

- SharafEldin, A. A. T. (2014). A Cognitive Metaphorical Analysis of Selected Verses in the holy Quran, International Journal of English Linguistics, Vol. 4, No. 6; 16 .
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986). Relevance: Communication and cognition. Oxford:Blackwell.
- Szabó, Z.G. 2006. The Distinction between Semantics and Pragmatics. In E. Lepore and B.
- Smith (eds). The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 361–389.
- Wolf, A. J. (2006). Subjectivity in a second language: Conveying the expression of self (Volume 8). Bern: Peter Lang.

13. Bibliography

- Babajide, A. O. (2000). Style and Stylistics. In A. O. Babajide (ED), Studies in English Language (pp. 123-136). Ibadan: Inc Publisher.
- Crystal, D., & Davy, D. (1969). Investigating English style. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Crystal, David. (1992). A Dictionary of Linguistics and phonetics. London: Blackwell publisher.
- Davies, A. (2007). An Introduction to Applied Linguistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- De Saussure, F. (2011). Course in general linguistics. Trans. W. Baskin and P. Meisel.
New York: Columbia University Press.
- George Yule (2013). Pragmatics .oxford university press.
- Goddard, C. (2011). Semantic analysis: A practical introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Hickey, L. (1993). Stylistics, Pragmatics, and Pragmastylistics. Revue Belge De Philology Et D'histoire, Vol. 71, No. 3, pp. 573-586.
- Huang, Yan (2012). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaszczolt, K. (2012). Semantics/pragmatics boundary disputes. In M. Claudia and K.
- Heusinger (Eds.). Semantics (Volume 3). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2333-2359.
- Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman.
- Leech, G. and Thomas, J. (1985). Pragmatics: The state of the art. Lancaster: Lancaster University.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, C. (1938). Foundations of the theory of signs. In O. Neurath, R. Carnap and C.
- Peter Verdonk.(2010). Stylistics. Oxford university press.
- Searle, J. (1992). Conversation reconsidered. In J. Searle, H. Parret and J. Verschueren
(Eds.). (On) Searle on conversation: Compiled and introduced by Herman Parret and JefVerschueren (Volume 21). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 137-147.

11. Appendix (1)

Number of verse (Ayah)	Assertives		Directives		Commissives		Expressive		Declaratives	
	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa
81	✓									✓
82	✓									✓
83	✓									✓
84	✓									✓
85	✓									✓
86	✓									✓
87	✓									✓
88	✓									✓
89	✓									✓
90	✓									✓
91	✓									✓
92	✓					✓				
93	✓					✓				
94	✓									✓
95						✓			✓	
96	✓									✓
97						✓			✓	
98						✓			✓	
99	✓									✓
100						✓			✓	
101	✓									✓
102	✓							✓		
103	✓					✓				
104						✓			✓	
105						✓			✓	
106	✓									✓
107			✓			✓				
108			✓			✓				
109			✓			✓				
110	✓					✓				
111	✓					✓				
112			✓			✓				

12. Appendix (2)

Perlocutionary effect		
	Warning	Threatening
Number of verses (A yah)	1,2,4,5,7,8,12,13,15,16,19,20,21,22,24,26,30,31,32,33,34,36,38,39,41,42,45,47,48,49,51,52,53,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,65,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,96,100,101,102,103,105,106,107,109,110,111,112	3,6,9,10,11,14,17,18,23,25,27,28,29,35,37,40,43,44,46,50,54,57,66,67,77,95,97,98,99,104,108
Total	81	31

10. Appendix (1)

Number of verse (Ayah)	Assertives		Directives		Commisives		Expressive		Declaratives	
	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa
41			✓							✓
42			✓			✓				
43	✓									✓
44						✓			✓	
45			✓			✓				
46			✓			✓				
47	✓									✓
48		✓							✓	
49	✓									✓
50						✓			✓	
51						✓			✓	
52	✓			✓						
53	✓									✓
54						✓			✓	
55	✓									✓
56	✓									✓
57						✓			✓	
58			✓							✓
59	✓									✓
60	✓									✓
61	✓			✓						
62			✓			✓				
63			✓							✓
64	✓									✓
65	✓									✓
66	✓					✓				
67					✓					✓
68			✓			✓				
69		✓	✓							
70	✓					✓				
71	✓									✓
72	✓									✓
73	✓									✓
74	✓									✓
75	✓									✓
76	✓									✓
77	✓									✓
78	✓									✓
79	✓									✓
80	✓					✓				

nine times to confirm and to bring the correspondence between the propositional content and reality.

