

**BLAME IN ENGLISH AND ARABIC RELIGIOUS TEXTS:
A PRAGMATIC STUDY**

ASST. PROF. RIYADH TARIQ KADHIM AL-AMEEDI

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION/ UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON)

PROF. AS'AD MOHAMMED ALI AL-NAJJAR

COLLEGE OF BASIC EDUCATION / UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON

SUZANNE SA'AD MOHAMMED ALI AL-KHAFAJI

(M.A. IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND INGUISTICS)

1. Introduction

The speech act of **blame** can be defined as "*the act of disapproving or condemning something bad.*" (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985: 191). In fact, the act of **blame** has received relatively little attention compared with many other speech acts. It seems that it is a problematic act since pragmatists and philosophers disagree in labelling this act under certain specific classification nor do they suggest its felicity conditions. Hence, the present study highlights the analysis of the act of blame pragmatically. Moreover, it deals with the semantic and syntactic constructions of blame in both English and Arabic whether explicitly or implicitly:

- (1) I blamed the man for his impatience. (explicit blame)
- (2) ألومك لقصورك في أداء واجبك. (explicit blame)
I blame you for ignoring your duty.
- (3) Can't you be more patient? (implicit blame)
- (4) { وَضَرَبَ لَنَا مَثَلًا وَنَسِيَ خَلْقَهُ قَالَ مَنْ يُحْيِي الْعِظَامَ وَهِيَ رَمِيمٌ } (implicit blame)

(يس: ٧٨)

He setteth unto Us an argument,
and hath forgotten his (own)
creation (origin), Sayeth he:

"Who will enliven the bones
when they are rotten?" (Ali, 1988: 1331)

It is to be noticed that blame conveys negative criticism, indignation and resentment. Under certain conditions, an addresser may find himself in a way or another blaming people as individuals or blaming their deeds or behaviours.

Thus, this study attempts to answer the following questions:

- 1- How can the act of blame be identified in both English and Arabic?
- 2- How can this act be recognized religiously in the two languages?

The study aims to:

- 1- Present material about the speech act of blame pragmatically, semantically and syntactically in both English and Arabic.
- 2- Set certain felicity conditions for issuing the speech act of blame in both languages.

It is hypothesized that:

- 1- The felicity conditions suggested could be applied to English and Arabic religious texts.

- 2- The explicit forms used to express the speech act of blame in such texts are expected to be less than the implicit ones.
- 3- There is no clear-cut line between blame and some other acts used in English and Arabic.
- The procedures adopted are the following:

- 1- Presenting a theoretical survey of the relevant literature on the speech act of blame in English and Arabic respectively.
- 2- Applying the felicity conditions suggested (p. 18) to analyze certain religious texts from the Holy Bible in English and the Glorious Qur'an in Arabic.

The study will be confined to the investigation of a number of Biblical verses from the "Old Testament and New Testament" in English and aayas taken from different surahs from the Glorious Qur'an in Arabic because such texts represent the standard forms of these languages.

2. Blame in English

2.1 Pragmatic Perspective

Blame is the act of expressing disapproval, negative feeling, censure, or annoyance towards a past or ongoing action whose consequences are perceived to the addressee's responsibility (Williams, 2006: 12). For Trosborg (1995:318) the act of blame presupposes that the accused is guilty of the offence. In blaming, the blamer may modify his disapproval of an action for which the accused is responsible:

(5) Honestly, couldn't you have been more careful?

Or he could state his blaming by alternative approach such as by condemning the accused action or the accused person himself.

(6) Oh no, not again! You really are thoughtless. (ibid: 319) Duff (1986: 40) states that the proper meaning of **blame** may simply need to involve forming a private judgment on someone's conduct; or having a certain attitude of resentment, indignation, anger or contempt towards him because of his wrong-doing, or criticizing him to others in his absence. However, **blame** is one of the acts that express the addresser's disapproval and/ or negative feelings towards the state of affairs that is described in the proposition for which the addresser holds the addressee responsible either directly or indirectly. Pragmatists and philosophers differ in their treatment of the speech act of blame. They even differ at the class the act belongs to. Some consider it as a behabitive act, others view it as assertive, expressive or verdictive. To sum up such views, Austin (1956:35), Austin (1962: 83), and Nozick (2000:108-9) label **blame** under the category of behabitives. 'Behabitive' is that kind of performative which is concerned roughly with reactions of behaviour and with behaviour towards others. It is designed to exhibit attitudes and feelings and, then, it has much to do with social behaviour.

Searle and Vanderveken (1985: 182-3), Vanderveken (1990:169) and Downs (1998: 378-9) list blame under assertives. An assertive illocutionary force has the word-to-world direction of fit. All

assertive illocutionary forces have the preparatory condition that the addresser has a reason, ground or evidence that supports the truth of the propositional content. As for Partridge (1982:101), Jordá (2005:64) and Proost (2007:32-3) **blame** is an expressive act. The illocutionary point of the act of blame is to express a negative evaluation by the addresser of some past action performed by the addressee. Finally, Kreidler (1998:183) labels **blame** under the category of verdictives. Verdictives are “*speech acts in which the speaker makes an assessment or judgment about the acts of another, usually the addressee*”. However, blame is a social judgment process. It involves human abilities to perceive and appraise one’s own cognitive states and processes of others. Blame is also realized in institutional discourse such as court trails (Meal, 1993: 40). The primary purpose of blame is to modify the addressee’s motives that he will in future avoid such conduct.

Duff (1986: 45) states that the addresser reminds the addressee of the values for which the addressee already cares, or brings him to understand and to care for moral demands by which he was not previously moved. The addresser’s blame gives the addressee reason to modify his conduct. It persuades him to judge his past actions, and thus to guide his future conduct, by those moral values which inform and justify the blame itself. Blame, like other kinds of rational argument, aims at persuasion. Its initial purpose is to engage the other person in a serious moral discussion; and it fails in that purpose only if the addressee refuses to listen at all or refuses to respond with any kind of moral seriousness (Oishi, 2006: 35). Blame is portrayed as a technique; as something the addresser does to someone in order to modify his action or behaviour.

It, morally, should be understood as an attempt to bring a person to recognize and repent his wrong-doing. It addresses and respects him as a responsible moral agent. Moral blame presupposes a set of moral standards by which the person judges the conduct of another which he believes the addressee should recognize (Duff, 1986: 47).

2.2 Semantic Perspective

Blame has more than one meaning. It may refer to an act of finding fault with, disapproval, criticism, or to place the responsibility for a fault on somebody:

(7) He always blames his mistakes on me. (Dalgish, 2002: s.v. blame)

According to Collin (1999: s.v. blame) the term **blame** means, “*to say that somebody has done something wrong or is responsible for a mistake*”:

(8) The union is blaming the management for poor industrial relations.

Malle and Bennett (1998:1) state that the term **blame** has at least two meanings. The first refers to “*the assigning of (causal) responsibility for an outcome to a person*”:

(9) People are too quick to blame their problems on others.

The second refers to “*the criticizing of a given intention or action*”:

(10) I love you too much to blame you for going away.

The second meaning is a synonym of **reproach** and **criticize** and it forms an asymmetry with the meaning of **praise** (ibid).

Blame has different meanings, and thus it can be well understood with reference to the meaning of the following terms: **admonish, censure, accuse, charge, chide, condemn, criticize, curse, denounce, deplore, disapprove, find fault with, rebuke, reprehend, reprimand, reproach, reprove and upbraid.**

Fillmore (1971: 279) puts **blame, accuse, criticize, credit, praise, scold, confess, apologize, forgive, justify** and **excuse** under the term verbs of judging.

Wilkins (1976:45) lists the verbs: **blame, remonstrate, reprimand, accuse, denounce, condemn, frown upon, allege, complain charge, disparage, deplore, reproach** and **impute** as verbs of disapproval. Such group is part of the judgment and evaluation verbs. Similarly, Ballmer and Brennenstuhl (1981: 35) believe that the verbs: **blame, scold, correct, criticize, praise, accept** and **reject** are used to give evaluation of an action. Being blameworthy is “*deserving disapproval; criticism; responsible for doing something wrong*”. Blameworthiness, guiltiness and culpability are comparable when they mean “*deserving reproach and punishment for a wrong, sinful, or criminal act, practice or condition*”. One, as a person or his act or work, is blameworthy that deserves blame or criticism and must suffer or receive reproach, censure or even punishment (Oxford Advanced Learners’ Dictionary of Current English, 2006: s.v. blame).

2.3 Syntactic Perspective

The verb **blame** is always a transitive non-idiomatic verb. It belongs to a pattern characterized by the use of a **three- place prepositional** verb. Its construction is:

Subject+ verb phrase+ direct object+ prepositional object

(Cobuild, 1992:142 and Biber et al.1999:151)

(11) Yeah, I was really quite, quite upset about it. Well I don’t blame you for it.

(12) Some business analysts blame the problem on tough competition in the insurance market. (Biber et al. 1999:151)

The prepositional object is usually an animate and it is the recipient or beneficial of the process described by the verb, while the direct object is usually a person (Quirk et al. 1985:1208).

(13) She blamed us for the failure.

(14) She blamed the failure on us. (ibid:734)

However, the two possible active-constructions of blame are not identical but very similar in meaning:

(15) a- Helen blamed John for the divorce.

b- Helen blamed the divorce on John.

Downing and Locke (2006: 95) state that not only the direct object constituent can become subject in the passive clause but also the indirect one. Thus, there are two passives for the above alternatives:

(16) a John was blamed for the divorce.

b The divorce was blamed on John.

The prepositional object, which may be an entity or an event, like other objects, encodes a participant that can be questioned by who or what:

(17) What was Jane blamed for?

(18) Who was the accident blamed on?

(ibid: 95-6)

However, the **to-infinitive** of **blame** which occurs in complement position after **be** could be a **noun-like** or an **adjective-like**:

(19) The poor weather was to blame for the low attendance.

(Chalker, 1989: 147)

In most cases, an action usually involves two different people but if we want to talk about a case where the same person is involved twice, we can use the reflexive pronoun as the object of a clause. For example, if the speaker is the only person involved in the blaming, he can say:

(20) I blamed myself for what happened.

(21) I blamed myself for not being paying attention. (Cobuild, 1992: 145)

Alexander (2002:83) and Thomason and Martinet (1986:80) demonstrate that there is a difference in meaning between themselves and each other after verbs such as **blame**, **accuse**, **help**, and **look at** :

(22) The two bank clerks blamed *themselves* for the mistake (i.e. they both took the blame).

(23) The two bank clerks blamed *each other* for the mistake (i.e. the one blamed the other).

The difference is that the meaning of the sentence will be changed if we replace the reflexive pronoun by the reciprocal pronoun **each other**:

(24) Tom and Ann blamed *themselves* for the accident. [Both Tom and Ann took the blame.]

(25) Tom and Ann blamed *each other* for the accident. [Tom blamed Ann and Ann blamed Tom.

