Sudan University of Science and Technology

College of Graduate Studies

Rhetorical Questions with Reference to the
Glorious Qur'an: Pragmatic Approach

دراسة تحليلية لبعض من أغراض الأسئلة البلاغية في القرآن الكريم

*A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Master's degree in Linguistics*

By:

Amna Ahmed Suliman Ahmed Alnaeim

Under the Supervision of:

Dr. Mahmud Ali Ahmed

2015

Approval Page

Name of Candidate: Amna Ahmed Soliman Ahmed

Thesis title: Rhetorical Questions with Reference to the Glorious Quran: Pragmatic Approach

....

....

....

....

Approved by:

1. External Examiner

Name: Dr. Ahmed Mukhtar Elmardi Osman ....

Signature: Ahmed .... Date: 12.10.015 AD.

2. Internal Examiner

Name: Dr. Yusuf AL Tiraifi Ahmed Abuagla ....

Signature: Yusuf .... Date: 12-10-2015

3. Supervisor

Name: Dr. Mohmnd Ali Ahmed ....

Signature: MAhd .... Date: 12/10/2015

Sudan University of Science and Technology

College of Graduate Studies

<u>Declaration</u>

I, the signing here-under, declare that I'm the sole author of the (M.Sc.) thesis entitled Rhetorical Question with Reference to the Glorious Quran: Pragmatic Approach ....

....

which is an original intellectual work. Willingly, I assign the copy-right of this work to the College of Graduate Studies (CGS), Sudan University of Science & Technology (SUST). Accordingly, SUST has all the rights to publish this work for scientific purposes.

Candidate's name: Amna Ahmed Soliman Ahmed ....

Candidate's signature: _Amna Ahmed_ ...... Date: 12/10/2015 ....

إقرار

أنا الموقع أدناه أقر بأنني المؤلف الوحيد لرسالة الماجستير المعنونة ..دراسة تحليلية لبعض......

....من أغراض الأسئلة البلاغية في القرآن الكريم ....

....

وهى منتج فكري أصيل . وباختياري أعطى حقوق طبع ونشر هذا العمل لكلية الدراسات العليا ـ جامعه السودان للعلوم والتكنولوجيا، عليه يحق للجامعه نشر هذا العمل للأغراض العلمية .

اسم الدارس : آمنة أحمد سليمان أحمد ....

توقيع الدارس : _Amna Ahmed_ .... التاريخ : 15/10/10 /2015م

Dedications

This study is dedicated to my lovely family.

Acknowledgement

First of all, I would like to thank Allah (SWT) who enabled me to finish this study.

I also would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Mahmud Ali Ahmed, who really supported me.

My great gratitude is also due to Dr. Muhammad Eltayeb, who helped me.

Much thanks to all my teachers, colleagues, and friends.

Abstract

This study attempts to investigate some functions of Arabic rhetorical questions and English ones with reference to the Glorious Qur'an. The main objective of this study is to highlight the importance of pragmatic competence in Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Acquisition scenes.

The sample of this study consists of ten rhetorical questions; which are chosen randomly and then purposively. The researcher studies each question under the following steps:

- To determine the rhetorical function of the interrogative.
- To analyze the rhetorical question.
- To make a proper due evaluation.

The researcher uses Ibn Ashour, Tafseer Al-Tahreer wa Al-Tanweer to determine the function of the rhetorical questions.

The findings of the study show that; Arabic functions of rhetorical questions are varying and complex; English sometimes can maintain the force of those interrogative statements by using special techniques.

In accordance with the finding; the researcher suggests a research-project that analyzes all the functions of Quranic rhetorical question and their equivalence in English.

ملخص الدراسة

تهدف هذه الدراسة للبحث و التقصي عن الأسئلة الاستفهامية في اللغة العربية وبعض من أغراضها وعلاقة ذلك بأغراض الأسئلة الاستفهامية في اللغة الإنجليزية. وعلاقة كل ذلك بالأسئلة الاستفهامية المستعملة في القران الكريم. وهل يمكن أن نتوصل إلى ترجمة إنجليزية مكافئة لمعاني القران الكريم. والغرض من ذلك كله التوصل إلى أهمية الكفاءة الاجتماعية في تعلم اللغة.

و تكونت عينة الدراسة من عشر استفهامات بلاغية اختيرت بطريقة عشوائية ثم تم انتقاء عشر أغراض مختلفة للدراسة. ثم قام الباحث بدراسة كل استفهام مبينا الغرض منه وتحليله وإنتهاءا بتقويمه بالنسبة لمطابقة الترجمة الإنجليزية للمعنى المقصود في النص الأصلي. و استعان الباحث بكتاب تفسير التحرير والتنوير لابن عاشور(1978) لتحديد المعنى البلاغي للإستفهامات القرآنية.

و خلصت الدراسة إلى تعدد أغراض الإستفهامات البلاغية في اللغة العربية وتعقدها. وأن اللغة الإنجليزية تستطيع إلى حد ما مجاراة بعض هذه الأغراض باستخدام تقنيات معينة. بينما تعذر عليها مجاراة بعضها الآخر.

وبناءا على ذلك أوصى الباحث بقيام مشروع بحثي يستوعب جميع الإستفهامات البلاغية في القران الكريم وأغراضها.

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background of the study:

Communication is an innate trait in human beings. Thus, in order to communicate, people developed languages. Those languages are enormously differing from each another. But they share two common properties; they contain sounds and they follow rules. Those sounds and rules are combined in accordance to various ways to make meaning. Meaning is what makes communication among people such an especial activity. But, when we speak about *meaning* there are some issues rise associated with the intended meaning. One of these issues is translating indirect speech act from one language into another; especially when the two languages are extremely differ. These issues increased when the text is of great sensitivity like the one we are going to investigate.