3. Stylistically the writer or the speaker reviews the contrast between good and bad positions by telling the story and the events that lead the hearer or the reader to continue of the reading eagerly and try to choose the right situation for his behalf. It has seen that warning comes eighty-one times while threatening it comes thirty-one times to express the ability of doing everything by only him that give the hearer or the listener an obligation to believe him fairly and advises them that no one can escape from his punishments.

9. Appendix (1)

Number of verse (Ayah)	Assertives		Directives		Commissives		Expressive		Declaratives	
	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa	DSa	Isa
1						✓			✓	
2	✓					✓				
3	✓			✓						
4	✓			✓						
5	✓			✓						
6	✓					✓				
7	✓	✓								
8		✓							✓	
9	✓					✓				
10	✓					✓				
11						✓			✓	
12	✓					✓				
13			✓			✓				
14						✓	✓			
15	✓					✓				
16	✓					✓				
17	✓									✓
18	✓					✓				
19						✓			✓	
20	✓			✓						
21	✓									✓
22						✓			✓	
23						✓			✓	
24	✓									✓
25						✓			✓	
26	✓									✓
27	✓									✓
28						✓			✓	
29						✓				✓
30	✓									✓
31						✓			✓	
32						✓			✓	
33		✓							✓	
34			✓							✓
35	✓									✓
36	✓									✓
37						✓			✓	
38	✓					✓				
39						✓			✓	
40		✓							✓	

In the same way, the researcher analysed the rest of the verses of Alanbya' surah in appendix (1) and counted the frequencies as it is shown in table (2) below.

Types	Direct speech acts (DSa)		Indirect speech acts (ISa)		Perlocutionary effect		
	Frequencies	Percent	Frequencies	Percent	Frequencies	Percent	
Assertives	68	60.72%	6	5.36%	Warning	81	72.33%
Directives	15	13.39%	6	5.36%			
Commissives	2	1.78 %	50	44.64%	Threatening	31	27,67%
Expressives	1	0.89%	1	0.89%			
Declaratives	26	23.22%	49	43.75%			
Total	112	100%	112	100%	Total	112	100%

Table (2) the frequencies of the five general functions of speech acts.

8. Conclusion:

The researcher reached the following conclusions:

1. Alanbya' surah is full of rhetorical devices that make ambiguity to non-native speaker of Arabic language therefore it was a hard work to get the accurate results. The surah paints the powerful and the harmful of the creator of the universe during the events which were also used as a proof to confirm his threatening and warning to people in the world. The conversation between Allah and his prophets in this surah explores the good distributions of the functions of speech acts but focuses on the warning and the threatening directly and indirectly as in the results of table(2)
2. Asseratives occur sixty-eight times in (DSa), while in (ISa) occurs six times that means the speaker or the writer stating or saying the truth of the events to the listener or the reader so as to convince them faithfully to believe in Allah and his power. Directves comes fifteen times in (DSa) but in (ISa) comes six times to express the speaker's ability to cause the hearer taking a particular course of action. commisives occur two times in (DSa) and in (ISa) occur fifty times to commit the speaker to some future course of action. Expressives occur one time for both (DSa) and (ISa) to express the speaker's psychological attitude towards a state of affairs. Declaratives come twenty-six times in (DSa) but in (ISa) they come forty-

وما ارسلنا قبلك الا رجالا نوحى اليهم فسلو اهل الذكر ان كنتم لاتعلمون (٧)

7. A. Locution. And we sent not before you except men to whom we revealed.so, ask the people of the reminder if you don't know

B. Illocutionary.

i. DSa. Assertive and directive (statement, ordering)

ii. ISa. Assertive (suggesting)

C. perlocutionary effect: declarative (warning)

وما جعلناهم جسدا لياكلون الطعام وماكانو خالدين (٨)