(Thomason and Martinet, 1986:80)

3. Blame in Arabic

3.1 Pragmatic Perspective

Blame اللوم is the assignment of responsibility and the finding of fault. It is evidence that human beings are sufficiently plastic to be able to learn. In most cases, blaming is despatched not for insulting rather for developing a certain kind of individuality. It is a communicative purpose that is presented by different linguistic means. The act of **blame** in Arabic can be expressed explicitly by the lexical verbs: عذب, لام, and عتب, and their derivations. These verbs differ according to the degree of strength of blame, which, on the other hand, differs from one utterance to another. This difference can be attributed to various factors such as the degree of certainty of the addresser, the addresser's authority, formality of the utterance, sex, age, social status of the speakers, time and place of the

utterance. Anyhow, the act of blame is expressed explicitly by declarative forms and implicitly by other forms. To distinguish the speech act of blame in declaratives, it is to adopt the same grammatical structure of Austin's performative hypothesis, which contains a subject in the first person 'I /we' plus a verb in simple present indicative active and the object is 'you'. The first example in the following instances is explicit while the others are all implicit:

(26) a - ألومك لإهمالك واجبك

I blame you for neglecting your duty.

b - هلا أديت واجبك

Why don't you carry out your duty?

c - أهملت واجبك؟

Are you heedless of your duty?

d - لماذا أهملت واجبك؟

Why did you neglect your duty?

e - لا تهمل واجبك مرة أخرى

Don't neglect your duty again.

Blame is implicitly expressed by constative and performative structures (2001:410, ميلاد). One of the pragmatic meanings of constative is blame which can be expressed sensitively, friendly, or harshly (severely).

(27) وتغتابني في كل نادٍ تحله و تزعم إني لست كفنأ لمثلكا

(1999: 87 يوسف)

(28) كلما أعفو عنك تعود إلى نفس العادات السيئة

Every time I forgive you, you go back to the same bad habits.

(Abdul-Raof, 2006:107)

(29) {وَتَأْكُلُونَ التُّرَاثَ أَكْلًا لَمًّا^{١٩} وَتُحِبُّونَ الْمَالَ حُبًّا جَمًّا^{٢٠}}

:١٩-٢٠ (الفجر ٢)

And ye devour heritage,
devouring (every thing) in greed
(indiscriminately),
And ye love wealth with exceeding
love. (Ali, 1988: 1853)

On the other hand, the requestive performative modes have many pragmatic meanings which convey the act of blame. Those modes are interrogative, prohibition, and vocative. Firstly denial reproaching (التوبيخي) is used to warn, blame, and reproach the addressee (2007:87, الحسيني):

(30) {الأعراف: ٢٢} (وناداهما ربُّهُمَا أَلَمْ أَنهَكُمَا عَنْ تِلْكَمَا الشَّجَرَةِ وَأَقُل لَكُمَا إِنَّ الشَّيْطَانَ لَكُمَا عَدُوٌّ مُبِينٌ)

And called out unto
them their Lord (saying): "Did
I not forbid ye two that tree,
and (did I not) say unto you both
that Satan is of ye both a

declared enemy?" (Ali, 1988: 572)

This type is divided into two types according to the time of the event:

- a. Blaming the addressee and reproaching him for something that has been done in the past.

Then, the perfect form of verb is used. It means 'that matter should not have happened':

(31) {أَفَعَصَيْتَ أَمْرِي}

(طه: ٩٣)

Hast thou then disobeyed
my order? (Ali, 1988: 981)

- b. Blaming the addressee and warning him from something bad which is either happening at the present time or is about to happen in the near future. It means 'this matter ought not to happen' (المومني, 2007:172, عتيق, 2006: 81):

(32) أتَعْصِي رَبِّكَ؟

Are you disobeying your Lord?

(33) {أَتَأْمُرُونَ النَّاسَ بِالْبِرِّ وَتَنْسَوْنَ أَنْفُسَكُمْ}

(البقرة: ٤٤)

What! Enjoin ye upon the
people righteousness and
ye forget your own selves? (Ali, 1988: 47)

Though the interrogative particle 'alhamza' الهمزة is used in most denial interrogatives, yet 434 (ميلاد 2001: 2001) and 136 (التفتازاني 2004, 2004) add that some other interrogative particles such as كيف and كم could be used in such cases:

(34) {سَلِّ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ كَمْ آتَيْنَاهُم مِّنْ آيَةٍ بَيِّنَةٍ}

(البقرة: ٢١١)

Ask the Children of Israel
how many of clear signs have
We given them. (Ali, 1988: 139)

(35) {كَيْفَ تَكْفُرُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَكُنْتُمْ أَمْوَاتًا فَأَحْيَاكُمْ ثُمَّ يُمَيِّنْكُمْ ثُمَّ يُحْيِيكُمْ ثُمَّ إِلَيْهِ تُرْجَعُونَ}

(البقرة: ٢٨)

How can ye disbelieve in
God; for ye were lifeless
(in your mother's womb).
He brought you to life. He
causeth you to die and
again (He will) restore you
to life then unto Him (only)
will ye be returned. (Ali, 1988:41)

(الزركشي 2005: 8-347) distinguishes the act of **reprimanding** التوبيخ/or التأنيب in (36), **reproach** اللوم المقوى \ الشديد in (37), and **gentle blame** العتاب in (38) as faces of affirmation while **blame** اللوم in (39) is classified as a subtype of denial interrogative and **rebuking** التوبيخ in (40) as an informing interrogative.

(36) {أَأَنْتَ قُلْتَ لِلنَّاسِ اتَّخِذُونِي وَأُمِّيَ إِلَهَيْنِ مِن دُونِ اللَّهِ}

(المائدة: ١١٦)

Didst thou say to the people,
take me and my mother two
gods beside God? (Ali, 1988:501)

{37} (أَلَمْ تَكُنْ أَرْضُ اللَّهِ وَسِعَةً فَتُهَاجِرُوا فِيهَا)
(النساء: ٩٧)

Was not the
land of God vast (enough)
for you to migrate therein? (Ali, 1988:410)

{38} {عَفَا اللَّهُ عَنْكَ لِمَ أَذِنْتَ لَهُمْ}
(التوبة: ٤٣)

God forgive thee (O'
Our Apostle!) Why didst thou
give them leave? (Ali, 1988: 665)

{39} {قَالَ أَتَعْبُدُونَ مَا تَنْحِتُونَ}
(الصافات: ٩٥)

What! Worship ye
what ye (yourselves) hew out? (Ali, 1988:1346)

{40} {أَفَعَبِّرَ دِينَ اللَّهِ يَتَّبِعُونَ}
(آل عمران: ٨٣)

Seek they other than the
religion of God? (Ali, 1988: 287)

However, **blame** and **rebuke** are purposes that could not be determined nor put under certain classification since they are defined under the context and other pragmatic circumstances.

430 :2001) (ميلاد) mentions that affirmation is used to express the act of blame:

{41} {أَأَنْتَ فَعَلْتَ هَذَا بِالْهَيْتِنَا يَا إِبْرَاهِيمُ}
(الأنبياء: ٦٢)

Hast thou done this
to our gods, O' Abraham? (Ali, 1988: 1005)

323 :2004) (فيود) assures that affirmation is used to **blame**, [**reproach**], [**rebuke**], or **reprimand** according to the context of the utterance:

{42} {أَأَنْتَ قُلْتَ لِلنَّاسِ اتَّخِذُونِي وَأُمَّيَ إِلَهَيْنِ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ}
(المائدة: ١١٦)

Didst thou say to the people,
take me and my mother two
gods beside God? (Ali, 1988: 501)

Here, both the addresser and the addressee are aware of the truth but Allah (♥) presents it in such a way in order to affirm the fact that Christ (☩) himself did not say such thing and at the same time to blame and scold those who take the Christ and his mother as gods beside Allah (See also :2001 ميلاد, 430).

101 :2007) الحسيني (1987:173) and (المومني 176 :2007) (السيوطي) agree that interrogative [more precisely affirmation] can be used to express **blame** in a very civil, polite, and friendly way. This gentle discourse leads the blamed person to avoid doing bad things or behaviour:

{أَلَمْ يَأْنِ لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَنْ تَخْشَعَ قُلُوبُهُمْ لِذِكْرِ اللَّهِ} (43)

(الحديد: ١٦)

Hath not the time yet come,
for those who believe that their
hearts become humble for the
remembrance of God...? (Ali, 1988: 1627)

Secondly, prohibition is a mode used to express the addresser's desire to prohibit someone from doing certain acts. 107 :2007) (الحسيني) shows that prohibition means preventing, i.e., to prohibit someone is to prevent him from performing bad or unacceptable actions:

{وَلَا تَلْبِسُوا الْحَقَّ بِالْبَاطِلِ وَتَكْتُمُوا الْحَقَّ وَأَنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ} (44)

(البقرة: ٤٢)

Mix ye not the truth with
falsehood and hide ye
not the truth when ye know (it). (Ali, 1988: 47)

It has many pragmatic functions, one of which is **blame (intensified blame)**. 68 :2006) عتيق suggests that by using prohibition, the act of **blame** is strengthened:

{لَا يَسْخَرُ قَوْمٌ مِنْ قَوْمٍ عَسَى أَنْ يَكُونُوا خَيْرًا مِنْهُمْ} (45)

(الحجرات: ١١)

Let not
a people laugh at (another)
people (to scorn) who happily
may be better than them. (Ali, 1988:1545)

Finally, vocative is used to express some pragmatic meanings, one of which is to express the attitude of the addresser toward the addressee, to warn, **blame** him and many other purposes.

112 :1999) (السعدي) states that blaming someone is a result of his negligence, carelessness, or his wrong behaviour, then the addresser tends to use the vocative mode to blame him:

(46) يا صديقي ألم تتلقن درسا من مشاكلك الكثيرة؟ O, my friend,

haven't you learned a lesson from your many problems?

3.2 Semantic Perspective

Blame in Arabic is one of the expressions that are used to reflect the speaker's feelings and attitudes toward persons or events. **Blame** is basically formed on a bridge between past and present events.

105 :1999) (السعدي) notes that Arab speakers used to use easy and well-known expressions that are widely used to express their negative emotions, feelings, and ideas. **Blame** is expressed by very few terms according to lexical dictionaries; five terms convey the meaning of **blame**. They are: العتاب **admonish** or **gentle blame**, اللوم **blame**, العذل **censure**, اللحي **abuse**, and التفتيد **confutation**.

add that blame through its synonyms: 'عاب' 'to find fault with', 'الضناوي' and 563 (مالك) 2007: 'عَبَّ' 'chide', 'وبخ' 'rebuke', 'انتقد' 'criticize', 'زجر' 'scold', 'reprimand' 'أنب'.

Anyhow, one of the derivations of the term عتب is استعتب asking for blaming which is not allowed. This form is the only one which is used in the Glorious Qur'an to give the meaning of asking for blaming which is not allowed, i.e.; the meaning of propitiation 'الاسترضاء':

{ تُمْ لَا يُؤْذَنُ لِلَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا وَلَا هُمْ يُسْتَعْتَبُونَ } (47)

(النحل: ٨٤)

Then shall be no permission
for those who disbelieve
(to make any excuses) nor shall
they be allowed to solicit any amends.

