rhetorical significance such as advice, threat, warning, guidance, etc. This study discussed the implicit rhetorical meanings of the Qur`anic imperative verses in chapter Joseph. It examined how these implicit meanings affected the concept of politeness. It also tried to examine how the translator explicated the form and meaning of the Qur`anic imperative verses in chapter Joseph. This study tried to deal with the implicit rhetorical meanings of the Qur`anic imperative verses based on Searle's Speech Acts theory. It tried to see how the implicit meaning of the Qur`anic imperative verses reflected Lakoff's theory of politeness. Larson's theory of translation was utilized to determine how the translator conveyed the implicit meaning of the Qur`anic imperative verses into English. The results showed that the Qur`anic imperative verses have been translated literally, whilst the implicit meanings have not been conveyed in the English translation. In some cases, the implicit meaning of the Qur`anic imperative verses have led to two implicit contrasting readings based on the politeness theory. Moreover, the results showed that Larson's theory (1984) i.e. literal translation was not able to provide the implicit meanings of the Qur`anic imperative verses in the English translated texts compared to the explicit meanings. To fully understand the nature of Qur`anic imperative verses and their implicit meanings the reader must understand the context of the verses

Keywords: Meaning, Rhetoric, Speech Act, Imperative, Politeness, Qur`an.

1. Introduction

Imperatives are used to convey command and order for example وَقَالَ الْمَلِكُ انْتُونِي بِهِ (54) / So the king said: "Bring him unto me; I will take him specially to serve about my own person." The imperative speech act "انتوني / Bring unto me" is an order from the King to bring Joseph to him. The explicit meaning of the imperative may reflect other implicit meanings such as to advice, guidance, threat, warning, plea, etc. The nature of the implicit meanings of the Qur`anic imperative verses may pose problem to a translator because it requires the translator to be aware of the intention of the addresser. For example, قَالَ تَزْرَعُونَ سَبْعَ سِنِينَ دَأْبًا فَمَا حَصَدْتُمْ فَذُرُوهُ فِي سُنْبُلِهِ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا مِمَّا تَأْكُلُونَ (47) / (Joseph) said: "For seven years shall ye diligently sow as is your wont: and the harvests that ye reap, ye shall leave them in the ear, except a little, of which ye shall eat" (Ali, 2006: 567-568). The imperative speech act "فذرّوه" / leave" with the explicit meaning of "order" became "advice and guidance" in its explicit form. The translator has to explain the implicit meaning to the English reader because the nature of verses needed to be translated or interpreted clearly for the reader. He has to be aware of each linguistic item, pre and after the Qur`anic imperative verses in order to be able to convey the implicit meaning to the addressee. The present study attempts to analyze

the implicit meanings of the Qur`anic imperative verses in the English translation of the chapter Joseph. The Arabic and English relationship in term of the Qur`anic imperative verses has been extensively studied from the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects. However, no studies have been done on the translation of the imperative verses in chapter Joseph. The present study tries to fulfill this gap namely the difficulties of understanding the rhetorical significance of the Qur`anic imperative verses in its English translation. This difficulty might be encountered by a translator due to linguistic and cultural distinctions between the two languages.

2. The Concept of Imperative in Arabic and English

In Arabic rhetoric, sentences can be divided into two main types: performative and informative sentences. Arab grammarians pay attention to the syntactic structure of a sentence, whereas rhetoricians focus on the functions of a sentence. Performative sentences ask the addressee to fulfill a particular action or something according to a certain demand. Informative sentences tell the addressee something and the addressee judges if a sentence is true or false. Performative sentences can be further sub-divided into two sub-classifications: demand and non-demand sentences. An imperative sentence is one of a demand / performative sentence. It requests the addressee to fulfill something (Al-Sa`eidi, 1999: vol. 2: 28). An imperative sentence may deviate from its normal meaning to provide further rhetorical meaning such as warning, threat, advice, permission, etc. (Al-Sa`eidi, 1999: vol. 2: 47-50).

From a grammarian perspective, an imperative is used to give an order and recognized by certain forms such as a bare imperative verb or by using a particular particle which is called "لام الامر / particle of imperative." A good example of a bare imperative verb is explicated in this Qur`anic verse وَقَالَ الَّذِي اشْتَرَاهُ مِنْ مِصْرَ لِامْرَأَتِهِ أَكْرِمِي *مَنْ مِصْرَ لِامْرَأَتِهِ أَكْرِمِي* وَمَنْ مِصْرَ لِامْرَأَتِهِ أَكْرِمِي (21) مَنْ مِصْرَ لِامْرَأَتِهِ أَكْرِمِي / "The man in Egypt who bought him, said to his wife: "Make his stay (among us) honorable: maybe he will bring us much good, or we shall adopt him as a son." (Ali, 2006: 556-557). The Qur`anic verse implied the basic meaning of the bare imperative speech act "أَكْرِمِي / "Make his stay (among us) honorable." The second man in the Kingdom of Pharaohs ordered his wife to take care of Joseph. His order is a clear obligation since she is his wife and he has a higher status. She has no choice but to follow. The verse also explained the reason behind them taking Joseph. Aziz of Egypt wanted to adopt him as his son.

According to Arab rhetoricians, an imperative is a request (or order) to fulfill an action from a superior of higher position (Atiq, 1998). This means that a request or order signals an obligation uttered by a superior person to an inferior person. The imperative sentence has other figurative meanings besides its fundamental meaning of "order" obtained from its context such as advice, guidance, warning, appealing, request, supplication, etc.

Imperatives in English are acts that bear commands and orders; their moods are usually used to convey an intention to influence the behaviour of the addressee (Imperative 2009: 1). Lyons affirmed that orders and commands are used interchangeably as a secondary class of directives to convey an intention to the addressee who takes this expressed desire as a motive to act (1977: 745). Orders do not have authority as opposite to commands, which have authority. In other words, the

orders do not necessarily require that the addresser must be in an authoritative position over the addressee, while commands require that (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985: 201). English imperatives have other meanings apart from its original meaning such as permission, supplication, request, advice, instructions, wish, challenge, threat, insult, etc.(Lyons, 1977, Quirk et.al., 1985, Davies, 1986).