8. A. Locution. And we didn't make the prophets forms not eating food, nor were they immortals.

B. Illocutionary

i. DSa. Declaratives: (declaration)

ii. Isa. Assertive. (Concluding)

C.perlocutionary effect.(warning)

ثم صدقناهم الوعد فانجيناهم ومن نشاء واهلكننا المسرفين (٩)

9. A. Locution. Then, we fulfilled for them the promise and we saved them and whom we willed and destroyed the wasters.

B. Illocutionary.

i. DSa. Assertive (reciting)

ii. Isa. commisive (warning)

C. Perlocutionary effect: (threating)

لقد انزلنا اليكم كتابا فيه ذكركم افلا تعقلون (١٠)

10. A. Locution. We have sent down to you a book in which is your mention. Do you not understand?

B. Illocutionary

i. DSa. Assertive and Directive (stating, asking)

ii. Isa. Commisive (warning)

C. Perlocutionary effect. (Threatening)

3. A. Locution with their hearts distracted. And those who do wrong conceal their private conversation, is this only human beings like you? So would you approach magic while you see?

B. illocutionary

i. DSa. Assertive (description of statement)

ii. Isa. Directive (asking)

C. Perlocutionary effect: (threatening)

قال ربي يعلم القول في السماء والارض وهو السميع العليم(٤)

4. A. Location: He said "My Lord knows the saying in the sky and the earth, and he is the all-hearing, the all-knowing".

B. Illocutionary

i. DSa. Assertive (beliefs)

ii. Isa. Directive (advice)

C. Perlocutionary effect. (warning)

بل قالوا اضغاث احلام افتراه بل هو شاعر فلياتنا باية كما ارسل الاولون (٥)

5. A. Locutionary. But they said "it is muddled dreams, but he has defamed it", but He is a poet. So, let him bring us a sign as the ones that sent previously.

B. Illocutionary

i. DSa. Assertive (claiming)

ii. Isa. Directive (ordering)

C. Perlocutionary effect. (warning)

ما امننت قبلهم من قرية اهلكناها افهم يؤمنون (٦)

6. A. Locution: We destroyed any town that didn't believe before them. So, will they believe?

B. illocutionary

i. DSa. Assertive and directive (statement and asking)

ii. Isa. commisive (warning)

C. perlocutionary effect: commisive (threatening)

joy or sorrow. **Directives** get someone else to do something by the speaker. In other words, they express what the speaker wants. They are commands, orders, and suggestions. While in **Commissives** speakers use to commit themselves to some future action such as promising, threatening, warning, refusal, and pledge.

7. Data Analysis

The following data are analysed according to the models that mentioned previously. The researcher selects some verses from 1-10 for analysis while the rest of the 112 verses are counted in appendix (1).

اقترب للناس حسابهم وهم في غفلة معرضون(1)

1. A. Location: The accounting of mankind is become closer, but they are turning away in heedlessness.

B. Illocutionary

i. DSa. Declaratives (declaration)

ii. ISa. Commisives (warning)

C. Perlocutionary effect (warning)

The Ayah (1) above is a declaration of warning to those who are mindless telling that the time of counting will be closer to them.

ماياتيهم من ذكر من ربهم محدث الا استمعوه وهم يلعبون(2)

2. A. Location: Every time new reminder comes to them from their Lord, but they listen to it as in jest.

B. Illocutionary

i. DSa. Assertive (statement)

ii. ISa. Comissive (warning)

C. Perlocutionary effect (warning)

The data (2) above (ma) it doesn't mean (no) because semantically it doesn't work as (negation). Anyhow, the speaker informs the listeners a truth and warning them.

لاهيبة قلوبهم واسروا النجوى الذين ظلمو هل هذا الا بشر مثلكم افتاتون السحر وانتم

تبصرون(3)

5. Rhetorical of Quranic language

The most important religion in the world that dominates the society is Islam. The corer resource book and the sacred Islamic text is the Quran which is the words of Allah to his Messenger (Mohammad). Literature and poetry were very common when the Quran was revealed to Mohammad the prophet of Allah (peace be upon him). (SharafEldin 2014;6-16)

Quranic language is the Arabic that is a part of the family of Semitic languages. It takes the form of either traditional or Qur'anic Arabic, modern Arabic standard (MSA) or systematic as well as spoken Arabic (ibid).