(Ali, 1988: 863)

{ فَأَلْيَوْمَ لَا يُخْرَجُونَ مِنْهَا وَلَا هُمْ يُسْتَعْتَبُونَ } (48)

(الجاثية: ٣٥)

So on that
day they shall not be taken out
thence, nor shall they be granted
any grace. (Ali, 1988:1490)

2004:3119) (قطب) states that in these aayas, Allah (♥) tells us about the predicament of the idolaters on the Day of Judgment. They will not be allowed to offer excuses or ask Allah's forgiveness:

{ فَإِنْ يَصْبِرُوا فَالنَّارُ مَثْوًى لَهُمْ وَإِنْ يَسْتَعْتِبُوا فَمَا هُمْ مِنَ الْمُعْتَبِينَ } (49)

(فصلت: ٢٤)

And if they be patient, yet the
fire shall be their abode: or if
they seek favour, yet then they
shall not be of the favoured
(ones). (Ali, 1988: 1427)

Thus, it could be concluded that asking for blame يستعتب means asking for an opportunity to offer excuses, apologize, repent or to ask for forgiveness and appeasement. The reason behind admonish (gentle blame) is throwing away friendship rights by leaving visiting and failing to help the friends and things like that. The main difference between admonish and blame is that in admonish the blamer should be well related to the blamee or the accused person (العسكري, 2006:65). The difference between rebuke (severe blame) and blame is that blaming is directed to deeds that had been done in the past and in the present as well, while rebuke is used to criticize past actions only (ibid). Sometimes, people mix between the act of blame and dispraise 'الذم'. In fact, they are not the same though there is a similarity between them in that they both convey a negative criticism against bad and ugly conduct. The difference between the two is that blame may be used to criticize bad and good conducts as well. For example, one can blame X for liberality which is a good deed, but dispraise could not be used here since it is used for bad and ugly deeds only. The second difference is that blame needs face to face interaction while dispraise could be faced to the criticized

person directly or in his absence. In addition, dispraise might be used metaphorically –that is one can dispraise an animate or inanimate- while blame could not be used in such a way (ibid: 64).

3.3 Syntactic Perspective

The verb **blame** لام in Arabic is very rich in its forms which change according to tense, mood, person, gender and voice. This can be expressed in the following table by (الاسمر 1997): which is modified to embrace all the derivative forms of the verb :

Pronouns	Perfect forms	Imperfect Forms			
		Indicative mood	Accusative mood	Jussive mood	Imperative mood
انا	لمت	الوم	الوم	الم	
نحن	لمنا	نلوم	نلوم	نلم	
أنت	لمت	تلوم	تلوم	تلم	لم
أنت	لمت	تلومين	تلومي	تلومي	لومي
أنتما	لمتما	تلومان	تلوما	تلوما	لوما
أنتم	لمتم	تلومون	تلوموا	تلوموا	لوموا
أنتن	لمتن	تلمن	تلمن	تلمن	لمن
هو	لام	يلوم	يلوم	يلم	
هي	لامت	تلوم	تلوم	تلم	
(هما) للمذكر	لاما	يلومان	يلوما	يلوما	
(هما) للمؤنث	لاما	تلومان	تلوما	تلوما	
هم	لاموا	يلومون	يلوموا	يلوموا	
هن	لمن	يلمن	يلمن	يلمن	

Blaming can be expressed by the perfect forms as shown in the table above. It needs direct object followed by a prepositional phrase. That is, it is called a ditransitive prepositional verb. The most common word order of blame in Arabic is:

Verb+ subject+ object; and

Verb+ subject+ object+ prepositional phrase:

(50) { ٣٢ } (يوسف: ٣٢) { قَالَتْ فَذَلِكُنَّ الَّذِي لُمْتُنَنِي فِيهِ }

Said she: “This is he about whom ye blamed me”.

(Ali, 1988:772)

(51) أَلومك لقلّة صبرك

I blame you for your little patience.

In nominal sentences, **blame** اللوم is expressed not by the verb blame but by forms derived from the verbal noun لوم. Wightwick and Gaafar (2008: 7) state that Arabic adds particles or combinations of particles between the root letters as well as at the beginning and at the end. Below are many derivation forms (collected from all the references mentioned after them for fluent reading)

:

المصدر: verbal noun: اللوم

اسم الفاعل: the active participle: لائم

اسم المفعول the passive participle : ملوم / مليم

اللوم: the plural of active participle.

صيغة المبالغة اللوامة: intensiveness form

اسم ممدود : اللوماء extended noun refers to blamer

اسم مقصور restricted form refers to the blamer اللومي

اللائمة: feminine blamer.

اللوائم: plural of اللائمة.

مصدر ميمي verbal noun : ملامة

لومة: the person who is blamed by others.

مصدر اسم مرة nomen vicis : لومة

ملاومة: it is an adjective refers to the action of blaming between more than one person.

الملاومة الملاوم: one of the blamers when doing the act of blaming

اسم هيئة اسم هيئة لومة: the state of the act of blaming

(مادة لوم: 189 d.538 A.H., 1998; الزمخشري: 1979; d.666 A.H., مادة لوم; الرازي: 1968; d.711 A.H., ابن منظور) and مصطفى et al, 2007: (مادة لوم).

(52) {فَأَلْتَقَمَهُ الْحُوتُ وَهُوَ مُلِيمٌ}
(الصافات: ١٤٢)

And the fish swallowed him
while he was blamed. (Ali, 1988:1352)

(53) {وَلَا تَجْعَلْ مَعَ اللَّهِ إِلَهًا آخَرَ فَتُلْقَى فِي جَهَنَّمَ مَلُومًا مَدْحُورًا}
(الإسراء: ٣٩)

And set not with God any
other god lest thou be cast into
the hell, blamed and cast away. (Ali. 1988:885)

(54) {يُجَاهِدُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَلَا يَخَافُونَ لَوْمَةَ لَائِمٍ} {
(المائدة: ٥٤)

Striving hard
in God's way and they fear not
the censure of any censurer. (Ali, 1988: 471)

(55) {فَتَوَلَّ عَنْهُمْ فَمَا أَنْتَ بِمَلُومٍ}
(الذاريات: ٥٤)

Then turn thou thy back
upon them for thou art not to
be blamed. (Ali, 1988: 1567)

4. Felicity Conditions of Blame

To analyze the speech act of blame in this study, certain felicity conditions which are necessary and sufficient for the act of blame to be successfully performed in the utterance of a given religious verse have to be suggested. These conditions will be applied to both English and Arabic texts. Before the application of these felicity conditions, the situation of each religious text is going to

be mentioned since such situations are thought to be important to realize the act of blame in the analyzed religious texts analyzed.

However, the felicity conditions suggested here are as follows:

1- **Comprehensive conditions (CCs):**

The addresser should specify a particular addressee(s).

2- **Propositional content conditions (PCCs):**

(i) A bad proposition P has been achieved;

(ii) Some individual is responsible for the existence of the state of affairs.

3- **Preparatory conditions (PCs):**

(i) The addresser has as evidence or a reason to blame (P/ addressee/addresser –himself/ or another agent);

(ii) A harmful effect has been received /or ongoing received by the addresser, and/ or the addressee and/ or another agent.

4- **Sincerity conditions (SCs):**

The addresser is discontent and believes that the state of affairs is bad and blameworthy.

5- **Essential conditions (ECs):**

The utterance counts as dissatisfaction or expression of blame to the effect that P represents the actual state of affairs.

5. Analysis of English Texts

This section analyzes the act of blame in certain religious verses selected from different books of the Holy Bible.

Text-1-

“How could you do such a thing?”

(Genesis, 3:13)

Allah (♥) is addressing Eve (Adam’s wife). Implicitly, there is a very strong blame for her bad deed. The first reason is that she allows the serpent to talk to her and consequently tempting her to eat from the forbidden fruit. Secondly, she picks out the fruit regardless of the command of Allah (♥), and thirdly she presents the forbidden fruit to her husband Adam who decides to eat. It is a sever blame expressed by a rhetorical yes-no question. This means ‘how dare you do such a shameful thing’.

Allah (♥) not only blames Eve but also Adam -when Allah (♥) blames Adam firstly He shifted the blame on her. Neither Adam nor his wife admitted their sin. Both of them refused to hold the responsibility. There was a shifting blame: Adam (☹) shifted the blame on Eve (☹) who shifted it on the serpent (Arterburn and Stoop, 1998:7 and Owen, 2004: 9).

The FCs of this verse are:

1- The CCs:

Allah (♥) is addressing Eve (☹).

2- The PCCs:

- i) Temptation is presented to Adam (☹) to eat the forbidden tree and then breaking the command of Allah (♥).
- ii) Eve is responsible for Adam's (☹) temptation.

3- The PCs:

- i) Allah's reason to blame Eve is giving the fruit to Adam (☹) to break His command.
- ii) Adam (☹) disobeyed Allah (♥) and consequently Allah (♥) no more trusts Adam (☹) and He makes Adam (☹) and his wife out of Eden.

4- The SCs:

Allah (♥) believes that hearing the serpent temptation and obeying him by taking the forbidden fruit and offering it to Adam (☹) is a bad action that deserves blaming.

5- The ECs:

The verse counts as a dissatisfaction and it implies a sever blame of Eve's deed.

Text-2-

1“Then Job spoke again: 2“How long will you torture me? How long will you try to break me with your words? 3Ten times now you have meant to insult me. You should be ashamed of dealing with me so harshly.4 And even if I have sinned, that is my concern, not yours. 5You are trying to over-come me, using my humiliation as evidence of my sin, 6 but it is God who has wronged me. I cannot defend myself, for I am like a city under siege.””

(Job, 19:1-6)

The Biblical speech above contains the blame of the Prophet Job (☹) to his friends Bildad, Zophar, and Eliphaz. He (☹) is blaming them because they had repeatedly accused him of sin but had yet to prove any of it. In his speech, Job's frustration reached a breaking point (Arterburn and Merrill, 2004: 638 and Simons, 2005: 45).

Though Job (☹) was a good man, yet he had terrible troubles. His friends came a long way to comfort him and they sat with him silently for a long time and they tried to help him, but their advice was wrong. They think that Allah would not allow an innocent person to suffer, but they were too polite to accuse Job clearly, especially they had no evidence (80-79 :1975 , جديد). Job's long suffering continued and the friends began blaming him for all the troubles that he suffered and they would accuse him clearly. They never understood the real reasons for Job's problems. And they did not believe that Job was a good man. Although Job (☹) was innocent, they accused him (☹) and thought him guilty. They guessed that Job had done many wicked things (Simons, 2005: 46).