3. Literature Review

Han (1998, p.221) attempted to identify general morpho- syntactic principles of imperatives and to develop a model for the interpretation of imperatives. He affirmed that rhetorical questions do not have patterns like other well –formedness conditions. Ramadan and Saleh (2011) investigated the imperative style in chapter Joseph in Arabic. They focused on presenting the basic and secondary meanings of imperative style in the chapter. Ashaer (2013, pp. 96-97) studied the same chapter from the semantic and pragmatic point of view in three translations to shed light on which method should be followed in translating its verses; to find out why the translators sometimes failed to get the implicit meaning of a verse because of the semantic and pragmatic reasons of a verse. She concluded that translators sometimes fail to capture the implicit meaning of the chapter because of rhetorical devices such as foregrounding, backgrounding, order, tense and number. She affirmed that sometimes the translator needs to use more than one method of translation; he may require literal, transliteration and communicative methods to avoid losing the meanings. Alharbi (2015, pp. iv and 211- 213) studied the forms of address and reference by the members in the story of Joseph chapter from the Glorious Qur`an. The forms of address and reference are analyzed using Brown and Gilman's (1960) theory of power and solidarity, Ford's (1961) theory of intimacy/status, and Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness. The results showed that the forms of address and reference used by the members in the story were affected by sociological factors such as status, age, distance, and gender. The results also showed that the three selected theories explained the selected verses. Nisreen (2016) shed light on the importance of context in the various meanings of imperatives. She said that imperatives can explain various functions in many contexts such as praying, optional, honoring, permission etc. (p.119). She also pointed out that Austin's speech acts may explain the relationship between certain syntactic and pragmatic elements in the Glorious Qur`an, particularly the imperative forms and their meanings from the Chapter of the Cow and Joseph (p.121). Elaissawi (2016) examined the imperative forms in the whole Qur`an from the linguistic approaches in translation. He also studied them from the perspective of performatives (p.17). He affirmed that non- imperative forms might communicate the meaning of the imperatives besides the imperative forms (p.164). Fathi and Othman (2016, p.224) pointed out the difficulties of translating the imperatives in the Qur`an in the absence of one to one correspondence between the form and the function of imperatives. In other words, misunderstanding the real function of the imperatives leads to inaccurate translation. This causes confusion between what obligatory duty is and what is recommended or apprehensive from the juristic perspective.

4. Research Methodology and Theoretical Framework

The present qualitative study explores the implicit rhetorical significance in the Qur`anic imperative verses in chapter Joseph that can prove a challenge for a translator. It explores seven Qur`anic imperative verses of the chapter in its English translation by Yusuf Ali based on Searle's (1976) speech acts theory and Lakoff's (1973) theory of politeness. The data with their English translation were also studied using Yule's (2010) built on the concept of context and Larson's (1984) theory of translation to find out how the implicit meanings were conveyed into English. The chapter Joseph was chosen because it is the only chapter in the Glorious Qur`an that tells the story of Joseph in detail. It is also the only chapter that begins with a dream and ends with the dream fulfilled. The chapter also contains various meanings such as guidance, advice, plea, rebuke, threat, entreaty and other imperative verses worth investigating. The study tried to focus on the verses that contained unique meanings especially on terms such as guidance, advice, and plea. They were selected intentionally to explore their unique meaning in the chapter. The study focused on the translation by Yusuf Ali though there are other English translations such as Pickthall (1930), Bell (1937-1939), Arberry (1955), Dawood (1956), Asad (1980), etc. The study chose the translation by Yusuf Ali since he was a well-known translator of Qur`anic text. His translation had many literary comments and used old English words such as *thy*, *thee* and *thou*.

The analysis was based on the English translation by Yusuf Ali (2006). Due to the nature of the imperative verses and the way that the translator handled them in the process of translation, it was to be expected that the meaning cannot be translated clearly, thus, the need to research other alternative translations such as those by Pickthall, Dawood, Asad, etc.

A comprehensive survey of the chapter was conducted to find out the imperative verses with implicit meanings. Searle's (1976) Speech Act theory was used to analyze the imperative verses in both the Arabic and English translation to determine and classify the kind of speech acts the verses contained. The imperative verses were also analyzed using Yule's (2010) concept of context and co-text of Yule (2010) to see whether the translator attempted to keep the contextual meaning of the Qur`anic imperative sentences or not. Lakoff's (1973) theory of politeness was used to analyze the degree of distance, politeness, and social rank of the speakers in the imperative verses taking into consideration the explicit and implicit meanings. Finally, the verses were analyzed using Larson's (1984) theory of translation to know how the translator Yusuf Ali translated the Qur`anic imperative verses into English. The translation can be classified as literal and idiomatic translations. The researchers tried to analyze the implicit meanings of the selected imperative verses in term of how the meanings were exactly communicated in English. A comparison of the English text with Larson's classification was done to classify the translation by Ali.

1. Speech Act Theory (Searle 1976)

Searle (1976) presented the concept of indirect speech acts in which the addresser conveys to the addressee more than what he/ she factually says. This depended on the information being exchanged and the intellectual and deductive powers of the addressee. People use indirect speech because direct speech can sometimes be seen

impolite and be misunderstood by their fellow workers. Indirectness can also enhance the power of the message communicated (Thomas, 1995: 143)

Searle (1976) classified speech acts into five types as follows:

- a. Representatives: the speaker intends to commit to the truth of a proposition. They imply report, assert, claim, conclude, and state.
- b. Directives: the speaker directs the hearer to do a particular act such as question, order, advice, and request.
- c. Commissives: the speaker commits to a future course of action. These acts hold an obligation on the part of the speaker.
- d. Expressives: these acts express the physiological state of the speaker. They imply blaming, apologizing, thanking, appraising, congratulating, and welcoming.
- e. Declaratives: the speaker can change the status or the conditions of the situation by uttering these acts. They imply appoint, declare, name, christen, resign, pronounce, bid, and judge.

2. *Politeness Theory (Lakoff 1973)*

Indirect speech acts connect with politeness better than direct speech acts. Leech (1983) pointed out that people resort to indirect speech acts because they want to decrease the tone of a message included in orders, commands and requests (108). Politeness is practiced in all languages and cultures. Being polite helps an individual to achieve his or her goals and desires. Politeness also makes the addressee more comfortable and to behave positively. Lakoff's theory helps to explain the element of respect speech contextually.