1.2 Statement of the Problem:

Non-native Arabs need to read the Glorious Quran in English (as English is a very dominant language nowadays) to understand its message. Thus many English Translations of the meaning of the Glorious Quran appear in English world since 1734; when George Sale translated the meaning of the Glorious Quran directly from Arabic to English. Nowadays we can find about 80 translations of the Glorious Quran into English. These translations need to be tested for their validity. However, the Glorious Quran is full of eloquence, so its translators encounter with several difficulties. One of these difficulties is translating rhetorical questions.

Although, rhetorical questions are found in both languages, they raised a dilemma because they function slightly different.

In addition, the researcher seeks to raise the awareness of the essentiality of pragmatics competence in ESL and EFL scenes.

1.3 Questions of the Study:

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

1) Do translators of the Glorious Quran achieve complete functional equivalence when translating rhetorical questions from Arabic into English?
2) Are there any functional differences between Arabic and English use of rhetorical questions?

1.4 Hypotheses of the Study:

This study attempts to test the following hypotheses:

1) Translators of the Glorious Quran don't achieve complete functional equivalent when they translate rhetorical questions from Arabic into English.
2) There are functional differences between Arabic and English use of rhetorical questions.

1.5 Objectives of the Study:

This study aims to investigate some functions of Arabic rhetorical questions.

1.6 Significance of the Study:

This study attempts to investigate whether functional equivalence could be maintained in the translation of Quranic rhetorical questions from Arabic into English.

The significance of this study branches out from the fact that, it has a mixture of theoretical, practical and religious connotations. From theoretical perspective; it hopes that this study will contribute to the existing literature on rhetorical questions. And it will contribute to a better understanding of these rhetorical devices and their role in discourse. In addition, it contributes to the field of contrastive linguistics, since it shows the way Arabic and English differ in the linguistic means used to express the illocutionary force of the same rhetorical questions.

From practical perspective, it hopes that the finding of this study will indicate how Arabic and English differ in expressing the same rhetorical questions. So, this will be value to teaching English language functions to Arab students. Such an aim is in consonance with modern trend in socio-linguistics and learning strategies of foreign languages.

As for the religious significance, discussing the functions and implied meanings of rhetorical questions will help both Muslims and Non-Muslims better comprehend the Glorious Quran when reading it.

1.7 Limitation of the Study:

This study will be limited to investigate the functional differences between Arabic and English rhetorical questions. In addition, it will be limited to Quranic rhetorical questions. The researcher will deal with selected sample of Quranic rhetorical questions, because dealing with all Quranic rhetorical questions is out of the researcher ability (huge data, time limitation...etc).

1.8   Methodology of the Study:

The researcher will use analytical method in this study. The data will be label structurally and selected randomly. Then the selected data will be analyzed.

1.9   Translation under Study: Muhammad Taqui-ud-Din Al-Hilali and Muhammad Muhsin Khan, Explanatory English Translation of the Meaning of the Holy Qur'an. Hilal Publishing House, Ankara, turkey, 1978

The reason for choosing this translated version of the Glorious Quran is that, it recognizes as been the more accurate translation of the meaning of the Glorious Quran.

Chapter Two

Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.0 Introduction:

This chapter consists of two parts: Theoretical framework and previous studies. The first part considers speech acts theory and then it focuses on the classification of illocutionary acts in terms of taxonomies of (1) Austin and (2) Searle with special attention to speech act of Requesting. It also takes into account indirect speech acts and deals with rhetorical questions or secondary meaning of interrogatives. In the second part the researcher tries to show some relevant previous studies which were carried out by some researchers.

What is Quran?

Quran is the sacred book of all Muslims, who believed that its words are from Divine origin. The Quran is consists of 114 chapters or suras, each sura is divided into many verses or ayas. Denffer (1989: 17) identifies the Quran as "The word of God (Allah), sent down upon the last prophet Mohammed through the Angel Gabriel, in its precise meaning and precise wording, transmitted to us by numerous persons, both verbally and written. It is inimitable and unique, protected by Allah from any corruption".

Quranic Discourse:

What is special about Quran is its language; which is full of eloquence and rhetoric. Arabic scholars believe that Quran was revealed in Arabic for instruction and challenge. The Glorious Quran was described as 'the sea of

rhetoric'. The rhetorical questions are enormously used in the Glorious Quran. And what is significance is that, those questions show a wide range of functions.

2.1.1 SPEECH ACTS THEORY:

❖ Speech Acts:

Speech act is not simply an act of speaking, rather it refers to a whole communicative situation including context and paralinguistic features. This concept appears firstly at philosophy by American philosopher named Austin, but it has been thoroughly applied in linguistics and has had an enormous impact in L2 pragmatics and learning. When we speak (we order, apology, promise, swear …etc.) we essentially perform actions by our words. Those actions must not be judged by their truth values, but by their successes'. Any utterance; since utterance is the minimal unit in speech act theory, must achieved its *intentions* in order to be successful. Thus intentionality is another basic concept in this theory. Austin subdivided speech act into three components: *locutionary, illocutionary,* and *Perlocutionary acts*.

- Locutionary act:

Is corresponds to the emission of an utterance having determinate sense and reference.

- Illocutionary act:

Is corresponds to the sender's communicative intentions in uttering the message.