The friends upset Job (☹) because their speeches were not correct. They suggested that Job (☹) was a wicked man and blamed him for his own troubles though he was a good, honest man. They were cruel to him. Though they had no evidence, they still accused Job (ibid: 48-50). He (☹) blamed them since he knew his own conscience - that he was not being punished for some hidden sin. He (☹) just wanted some comfort and understanding. Most of the time he (☹) needed comfort, not judgement. He (☹) believed that the friends did not need to accuse him nor to speak so many times. Even if he committed a sin, Job (☹) believed that it was Allah's duty to punish him, not his friends. Job (☹) really wanted them to comfort him (Arterburn and Merrill, 2004: 638).

The FCs of this speech are:

1- The CCs:

The Prophet Job (☹) is addressing his friends.

2- The PCCs:

i) Accusing Job of committing wilful sin is the proposition that is achieved.

ii) His friends are responsible for the accusation presented to him.

3- The PCs:

i) Job's reason for blaming them is that they accused him while they ought to give him comfort and support.

ii) Their deeds frustrate Job and make him very sad.

4- The SCs:

Job (☹) believes that accusing him to be a sinner is blameworthy.

5- The ECs:

The speech counts as a dissatisfaction of the way they think of.

Text-3-

“¹⁸ What you have gained by worshiping all your man- made idols? How foolish to trust in something made by your own hands! What fools you are to believe such lies! ¹⁹ How terrible it will be for you who beg lifeless wooden idols to save you. You ask speechless stone images to tell you what to do. Can an idol speak for God? They may be overlaid with gold and silver, but they are lifeless inside.”

(Habakkuk, 2: 18-19)

In this Biblical speech, Allah (♥) – on the tongue of his Prophet Habakkuk (☹)-is talking to the people of Judah. They are wicked people since they trust in themselves and proudly try to make their own way in the world under their power (Arterburn and Stoop, 1998: 1079). Allah (♥) in this speech is blaming them severely for worshiping idols and committing sins and doing bad things. In Judah, people did not obey God's rules. The rulers built their cities with money gained by murder and

corruption. Habakkuk (ﷺ) did not understand why Allah (ﷻ) did nothing to make them obey Him (Churchyard, 2007: 22).

The speech is a series of rhetorical questions, which could be summarized up as not worshipping idols and telling them that they ought to worship Allah (ﷻ).

The FCs of this speech are:

- 1- The CCs:
Allah (ﷻ) is addressing the people of Judah.
- 2- The PCCs:
 - i) Not worshipping Almighty Allah (ﷻ) is the proposition for blaming.
 - ii) Rulers of Judah are responsible for people committing such sins.
- 3- The PCs:
 - i) Allah's reason to blame them is worshipping idols behind Him.
 - ii) Allah (ﷻ) has been displeased with them and He (ﷻ) is sad for them since they will be helled out of their sins and mistakes.
- 4- The SCs:
Allah (ﷻ) knows that not worshipping Him is a bad deed and it deserves blame.
- 5- The ECs:
In these verses the blame is expressed severely as a dissatisfaction of their deeds.

Text-4-

“A son honors his father, and a servant respects his master. I am your father and master, but where are the honor and respect I deserve? You have despised my name!”

(Malachi, 1: 6)

Allah (ﷻ), on the tongue of his Prophet Malachi (ﷺ), is talking to the priests and the people of Israel who returned to Jerusalem. He (ﷻ) is blaming them because they were corrupting the worship that took place in the Temple. In other words, they failed to bring their gifts to it (Nelson, 1975: 1345).

Allah (ﷻ) is not only blaming them but also rebuking them because they, being priests, ought to be the most faithful people. They defiled the sacrifices by giving blind, crippled and diseased animals and keeping the best for themselves. Allah (ﷻ) wanted the priests and the people of Israel to back up their words with appropriate actions (Arterburn and Stoop, 1998: 1106 and Churchyard, 2005: 13).

The FCs of this speech are:

- 1- The CCs:
Allah (ﷻ) is addressing the priests of Israel.
- 2- The PCCs:

- i) The name of Allah (♥) is despised.
- ii) The priests of Israel are responsible for this despise since they were the leaders.
- 3- The PCs:
 - i) Allah's reason to blame them is that the priests show no respect to Him.
 - ii) Allah (♥) was displeased with them because they were unfaithful to Him.
- 4- The SCs:

Allah (♥) believes that despising His name is a bad action.
- 5- The ECs:

The verse counts as a dissatisfaction of their wrong deeds. In other words, the blame is expressed implicitly.

Text-5-

“You don’t have much faith,” Jesus said. “Why did you doubt me?”

(Matthew, 14:31)

Jesus (☹) in these verses is addressing his disciple Peter. One night, the disciples were in trouble far away from land for a strong wind had risen. About three o'clock in the morning, Jesus (☹) came to them walking on water. When they saw him, they screamed and terrified thinking that he was a ghost. Seeing them so, Jesus (☹) asked them not to be afraid. Then Peter talked to him: “²⁸Lord, if it is really you, tell me to come to you by walking on water”. Jesus (☹) did and Peter walked on water toward him but, when he looked round at the high waves, he was terrified and began to sink. Instantly, Jesus (☹) reached and grabbed him and he (☹) blamed Peter for having little faith and for his doubt (Bright, 2005:62). Jesus (☹) was as kind with his friends and disciples as his blame was. It is worth mentioning that Jesus' speech was of two sentences: the first is a statement expressing his annoyance of Peter's little faith. It means that Jesus' disciples ought not to be of little faith. The second sentence is an interrogative uttered by Jesus not to seek an explanation from Peter but to blame him implicitly and to strengthen the feeling of dissatisfaction.

The FCs of this verse are:

- 1- The CCs:

Jesus (☹) is addressing his disciple Peter.
- 2- The PCCs:
 - i) Doubting Jesus (☹) and his ability has been achieved.
 - ii) Peter is responsible for the existence of the state of affairs.
- 3- The PCs:
 - i) Jesus (☹) saw Peter sinking which was a sign of Peter's doubt.

- ii) A harmful effect has been received by the addresser and the addressee as well. For Jesus (ﷺ), he was really displeased and annoyed since his disciple was of a little faith. For Peter, his doubt caused his sunk.
- 4- The SCs:
Jesus (ﷺ) assures that the doubt of his ability is blameworthy.
- 5- The ECs:
The blame in this speech counts as a dissatisfaction.

Text-6-

“And why do you, by your traditions, violate the direct commandments of God?”

(Matthew, 15:3)

Jesus (ﷺ) in this verse is blaming Pharisees for ignoring the laws of Allah (♥) and changing them for their sake. His blame comes as an answer to their accusation. They accused Jesus and his disciples of disobeying the old tradition of ceremonial hand washing before any eat. Jesus is talking to the Pharisees and to the men who taught the law. They considered that their traditions were more important than Allah’s commands. Jesus (ﷺ) reminded them of one command as an example: Allah said that people should give honour to their parents. When parents need something, their children have a responsibility to help them. But the Pharisees had another tradition. People could put things that their parents needed aside and they could say that they had given those things to Allah. Sometimes they only pretended to give those things to Allah. And this behaviour avoided the need of their parents. Though the Pharisees made serious promises in front of Allah, that they must keep them forever, they were making a tradition more important than their responsibility for their parents (Bright, 2005: 76).

They nullify the direct commands of Allah (♥) and restrict to their own traditions (Nelson, 1975: 1446).

The FCs of this verse are:

- 1- The CCs:
Jesus (ﷺ) is talking to the Pharisees.
- 2- The PCCs:
- i) People break the law of Allah (♥).
- ii) Pharisees are responsible for people who disobey Allah (♥) since they are the leaders and people follow the leaders blindly.
- 3- The PCs:
- i) Jesus (ﷺ) has evidence to blame them, which is that they pretended that they follow the scripture of Moses but they did not; instead, they follow their own instructions.

- ii) Jesus and his disciples were annoyed by the Pharisees' continuous accusation and criticism of being disobediences.
- 4- The SCs:
Jesus (☺) believes that breaking and violating the laws of Allah (♥) is a bad deed.
- 5- The ECs:
The verse counts as dissatisfaction as it implies indirect blame to their behaviour.

Text-7-

“⁸You have so little faith! Why are you worried about having no food? ⁹Won't you ever understand? Don't you remember the five thousand I fed with five loaves, and the baskets of food that were left over? ¹⁰Don't you remember the four thousand I fed with seven loaves, with the baskets left over? ¹¹How could you think I was talking about food?”

(Matthew, 16:8-11)

Jesus (☺) is blaming his disciples for their little faith. The situation is that while he was warning them from Pharisees in the verse “⁶Be ware of the yeast of the Pharisees and of Herod”, they misunderstood him. They thought that he was talking about food because, in that day, they forgot bringing food. Jesus (☺) was troubled by his disciples' lack of faith and their seeming inability to learn the basic lessons he was trying to teach them. Then in this speech, Jesus (☺) is blaming them gently (Arterburn and Merrill, 2004: 1147). The disciples apparently failed to realize from the feeding of the five thousand and from the feeding of four thousand that Jesus (☺) can certainly provide for their needs (Nelson, 1975: 1510). More than one sentence is used to express the act of blame. In the first one, Jesus (☺) expresses his astonishment of the way they think. Then he uses interrogatives whose answers were known. He is reminding them of the miracles as if he were saying: ‘haven't you realized the lessons yet’.

The FCs of this speech are:

- 1- The CCs:
Jesus (☺) is addressing his disciples.
- 2- The PCs:
i) The disciples were thinking about their food.
ii) Their little faith was the reason behind not getting Jesus' intended lessons.
- 3- The PCs:
i) Misunderstanding Jesus was the evidence for having little faith for which Jesus blamed them.
ii) Jesus (☺) feels upset since his disciples failed in realizing the lessons he taught them.
- 4- The SCs:
Jesus (☺) believes that his disciples being of little faith and be thinking about themselves is a bad behaviour and it deserves blaming.

5- The ECs:

The verses account as a dissatisfaction of their way of thinking.

Text-8-

“Shouldn’t you have mercy on your fellow servant, just as I had mercy on you?”

(Matthew, 18:33)

The King is addressing and blaming his servant for imprisoning and not forgiving his fellow servant. The situation there was a certain king, the sovereign Father, to whom the debt is owed., and the one who owed him is his servant or satrap who had access to the king’s money, which represents the individual sin. The money was millions of dollars in our currency. It represents the dept of sins, which the sinner cannot possibly pay by himself. The command that he be sold and payment to be made indicates his being placed in a debtor’s prison:

²⁵ He couldn’t pay, so the king ordered that he, his wife, his children, and everything he had be sold to pay the debt. ²⁶But the man fell down before the king and begged him, ‘Oh, sir, be patient with me, and I will pay it all’. ²⁷ Then the king was filled with pity for him, and he released him and forgave his debt.

(Matthew, 18:25-27)

The picture illustrates Allah’s total forgiveness when dealing with human sins at the point of salvation (Nelson, 1975: 1455):

²⁸But when the man left the king, he went to a fellow servant who owed him a few thousand dollars. He grabbed him by the throat and demanded instead payment. ²⁹His fellow servant fell down before him and begged for a little more time. But his creditor wouldn’t wait. He had the man arrested and jailed in full.