The linguist Robin Lakoff formulated the politeness theory in 1973. Politeness, according to her, is a form of behaviour used by individuals to minimize friction in personal interactions. She suggested certain rules of politeness to Grice's theory of cooperative principles, called the rules of conversation. By adding these rules, Lakoff attempted to set up pragmatics rules to supplement the syntactic and semantic rules. She pointed out that politeness rules extend from the first rule of formal politeness (do not impose), via the second rule of politeness (give options) to the third rule of intimate rule of politeness (makes one feel good). Lakoff stated that politeness in language is important because language conveys information. She stated that information was not only important in conversations but also the effect of the words on the interlocutors. A wrongly delivered message may cause misunderstandings. Therefore, politeness is very important in human interactions to maintain good relationships. In the first rule of politeness, the addresser attempts to avoid causing offence to the addressee because of the distance in term of their social status. It is applied when there is a distance in term of social status between the addresser and the addressee. This rule can be seen in terms of age, position, family relations, etc. In the second rule of politeness, the addresser gives the addressee an option to respond to what the addresser says. It is used as a mark of true politeness. Here, the addresser knows what he/ she intends, knows that he/ she has the right to wait for the addressee to respond, and the addressee knows this. The addresser knows what he/ she intends, but he/ she does not like to effect on the decision of the addressee. This is achieved using indirect speech acts. The third rule of politeness affirms and reflects the close

relationship between the addresser and the addressee. The rule signals equality in status between the addresser and the addressee. Although, the addresser is of higher status compared to the addressee, he/ she show that the addressee is equal to him/ her. This makes the addressee feels good. Her maxims imply that both the message that the addresser wants to convey and the feelings of the addressee are important in a conversation to avoid any misunderstanding or conflict.

3. Concept of Context and Co-Text (Yule, 2010, Yule, 2008, 2000, 1996, Brown and Yule, 1983)

Context is an essential concept in linguistics and translation studies. Yule accounted for context when he studied references and inferences. To him, context is of two types: linguistic context and physical context. The concept of linguistic context is known as co-text. The co-text of a word means a set of other words used in the same sentence or phrase. It is just a linguistic part of the environment in which a referring expression is used (Yule 1996:21). The co-text has an important role and power in clarifying and restraining the interpretation of sentences. Sentences imply a particular reference to what has been said before. Brown and Yule (1983) pointed out, that the more co-text is available the better is the interpretation. For example, the word Brazil in "Brazil wins World Cup" is the referring expression and the rest of the sentence is the co-text.

Yule (2010) pointed out that linguistic context determines the intended meaning of a particular word. The word "bank" has various meanings like "steep, overgrown, and the place from which the money is withdrawn." Each one of these intended meanings is identified based on its linguistic context.

Yule identified physical context as an environment in which a word is used (2000: 128). He viewed that our understanding of what we read or hear is related to how much we know about the features of the physical context (Yule 2010: 129- 130). Brown and Yule (1983) said that even in the absence of time, place, the information about the speaker and his intended audience, there is a chance to retain at least some piece of information related to the physical context that helps us to interpret the text.

4. Theory of Translation (Larson 1984)

Translation implies transferring the meaning of an original text into a target text without distorting it. It is important to preserve the meaning in the target language, even if the translation changed the text of the original. The form signifies the grammatical structure and the meaning indicates the semantic structure. Translation relies on the semantic structure of the language taking into account the intention of the writer, cultural and historical contexts, and implicit and explicit meanings of the text (Larson, 1984). Larson divided translation into two main types: form-based and meaning-based translation. Form-based translation is known as literal translation. It is based on the form of the source text. Form-based translation can be nonsensical and has less communicative value. It could be understood if the grammatical forms of the two languages are similar. Meaning-based translation is known as idiomatic translation. It is about conveying the meaning of the source text in compliance with the ordinary forms of the target text. Idiomatic translation handles ordinary forms of the target language via grammatical formations and choices of the lexical items of the

target language. Idiomatic translation has more communicative value and it reflects the original text in the target text (Larson 1984:15-16).

5.Data analysis

ST (1) اَقْتُلُوا يُوسُفَ أَوْ اِطْرَحُوهُ اَرْضًا يَخْلُ لَكُمْ وَجْهُ أَبِيكُمْ وَتَكُونُوا مِنْ بَعْدِهِ قَوْمًا صَالِحِينَ [Verse, 9]

TT (1) "Slay ye Joseph or cast him out to some (unknown) land, that so the favor of your father may be given to you alone: (there will be time enough) for you to be righteous after that!"(Ali 2006: 552).

The Qur`anic verse has two contrasted images; the good in Joseph and the wickedness of his brothers. It presented the wickedness on the part of the brothers who plotted against Joseph. It revealed that there was a serious agreement among the brothers to kill Joseph. This agreement was obvious when the brothers expressed their bad intention by using two imperative speech acts to show their desire to get rid of Joseph. The brothers` decision to kill Joseph came about after a series of discussions among them followed by a unanimous agreement about killing him or throwing him away. Finally, they decided on two options, either to kill Joseph or to throw him away. The Qur`anic verse implied two imperative clauses "اَقْتُلُوا يُوسُفَ" / "slay ye Joseph" and "اِطْرَحُوهُ اَرْضًا" cast him out to some (unknown) land" connected by the particle " / أو" which acted as an indicator of choosing between two things. Both imperative clauses did not show the main meaning of order, but referred to the implicit meaning of guidance. Guidance is a non –intentional directive in which the addresser does not oblige the addressee to do a particular action, but to convey the belief that doing a particular action is a good idea (Bach and Harnish, 1979: 49).

The first imperative speech act "اَقْتُلُوا" was translated literally by Ali into the speech act "slay" which indicated killing deliberately with violence. However, the imperative speech act should be translated based on the function it transferred. The function it transferred implied a sense of guidance. The second imperative speech act "اِطْرَحُوهُ / cast him out" was also translated literally which indicated the act of throwing. It was not translated according to its function, i.e. guidance. The imperative verb "اِطْرَحُوهُ / cast him out" gave a hint that Joseph`s brothers were physically strong. The lexical word "اَرْضًا / to some unknown land" reinforced and reflected their intention towards Joseph. It also referred to any deadly land because the lexical word "اَرْضًا / to some unknown land" is an indefinite and undefined noun.

The Qur`anic verse "يَخْلُ لَكُمْ وَجْهُ أَبِيكُمْ" / that so the favor of your father may be given to you alone" clarified why the brothers wanted to get rid of Joseph. The brothers wanted to leave Joseph in a place far away from their father because they wanted to gain their father`s love who showered his love and attention on Joseph and his brother Benjamin. This reason was in line with the previous Qur`anic verse (8) " اِنْذِرْ قَوْمَكَ يَوْمَ قَالُوا لِيُوسُفُ وَاخُوهُ اَحَبُّ اِلَىٰ اَبِينَا مِنَّا وَنَحْنُ عُصْبَةٌ اِنَّ اَبَانَا لَفِي ضَلَالٍ مُّبِينٍ / When they said: Verily Joseph and his brother are dearer to our father than we are, many though we be. Lo! Our father is in plain aberration" which showed the main reason for getting rid of Joseph. Both imperative speech acts have been translated literally. However, the translator failed to convey the literal meaning of the first imperative speech act "اَقْتُلُوا". He translated it into "slay." The English equivalent "slay" is an old word and used

commonly in certain figurative examples. Thus, the explicit meaning of the speech act "اقْتُلُوا" has been distorted and the implicit meaning of guidance has not been conveyed. The use of the speech act "murder" seems to be more suitable in the context of this Qur`anic verse. It indicated the action of "killing unlawfully with premeditation" and reflected the serious intention of the brothers to get rid of Joseph.