6. Models of Analysis

In this study, George yule (2013) and Peter Verdonk (2010) are adopted as models of pragma-stylistic analysis of Alanbiya' Surah. Speakers are involved in three acts: locutionary, illocutionary as well as perlocutionary when that comes to create speech, "The production of a well-formed utterance (words and sounds with their referential meaning) is called a locutionary act". The performed via communicative force of an utterance is called an illocutionary act. A perlocutionary act is "the impact of the speaker's talking on the listener".

The general functions of speech acts are illustrated in table (1):

Speech act type	Direction of fit	S=speaker X=situation
Declarations	Words change the world	S causes X
Representatives	Make words fit the world	S believes X
Expressive	Make words fit the world	S feels X
Directives	Make the world fit words	S wants X
Commissives	Make the world fit words	S intends X

Table (1) Five basic roles of speech acts.

Declarations change the world via their utterance. **Representatives** state what the speaker believes to be the case or not such as Statements of fact, assertions, conclusions, and description. **Expressives** state what the speaker feels. They express psychological states like statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes,

composed of knowledge, beliefs, assumptions, earlier utterances of the language user themselves. See the following examples: A. The dog bit John.

B. John was bitten by the dog

The sentence (A)' is used to talk about the dog and the sentence (B) is used to talk about John (Hickey, 1993: 578).

According to (Crystal, D., & Davy, D., 1969): 66-76) and (Leech and Short; 2007) Stylistics has been zapping toward pragmatics looking of language use facets which itself cannot provide sufficiency. Modern stylistic studies have taken an interest in both pragmatics and studying the application of linguistic utterances. The eventuating studies are called pragma-stylistic. So, Pragma-stylistics aims to provide a framework for construing the relations between linguistic form and pragmatic interpretation and also shows the variety of style in communication as the speaker aids the hearer to distinguish the thought behind an utterance. Pragma-stylistics is, thus, stylistics with a pragmatic component (Hickey, 1993: 578).

Pragmatics contributes to the study of literature with the benefit of pragmatic theories for explaining the literary texts. Yet, Pragma-stylistics is a sub field of stylistics which applies notions and conceptions from linguistic pragmatics to the literary texts analysis and their explanation. (Davies; 2007:106),

Pragma-stylistics is the study of all terms that enable a language's outposts and capability to collate also with functional elements including its context to produce a text that prompts particular significant changes in the mind or awareness of the recipient (ibid.).

Crucially, it is probable to differentiate between linguistics, stylistics, pragmatics, and pragma-stylistics by expounding the following questions with some modifications:

Linguists ask: **what do you say or what aspects of language are used?**

Stylisticians ask: **how do you say what you say?**

Pragmatists ask: **what do you do with what you say?**

Pragma-stylisticians ask: **how do you do, what you do?** (Hickey 1993: 583)

difference is not as simple in natural language processing, as the conceptual system requires an adaptive analysis to find the deductive meaning and context-dependency of language communication. Like in:

- A. The dress was red.
- B. The child's nose is red.

The state of fact for semantic interpretation reveals a sémintical idealisation of the term "red" in the statement,' which, in the sense of the dress, is due to redness, this may be named contents when values such as redness retia and colour distribution are contextually and pragmatics oriented. The redness of the above illustration (B) often involves inferential analysis to assign a redness meaning, which is pragmatically context-based.

4. Pragmatic and stylistics (pragma-stylistics)

Pragmatics, according to (Leech; 1983: 5), is a theory of suitability, while Levinson (1983: 5) defines pragmatics as the study of language use. By language, speakers can change either the word (for example, by getting another person to do something) or the state of mind or knowledge of others (for instance, by telling them something new). So Pragmatics is the study of what language users mean, what they do and how they do it in real situations. (ibid)

Style means moving away to semantic and convincing impact from a conventional usage language. In fact, stylistics comprises of stylistics "literary" and "not literary" (Babajide; 2000: 123).