- Perlocutionary act:

Is corresponds to the effect the sender wishes to achieve in the mind of the interlocutor (or interlocutors) by means of uttering the expression.

The three components of speech acts are governed by different set of felicity conditions which` determined the success or failure of each one. However, success of one component does not necessary involve the success of the following one. The failures of felicitous condition fall into two classes; *misfire* and *abuse*. In misfire felicity the putative speech act fails to be performed at all, as a result of lacking authority for doing that specific speech act. For example, one cannot sentence another to be in a jail without been a judge; otherwise one has not the authority to do so. While in abuse felicity the putative speech act fails to live up to a standard appropriate for speech act of its kind; that is as a result of lacking of sincerity.

Furthermore, these felicity conditions cannot be applied to perlocutionary acts because they are strictly private; i.e., they take place in the interlocutor's mind and there is no direct way to discover their felicity by the sender. By contrast locutionary and illocutionary acts can be measured by felicity conditions.

However, Austin and then Searle (1969) focus more in the illocutionary acts. They grouped illocutionary acts into limited numbers of categories according to the main features of their force:

- Austin (1962) taxonomies:
1. Verdicatives (acquit, convict, diagnose…etc.)

2. Exercitives (appoint, order, name...etc.)

3. Commissive (promise, agree, bet...etc.)

4. Behabitives (apologize, compliment, welcome...etc.)

5. Expositives (deny, inform, concede...etc.)

- Searle (1976) taxonomies:

1. Representatives: assertions about the world based on the belief of the Speaker.

2. Directives: attempt to get a listener to do something in response to the utterance.

3. Expressive: expressions of the inner thoughts or feelings of the Speaker.

4. Commissive: obligations that a Speaker places on oneself.

5. Declaration: formal statements by which a Speaker declares something to be true or accepted.

2.1.2Directive speech acts:

As a purpose of this research I will shed more light on directives with more focus on speech act of Requesting. *Directives* are essentially commands. They convey a proposition about a future act of the Addressee that the Speaker desires, and the point is to try to get the Addressee to commit to making the proposition true (Griffiths). According to Searle (1976) are those in which the Speaker's purpose is to get the Hearer to commit him/herself to some future course of Action. Put more simply, directives are attempt to make the world match the word. Thomas (1995) states that, both Speaker and Hearer are to be taken into account when producing directive speech acts. That is because the actions will not successes if not the Hearer accepting the speaker's intentions.

Directive verbs generally express only future events and are Addressee-oriented, as the Addressee is the intended agent responsible for future events. An important criterion for delimitation between the meanings of sub-types of directive verbs is the presence or absence of the requirement for agreement/compliance of the addressee. While in ritualized orders and commands the requirement of compliance/agreement is absent since the Addressor believes that his/her utterance is sufficient reason for the Addressee to act, the other types of directives require the collaboration of the Addressee in order for the speech act to succeed. Then, how can we test their felicity conditions. Searle (1969) identifies four felicity conditions for directive speech acts: *Preparatory condition* (Hearer is able to perform Act); *Sincerity condition* (S wants H to do A); *Propositional condition* (S predicates a future A of H); *Essential condition* (counts as an attempt by S to get H to do A). He also identifies three basic sentence types that are most frequently employed to indirect express directive situations (Searle 1975):

1. Sentences having to do with felicitous conditions on the performance of a directive illocutionary act, including the ability of H to perform A (Preparatory condition; can you reach the salt?), the desire of S that H form A (Sincerity condition; I hope you'll do it), and the predication of A of H (Propositional content condition; officers will henceforth wear ties at dinner).
2. Sentences having to do with reasons for doing the act, including H's desire to do something and explicit reasons (would you be willing to write a letter of recommendations for me? It would be a good idea if you left town).

3. Sentences embedding one element inside another one, typically through performative verbs (would you mind awfully if I asked you if you could write me a letter of recommendation?).

2.1.3 Ordinary Questions vs. Rhetorical Questions:

Interrogative sentences are normally used to ask questions. However, there is no watertight one-to-one relationship between syntactic form and the use of this form might be put to. Thus, there are situations in which interrogative sentences are not used to ask question at all. For example, when someone says:

- Can you be quite?

S/he is not asking about the Addressee's ability to be quite. Rather, it must be taken as an order to be quite. Those interrogative sentences are called *RHETORICAL QUESTIONS.*

❖ Definition of Ordinary Questions:

1. An ordinary question is an interrogative clause whose answer is not known to the Speaker, but the Speaker thinks the Addressee may know it. An answer is required in order for dialogue to be felicitous. Only the Addressee can answer.

❖ Definition of Rhetorical Questions:

2. A rhetorical question is an interrogative clause whose answer is known to the Speaker and the Addressee, and they both know that the other knows the answer as well. An answer is not required. Either the Speaker or the Addressee can answer.

3. The difference is briefly as Caponigro and Sprouse put it:

4. *The difference between RQs and OQs is just a matter of the Speaker's and the Addressee's knowledge and beliefs with respect to the answer to the question under discussion. (p2).*

5. Many scholars were debate about *rhetorical questions* (as Sadock 1971, 1974; Progovac 1993; Han and Siegel 1996; Ladusaw 1979; Van Rooy 2003; Caponigro and Sprouse 2007 among many others) (cited from Caponigro and Sprouse 2007). Those scholars were developed four approaches to handle *Rhetorical Questions*:

    • Rhetorical questions are interrogatives syntactically, but are semantically equivalent to negative statements.