The literal explicit meaning of the second imperative speech act " اطرَّحُوهُ / cast him out" has been translated accurately but its implicit meaning of guidance has not been conveyed. This failure revealed the linguistic gap between the source and the target language. Here, the translator has succeeded in translating the meaning by choosing the particle "أو /or" into English by using the equivalent "or".

Related to Lakoff's politeness theory, the Qur`anic verse sheds light on the speech among the brothers. They were all of the same social rank and had no status distance between each other. Explicitly, the Qur`anic verse presented a close and tight relation among the brothers because they all agreed to get rid of Joseph. The lexical items "اقْتُلُوا / slay, اطرَّحُوهُ / cast him out, لَكُمْ / to you, أَبِيكُمْ / your father, وَتَكُونُوا / to be, يَخُلْ لَكُمْ وَجْهَ أَبِيكُمْ وَتَكُونُوا مِنْ بَعْدِهِ قَوْمًا صَالِحِينَ / righteous " in the Qur`anic verse " that so that the favor of your father may be given to you alone (there will be enough time) for you to be righteous after that! reflected that the addresser made use of politeness in his speech. The addresser made use of the plural personal pronouns in these items, which reflected politeness towards his brothers. It implied that they are all responsible for the act namely killing. . This reflected Lakoff's first rule (don't impose or distance), and implied that they had an unhealthy relationship with their father and Joseph. This relationship was reflected in يَخُلْ لَكُمْ وَجْهَ أَبِيكُمْ / "that so the favor of your father may be given to you alone"

The brothers seemed undecided on how to get rid of Joseph; hence, they considered two ways of getting rid of him. They could either kill him or to cast him away. This reflected Lakoff's second rule (give options). The Qur`anic imperative sentence also met the third rule of politeness (to express good feelings- be friendly). It showed solidarity between the brothers and their wish to get rid of Joseph. This rule was reflected in the use of " قَوْمًا صَالِحِينَ / righteous" which gave the brothers some kind of comfort and satisfaction after they murder Joseph.

ST (2) قَالَ قَائِلٌ مِنْهُمْ لَا تَقْتُلُوا يُوسُفَ وَالْقَوْهَ فِي غِيَابَتِ الْجُبِّ يَلْتَقِطُهُ بَعْضُ السَّيَّارَةِ نَ كُنْتُمْ فَاعِلِينَ [Verse, 10]

TT (2) Said one of them: "Slay not Joseph, but if ye must do something, throw him down to the bottom of the well: he will be picked up by some caravan of travellers." (Ali 2006:552).

One of the brothers, wise and less cruel, requested that Joseph be spared. Rather than commit the sin of murder, he suggested that Joseph be separated from his father. The imperative speech act " وَالْقَوْهَ / throw him down" did not imply "request" but instead to "guide" the brothers from committing the sin of murder. The imperative speech act was translated literally to indicate the performance by someone (Oxford Dictionary Online). It should convey the implicit meaning of guidance based on the function it transfers. Guide is a directive speech act in which the addresser gets the addressee to do something (Searle, 1999: 28).

Some clues functioned as indicators as to the meaning of guidance. The Qur`anic verse "وَأَلْقُوهُ فِي غَيَابَتِ الْجُبِّ يَلْتَقِطُهُ بَعْضُ السَّيَّارَةِ" / throw him down to the bottom of the well: he will be picked up by some caravan of travellers " connects with the pre- prohibitive Qur`anic verse "قَالَ قَائِلٌ مِنْهُمْ لَا تَقْتُلُوا يُوسُفَ" / Said one of them: "Slay not Joseph " by the coordinator " و / wa". The prohibitive verse "لَا تَقْتُلُوا يُوسُفَ" / "Slay not Joseph" has the meaning of advice and the coordinator " و / wa" is usually used to join two clauses in a general semantic framework. Hence, the imperative speech act "وَأَلْقُوهُ / throw him down" has the meaning of guidance and advice.

The Qur`anic verse "وَأَلْقُوهُ فِي غَيَابَتِ الْجُبِّ يَلْتَقِطُهُ بَعْضُ السَّيَّارَةِ" / throw him down to the bottom of the well: he will be picked up by some caravan of travellers " showed that the speaker wanted to put Joseph in the well gently, to place him there and hope that he will be picked up by other travellers to take him to another country. The lexical word "يَلْتَقِطُهُ / picked up by", in the second part of the imperative clause " يَلْتَقِطُهُ بَعْضُ السَّيَّارَةِ / picked him up by some caravan of travellers", seemed to answer the imperative speech act "وَأَلْقُوهُ / throw him down" which meant " if you throw him down, travellers will pick him up." The verse implied that throwing Joseph in the well is better than killing him. The lexical word " الْجُبِّ / well "was pre-attached by the definite article " ال / the." It showed that there was serious disagreements among the brothers about throwing Joseph in any well because the road was full of wells. This means that the lexical word "الْجُبِّ / the well" implied indefiniteness because the addresser did not specify a particular well. The lexical word "السَّيَّارَةِ / caravan of travellers" is a feminine word referring to a group of people gathered together. The addresser made use of the definite article in the word "السَّيَّارَةِ / caravan of travellers" because the addresser knew that the road was well travelled.

The translator translated the imperative Qur`anic speech act "وَأَلْقُوهُ" accurately into "throw him down", but he failed to do that implicitly. If the translator had tried to use the implicit speech act of guidance, the translated text will lose its religious effect and it will be distorted. In term of politeness theory, the verse showed a close social bond among the brothers. The addresser tried to maintain the tight social bond as tight as possible; thus, the suggestion to throw Joseph down the well. He did that to assuage their conscience. This was clearly shown using "قَالَ قَائِلٌ مِنْهُمْ لَا تَقْتُلُوا يُوسُفَ" / Said one of them: "Slay not Joseph "and "وَأَلْقُوهُ فِي غَيَابَتِ الْجُبِّ" / throw him down to the bottom of the well". This reflected the first rule of politeness.

The Qur`anic imperative verse also fulfilled the second rule of politeness giving the addressee an option when he said "إِنْ كُنْتُمْ فَاعِلِينَ" / but if ye must do something." It is a conditional sentence, which means, "if you want to do that." In other words, the addresser gives the addressees a chance to accept or to refuse his guidance.