(Matthew, 18:28-29)

When the king has been told what happened, he calls for his servant and blames him severely for his behaviour (See also Bright, 2005: 97).

The FCs of this verse are:

1- The CCs:

The king is addressing his wicked servant- the satrap.

2- The PCCs:

- i) The satrap treated his fellow servant badly since he cast him in prison till the debt be paid.
- ii) The satrap is responsible for the situation as a whole.

3- The PCs:

- i) Other king’s servants witnessed what was done and they told him.
- ii) The fellow servant has been treated badly and castled in prison.

4- The SCs:

The king believes that the servant being behaved in such a way is blameworthy.

5- The ECs:

The king's utterance counts as a dissatisfaction implying blame.

Text-9-

“Couldn't you stay awake and watch with me even one hour?”

(Matthew, 26:40 and Mark, 14: 37)

Jesus (☹) is talking to Peter. He (☹) is blaming his disciples Peter for leaving him alone at the last hour of his life. Jesus (☹) opened his heart to Peter, James and John. He (☹) said: “My soul is crushed with grief to the point of death”, (Mark, 14: 34). Jesus (☹) evidently needed their support in this hour of agony shortly before his death. He (☹) asked them to stay and watch with him but while he was praying, they went on sleeping (Hibbs, 2006: 50 and Davies and Chapman, 2006: 45).

The FCs of this verse are:

1- The CCs:

Jesus (☹) specializes Peter in the above verse.

2- The PCCs:

- i) Jesus (☹) does not get the spiritual support he needed.
- ii) Peter, James, and John are responsible for Jesus' loneliness.

3- The PCs:

- i) Jesus (☹) sees them sleeping at the time he requested them to be awake.
- ii) Jesus (☹) feels sad because his best disciples have disappointed him.

4- The SCs:

Jesus (☹) believes that getting relaxation at the time that others need support is blameworthy. In other words, leaving brothers face their destiny alone without even any spiritual aid is bad.

5- The ECs:

The verse counts as a dissatisfaction implying a gentle blame.

Text-10-

“Son! Why have you done this to us? Your father and I have frantic, searching for you everywhere.”

(Luke, 2: 48)

Mary (☹) is addressing her son Jesus (☹). She (☹) is blaming him gently for his staying in Jerusalem. The situation is that when Jesus (☹) was twelve years old, he attended –with his parents, Mary and her husband Joseph – the festival. After the celebration was over, they started home to Nazareth, but Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem. They did not miss him at first, because they thought that he was with his friends among the travellers. But when he (☹) did not show up that evening, they started to look for him among the relatives and friends. When they could not find him, they went

back to Jerusalem to search for him there. Three days later, they found him. He (ﷺ) was in the Temple, sitting among the religious teachers (Pride, 2008: 12).

The FCs of the above speech are:

1- The CCs:

Mary (ﷺ) is talking to her son Jesus (ﷺ).

2- The PCCs:

i) Jesus (ﷺ) did not tell his parents about his intention so they were worried about him.

ii) Jesus (ﷺ) is responsible for his parents being worried and terrified.

3- The PCs:

i) Mary's reason for blaming her son is that he did not follow them when they returned home.

ii) Mary (ﷺ) and her husband were terrified of missing their son Jesus (ﷺ).

4- The SCs:

Mary (ﷺ) believes that the son's behaviour was wrong. He ought not to stay without telling them.

5- The ECs:

The speech counts as a dissatisfaction. It expresses what a surprise she got when she saw him in the Temple.

6. Analysis of Arabic Texts

This section is going to analyze the speech act of blame in Arabic religious texts. The aayas analyzed here are selected from different Surahs from the Glorious Qur'an:

Text-1-

{كَيْفَ تَكْفُرُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَكُنْتُمْ أَمْوَاتًا فَأَحْيَاكُمْ ثُمَّ يُمِيتُكُمْ ثُمَّ يُحْيِيكُمْ ثُمَّ إِلَيْهِ تُرْجَعُونَ }
(البقرة: ٢٨)

How can ye disbelieve in
God; for ye were lifeless
(in your mother's womb).
He brought you to life. He
causeth you to die and
again (He will) restore you
to life then unto Him (only)
will ye be returned.

(Ali, 1988: 41)

Allah) ♥(in this aaya is addressing the polytheists of Quraish. He)♥(blames them since they refuse to admit the existence of Allah)♥(and the fact that Allah)♥(is the Creator. Their refusing is not out of ignorance because Allah)♥(states for them all the pieces of evidence, yet they disbelieve. Because of their head-strangeness, Allah) ♥(is not only blaming them but also censuring and dispraising them (See الالوسي d.1270 A.H., 1999: 287).He (♥) brought them from the state of non-existence to life. How can anyone deny Allah's existence or worship others with Him? Allah (♥) testifies His existence and He (♥) is the Creator and the Sustainer Who has full authority over His

servants. People did not exist beforehand. They were nothing until Allah (♥) created them; He (♥) will bring death to them and then bring them back to life during Resurrection (ibid). After Allah (♥) mentioned the proofs of their creation, and what they can witness in themselves as proof of that, He (♥) mentioned another proof that they would witness, that is, the creation of the heavens and earth (القرطبي d.671 A.H., 2000: 171-2). Allah (♥) said in the aaya 29 in the same surah: { هُوَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ لَكُمْ مَا { فِي الْأَرْضِ جَمِيعاً ثُمَّ اسْتَوَىٰ إِلَى السَّمَاءِ فَسَوَّاهُنَّ سَبْعَ سَمَاوَاتٍ وَهُوَ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيمٌ ۚ ۲۹

He, it is who created for
you all that is in the
earth and then directed to
the heavens (and) then
fashioned them into seven
heavens; and (while) He, of
all things, is the Knower. (Ali, 1988: 41)

Allah (♥) in many Qur'anic aayas disputes with them: 'Are you (the human) more difficult to create or is the heaven that Allah (♥) has constructed. He (♥) raised its height, and has perfected it. After that, He (♥) spreads the earth out and brings forth its water and its pasture. This is to be a provision and benefit for the man and his cattle'. So how they could after all these proofs disbelieve in Allah (♥) and His ability. The aaya is initiated by an interrogative particle (كيف) which is here not for asking, rather for denying, blaming severely and astonishing of their obstinacy and disbelief (عضيمة, 2004: 341; السيوطي, 1987: 171; الالوسي, 1999: 287; القرطبي, 2000: 172).

The FCs of this aaya are:

- 1- The CCs:
Allah (♥) is addressing the polytheists of Quraish.
- 2- The PCCs:
 - i) They are insisting on disbelieving in Allah (♥).
 - ii) The people of Quraish are responsible for atheism.
- 3- The PCs:
 - i) Their atheism was the reason for the blame of those people.
 - ii) Because of their disbelief, they will be in hell. This displeases Allah (♥).
- 4- The SCs:
Allah (♥) assures that disbelieving is a bad deed that deserves blaming and even censuring.
- 5- The ECs:
The act of blame expressed here is indirect and it is a severe one.

Text-2-

{ أَتَأْمُرُونَ النَّاسَ بِالْبِرِّ وَتَنْسَوْنَ أَنْفُسَكُمْ وَأَنْتُمْ تَتْلُونَ الْكِتَابَ أَفَلَا تَعْقِلُونَ }
(البقرة: ٤٤)

What! Enjoin ye upon the

people righteousness and
 ye forget your own selves?
 Yet ye read the scripture?
 What! Do ye not
 understand?

(Ali, 1988: 47)

In this Qur'anic aaya, Allah (♥) is addressing the Jewish religious men. He (♥) is blaming them severely for their deeds. The aaya reveals that the People of the Book used to command people to pray and fast and they themselves did not practice what they commanded (335 :1999, (الالوسي). So, whoever commands people to do righteousness let him be the first one of them to implement that command. Also, they advise their Muslim relatives to stay at their religion (Islam) and they themselves did not adopt Islam. That is why Allah (♥) blames them (143 :2005, (الشيرازي). While they recited the Scripture (Tawrah), they forbade people from rejecting the prophethood and the covenant that they have mentioned with Allah (♥) in the Tawrah, yet they had forgotten it. They had forgotten the covenant that Allah (♥) made with them that they would accept His Messenger. They have breeched His covenant and rejected what they know in Allah's Book. Therefore, Allah (♥) blames the Jewish for this behaviour and alerted them to the wrongs they were perpetrating against themselves by ordering for righteousness, yet refraining themselves from righteousness (القرطبي, 252 :2000).

Therefore, the blame is conveyed by denial interrogative. 198 :2004) (عضيمة) adds that the blame in this aaya is made by using the denial interrogative particle الهمزة and the word (أفلا) which makes the blame severe. The denial here means that 'they ought not to command people to do righteousness and they refrain themselves from it'.

The FCs of this aaya are:

- 1- The CCs:
Allah (♥) is addressing the scholars and the religious men of the Jew.
- 2- The PCCs:
 - i) They did not follow what they had been commanded to do although they knew very well that what they had been commanded to do is the right thing.
 - ii) Jewish scholars are responsible for people being doubtful in religion and being uncertain believers.
- 3- The PCs:
 - i) Contradicting themselves was the reason for Allah (♥) to blame the Jewish scholars.
 - ii) By their behaviour, they will harm themselves and the people they lead, which annoys Allah (♥).
- 4- The SCs:
Allah (♥) knows that their behaviour is bad and blameworthy.
- 5- The ECs:

This aaya counts as a dissatisfaction of their deeds and behaviours.

Text-3-

{ هَآأَنْتُمْ هُوَلَاءِ جَادَلْتُمْ عَنْهُمْ فِي الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا فَمَنْ يُجَادِلُ اللَّهَ عَنْهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ أَمْ مَنْ
يَكُونُ عَلَيْهِمْ وَكِيلًا }

(النساء: ١٠٩)

Behold! ye pleaded for these
in this worldly life; but who
shall plead with God for them
on the Day of Resurrection?
or who shall be their defender?
(Ali, 1988: 413)

Some commentators believe that this aaya refers to the secret consultations that were held by the hypocrites of the Tribe of Ubraiq and Asaid bin Urwah who went to the Prophet (ﷺ) pleading the three culprits hiding their crime. Other commentators give different stories but the fact is that it relates to a theft, i.e.; a breach of the trust in which a non-Muslim and a Muslim were involved. These aayas are revealed on the dispute between a Muslim Tribe and a Jew. Three brothers Basheer, Mubshir, and Bisher, sons of Ta'ma of the Ubraiq Tribe stole food, sword, and armour from the house of Rifa'ah Ibn Zaid, who complaints the accident to his brother's son Qatada Ibn Al-Nua'man. The robbers concealed the properties in the house of a Jew and when the theft was revealed, they threw the whole blame on the Jew (الطبرسي d.548 A.H., 2005: 109-110). Some people, their tribe, defended the criminal and blamed the Jew. Allah (ﷻ) blames those people for their deed. They defended sons of Ubraiq because they were Muslims and blamed an innocent person because he is Jewish. Allah's blame was to develop an inner preventive force against all individual and social crimes by directing the attention of man towards Allah (ﷻ) in all circumstances of shame, fear, hope, etc. (ibid). Allah (ﷻ) blames them severely because they defended a criminal in this world but on the Day of Judgment they shall have no pleaders on their behalf. The aaya involves an unreal interrogative that signifies blaming. It is informing interrogative that is introduced by the particle (الشيرازي, 2005: 184 and من) (القرطبي, 2000: 243).