Stylistics and pragmatics are interested in speaker's options among grammatical linguistic forms. But, the option for pragmatics is the way selected for performing actions (request, inform, etc.), whereas the option for stylistics is the particular interest in the findings on the linguistic level and the effects on the hearer (aesthetic, affective, etc.) (Hickey; 1993: 578).

Style is a contextually determined a variety of language, while pragmatics studies the relationships between language and context. However, the context is perceived somewhat differs in each case. Whereas stylistics context is usually the status that makes a certain way of speaking more likely, but pragmatics sees a context as

especially when the context of the expression differs completely from the structure of a sentence. Therefore, both the illocutionary intensity and the perlocutionary impact of expressions contribute to the viewpoint of pragmatics. Nevertheless, a few other researchers (Szabó, 2006; Jaszczolt, 2012) have developed a more abstract conceptualization of both the differentiation and produced other protocols. Grice's examination of semantics and pragmatics is focused on the contrast of what is meant and what is concerned. An effort was made to seek a version of "the true contents of the statement are enriched so as to reflect the intentions of the speaker and the conjecture of the speaker about what is said" (Jaszczolt, K., 2012: 2333).

Jaszczolt (ibid.) notes that certain true semantics require a highly-developed common sense approach with transmitting phrase meaning, but (semantic) facets of thought need a more than just statement indicating to give comprehensive understanding. The English sentence connective 'and' may, for example, have a reality-conditional assessment and can express many as one significance in respect to the sentence context, in relation from its characteristics. The multiple interpretations of "and" in phrases (A) & (B) make this clear:

- A. The concierge left the door open and the prisoner ran away.
- B. The prisoner ran away and the concierge left the door open.

In the first case, it is evident that 'and' not only reflects a straightforward two-phrase conjunction, and as such it reflects more sense than that of reality conditional semantic. In (A), "And" may be understood to transmit "accordingly". There is 'more' meaning when progressing with a truth-conditional semantic independent review of phrases or expressions from outlets apart from embedded information, such as context, additional details about the interlocutors, as well as everyone's practical knowledge. Such took part in pragmatics. Likewise, Szabó made the argument, (Szabó, Z.G., 2006) (Sperber, D. & Wilson, D., 1986: 12-13) that a semantic coding technique utilizes linguistic expression to be paired with meaning as well as a pragmatic inferential technique that integrates linguistic meaning with contextual information is fundamentally and significantly different. Nonetheless, (Szabó, Z.G., 2006) does not comply with (Sperber, D. & Wilson, D., 1986) the point is that the

Morris mentions pragmatics in his studies of symbolic representation (semiotics) like a concept at which characterize semantics, pragmatics, and syntax (Morris, C., 1938).

The semantic is explained by Goddard (Goddard, C., 2011: 17) as an analysis of interpretations embedded in the words as well as the language structure. Whereas Pragmatics recognizes meaning depend on various factors such as the context, the social environment, cultural events and knowledge including its speaker 's perspective, Pragmatics offers an opportunity to analyse interaction from the side of the language user, which can be associated as "investigating the importance to their customers and their translators of etymological expressions."

Leech, G. & Thomas (J, 1985:173), distinguishes the informative intention including its utterance and the communication intention of the person speaking. Not only does the pragmatic account concern reference itself but the acceptability and usability in the given context of such utterances. It can also be applied to a large number of topics.

Levinson (1983:32) defines pragmatics by reviewing various definitions such as excluding semantics represents pragmatics. Even so, it is not an easy work to identify among semantic significance or pragmatics.

Leech (1983: 5) states that meaning is "derived from the way in which utterances are used and how they relate to the context in which they are uttered".

As indicated by Levinson (1983: 5), pragmatics is mainly interested in what people do with language, its uses, and users. So pragmatics is "the study of language use".