ST (3) أَرْسَلَهُ مَعَنَا غَدًا يَرْتَعِ وَيَلْعَبُ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ [Verse, 12]

TT (3) "Send him with us tomorrow to enjoy himself and play, and we shall take every care of him." (Ali, 2006:553).

The verse involved a conversation between Jacob and his sons. The brothers tried to persuade Jacob to acquiesce to their request. They requested humbly from their father to send Joseph with them to have fun. They promised to take care of Joseph and not leave him alone.

The Arabic imperative speech act "أَرْسِلْهُ / send him " was devoid of obligation. It also meant a plea. A plea is a request on the part of addresser to the addressee who has the power to decide (Davies, 1986: 39). The imperative verse "أَرْسِلْهُ مَعَنَا غَدًا يَرْتَعْ وَيَلْعَبْ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ / "Send him with us tomorrow to enjoy himself and play, and we shall take every care of him" involved a plea made by person/s of lower status to someone of higher status. The imperative speech act "أَرْسِلْهُ / send him " belongs to expressive acts, which expresses the psychological state of the addressee (Yule, 2008). It is translated literally as "send him" which refers to the action of causing to go or to be taken to a particular destination (Oxford Dictionary Online). However, this should be read in the context of the verse, to present the implicit meaning of plea. The brothers used words such as "وَإِنَّا / we, لَحَافِظُونَ / shall take every care of" to support their plea and to present their good intention towards Joseph.

Actually, their plea is to convince Jacob to send Joseph with them. They affirmed their plea by using the particle "ل/ lam" in the lexical word "لَحَافِظُونَ" which has been translated accurately into the auxiliary verb "shall." The translator translated the explicit meaning of the imperative speech act "أَرْسِلْهُ / send him" literally, but failed to convey its implicit meaning, i.e. plea. This failure was due to the existence of a linguistic gap between the two languages. If the translator tried to convey the implicit meaning of plea explicitly, he would have used "plea" instead "send." Hence, the form of the translated Qur`anic verse will be distorted.

The Qur`anic imperative verse reflected the first rule of politeness. The brothers followed the rule "ياأبانا/ our father" in the pre- Qur`anic verse قَالُوا يَا أَبَانَا مَا لَكَ لَا تَأْمَنَّا عَلَىٰ يُوسُفَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَنَاصِحُونَ (11) / They said: "O our father! why dost thou not trust us with Joseph,- seeing we are indeed his sincere well-wishers which showed their respect towards Jacob.

The Qur`anic imperative verse followed the second rule of politeness. It gave Jacob an option to accept or to refuse his sons` plea to sending Joseph with them.

The Qur`anic clause "أَرْسِلْهُ مَعَنَا غَدًا يَرْتَعْ وَيَلْعَبْ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ" / "Send him with us tomorrow to enjoy himself and play, and we shall take every care of him" complied with Lakoff`s third rule of politeness. The plural personal pronoun in the word "مَعَنَا / with us, and the lexical word "لَحَافِظُونَ / shall take every care of" showed Jacob that his sons were strong collectively. The lexical words "يَرْتَعْ وَيَلْعَبْ / to enjoy himself and play" are persuasive words because they wanted Jacob to feel that they will make Joseph feel happy and entertained.

The Qur`anic verse implicitly revealed the bad intention of the brothers towards Joseph. This hate was obvious in verse (9) "اقْتُلُوا يُوسُفَ أَوْ اطْرَحُوهُ أَرْضًا / "Slay ye Joseph or cast him out to some (unknown) land." Their bad intention was revealed by verse (8) "إِذْ قَالُوا لِيُوسُفَ وَأَخُوهُ أَحَبُّ إِلَيْنَا مِنَّا وَنَحْنُ عُصْبَةٌ (8) / They said: "Truly Joseph and his brother are loved more by our father than we: But we are a goodly body!. The words in this Qur`anic verse (8) showed their hatred and jealousy towards Joseph which resulted in their action. The verse (12) did not comply implicitly with Lakoff`s third rule of politeness.

ST (4) يُوسُفُ أَعْرَضَ عَنْ هَذَا وَاسْتَغْفِرِي لِذَنْبِكِ إِنَّكِ كُنتِ مِنَ الْخَاطِئِينَ [Verse, 29]

TT (4) "O Joseph, pass this over! (O wife), ask forgiveness for thy sin, for truly thou hast been at fault!" (Ali, 2006: 560).

The main addresser in this Qur`anic verse was the second person in the kingdom of the Pharaohs who directed his address to Joseph and his wife. This dialogue occurred after the act of seduction. The first imperative clause "يُوسُفُ أَغْرِضْ عَنْ هَذَا" / O Joseph, pass this over!" was uttered by Aziz calling Joseph without "ya". The omission of the vocative particle "ya" indicated Joseph's special status in the opinion of his master, Aziz of Egypt. The imperative speech act "أَغْرِضْ / pass over" was translated literally which indicated the action "to neglect". It was free of obligation; it implied a plea with a slight threat. Plea is usually from a person in an inferior position to a superior position. Plea in imperative sentences is a humble request on the part of an addresser towards an addressee who has the power to decide (Davies, 1986: 39). It belongs to expressive acts, which expresses the psychological state of the addressee (Yule, 2008). The demonstrative pronoun "هَذَا/ this" referred to the act of seduction and functions as an emphatic clue to reinforce the meaning of plea. It is translated into English to the demonstrative pronoun "this". The imperative speech act "أَغْرِضْ / pass over" was violated by the use of plea. Its use has been inverted since plea is usually from an inferior to a superior. Instead, it was uttered by a superior (Aziz of Egypt) to an inferior (Joseph).

The imperative speech act "أَغْرِضْ / pass over" also meant threat. Threat is a commissive act in which the speaker commits himself to do some future action. It expresses what the speaker intends (Searle 1976: 1-15, Yule 2008:53). Imperative can convey the meaning of threat when the speaker commits himself to do something to harm the addressee, 1985:193). Aziz of Egypt (the addresser), tried to influence Joseph's behaviour in a negative manner by using the imperative speech act "أَغْرِضْ / pass over". Aziz of Egypt was afraid that the news of the seduction may become known to the public and this will affect his high social status as the second highest person in Egypt. The translator successfully translated the explicit meaning of the imperative speech act "أَغْرِضْ / pass over", but he failed to convey the implicit meaning of "plea" and "threat" into English. This failure was due to a linguistic gap between the two languages. If the translator tried to use the implicit meaning of "plea" and "threat", the translated text would be distorted and the religious impact of the original text would be lost.