    • Rhetorical questions should be analyzed as ordinary questions whose answer-set is empty. Therefore, they cannot answer or can receive only negative answers.

    • Rhetorical questions are full-fledged ordinary questions, but impose restrictions on the kind of answer they allow to.

    • Rhetorical questions are like ordinary questions semantically and syntactically, but they differ in pragmatic level.

2.1.4 Functions of English Rhetorical Questions:

There are four principle functions of rhetorical questions in English:

• A statement of certitude.

• A statement of incertitude.

• A statement of evaluation or obligation.

• To introduce a new subject or a new aspect of a subject.

2.1.4.1 A Statement of Certitude:

Rhetorical questions are simply expressing the fact that the Speaker is sure of what s/he is saying. If the information expressed is a common knowledge to the Speaker and the Addressee, the Speaker is calling the Addressee's attention to it. The statement in which a rhetorical question transforms may be

- an affirmation
- a negation, or
- a combination of both.

2.1.4.2 A Statement of Incertitude:

Rhetorical questions are used to express incertitude in various forms, such as doubt, perplexity, an uncertainty; or contingency or deliberation.

2.1.4.3 A Statement of Evaluation or Obligation:

Those rhetorical questions which are transformed into statements, that are carry an implication of evaluation or obligation. In other words, the question form is used as more polite or less direct way to administer a rebuke or command. Questions of this type are generally transformed into

- statements, or
- imperative forms, or
- negative imperatives (prohibition).

2.1.4.4 To Introduce a new Subject or a new Aspect of a Subject:

Rhetorical questions are used as signal the start of a new subject or some new aspects of the same subject.

2.1.5 Functions of Arabic Rhetorical Questions:

Arab rhetoricians names as many as forty functions for secondary meaning of interrogative. I will illustrate some functions which are more frequently used in the Holy Qur'an.

2.1.5.1. Exclamation:

(ألم تر إلى الذين تولوا قوما غضب الله عليهم ماهم منكم ولا منهم ويحلفون على الكذب وهم يعلمون)14المجادلة (التحرير والتنوير 28-48)

(14) Have you not seen those (hypocrites) who take for friendships, a people upon whom Allah is worth (i.e., Jews)? They are neither of you (Muslims) nor of them (Jews) and they swear a false oath knowingly.

14. Turnest thou not thy attention to those who turn (in friendship) to such as have the Wrath of Allah upon them? They are neither of you nor of them, and they swear to falsehood knowingly.

2.1.5.2. Order:

(فقربه إليهم قال ألا تأكلون)27الذاريات

(27) And placed it before them (saying): Will you not eat?

27. And placed it before them…he said, "Will ye not eat?"

2.1.5.3. Negation:

(يأيها النبي **لم تحرم** ما أحل الله لك تبتغي مرضات أزواجك والله غفور رحيم) 1-التحريم

الاستفهام في قوله تعالى (لم تحرم) مستعمل في معنى النفي أي لا يوجد ما يدعو إلى أن تحرم على نفسك ما أحل الله لك (التحرير والتنوير 28-346).

(1)O Prophet! Why do you ban (for you) that which Allah has made lawful for you?

1. O Prophet! Why holdest thou to be forbidden that which Allah has made lawful to thee?

2.1.5.4. Importability:

(ويقولون متى هذا الوعد إن كنتم صادقين) 25الملك

الاستفهام بقولهم (متى هذا الوعد) مستعمل في التهكم لأن من عادتهم أن يستهزوا بذلك. (التحرير والتنوير 29-49).

(25) They say: When will this Promise (i.e., the Day of Resurrection) come to pass? .. if you are telling the truth.

25. They ask: When will this promise be (fulfilled)? -If you are telling the truth.

2.1.5.5. Inducement of Fascination:

(وهل أتاك حديث موسى) 9-طه

الاستفهام مستعمل في التشويق إلى الخير مجازا. (التحرير والتنوير 16-193).

(9) And has the story of Moses reached you?

9. Has the story of Moses reached thee?

(فوسوس إليه الشيطان قال هل أدلك على شجرة الخلد وملك لا يبلى) 120-طه

(هل أدلك) استفهام مستعمل في العرض, وهو أنسب المعاني المجازية للاستفهام لقربه من حقيقته. (التحرير والتنوير 16-325).

(120) But Satan whispered evil to him, he said: "O Adam! Shall I lead you to the tree of Eternity and a kingdom that never decays?"

120. But Satan whispered evil to him: he said, "O Adam! Shall I lead thee to the Tree of Eternity and to the kingdom that never decays?"

2.1.5.6. Negative Imperative:

(أتخشونهم فالله أحق أن تخشوه إن كنتم مؤمنين) 13التوبة (التحرير والتنوير 10-134)

(13) ....Do you fear them? Allah has more right that you should fear Him, if you are believers.

13. ....Do ye fear them? Ney, it is Allah Whom ye should more justly fear, if ye believe!

2.1.5.7. Scorn and Mockery:

(قل أذلك خير أم جنة الخلد التي وعد المتقون كانت لهم جزاء ومصيرا)15الفرقان

الاستفهام للتهكم إذا كان الخطاب للمشركين. أما إذا كان الخطاب للمؤمنين فهو مستعمل في التلميح والتلطف.(بتصرف 18-335)

(15) Say: Is that (torment) better or the eternal Garden (Paradise) promised to the pious?

15. Say: "Is that best, or the eternal garden, promised to the righteous?

2.1.5.8. Expression of Awe and Exaltation:

(الحاقة * ما الحاقة) 1+2 الحاقة (التحرير والتنوير 29-113)

(1) The Reality (i.e. the Day of Resurrection) (2) What is the Reality?