The FCs of this aaya are:

- 1- The CCs:
Allah (ﷻ) is addressing those people who defended Basheer.
- 2- The PCCs:
 - i) People defended a criminal person and blamed an innocent one.
 - ii) Basheer's relative and the people of Ubraiq are responsible for the existence of the state of affairs.
- 3- The PCs:
 - i) Allah (ﷻ) knows that the non-Muslim person is not the robber and He (ﷻ) knows that they threw the properties in his house and accused him of the theft.

- ii) An innocent man is accused to be a criminal.
- 4- The SCs:
Allah (♥) knows that this behaviour is bad and blameworthy.
- 5- The ECs:
The aaya counts as an indirect blame to denounce their behaviour.

Text-4-

{ فَلَعَلَّكَ بَاخِعٌ نَّفْسَكَ عَلَى آثَارِهِمْ إِنْ لَمْ يُؤْمِنُوا بِهَذَا الْحَدِيثِ أَسَفًا }

(الكهف: ٦)

So maybe that thou wilt
worry thyself with grief
after them, if they believe not
in this revelation (the Qur'an)

(Ali, 1988: 911)

The aaya is related to the reason behind the revelation of this Surah (Al- Kahaf). People of Quraish asked the Messenger of Allah (♥) about three things: the strange and wonderful story of some young men in ancient times, the story of a man who travelled a great deal and reached the east and the west of the earth, and the mystery of Ruh (soul or spirit). They did that to test his prophethood. The Messenger said: 'I will tell you tomorrow about what you have asked me', but he did not say 'If Allah wills.' So they went away, and the Messenger stayed for fifteen days without any revelation from Allah concerning that, and Jibril (جبريل) did not come to him either (310 :2005. الطبرسي). People of Makkah started to doubt him, and said, 'Muhammad promised to tell us the next day, and now fifteen days have gone by and he had not told us anything in response to the questions we asked.' The Messenger felt sad because of the delay in revelation, and was grieved by what the people of Makkah were saying about him. Then Jibril (جبريل) came to him with the Surah about the companions of Al-Kahaf, which also contained a blame for feeling sad about the idolaters (ابن كثير, d.774 A.H., n.d: 314).

The FCs of this aaya are:

- 1- The CCs:
Allah is addressing the Prophet Muhammad (✕).
- 2- The PCCs:
- i) Feeling sorry and being gloomy for those who will not believe in the Holy Qur'an in any way is not a right behaviour.
- ii) The Prophet Muhammad (✕) is responsible for his state.
- 3- The PCs:
- i) Being grieved about the idolaters is the reason to blame the Prophet.
- ii) The Prophet was about to kill himself in grief and this displeases Allah (♥).

4- The SCs:

Allah (♥) knows that the deep sorrow over the idolaters is blameworthy.

5- The ECs:

The soft blame in this aaya is expressed implicitly.

Text-5-

{ قَالَ أَلَمْ أَقُلْ لَكَ إِنَّكَ لَنْ تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا }

(الكهف: ٧٥)

He said : “ Said I not unto thee
that thou canst not be with
me in patience?”

(Ali, 1988:928)

In this aaya, Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) is addressing the Prophet Moses (ﷺ). He – Al- Khidr- is blaming him for breaking the promise three times.

When Moses (ﷺ) wanted to follow Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) on condition that the latter had to teach him some of that knowledge which Allah (♥) had taught him, Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) told Moses (ﷺ) that he would not be able to have patience with him-Al-Khidhr (ﷺ). In other words, he will not be able to accompany Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) when he would see him doing things that go against Moses’ law, because Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) has knowledge from Allah (♥) which, He has not taught to Moses (ﷺ). Moreover, each has responsibilities before Allah that the other does not share. That is why Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) believed that Moses (ﷺ) would denounce him justifiably. But Moses (ﷺ) insists saying that he will find him patient-if Allah wills- and he will not disobey him as it must be (14-13 :2000 .القرطبي).

Then, Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) had made the condition that Moses (ﷺ) should not ask him about anything he found distasteful until he himself initiated the discussion and offered an explanation: { قَالَ }
{ فَإِنْ اتَّبَعْتَنِي فَلَا تَسْأَلْنِي عَنْ شَيْءٍ حَتَّى أُحْدِثَ لَكَ مِنْهُ ذِكْرًا }^{٧٠}

Said he: “ If thou followest
me, ask me not of aught until I
myself unto thee make mention
of it” (Ali, 1988: 927)

So they went on board the ship. When the boat took them out to the sea and they were far from the shore, Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) got up and damaged the boat, pulling out one of its planks and then patching it up again, Moses (ﷺ) could not restrain himself from denouncing him, so he said: { قَالَ أَحْرَقْتَهَا لِتُغْرَقَ أَهْلُهَا }
{ أَلْقَدَ جَنَّتَ شَيْئًا إِمْرًا }^{٧١}

Moses said: “Made thee a hole in it
to drown its inmates? Indeed
thou hast done a strange thing?” (Ali, 1988: 928)

Moses (ﷺ) was astonished. At that point, Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) reminded him of the previously- agreed condition. He said: { قَالَ أَلَمْ أَقُلْ لَكَ إِنَّكَ لَنْ تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا }^{٧٢}

He said: “Said I not unto thee

that thou canst not be with me
in patience?" (Ali, 1988: 928)

Moses' question was out of forgetfulness and Al-Khidhr's answer was a reminding of the condition and it was admonition and alerting. Then, they both proceeded until they met a boy and Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) killed him. At this point Moses (ﷺ) forgot the condition again and immediately denounced Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) more fervently than in the first case and said: { أَفَقَتَلْتَ نَفْسًا زَكِيَّةً بِغَيْرِ نَفْسٍ لَقَدْ جِئْتَ { شَيْئًا نُكْرًا ۗ

Slew thou an innocent
person, who had slain none?
Indeed thou hast done a horrible
thing! (Ali, 1988: 928)

Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) blamed Moses (ﷺ) since he did not consider the advice nor keep his promise. Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) uses an affirmation interrogative i.e., it means he did not present his blame directly rather his blaming is expressed by reminding Moses (ﷺ) of the condition and of the advice that he refused to understand (ابن كثير, n.d : 320).

الطباطبائي d.1402 A.H. (2002:341) shows that Al-Khidhr's utterance is more than blaming, it is rebuking since he uses the pronoun **you** to make the blame severe because Moses did not keep his promise nor did he take Al-Khidhr's advice into consideration.

On his remark, 108 :2003) (المشهدى) finds out that the aaya under study does not express a severe blame nor rebuke, it is just blaming on Moses (ﷺ) for refusing Al-Khidhr's advice and for Moses' little patience.

The FCs of this aaya are:

- 1- The CCs:
Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) is addressing Moses (ﷺ).
- 2- The PCCs:
 - i) Breaking the condition agreed upon by both is the bad proposition.
 - ii) Moses (ﷺ) is the one who breaks the condition.
- 3- The PCs:
 - i) Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) blames Moses (ﷺ) because Moses (ﷺ) does not take his advice into consideration nor keep his promise.
 - ii) Moses' behaviour annoys Al-Khidhr (ﷺ).
- 4- The SCs:
Al-Khidhr (ﷺ) believes that Moses's behaviour is blameworthy.
- 5- The ECs:
The utterance counts as a dissatisfaction. It is an implicit blame.

Text-6-

{ وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَلَا مُؤْمِنَةٍ إِذَا قَضَى اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ وَمَنْ يَعْصِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ ضَلَّ ضَلَالًا مُبِينًا }

(الأحزاب: ٣٦)

And it is not for a believer
man or woman to have any
choice in their affair when God
and His Apostle have decided a
matter; and whoever disobeyeth
God and His Apostle, indeed
he hath strayed off a manifest
straying.

(Ali, 1988: 1254)

This aaya was revealed regarding Abdullah bin Jahesh and his sister Zainab whose hand the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) asked for in marriage. They were members of a leading noble family. The Prophet (ﷺ) asked her hand on behalf of Zaid bin Harith, who was a liberated slave of the Prophet (ﷺ) and was brought up by him. Then, the social distances between them were global. When Zainab knew the person for whom she was demanded in wedlock, she refused the proposal at first since she did not want to be a wife of a slave man and her brother Abdullah agreed to her resentment (القرطبي, البحراني, 2007: and قطب 2004: 2865; الشيرازي, 2005: 185; 2001: 548; 2000 d.538 A.H.: 121; الزمخشري 286).

That is why Allah (ﷻ) blames them. A man should never bring his will against the will of Allah (ﷻ). He must accept it faithfully and help himself as best as he could to carry out his individual will in agreement to the universal will of Allah(ﷻ).

The FCs of this aaya are:

- 1- The CCs:
Allah (ﷻ) is addressing directly Zainab bint Jahesh and her brother Abdullah.
- 2- The PCCs:
 - i) They resent the proposal of Zaid, which was the order of Allah (ﷻ).
 - ii) Abdullah and his sister Zainab are responsible for the existence of the state of affairs.
- 3- The PCs:
 - i) Allah (ﷻ) blames them because they resent Zaid and by this decision, they disobey Allah (ﷻ) and His Prophet (ﷺ).
 - ii) Allah (ﷻ) is displeased with their behaviour.
- 4- The SCs:
Allah (ﷻ) assures that their behaviour is blameworthy.
- 5- The ECs:
The sever blame here is expressed indirectly by prohibiting them from doing the rejected things and the aaya is an order to do the appropriate ones.

Text-7-

{ يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَدْخُلُوا بُيُوتَ النَّبِيِّ إِلَّا أَنْ يُؤْذَنَ لَكُمْ إِلَى طَعَامٍ غَيْرِ نَظِيرٍ
إِنَاهُ وَلَكِنْ إِذَا دُعِيتُمْ فَادْخُلُوا فَإِذَا طَعِمْتُمْ فَانْتَشِرُوا وَلَا مُسْتَأْسِينَ لِحَدِيثٍ إِنَّ ذَلِكُمْ كَانَ
يُؤْذِي النَّبِيَّ فَيَسْتَحْيِي مِنْكُمْ وَاللَّهُ لَا يَسْتَحْيِي مِنَ الْحَقِّ وَإِذَا سَأَلْتُمُوهُنَّ مَتَاعاً
فَاسْأَلُوهُنَّ مِنْ وَرَاءِ حِجَابٍ ذَلِكُمْ أَطْهَرُ لِقُلُوبِكُمْ وَقُلُوبِهِنَّ وَمَا كَانَ لَكُمْ أَنْ تُؤْذُوا
رَسُولَ اللَّهِ وَلَا أَنْ تَنْكِحُوا أَرْوَاجَهُ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ أَبَدًا إِنَّ ذَلِكُمْ كَانَ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ عَظِيمًا }

(الأحزاب: ٥٣)

O' ye who believe! enter
ye not in the houses of the
Prophet unless it is permitted
to you for a meal, without
waiting for the cooking to be
finished– but when ye are invited,
enter ye , and when ye have
taken the food– then disperse ye
without seeking any familiar talk;
verily this annoyeth the Prophet,
but he forbeareth for you, and
God forbeareth not from the
truth, and if ye ask from them
any goods, ask ye of them from
behind the curtain; Purer it is
for your hearts and (for) their
hearts: and it is not for you
that ye should annoy the Apostle
of God (Muhammad)! nor that
ye should ever wed his wives
after him: Verily this with God
is very grievous.