The second imperative sentence "وَاسْتَغْفِرِي لِذَنْبِكِ" / (O wife), ask forgiveness for thy sin" was uttered by Aziz of Egypt to his wife. He began by using the imperative speech act "وَاسْتَغْفِرِي" / ask forgiveness" to indicate that she was guilty and she had to ask forgiveness from him and Joseph. The imperative speech act "وَاسْتَغْفِرِي/ask forgiveness" was translated literally into English which implied the action of or process of forgiving (Oxford Dictionary Online). It should be translated based on the function it transfers. It should imply the implicit meaning of order. Order is a directive speech act in which the addresser directs the addressee to do a particular action (Searle, 1976: 1-15, Yule, 2008:53). Order means an authoritative instruction to do something (Oxford Dictionary Online). In this imperative clause "وَاسْتَغْفِرِي لِذَنْبِكِ" / (O wife), ask forgiveness for thy sin", it was issued from a husband to his wife because he knew that she was guilty.

The imperative speech act "وَاسْتَغْفِرِي" / ask forgiveness" also implied rebuke. He rebuked his wife because of her action. Rebuke is an expressive speech act that explains what the addresser feels (Yule 2008: 53). The Qur`anic clause "إِنَّكَ كُنْتِ مِنَ الْخَاطِئِينَ" / for truly thou hast been at fault!" reinforced the implicit meaning of rebuke.

The lexical words *إِنَّكَ* / thou and *الْخَاطِئِينَ* / hast been at fault!" confirmed her terrible deed when she tried to seduce her slave Joseph. The lexical word "*الْخَاطِئِينَ*" literally means "sinful-doer." It is in the masculine plural to reinforce her sin because seduction is usually done by men not women. The translator successfully translated the imperative speech act "*وَاسْتَغْفِرِي* / ask forgiveness" explicitly, but he failed to communicate the implicit meaning of rebuke. Conveying the implicit meaning of rebuke into English explicitly would result in distorting the translated text and its religious impact. The implicit order in the imperative speech act "*وَاسْتَغْفِرِي* / ask forgiveness" has been conveyed because it complied with the explicit meaning of the imperative speech act "*وَاسْتَغْفِرِي* / ask forgiveness". The Qur`anic clause "*يُوسُفُ أَعْرِضْ عَنْ هَذَا* / O Joseph, pass this over!" reflected the first rule of politeness. It shows the politeness of Aziz of Egypt towards Joseph, despite of his high social status. His politeness was demonstrated when he omitted the vocative particle "ya" when he called for Joseph "*يُوسُفُ*" The translator failed to realize the importance of omitting the vocative particle "ya" and translated it explicitly to "O Joseph." The imperative Qur`anic clause "*يُوسُفُ أَعْرِضْ عَنْ هَذَا* / O Joseph, pass this over!" lacked the feelings of solidarity on the part of Aziz of Egypt towards Joseph. This was realized by the use of the imperative speech act "*أَعْرِضْ* / pass over" with a slight implicit meaning of threat as well as the original implicit meaning of plea. Consequently, the imperative Qur`anic clause "*يُوسُفُ أَعْرِضْ عَنْ هَذَا* / O Joseph, pass this over!" did not reflect the third rule of politeness. The imperative speech act "*أَعْرِضْ* / pass over" did not reflect the second rule of politeness because Aziz of Egypt didn't give Joseph the option to accept or to refuse. The imperative Qur`anic clause "*وَاسْتَغْفِرِي لِذَنْبِكِ* / ask forgiveness for thy sin" did not reflect the first rule of politeness because the addresser; i.e. Aziz of Egypt offended his wife for her attempt to betray him..

The imperative Qur`anic clause "*وَاسْتَغْفِرِي لِذَنْبِكِ* / ask forgiveness for thy sin" did not reflect the second rule of politeness because the addresser; i.e. Aziz of Egypt, did not give his wife an option. Meanwhile, Aziz of Egypt maintained a bond of solidarity with his wife when he said "*وَاسْتَغْفِرِي لِذَنْبِكِ* / ask forgiveness for thy sin." He did not behave angrily towards his wife who attempted to betray him. This bond of solidarity reflected the third rule of politeness, though the imperative speech act "*وَاسْتَغْفِرِي* / ask forgiveness" which implied an order with a slight rebuke.

ST (5) [Verse, 67] *وَقَالَ يَا بَنِيَّ لَا تَدْخُلُوا مِنْ بَابٍ وَاحِدٍ وَادْخُلُوا مِنْ أَبْوَابٍ مُتَفَرِّقَةٍ*

TT (5) Further he said: "O my sons! enter not all by one gate: enter ye by different gates. Not that I can profit you aught against God (with my advice) (Ali, 2006:575).

Jacob was concerned for his envious sons and he advised them to enter Egypt from different gates. He was a wise and experienced man. He was worried that his sons would attract undue attention since they were in a strange land, they dressed differently, talk a strange language and they had a difficult mission with no credentials. Thus, he requested his sons to enter Egypt from various gates.

The imperative speech act "*وَادْخُلُوا* / enter" was translated literally to denote the action of coming or going to (Oxford Dictionary Online). It was translated literally and not according to its function i.e. of advice. The imperative speech act "*وَادْخُلُوا* / enter" was devoid of its original meaning of order; instead it denoted the meaning of

advice. Advice is a non-intentional directive in which the addresser does not oblige the addressee to do a particular action, but to convey his belief that doing a particular action is a good idea (Bach and Harnish, 1979:49). Advice is a directive speech act in which the addresser gets the addressee to do something (Searle, 1999: 28).

Jacob's advice in this Qur'anic clause " *وَادْخُلُوا مِنْ أَبْوَابٍ مُتَفَرِّقَةٍ* / enter ye by different gates" was built on the previous prohibitive Qur'anic clause " *يَا بَنِيَّ لَا تَدْخُلُوا مِنْ بَابٍ وَاحِدٍ* / "O my sons! enter not all by one gate" which implied his implicit advice not to enter from one gate. The imperative clause " *وَادْخُلُوا مِنْ أَبْوَابٍ مُتَفَرِّقَةٍ* / enter ye by different gates" was linked with the previous prohibitive clause " *يَا بَنِيَّ لَا تَدْخُلُوا مِنْ بَابٍ وَاحِدٍ* / "O my sons! enter not all by one gate" by the co-ordinator "و / and." The imperative clause " *وَادْخُلُوا مِنْ أَبْوَابٍ مُتَفَرِّقَةٍ* / enter ye by different gates" advised them to enter Egypt individually to attract as little attention as possible. Previously, Jacob did not request his sons to enter from different gates because they were unknown to the Egyptians.

The translator failed to convey the implicit meaning of the imperative speech act of " *وَادْخُلُوا* /enter", though he succeeded to convey its explicit meaning literally.