1. The Sure Reality! 2. What is the Sure Reality?

2.1.5.9. Wish (Optative):

(فهل لنا من شفعاء فيشفعوا لنا)53 الأعراف (التحرير والتنوير 8-156)

(53) ….now are there any intercessors for us that they might intercede on our behalf?

53. ….Have we no intercessors now to intercede on our behalf?

2.1.5.10. Affirmation:

2.1.5.10.a Actualization and Realization:

(قال ألم نربك فينا وليدا ولبثت فينا من عمرك سنين)18 الشعراء (التحرير والتنوير 19-111)

(18) (Pharaoh) said (to Moses): "Did we not bring you up among us as a child? And you did dwell many years of your life with us?

18. (Pharaoh) said: "Did we not cherish thee as a child among us, and didst thou not stay in our midst many years of thy life?

2.1.5.10.b Requesting the Addressee to Affirm and Recognize what the Speaker Want:

(أليس الله بقادر على أن يحيي الموتى)40 القيامة (التحرير والتنوير 29-368)

(40) Is not He (Allah who does that) Able to give life to the dead?

40. Has not He, (the same), the power to give life to the dead?

2.1.5.11. Disaffirmation:

2.1.5.11. a. Reproach Disaffirmation:

(ومالكم الا تنفقوا في سبيل الله ولله ميراث السماوات والأرض)10 الحديد (التحرير والتنوير 27-373)

(10) And what is the matter with you that you spend not in the cause of Allah?

10. And what cause have ye why ye should not spend in the cause of Allah?

2.1.5.11. b. Denial Disaffirmation:

(وياقوم من ينصرني من الله إن طردتهم أفلا تذكرون)30 هود (التحرير والتنوير12-56)

(30) And O my people! Who will help me against Allah, if I drove them away?

30. And O my people! who help me against Allah if I drove them away?

2.2 Previous Studies:

There were various studies which have been carried out by many scholars on rhetorical questions. The researcher will briefly introduce some of them, as follow:

2.2.1. Al-Malik, fahad M. (1995) Performative utterances: their basic and secondary meaning with reference to five English translation of the meaning of the Holy Qur'an. Durham theses, Durham University: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/973/.

Aim:

To study performative utterances from both Arabic and English point of view, and to find how the translators of the translations under consideration deal with such utterances when they are used to indicate a secondary meaning. The researcher aims to suggest from his point of view as a translator the best way to treat the secondary meaning of a performative utterance.

Tools:

The data gather via questionnaire.

Findings:

1. The use of particles in English is sometimes essential in conveying the illocutionary force of a performative utterance. The uses of these particles in some contexts give a greater sense of the concerned secondary meaning.

2. English seems to use the negative more widely than Arabic does. The use of negative in the question, for example, in English provides a rhetorical force and implies a reply in positive.

3. It is sufficient merely to convey the same illocutionary force (secondary meaning) even if this involve using a form whose locutionary force and illocutionary force are in effect are identical (i.e., where the English form has only a basic meaning with no additional rhetorical meaning). Here it seems to

me (i.e., Al-Malik) that equivalence of illocutionary force is the essential feature in translation in general, and in religious translation in particular. We should be aware that the illocutionary force depends in most cases on the situational context.

4. The study and the analysis of the basic meaning of a performative utterance depend on the study of both the locutionary force of the sentence and its conventional grammaticalized features (non-truth conditional meaning). The study of the secondary meaning of a performative utterance on the other hand, equals the study of illocutionary force of the utterance. So, we may simply say:

Basic meaning= locutionary force+ conventional grammaticalized features.

Secondary meaning= illocutionary meaning

5. Sometimes the translator, when translating a performative utterance, may substitutes the locutionary force of the Arabic for the illocutionary force. In this case, the proposed illocutionary force is the same as the locutionary force.

6. It seems in general that the more specific (and therefore more emphatic) the utterance is, the more its likely to be interpreted as unacceptable in its basic meaning and therefore to have a secondary meaning.

7. Stylistic oddity seems to affect respondents' judgments in the essential different area of assessment of secondary meaning.

8. With regard to the style of translation, I (i.e., Al-Malik) draw the attention to the fact that in many examples the effect of the use of 'religious' archaism on respondents' perceptions of secondary meaning was very clear.

9. The account of secondary meanings does have some shortcomings. The most interesting of these is the following. Consider an example such as (فهل أنتم

منتهون). In English this can only be successfully translated with a negative question 'Will you not then abstain?', and not with a positive question 'Will you then abstain?'. If a Gricean/ relevance theory account were sufficient on its own to explain the operation of secondary meanings, it would be clearly be possible to translate (فهل أنتم منتهون) as 'Will you the abstain?', and to achieve the same secondary meaning. This is because the same inferences would be drawn in the two languages (and indeed in any languages) from the failure of (فهل أنتم منتهون) to be successfully interpreted in its primary meaning, and the same secondary meaning would be arrived at. Clearly, this is not what happens in practice. I believe it is necessary therefore to accept that in addition to the operation of implicatures etc., there also a conventional element in the occurrence and interpretation of secondary meanings. That is to say, it's an illocutionary convention of Arabic that (فهل أنتم منتهون) can, in some contexts, have the illocutionary force of an order. In English, this convention does not exist. However, English have the illocutionary convention that 'Will you not then abstain?' can, in some contexts, have the illocutionary force of an order.