(Ali, 1988: 1269)

The Qur'anic aaya is addressing three Muslims who stayed in the Prophet's house chatting and forgetting themselves to such an extent that this caused inconvenience for the Prophet (X). After a wedding feast, people left, and some men stayed behind conversing in the house after eating. Staying conversing in the house annoys the Prophet (X), but he was too shy to ask them to leave. Therefore, he went out- just to make them feel his annoyance- and started to go around all the apartments of his wives, greeting them (القرطبي, 2000: 144; الزمخشري, 2001: 564; قطب, 2004: 2877); Allah (♥) in this aaya is blaming the believers implicitly. The act of blame here is expressed to refine the Muslims. Though the vocative and the speech seems to be delivered to those who annoyed the Prophet (X), yet the properties were to be followed by all Muslims. This is a polite-blame. Simply it means that Muslims ought not to behave –neither in the present time nor on future- as such behaviour, rather they ought to follow the accepted standards of behaviour mentioned in the rest of the aaya. Syntactically more than one device is used to convey blame. The vocative is used firstly, then, the prohibition and negation. But the main device is the prohibition.

The FCs of this aaya are:

1- The CCs:

Allah (♥) in this aaya on the tongue of his Prophet (✕) is addressing some believers who were invited by the Prophet (✕).

2- The PCCs:

- i) The guests are staying in the Prophet's house after they had finished their meal.
- ii) Those believers who stayed behind were responsible for the Prophet's annoyance.

3- The PCs:

- i) Allah's reason for blaming those believers is that they displeased the Prophet Mohammed (✕).
- ii) Their behaviour annoys the Prophet (✕) and accordingly what displeases him displeases Allah (♥).

4- The SCs:

Allah (♥) knows that such behaviour is wrong and blameworthy.

5- The ECs:

The aaya counts as a dissatisfaction of their unacceptable behaviour.

Text-8-

{ يَا دَاوُدُ إِنَّا جَعَلْنَاكَ خَلِيفَةً فِي الْأَرْضِ فَاحْكُم بَيْنَ النَّاسِ بِالْحَقِّ وَلَا تَتَّبِعِ الْهَوَىٰ فَيُضِلَّكَ عَنْ سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَضِلُّونَ عَنْ سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ لَهُمْ عَذَابٌ شَدِيدٌ بِمَا نَسُوا يَوْمَ الْحِسَابِ }

(ص:٢٦)

O' David ! Verily We have appointed thee a vicegerent in the earth, so judge thou between the people with justice and follow not vain desires, lest it should take thee astray from the Way of God; for them shall be a severe chastisement for forgot they the Day of Reckoning.

(Ali, 1988:1365)

In this aaya, Allah (♥) is blaming His Prophet David (ﷺ) for being fast in his verdict. David has set apart certain days in the week for attending the court of justice and for other works. In the day, fixed for prayer, he used to shut himself into a guarded chamber and none would be allowed to have any approach to him to disturb him. The angels entered into David's private chamber and presented their case, demanding strict justice from him in this matter. The two said that one of them had already ninety-nine ewes and the other had only one. Nevertheless, the one who had ninety- nine ewes wanted to have the only one, which the other one had. David decided that demand was unjust. When disputants left, David thought deeply of his decision. David understood that they were angles sent to

him by Allah to prove his indiscretion. This was a test in which David's shortcoming was only that before listening to the defendant, he gave the verdict on the basis of the analogy and immediately he himself felt that it was a heavenly trial (الشيرازي, 2005: 9-348). The vocative here is used to convey blame. David is blamed since he let feelings and emotions control him in that situation. That is why he was fast when stating his verdict i.e. they affect his judgment negatively.

The FCs of this aaya are:

1- The CCs:

Allah (♥) is addressing His Prophet David (☺).

2- The PCCs:

i) He was quick in passing judgment without listening to the second litigant, where the fair judge should listen to both litigants to have a fair judgment.

ii) David under certain situation is responsible for the verdict he presented.

3- The PCs:

i) Allah (♥) blames David for his rashness in judging.

ii) The litigant who was not listened to would be treated unjustly.

4- The SCs:

Allah (♥) believes that judging without listening to the two litigants is blameworthy.

5- The ECs:

The aaya counts as a dissatisfaction of David's behaviour.

Text-9-

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لِمَ تَقُولُونَ مَا لَا تَفْعَلُونَ^٢ كَبُرَ مَقْتًا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ أَنْ تَقُولُوا مَا لَا تَفْعَلُونَ^٣

(الصف: ٢-٣)

²O' ye who believe! Why say
ye what ye (yourselves) do (it)
not?

³Most hateful is it unto God
that ye say what ye (yourselves)
do (it) not.

(Ali, 1988:1668)

Here, Allah (♥) is blaming some people who believe in Him and His Prophet Muhammad (✕). Those people talked a lot about their devotion to Allah (♥) and His Prophet (✕), about the great sacrifices they were ready to offer, and about their verbal determination to do or to die in the fight for the Truth. Their promises were before Allah (♥) commanded Muslims to fight for their religion and when the occasions arose against the enemy, they miserably failed to maintain their verbal resolution with any firmness in action. They were tested on the Day of Uhud. However, they retreated and fled, leaving the Prophet (✕) behind. It was about their case that Allah (♥) revealed

this aaya (522 :2001 الزمخشري, and 3551 :2004 قطب). Later they promise to do many things to defend the Islam but they did not keep their promise. The aaya was revealed about the gravity of fighting in battle, when one says that he fought and endured in the battle, even though he did not do so. Qatadah and Ad-Dahhak said that this aaya was sent down to blame some people who used to say that they killed, fought, stabbed, and did such and such during battle, even though they did not do any of it (3551 :2004 قطب). The interrogation here is used to blame those Muslims because they did not do the right and good deeds nor did they keep their promise, which is an abominable thing. Allah (♥) in the following aaya assures that their deed is the most abominable and hateful act for Allah (♥).

”كَبُرَ مَقْتًا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ أَنْ تَقُولُوا مَا لَا تَفْعَلُونَ“^٣

Most hateful is it unto God
that ye say what ye (yourselves)
do (it) not.) (Ali, 1988: 1668)

That is why the blame here is server and hard. Always Allah (♥) blames Muslims to advise them and to put them on the right way (386 :2000 الالوسي). Here, the denial interrogative, which is in the present tense, is used to convey the act of blame. It means that they ought not to do such a thing in the present day nor in the future time (53 :2000 القرطبي). Consequently, Allah (♥) explains to them what they ought to do and what the preferable thing is to Him:

”إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الَّذِينَ يُفَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِهِ صَفًّا كَأَنَّهُمْ بُنْيَانٌ مَرْصُورٌ“

Verily God loveth those
who fight in His way in ranks
as if they were an unbreakable
metalled wall. (Ali, 1988: 1668)

The FCs of these aayas are:

1- The CCs:

Allah (♥) is addressing those believers who believe in Him and in His Prophet (✕).

2- The PCCs:

- i) They did not do what they promise.
- ii) Some Muslims are responsible for the existence of the state of affairs.

3- The PCs:

- i) Allah (♥) blames them because they did not behave appropriately and because they broke their promise.
- ii) The Prophet (✕) and the other Muslims were left without support in the field of battle.

4- The SCs:

Allah (♥) assures them that their deeds are wrong and blameworthy.

5- The ECs:

The aaya shows directly the bad deeds they do, yet the sever blame is conveyed indirectly.

Text-10-

{عَبَسَ وَتَوَلَّىٰ ۖ أَنْ جَاءَهُ الْأَعْمَىٰ}

(عبس: ١- ٢)

¹He frowned and he turned
away,
²Because came unto him the
blind man².

(Ali, 1988: 1811)

The occasion for the revelation of this Surah is a historical incident. Once, the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) was with some chieftains of the Quraish, Abdullah Ibn- Maktoom who was blind and was one of the intimate companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) came to the Prophet (ﷺ). The Prophet (ﷺ) received him with honour and pleasure and gave him the place closest to him. Since Abdullah was poor and blind, the chieftains of Quraish looked down upon him, and they did not like the honour done and the place given to him by the Prophet (ﷺ) in their own presence. However, one of them frowned at Abdullah and sat turning his back to him. This displeased Allah (ﷻ). That is why this Surah was revealed to the Prophet (ﷺ). It esteems Abdullah's position, though poor and blind and condemns the loathsome attitude of the companions. Allah (ﷻ) blames that man for his behaviour (Ali, 1988: 1810).

The FCs of these aayas are:

1- The CCs:

Allah (ﷻ) is addressing the person who resented Abdullah bin- Maktoom.

2- The PCCs:

i) One of the believers is resented and treated badly.

ii) One of the dignitaries looked down upon Abdullah and sat turning his back to him.

3- The PCs:

i) Allah's reason for blaming the dignitary is that his way of treating Abdullah.

ii) Allah (ﷻ) is displeased with that behaviour.

4- The SCs:

Allah (ﷻ) believes that that way of treating people especially the believers is bad and blameworthy.

5- The ECs:

The blame in this aaya is expressed indirectly.

7. Conclusions

1. The suggested felicity conditions show clearly that they can be applied to religious texts in English and Arabic. This means that the first hypothesis is validated.
2. The explicit blame is rarely used in religious texts of both languages. It is better conveyed by using implicit forms; that is, by expressing implicit act of accusing, criticizing, rebuking, scolding, and reprimanding. That is why it seems that there is no clear-cut line between blame and this bundle of negative acts. The confusion of these acts is highly recognized in Arabic

since Arab scholars believe that these acts are similar and they did not tackle such acts separately. In English, the matter is somehow different since some of these acts have been recognized. This validates the second and the third hypotheses of this study.

3. It is also concluded that Arabic implicit blame is mostly conveyed by using performative structure. Interrogative mode is highly used in this respect especially the denial interrogative since the latter is considered an intelligent way to lead the addressee to think deeply about the state of affairs. What is more, it is an eloquent and polite style to embarrass him/ her and make him/ her be ashamed of his/ her conduct. As for English, rhetorical question is widely used to express blame since interrogative is a means of polite interaction.