This failure was due to the non-existence of an intentional linguistic equivalent in the target language, which denotes an implicit meaning of the source language. If the translator intended to use the speech act of "advice" as an equivalent of the imperative speech act of " *وَادْخُلُوا* ", the Qur'anic verse will be distorted and it will lose its religious and linguistic impact. The verse showed Jacob's feeling of solidarity and sympathy towards his sons when he said *يَا بَنِيَّ* / O my sons". It reflected that he was keen to keep his sons away from any unexpected dangers in spite of their actions towards him and Joseph. His love for his sons served to provide some kind of psychological comfort for them. Thus, the verse reflected the third rule of politeness "makes one feel good." The Qur'anic verse also reflected the first rule of politeness "don't impose, distance" by using " *يَا بَنِيَّ* / O my sons", " *يَا بَنِيَّ لَا تَدْخُلُوا مِنْ بَابٍ وَاحِدٍ* / "O my sons! enter not all by one gate", " *وَادْخُلُوا مِنْ أَبْوَابٍ مُتَفَرِّقَةٍ* / enter ye by different gates" that showed Jacob wanted to avoid offending his sons.

The imperative Qur'anic verse reflected the second rule of politeness of "give option" which gave the sons the option to follow the advice of their father or not.

ST (6) *وَاسْأَلِ الْقَرْيَةَ الَّتِي كُنَّا فِيهَا وَالْعَيْرَ الَّتِي أَقْبَلْنَا فِيهَا وَإِنَّا لَصَادِقُونَ* [Verse, 82]

TT (6) "Ask at the town where we have been and the caravan in which we returned, and (you will find) we are indeed telling the truth." (Ali 2006: 581).

The scenario repeated itself again after several years. The sons came back without Benjamin. Jacob lost another beloved son at the hand of his own sons after they swore they would take care of Benjamin. The Qur'anic imperative verse showed the excuses made by Jacob's sons. They cannot comprehend what happened since everything was fine initially.

The imperative speech act " *وَاسْأَلِ* / ask" was translated literally denoting a reporting speech act namely to obtain an answer or some information (Oxford Dictionary Online). It was devoid of obligation and had the implicit meaning of astonishment. Astonishment means great and profound surprise; it is an expressive speech act that conveys a psychological state of sincerity. It is related to the state of affairs located in the content of proposition (Searle, 1999: 30). Yule (1996:53) stated

that it conveys the psychological state of a speaker and can be a statement of dislike, like, pain, etc. The verse revealed the brothers' astonishment because they did not know the reason for what happened to Benjamin. Arabs usually used a suitable proverb to express astonishment. They said "إذا عُرِفَ السَّبَبُ بَطَلَ الْعَجَبُ" /when the reason is known, there will be no more wonder." Therefore, they asked their father to ask the people of the city "الْقَرْيَةَ" / the town" where they were and the members of caravan "وَالْعَيْرَ الَّتِي أَقْبَلْنَا" / the caravan in which we returned" with which they came back. They wanted to proof to their father that they were honest and that they were telling the truth. This was obvious when they used "وَإِنَّا لَصَادِقُونَ" / we are indeed telling the truth."

The translator was able to convey explicitly the basic meaning of the Arabic speech act "وَاسْأَلْ" / ask" into English literally, but failed to translate the implicit meaning of astonishment. This required the use of the speech act "astonish" in the English text; that distorted the meaning of the Qur`anic imperative verse and its original religious meaning. The verse highlighted the social gap between Jacob and his sons, which grew by what happened to Benjamin. The social gap was obvious when they used "وَاسْأَلْ" / ask" and "وَإِنَّا لَصَادِقُونَ" / we are indeed telling the truth." The Qur`anic imperative verse reflected Lakoff's third rule of politeness which affirmed the close relationship between the addresser and the addressee. The verse also reflected Lakoff's second rule of politeness namely a chance for their father to ask the people of the city were they there "الْقَرْيَةَ" / the town" and the members of caravan with which they came back "وَالْعَيْرَ الَّتِي أَقْبَلْنَا" / the caravan in which we returned."

ST (7) قَالُوا يَا أَيُّهَا الْعَزِيزُ مَسَّنَا وَأَهْلَنَا الصُّرُورُ وَجِئْنَا بِبِضَاعَةٍ مُرْجَاةٍ فَأَوْفِ لَنَا الْكَيْلَ وَتَصَدَّقْ عَلَيْنَا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَجْزِي الْمُتَصَدِّقِينَ [Verse, 88]

TT (7) They said: "O exalted one! distress has seized us and our family: we have (now) brought but scanty capital: so pay us full measure, (we pray thee), and treat it as charity to us: for God doth reward the charitable." [Ali 2006: 583].

The verse spoke of the second meeting between the brothers and Joseph after he became Aziz of Egypt. The brothers came back to Joseph following their father's advice. They conveyed the sorry state of their father and their current adversity faced with starvation. They humbly requested from Joseph to release Benjamin and be charitable. The first imperative speech act "فَأَوْفِ" /pay full" was translated literally using a phrasal verb. It indicated the action of "giving to us". It needed to be translated according to its context to convey the implicit meaning it transfers. The imperative speech act "فَأَوْفِ" / pay full" did not mean obligation, but the implicit meaning of entreaty. Entreaty means an earnest or humble request (Oxford Dictionary Online). It is an expressive speech act in which the addresser conveys his / her psychological state and reflects statements such as like, dislike, pleasure, sorrow, etc. (Yule 1996:53).

The second imperative speech act "وَتَصَدَّقْ" / treat" was translated literally into "treat" which indicated the action of regarding something as being of a specified nature with implications for one's actions concerning it (Oxford Dictionary Online). The imperative speech act "وَتَصَدَّقْ" / treat" did not mean obligation, but had the implicit meaning of entreaty. The second imperative speech act "وَتَصَدَّقْ" / treat" was joined

with the first act of "فَأَوْفِ / pay full" by the co-ordinator "و" which was translated correctly into "and".

The Qur`anic verb clause "مَسَّنَا وَأَهْلَنَا الضُّرُّ" / distress has seized us and our family" and the clause "وَجِئْنَا بِبِضَاعَةٍ مُّزْجَاةٍ" / we have (now) brought but scanty capital" reinforced the implicit meaning of entreaty for both the imperative speech acts. Both clauses reflected their state of suffering, poverty and starvation. The brothers also entreated Joseph to be more charitable and they reinforced their entreaty when they said " إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَجْزِي الْمُتَصَدِّقِينَ" / for God doth reward the charitable." The particle " إِنَّ" / for" affirmed the whole clause after it which was translated into the particle of reason "for". The intention of the brothers to use " إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَجْزِي الْمُتَصَدِّقِينَ" / for God doth reward the charitable" was to win Joseph`s heart and to make him more charitable.