6. **2.2.2 Al-Fadda, Najla Abdul-Aziz (2010). Translation of Rhetorical Questions in Hadith from Arabic into English: A Functionalist Perspective, King Saud University.**

Aims:

The study attempts to investigate the possibility of achieving functional equivalence when translating rhetorical questions in Hadith from Arabic into English.

Tools:

The data analyzed consisted of seventeen rhetorical questions representing seventeen rhetorical meanings. The analysis of these rhetorical questions followed a linguistic approach which was based on Mousa's levels of rhetorical questions (1995): the syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and aesthetic levels. Each translation of a rhetorical question was examined in terms of these levels and in comparison with the original rhetorical question.

To get objective results and to validate the discussion, the readers' responses to the translations were examined. This was done through a questionnaire distributed to three bilingual scholars experienced in the two languages involved (i.e., Arabic and English). They evaluated the translated rhetorical questions in terms of the four levels mentioned above. Based on the analysis and the comparison, the degree of adequacy of a translation was determined on basis of its success in maintaining functional equivalence.

Results:

The results showed that partial rather than complete functional equivalence could be achieved when translating rhetorical questions in Hadith from Arabic into English. They also showed that, there were certain linguistic and extra-linguistic signals and strategies used by translators in order to convey the functions of the original rhetorical questions.

2.3 Summary of the Chapter:

This chapter divides into two sections. The first one deals with theoretical framework of the study. This section subdivides into five subsections. Firstly, researcher speaks about speech act theory as well as Austin and Searle taxonomies. Then researcher sheds more light on directive speech acts, with

more focus on Requesting. After that, researcher differentiates between ordinary questions and rhetorical questions. While the last two subsections speak about functions of rhetorical questions in English and Arabic.

The second part of the chapter illustrates two previous studies. The first one studies performative sentences in general. While the second deals with rhetorical questions in Hadith

Chapter Three

Chapter Three

Research Methodology

3.0 Introduction:

This chapter explains the methodology that followed in conducting the present research. It starts with a description of data selected, followed by a description of the theoretical framework used for analysis, along with the procedures used for data analysis.

3.1 Sampling:

This research adopts a corpus-based approach to pragmatic investigation. It is based upon data of ten rhetorical questions used in the Glorious Quran. Although there were many researches had done on Arabic rhetorical questions, none of them chooses a pragmatic approach for their analysis.

3.2 Data collection:

The data were selected randomly then purposively.

Steps of data collection:

1. Listing hundred interrogatives randomly from the Glorious Quran.
2. Classifying the interrogative utterances in accordance to their genre into genuine or rhetoric.

3. Determine the intended function of each rhetorical interrogative. The researcher adopts Al-Tahreer wa Al-Tanweer for Ibn Ashoor in doing this.

4. Selecting the rhetorical interrogatives for the present research from 114 Suras and huge numbers of rhetorical questions in the Glorious Quran, ten rhetorical interrogatives were chosen on the basis of the following criteria:

   - They display different rhetorical functions.
   - They are of different length.

The ten rhetorical functions of the rhetorical questions under investigation are:

Affirmation, arouse interest, awe, compassion, denouncement, disaffirmation and scolding, encouragement, improbability, induce aspiration, and wonderment.

3.3 Data analysis:

This study is analytic in nature. It analyzes the function of rhetorical questions in selected verses from the Glorious Quran pragmatically.

3.3.1 Theoretical frame of the analysis:

The researcher will analyze each rhetorical question pragmatically to see if the translated text can convey appropriately the secondary purpose of it.

3.3.2 Procedures for data analysis:

For each rhetorical question chosen, the following procedures are used for analysis:

- The Arabic version of the verse containing the rhetorical question is given, with the rhetorical question to be discussed written in bold. This followed by the equivalent rhetorical question in the translated version.
- The function of the rhetorical question is determined. Tafseer Al-Tahreer wa Al-Tanweer is adopted for this.
- Then the pragmatic analysis of the verse establishes.

Chapter Four

Chapter Four

Data Analysis, Result, and Discussion

4.0 Introduction:

In this chapter researcher will present data under investigation, then analyzes them, and finally will show the result and discussion.

4.1 Data:

1.

ST	وكانوا يقولون أئذا كنا ترابا وعظاما **إنا لمبعوثون** 47-56
TT	When we die and become dust and bones, shall we then indeed be raised up again?

Rhetorical function of the interrogative:

In this verse the rhetorical function of the interrogative form is to express improbability. The unbelievers asked the Prophet (PBUH) this question regularly, because they don't believe in the Resurrection. So they tried to show the Prophet (PBUH) as a liar. They always asked him in public "Did you say that "dead will come to life again", we did not notice that there is any dead person come to life again?" Resurrection is a big lie for them. So they don't need an answer from the prophet (PBUH), but they tried to win the deliberation between the two groups.

Analysis:

In Arabic using present tense indicates repeated actions. This repeatability does not appear in the translation version. From the researcher point of view, the use of the adverb 'indeed' gives us a clue that we are not facing a real question but a rhetorical one. Initializing the verse using" what!" Give more emphasis to the rhetorical meaning.

The using of "shall" in the TT which indicate uncertainty is appropriate.

Evaluation:

The TT does conveying the illocutionary force adequately.

2.