Bibliography

1-English References:

- Abdul-Raof, Hussein. (2006). **Arabic Rhetoric: A Pragmatic Analysis**. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Alexander, L. G. (2002). **Longman English Grammar**. New York: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Ali, Ahmed. (1988). **The Holy Qur'an**. Elmhurst: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an, Inc.
- Arterburn, Stephen and David Stoop. (1998). **The Life Recovery Bible: New Living Translation**. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers.
- Arterburn, Stephen and Dean Merrill. (2004). **Every Man's Bible**. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers.
- Austin, J. (1956). "A Plea for Excuses". Republished in *Proceedings of Aristotelian Society 1956_7*. Transcribed by Andrew Churcky 2007. <http://www.ditext.com/austin/plea.html>.
- _____ (1962). **How to Do Things with Words**. Oxford: OUP.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan (1999). **Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English**. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Bright, Hilda. (2005). "Matthew's Good News: An Easy English Bible Version and Commentary on Matthew's *Gospel". Wycliffe Associates (UK). <http://www.easyenglish.info/>
- Chalker, Sylvia. (1989). **Current English Grammar**. Hong Kong: Chajker Macmillan Publishers.
- Churchyard, Gordon. (2005). "My Messenger: An Easy English Bible Version and Commentary on the Book of Malachi". Wycliffe Associates (UK). <http://www.easyenglish.info>.
- _____ (2007). "An Easy English Bible Version and Commentary on the Books of Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah". Wycliffe Associates (UK). <http://www.easyenglish.info>
- Cobuild, Collins. (1992). **English Grammar**. New Delhi: William Collins Sons & Co Ltd.
- Collin, P.H. (1999). **English Business Dictionary**. London: Peter Collin Ltd.
- Dalgish, Gerard M. (2002). **Advanced English Dictionary**. New York: Random House Webster's.
- Davies, Ruth and Shirley Chapman. (2006). "Mark tells us the Good News about Jesus: An Easy English Version with Notes of the Gospel of Mark". Wycliffe Associates (UK). <http://www.easyenglish.info>
- Downes, William. (1998). **Language and Society**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Downing, Angela and Philip Locke. (2006). **English Grammar**. London: Taylor & Francis E. Library.
- Duff, R. A. (1986). **Trials and Punishments**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fillmore, Charles. (1971). 'Verbs of Judging'. In Fillmore, Charles and D. Terence Langendoen (eds). **Studies in Linguistic Semantics**. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Hibbas, G. (2006). 'What shall I do with the King? : Easy English questions on Mark's Gospel'. Wycliffe Associates (UK). <http://www.easyenglish.info/>.
- Jordá, Maria Pilar Safont. (2005). **Third Language Learners: Pragmatic Production and Awareness**. London: Cromewell Press Ltd.
- Kreidler, Charles W. (1998). **Introducing English Semantics**. London: Routledge.
- Malle, Bertram F. and Ruth E. Bennett. (1998). 'People's Praise and Blame for Intention and Actions: Implication of the Folk Concept of Intentionality'. <http://www.ibiblio.org/rcip/selfblamersearch.html#tob>
- Meal, G. H. (1993). **Mind, Self and Society**. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Nelson, Thomas. (1975). **Holy Bible: King James Version**. Nashville: Publishers, Inc.
- Nozick, Robert. (2000). **Studies in Ethics**. New York: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Oishi, Etsuko. (2006). "Austin's Speech Act Theory and the Speech Situation". <http://www.univ.trieste.it/~eserfilo/art106/oishi106.pdf>.
- Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary of Current English**. (2006). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Owen, Alun. (2004). "God Makes Everything: An Easy English Bible Version and Commentary on Genesis chapters 1-11". Wycliffe Associates (UK). <http://www.easyenglish.info>

- Partridge, John Geoffrey. (1982). **Semantic, Pragmatic and Syntactic Correlates: An Analysis of Performative Verbs Based on English**. Alle Rechte vorbehalten: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Pride, Leslie. (2008). "The Gospel of Mark: An Easy English Semantically Analysed Text (Level B) on Mark's Gospel (A semantically analysed text makes implicit information explicit)". Wycliffe Associates (UK). <http://www.easyenglish.info>
- Proost, Kristel. (2007). **Conceptual Structure in Lexical Items**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. (1985). **A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language**. London: Longman.
- Searle, John R. and Daniel Vanderveken. (1985). **Foundation of Illocutionary Logic**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simons, Keith. (2005). "Job, a servant of God: An Easy English Commentary on the Book of Job". Wycliffe Associates (UK) <http://www.easyenglish.info/>
- Thomason, A. J. and A. V. Martinet. (1986). **A Practical English Grammar**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trosborg, Anna. (1995). **Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies**. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vanderveken, Daniel. (1990). **Meaning and Speech Acts: Principles of Language Use**. Vol.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. (1987). **English Speech Act Verbs**. Sydney: Academic Press.
- Wightwick, Jane and Mahmoud Gaafar. (2008). **Arabic Verbs and Essentials of Grammar**. New York: The McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Wilkins, D. A. (1976). **Notional Syllabuses**. Oxford: OUP.
- Williams, Garrath. (2006). 'The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Praise and Blame' <http://www.iep.utm.edu/p/blame.htm>.

2-Arabic References:

القرآن الكريم.

- الا لوسي، شهاب الدين محمود ت ١٢٧٠ هـ. **روح المعاني في تفسير القرآن العظيم والسبع المثاني** ج١ (١٩٩٩). بيروت: دار إحياء التراث العربي. / ج١٥، ج٢٢، ج٢٣، ج٢٨ (٢٠٠٠). ابن منظور، جمال الدين محمد بن مكرم ت ٧١١ هـ. **لسان العرب**. بيروت: دار صادر. (١٩٦٨).
- ابن كثير، عماد الدين ت ٧٧٤ هـ. **تفسير القرآن العظيم**. القاهرة: دار مكتبة التراث. (د.ت).
- الاسمر، راجي. **المعجم المفصل في علم الصرف**. بيروت: دار الكتب العلمية. (١٩٩٧).
- البحراني، هاشم الحسيني. **البرهان في تفسير القرآن**. ج٦. قم: مؤسسة المجتبى للمطبوعات. (٢٠٠٧).
- التفتازاني، سعد الدين مسعود بن عمر ت ٧٩٢ هـ. **مختصر المعاني**. بيروت: مؤسسة التاريخ العربي. (٢٠٠٤).
- جديد، اسكندر. **هوذا طوبى لرجل يؤدبه الله**. بيروت: مركز الشبيبة. (١٩٧٥).
- الحسيني، السيد جعفر السيد باقر. **أساليب المعاني في القرآن**. قم: مؤسسة بوستان. (٢٠٠٧).
- الخليفة، هشام عبد الله. **نظرية الفعل الكلامي**. بيروت: مكتبة لبنان ناشرون. (٢٠٠٧).
- الرازي، محمد بن أبي بكر بن الفاهر ت ٦٦٦ هـ. **مختار الصحاح**. بيروت: دار الكتاب العربي. (١٩٧٩).
- الزركشي، الإمام بدر الدين محمد بن عبد الله ت ٧٥٤ هـ. **البرهان في علوم القرآن**. بيروت: دار الفكر للطباعة والنشر والتوزيع. (٢٠٠٥).
- الزخشري، جار الله أبو القاسم محمود بن عمر بن احمد ت ٥٣٨ هـ. **أساس البلاغة**. بيروت: دار الكتب العلمية. (١٩٩٨).
- _____ **الكشاف عن حقائق التنزيل وعلوم القرآن في وجوه التأويل**. ج٣، ج٤. بيروت: دار إحياء التراث العربي. (٢٠٠١).
- السعدي، رجا لازم رمضان. 'العتاب واللوم في الشعر الإسلامي والأموي (دراسة تحليلية)'. رسالة ماجستير غير مطبوعة. جامعة بغداد. (١٩٩٩).
- السيوطي، أبو الفضل جلال الدين عبد الرحمن أبي بكر ت ٩١١ هـ. **الإتقان في علوم القرآن** ج٢. بيروت: دار الكتب العلمية. (١٩٨٧).
- الشيرازي، ناصر مكارم. **الأمثل في تفسير كتاب الله المنزل**. ج١، ج٩، ج١٣، ج١٤، ج١٨. بيروت: دار إحياء التراث العربي. (٢٠٠٥).
- الضناوي، سعدي و جوزيف مالك. **معجم المترادفات والأضداد**. طرابلس: المؤسسة الحديثة للكتاب. (٢٠٠٧).
- الطباطبائي، محمد حسين بن محمد بن علي الأصغر ت ١٤٠٢ هـ. **الميزان في تفسير القرآن**. ج١٣، ج١٧. بيروت: منشورات مؤسسة الأعلى للمطبوعات. (٢٠٠٢).
- الطبرسي، أبو علي الفضل بن الحسن ت ٥٤٨ هـ. **مجمع البيان في تفسير القرآن**. ج٣، ج٦، ج٨. بيروت: منشورات مؤسسة الأعلى للمطبوعات. (٢٠٠٥).
- عتيق، عبد العزيز. **علم المعاني**. القاهرة: دار الأفاق العربية. (٢٠٠٦).
- العسكري، أبو هلال الحسن بن عبد الله بن سهل ت ٤٠٠ هـ. **الفروق الفردية**. بيروت: دار الكتب العلمية. (٢٠٠٦).
- عزيمة، محمد عبد الخالق. **دراسات لأسلوب القرآن**. ج١، ج٢. القاهرة: دار الحديث. (٢٠٠٤).
- فيود، بسبوني عبد الفتاح. **علم المعاني: دراسة بلاغية ونقدية لمسائل المعاني**. القاهرة: مؤسسة المختار للنشر والتوزيع. (٢٠٠٤).
- القرطبي، أبو عبد الله محمد بن احمد الأنصاري ت ٦٧١ هـ. **الجامع لأحكام القرآن**. ج١، ج٣، ج١٠، ج١٤، ج١٧، ج١٨. بيروت: دار الكتب العلمية. (٢٠٠٠).
- قطب، سيد. **في ظلال القرآن**. ج١، ج٥، ج٦. القاهرة: دار الشروق. (٢٠٠٤).
- المشهدي، محمد بن محمد رضا أقمي. **تفسير كنز الدقائق و بحر الغرائب**. ج٨. قم: دار الغدير. (٢٠٠٣).
- مصطفى، إبراهيم؛ احمد حسن الزيات؛ حامد عبد القادر؛ و محمد علي النجار. **المعجم الوسيط**. بيروت: دار الدعوة. (٢٠٠٧).
- المومني، أسماء احمد رشيد. **لسانيات تقابلية: الاستفهام بين العربية والانجليزية**. الأردن: دار الكندي للنشر والتوزيع. (٢٠٠٧).
- ميلاد، خالد. **الانشاء في العربية بين التركيب والدلالة: دراسة نحوية تداولية**. تونس: المؤسسة العربية لتونس. (٢٠٠١).