The translator accurately translated the first imperative speech act "فَأَوْفِ / pay full" by using the phrasal verb to convey its explicit meaning literally. However, he failed to convey the implicit meaning of "entreaty". To communicate the implicit meaning of the imperative speech act "فَأَوْفِ / pay full" required the translator to use the implicit speech act "entreaty". Hence, the translated verse will be distorted and it will lose its original religious impact. The translator has also accurately translated the second imperative speech act "وَتَصَدَّقْ" / treat" by using the phrasal verb to communicate its literal meaning. However, he failed to translate its implicit meaning due to the linguistic gap between the two languages. The use of the implicit speech act "entreaty" in the English translation will distort the translated text and it will lose its original religious impact.

In term of politeness, the whole Qur`anic verse "قَالُوا يَا أَيُّهَا الْعَزِيزُ مَسَّنَا وَأَهْلَنَا الضُّرُّ" / they said: O exalted one! distress has seized us and our family: we have (now) brought but scanty capital: so pay us full measure, (we pray thee), and treat it as charity to us: for God doth reward the charitable."(88) revealed social distance between Joseph and his brothers. It showed their respect towards Joseph when they used the honorific expression " يَا أَيُّهَا الْعَزِيزُ" / "O exalted one!" which reflected the first rule of politeness. Both imperative Qur`anic clauses complied with the second rule of politeness which gave Joseph a good chance to accept or to refuse their entreaty. However, the third rule of politeness was not applicable to the verse because the brothers were inferior in their status to Joseph. Their inferior position was reflected when they used " فَأَوْفِ لَنَا" / pay us full "and" "وَتَصَدَّقْ عَلَيْنَا" / treat it as charity to us" which reflected their serious need for Joseph and his charity.

6. Conclusion

The present study discussed the rhetorical significant of the Qur`anic imperative verses and their English translation in terms of Searle`s Speech Acts theory, context and co-text by Yule, Lakoff`s theory of politeness, and Larson`s theory of translation. Based on these theories, seven Qur`anic imperative verses were analyzed in terms of their explicit and implicit meanings. The results showed that the Qur`anic imperative verses contained implicit meanings in addition to their explicit meanings such as guidance, option to guide, advice, plea, threat, and order. Generally, the explicit meaning of the verses has been preserved literally in the translated text. However, the implicit meaning of the verses can be distorted in their translations. Thus, the religious

and linguistic impacts of the imperative verses may be lost in the translated verses. The translator used footnotes to convey the implicit meaning of the Qur`anic imperative verses in English. A single imperative verse containing imperative speech acts may contain two implicit meanings as well as their explicit meanings. A single imperative speech act may have similar implicit and explicit meaning and this allows a translator to convey the meanings to a reader. Certain Qur`anic imperative verses often comply to one or two out of the three rules of politeness, and there can also be a mismatch pertaining to one of the three rules. Occasionally, two contrasting implicit readings of the Qur`anic imperative verses may exist based on the politeness theory dealing with the context and co-text. These two contrasting implicit readings have not been conveyed into the English translated verses. The results have shown that Speech Acts theory, politeness theory, context and co-text work can be used together to analyze the implicit meaning of the Qur`anic imperative verses compared to the translation theory which failed to convey the implicit meaning of these verses into English.

References

- Alharbi, Tahani A. 2015. *"A Socio- pragmatic Study of Forms of Address and Terms of Reference in Classical Arabic as Represented in the Chapter of Joseph in the Holy Quran."* Ph.D. thesis, University of Leeds, London.
- Ali, Yusuf. 2006. *The Meaning of the Holy Qur`an (Trans.)*. U.S.A.: Amana Publications.
- Al- Masri, Nisreen. N. 2016. *"Speech Acts in Imperative Sentence Used in the Holy Qur`an: The Case of Both the Cow and Joseph Chapters."* MA thesis, Hebron University, Palestine.
- Ashaer, Tasneem N. 2013. *"A Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis of Three English Translations of Surat Yusuf."* MA thesis, An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.
- Atiq, Abdul-Aziz. 1998. *Science of Semantics, Tropes, Schemes*. Beirut: Dār al-Nāḥḍa al-Arabiya.
- Bach, Kent and Robert M. Harnish. 1979. *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England. The MIT Press.
- Brown, Gillian and George, Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, Eirlys. 1986. *The English Imperative*. London: Croom Helm.
- The Imperative. 2009. www.znanje.org/knjige/english/grammar/verbs/imperative.
- Elaissawi, Ibrahim. E. 20160. *"Translation of the Imperative Forms in the Holy Qur`an."* MA thesis. American University of Sharjah, Sharjah.
- Fathi, Dhuha A. and Muhd, S. Othman. 2016. "Problems of Translating Imperative Mood in the Glorious Qur`an into English." In *International Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, Vol.1, no.1, pp. 224-239.
- Han, Chung -hye. 1998. *"The Structure of Interpretation of Imperatives: Moods and Force in Universal Grammar."* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, USA.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1973. "The Logic of Politeness; or Minding Your P's and Q's", In *Chicago Linguistics Society*, 8, pp.292-305.
- Larson, Mildred.1984. *Meaning -Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. 2nd edition.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. (vol. I & II). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Geoffrey, Leech, and Svartvik, Jan. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Searle, John. R. 1976. *A Classification of Illocutionary Acts*. In *Language in Society*, 5(01), pp.1- 23.

Ramadhan, Ahmed F. and Ahmed M. E. Saleh. 2011. Imperative Style in Joseph Chapter: A Rhetorical Study, In *Adab al-Rafideen*, no. 60, pp.1-32.
Searle, John. 1999. *Mind, Language and Society: Philosophy in the Real World*. New York
Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in interaction*. London: Longman.
Yule & Brown G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Yule, George. 2000. *Pragmatics*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education press
Yule, George. 2008. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
Yule, George. 2010. *The Study of Language*.4th edition. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dr. Nida S. Omar
Faculty of Medicine, University of Mosul, Iraq
nidaa.omar@gmail.com
Mobile: +964771639818

Dr. Kais A. Kadhim
Sohar University, Oman
KAlwan@su.edu.om
Mobile: 00601117776924

Mahmood Abdul Khaliq Al-Baqoa
Faculty of Education for Girls, University of Mosul, Iraq
Mobile: +9647701676818

In SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation [online]. 2019, vol. 12, no. 2 [cit. 2019- 20-12]. Available online at
http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI17/pdf_doc/05.pdf. ISSN 1336-7811.