ST	قل **من ينجيكم من ظلمات البر والبحر** تدعونه تضرعا وخفية لئن أنجانا من هذه لنكونن من الشاكرين63-6
TT	Say: "**Who saves you from the darkness (dangers like storm etc.) of the land and the sea,** you call upon Him in humility and in secret (saying): If He (Allah) only saves us from this danger, we shall truly be grateful". P.134

Rhetorical function of the interrogative:

The interrogative here is used as a persuasive tool. It is served as an attempt to make interlocutors admit the truth of some event or affairs. Allah tells the Prophet (PBUH) to ask Unbelievers this question as an act of persuasion. This is an attempt to make them (i.e., Unbelievers) approach Islam and accept worshiping Allah (SWT).

Analysis:

The illocutionary force of this interrogative is to make interlocutors affirm and recognize what is the Speaker want. No answer is expected to it.

Evaluation:

Although this rhetorical usage of interrogative is common in English, the TT changes the interrogative form into statement by ignoring the use of question signal.

3.

ST	يقول الانسان يومئذ **أين المفر** 75-10
TT	Where (is the refuge) to flee?

Rhetorical function of the interrogative:

In this verse the rhetorical function of the interrogative form is used to induce aspiration. The previous verses present some of the Resurrection Day's events. The Unbelievers asked skeptically about the timing of the Resurrection Day; because they don't believe on it. On that Day Man will surround by many horrible events; Man's sight will daze, Moon light will darken, and Moon and Sun will joined. At that moment Man will frighten searching for a refuge to flee, but there is no safety. The meaning of the verse is that "I hope I can find a place to hide, but there is no refugee". In the Day of Resurrection will be many unusual circumstances which will frighten Man. So Man on that Day will search for a refuge to flee from these horrible events. It will be obvious that there is no refuge. Ibin Jubayr and several others of Salaf said, "There will be no salvation".

Analysis:

In TT adding the phrase "to flee" makes more explanation to the interrogative.

Evaluation:

TT maintains its genre and force.

4.

ST	قل الحمد لله وسلام على عباده الذين اصطفى **ءآلله خير أما يشركون** 59-27
TT	Is Allah better, or (all) that you ascribe as partners (to Him)?

Rhetorical function of the interrogative:

The function of the interrogative form in this verse is to denouncing the idolaters for their worship of other gods beside Allah. And it aimed at establish a common ground between the two groups (i.e., believers and idolaters), that Allah is the One who deserved Worship. However, it (i.e., the interrogative) works as an opening scene to the following verses which provide evidences that Allah is the best.

Analysis:

The real intention of this interrogative is to warn the polytheists against their error. No one would do anything unless he saw some good in it. The polytheists serve their deities and implore them for their needs and present their offerings before them, which would be meaningless unless they perceive some good in them. That is why they have been   asked to consider whether Allah is better or their deities. They helplessly could not say that their gods are better. So by acknowledging that Allah is better their whole creed demolish, because it would not be reasonable to adopt the inferior against the superior creed.

Evaluation:

  TT maintains the ST genre and force.

5.

ST	**أكان للناس عجبا أن أوحينا إلى رجل منهم** أن أنذر الناس وبشر الذين آمنوا أن لهم قدم صدق عند ربهم قال الكافرون إن هذا لساحر مبين 2-10
TT	It is a wonder for mankind that We have sent Our inspiration to a man from among themselves.

Rhetorical function of the interrogative:

In this verse the rhetorical function of the interrogative form is to express wonderment. The unbelievers' wonderment drives from sending a man as a prophet which, from their point of view, is not accepted.

Analysis:

In this verse the interrogative form is used to indicate a wonder and astonishment of the Unbelievers about sending a Man as a Prophet. In this case, no answer is expected to the interrogative. "The exclamatory question is interrogative in structure, but has the illocutionary force of an exclamatory assertion" (Al-Malik p.182).

Evaluation:

The TT shows appropriate meaning for the original meaning. The partial (Hamza) uses to express disaffirmation, that means; how they astonished from this (i.e., sending a man as a prophet). Furthermore, the combination of (Hamza) with the verb (kana) transforming the function of (Hamza) from disaffirmation to astonishment.

TT translates the interrogative into a statement. Which changes the function of the rhetorical question (i.e., as a statement it expresses affirmation).

6.

ST	**هل أتاك حديث الجنود** فرعون وثمود (17-18)-85
TT	Has the story reached you of the hosts… Of Pharaoh and Thamud?

Rhetorical function of the interrogative:

The rhetorical function of the interrogative form in this verse is to express awe.

Analysis:

This interrogative introduces to get the attention of the interlocutors; that there is an important topic under discussion.

Evaluation:

This type of rhetorical interrogative is commonly used in English.

7.

ST	أيحسب أن لم يره أحد 7-90
TT	Thinks he that none sees him?

Rhetorical function of the interrogative:

In this verse the interrogative form is used to express disaffirmation and scolding.

Analysis:

In this verse the intended meaning is that Allah knows his acts and motives, and showing himself as a generous man is false (AlTahreer wa AlTanweer 30-p. 353). Allah is the all known. He knows everything. Do you think that no one see you? Even though, if there is no person, nor animal see you; Allah will. You cannot delude Allah Who knows everything.

Evaluation:

The translated version maintains the interrogative's intention.

8.

ST	أفلا يتوبون إلى الله ويستغفرونه والله غفور رحيم 74-5

TT	Will they not repent to Allah and ask His Forgiveness?

Rhetorical function of the interrogative:

The rhetorical function of the interrogative form is to encourage interlocutors to do action under discussion.

Analysis:

Arabic partial (a'fla) does not utilize to express a suggestion, but to encourage interlocutors urgently to do some kind of action.

Evaluation:

 The translated version probably transfers the original meaning.

9.