3. Pragmatics and semantics

In semantics, meaning is percent of the respondents indicated as the attribute of representations in such a particular language. The significance of pragmatics is additionally affirmed when breaking down discourse acts with illocutionary powers that can't be distinguished dependent on their semantic substance. (Bloodsucker; 1983: 6)

Searle et al. (1992), states that Pragmatics could even recognise vital information to transmit the targeted content of the message,

1. Introduction

As per (Hickey; 1993: 578) Pragmatics and stylistics are straightforwardly minded in speaker's decisions. For Pragmatics, a decision is the methods chosen to perform activities .while stylistics thinks about decision inside specific consideration in the outcomes on the etymological level and the impacts created on the listener. Style is a relevantly scanted assortment of language, while pragmatics is an investigation of breaking down the connections among language and setting. Pragma-stylistics is a method for giving a system to clarify the relations between semantic structure and down to business translation and how the style of correspondence differs as the speaker helps the listener to separate the idea behind an articulation. Be that as it may, for (Huang; 2012:19) Pragma-stylistics or down to business stylistics alludes to the execution of the discoveries and systems of the hypothetical pragmatics to the investigation of the idea of style in language.

2. Pragmatics

A newcomer word on the scene before 1980s was pragmatics, which it is used to refer to one of the branches of inquiry in the philosopher Charles Morris' (1938) who divided the theory of signs into syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Syntax described the combinatory possibility of signs; semantics the relationship between signs and their denotation; while pragmatics referred to the relationship between signs and their interpreters. (ibid; 3)

Pragmatics was characterized by Crystal (1992:271) as "the investigation of the standards making a decision about the open utilization of language, particularly experienced in interlocutions".

An apparent gap between, language as semantic structure or code and setting subordinate standards of language use is crossed over by pragmatics as indicated by (Wolf; 2006: 22).

Pragmatics are characterized by Saussure as two components of a language: "langu" (language; e.g. conceptual structure of language norms and rules) and "parole" (speech; i.e. the words of participants and the manner in which they deploy the language) (De Saussure, F., 2011).

Abstract:

Linguistics is a discipline that has a significant contribution to Quranic studies; therefore, this study aims to find out the rhetorical secret behind the Quranic words that changed the world. Pragmatics: is subfield of linguistics which studies the use of words, phrases and sentences in the actual context of discourse while Pragma-stylistics: is a sub-field of stylistics that studies how pragmatic issues formalize stylistic devices and the felicitousness of utterances in forming context. This range of stylistic approaches demonstrates which pragmatic tools including the performative as well as speech acts should be utilized for accomplish stylistic activities. The field of stylistics is a multi - disciplinary field which integrates with other fields of etymology as well as sections of all of literary and non-literary text research.

Quran is the primary religious content of Islam which was orally uncovered to Prophet Muhammad through Jibril; in this way; it is viewed as the discourse of Allah. This examination is an endeavor to research the pragma-stylistic investigation that are utilized in Alanbya' surah and how the two etymological methodologies blended to make the translation of the explanatory qur'anic language in Alanbya' surah.

Key words: pragmatics, stylistics, pragma-stylistics, rhetorical of qur'anic language.

المخلص:

تهدف هذه الدراسة الى التحري عن السر البلاغي في الأسلوب التداولي في القرآن الكريم وبالأخص سورة الأنبياء، يتضمن البحث تعاريف للمفاهيم والاصطلاحات العلمية في علم اللغة والأسلوبية والتداولية وتأثيرها على السياق الأدبي والشخصي للمتلقي في سورة الأنبياء يلاحظ ان الله سبحانه وتعالى يخاطب الناس ويحذرهم ويروي لهم من خلال كلماته القصص التي احلت بالأقوام السابقة ليأخذوا منها عبرة ويتوبوا ويؤمنوا بالمرسلين فمن خلال هذه الكلمات استطاع علماء اللغة تحليل الأسلوب التداولي في أي لغة والغرض منها ومدى تأثيرها على المستمع أو القارئ.

الكلمات المفتاحية: علم اللغة، الاسلوبية، التداولية، اللغة البلاغية في القرآن الكريم، أسلوب التداولية، التحذير، التهديد، الوعيد.

A Pragma-stylistic Analysis of Alanbya' Surah

Lecturer

Tawfeeq Alghazali

Islamic university in Najaf, Iraq

gazali.tawfeeq@gmail.com

gazali_alkufi@iunajaf.edu.ir

تحليل أسلوب التداولية في سورة الأنبياء

المدرس

توفيق عبد الأمير هاشم الغزالي

الجامعة الإسلامية في النجف الاشرف