ST	وماتلك بيمينك يا موسى 17-20
TT	And what is that in your right hand, O Moses?

Rhetorical function of the interrogative:

In this verse the rhetorical function of the interrogative form is to express compassion. Allah (SWT) knows what is in Moses hand, but He asks him in order to make him feel relax and don't fear. Furthermore, it helps Moses (PBUH) to recognize that it is neither a dream nor an illusion, it is the reality.

Analysis:

The interrogative in this verse is used as an opener for the conversation between Allah (SWT) and Moses (PBUH). Both of them know what is in Moses' hand, so no answer is required. But at that position, at that night, at that time, all the circumstances make Man fears.

Evaluation:

Although we could not find this type of rhetorical function in English, the Translated Text maintains its function.

10.

ST	قل **هل أنبئكم بالأخسرين أعمالا** 18-103
TT	Shall We tell you the greatest losers in respect of (their) deeds?

Rhetorical function of the interrogative:

This interrogative is used as a means of inducing fascination and arousing interest, so that it drags interlocutors' attention to the topic under discussion.

Analysis:

The interrogative form is used here as a discourse opener. This opening position of the rhetorical question puts the interlocutors in a particular frame of mind, and prepares them to be receptive to what comes. In addition, it marks the following discourse as more interesting since it would be an extension of the exordial rhetorical question.

Evaluation:

This type of rhetorical meaning of an interrogative is commonly used in English. Thus, the TT arouses the same interest as the ST.

4.2 Result and Discussion:

The following table shows the result of the analysis:

Force	Yes	Sometimes	No
Affirmation		●	
Arousing Interest	●		
Awe	●		
Compassion	●		
Denouncement	●		
Disaffirmation and Scolding	●		
Encouragement	●		
Improbability	●		
Induce Aspiration	●		
Wonderment			●

Table1: Results

The above table shows that the rhetorical functions of eight interrogatives are maintained. Which are arousing interest, awe, compassion, denouncement, disaffirmation and scolding, encouragement, improbability, and induce aspiration.

For *affirmation* in TT does not sustain the function to some extent. And *wonderment* in TT does not convey the force totally.

Chapter Five

Chapter Five

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Suggestion for Further Studies

5.0 Introduction:

This study is an attempt to investigate some functions of rhetorical question in Arabic language and its equivalent in English language with reference to the Glorious Quran. This chapter consists of findings, recommendations, and suggestions for further studies.

5.1 Findings:

The major findings are as follows:

1. The functions of Arabic rhetorical question are varied and more complex.
2. English language can handle the complexity and diversity of functions of Arabic rhetorical question with using special techniques.
3. Sometimes, English language fails in counter the function of Arabic rhetorical question.

5.2 Recommendations:

In the light of findings, the following recommendations might be helpful in studying the functions of Arabic rhetorical questions:

1. Researchers are advised to conduct more studies in secondary meanings of speech acts in general.
2. Researchers must highlight the importance of pragmatic competence in FLA (Foreign Language Acquisition) scenes.
3. Researchers should equip facilitators with will design methods, that help facilitators explain the use of different genres in the intended language.

5.3 Suggestions:

As a result of the findings the researcher suggests the following:

1. A research project that analyzes all the functions of Arabic rhetorical question and its equivalence in English.

5.4 Conclusions:

This study is an attempt to investigate some functions of Arabic rhetorical questions, and its influence in the translation of the Glorious Quran. The importance of the topic is spring out from its religious connotations. The researcher hopes that it will shed light on the essentiality of pragmatic competence in FLL (Foreign Language Learning).

References

English References:

Al-Fadda,   Najla Abdul-Aziz (2010). Translation of Rhetorical Questions in Hadith from Arabic into English: A Functionalist Perspective. King Saud University.

Al-Hilali,   Muhammad Taqui-ud-Din and Khan, Muhammad Muhsin (1978). Explanatory English Translation of the Meaning of the Holy Qur'an. Hilal Publishing House. Ankara, Turkey.

Ali,   Abdullah Yusuf. The Meaning of the Glorious Qur'an Text, Translation and commentary. IslamicBulletin.org

Al-Jabari,   Raed (2008). Reasons for the Possible Incomprehensibility of some Verses of Three Translations of the Meaning of the Holy Qur'an into English. University of Salford, Salford, UK.

Al-Malik,   Fahad M. (1995). Performative Utterances: their Basic and Secondary Meaning with Reference to five English Translations of the Meaning of the Holy Qur'an. Durham theses, Durham University.

Demeter,   Gusztav (2000). A Pragmatic Study of Apology Strategies in Romanian. North University. Baia Mare, Romania.

Griffiths,   Patrick. (2006). An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics. Edinburgh University Press.

Schifrin,   Amanda (2005). Modeling Speech Acts in Conversational Discourse. The University of Leeds.

Arabic References:

ابن عاشور. محمد الطاهر (1984). تفسير التحرير والتنوير. الدار التونسية للنشر.

البلخي. محمد ابراهيم محمد شريف (2007-2006). أساليب الاستفهام في البحث البلاغي و أسرارها في القرآن الكريم. الجامعة الاسلامية العالمية. اسلام أباد. باكستان.

العامري. شاكر و آخرون (2012). تجاهل العارف في القرآن الكريم: استعمالاته وأغراضه البلاغية. مجلة دراسات في اللغة العربية وآدابها. العدد الثامن.

العمار. عبدالعزيز بن صالح (2006). التصوير البياني في حديث القرآن عن القرآن. دراسة بلاغية تحليلية.

القرآن الكريم.