



ISSN: 1817-6798 (Print)

Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities

available online at: www.jtuh.org/
JTUH
 مجلة جامعة تكريت للعلوم الإنسانية
 Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities
Samara Mohammed Ahmed (Ph.D)

Tikrit University/College of Education for Humanities

Safaa Burhan Jawad

Tikrit University/College of Education for Humanities

* Corresponding author: E-mail :
Samarakh@tu.edu.iq

Keywords:

Pragmatics
 Speech Act Theory
 Performatives and Constatives Directives
 Commands

ARTICLE INFO**Article history:**

Received 1 Sept 2024
 Received in revised form 25 Nov 2024
 Accepted 2 Dec 2024
 Final Proofreading 2 Mar 2025
 Available online 3 Mar 2025

E-mail t-jtuh@tu.edu.iq

©THIS IS AN OPEN ACCESS ARTICLE UNDER
 THE CC BY LICENSE

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>


Explicit and Implicit Command in English and Arabic

A B S T R A C T

This study delves into the fascinating realm of explicit and implicit commands in the English language, exploring their nuanced roles within pragmatic studies of directive speech acts, performative verbs, illocutionary force, interpretation dynamics, and the influential factors shaping these commands. By dissecting the linguistic and pragmatic complexities of commands, the study seeks to unravel the distinct features of directive speech acts, the role of performative verbs in command construction, and the nuanced illocutionary forces at play. Moreover, it explores how individuals interpret explicit and implicit commands, shedding light on the contextual and social factors that influence their understanding.

The research explores how explicit commands, using verbs like "close the door" or "please take a seat," differ from implicit ones, such as "it's cold in here" or "can you give me a hand?" Factors like social context, power dynamics, speaker-hearer relationship, and cultural norms influence how these implicit utterances are interpreted as commands.

The analysis examines potential for misinterpretation and ambiguity arising from implicit commands, considering pragmatic principles and conversational maxims. It also investigates how intonation, facial expressions, and gestures contribute to

conveying the intended illocutionary force in both explicit and implicit forms.

© 2024 JTUH, College of Education for Human Sciences, Tikrit University

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.32.3.2.2025.04>

الأوامر الصريحة والضمنية في اللغة الإنجليزية والعربية

سمارة محمد احمد / كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية / جامعة تكريت

صفاء برهان جواد الحمداني / كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية / جامعة تكريت

الخلاصة:

تركز الدراسة على الأوامر الصريحة والضمنية في اللغة الإنجليزية، وتحلل دور البراغماتية في فهمها. تهدف إلى تشرح التعقيدات اللغوية والبراغماتية للأوامر، وفهم دور الأفعال الأدائية والسياق الاجتماعي والثقافي في بنائها وتفسيرها. النتائج تشير إلى أن الأوامر الصريحة تعتمد على أفعال مثل "أغلق الباب"، بينما تعتمد الأوامر الضمنية على سياق مثل "الجو بارد".

هنا". العوامل السياقية والاجتماعية والثقافية تلعب دورًا مهمًا في فهم الأوامر. هذه الدراسة تساهم في تعزيز التواصل الفعال، وتطوير مهارات اللغة والتفاهم الثقافي، وتساهم في تطوير النظريات اللغوية والبراغماتية.

SECTION ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

Instructions in English can be direct ("Open the door!") or indirect ("It's getting cold in here"). Explicit commands are clear, while implicit ones risk misunderstandings. Effective communication requires clarity and context to prevent confusion. The research on explicit and implicit commands in English aims to:

- Learn how commands are expressed in English: explicitly (e.g., "Close the door") and implicitly (e.g., "It's getting cold in here").
- Examine factors influencing the interpretation of commands, such as speaker-hearer relationships, social context, and urgency.
- Understand the linguistic features that distinguish explicit and implicit commands, including imperative verbs, modals, and intonation.

This research explores the use of explicit and implicit commands in Arabic and English, focusing on how cultural and social factors shape their expression. Key guiding questions include:

- How do speakers use explicit and implicit commands in different contexts, and what influences their choice?
- What role does cultural background play in the use and interpretation of these commands?
- How does the speaker-listener relationship affect the effectiveness of explicit and implicit commands?
- How do politeness strategies vary when using explicit and implicit commands across English-speaking communities?

Research on explicit and implicit commands in English offers insights into communication strategies, cultural nuances, and social dynamics, exploring command styles, cross-cultural variations, and language pragmatics.

This research includes some basic terms that need to be concisely and accurately defined :

Command: "Command is the directive speech act which is used to direct, guide or give instructions." (Wierzbica 1987: 194).

Explicit Command: An explicit command, in pragmatics, refers to a direct and clear expression of a request or directive. It is a speech act that leaves little room for interpretation, conveying the speaker's intentions straightforwardly (Searle 1969: 85).

Implicit Command: Implicit commands are directives expressed without using imperative verbs like "close" or "do." They rely on context, intonation, and pragmatic cues to convey the speaker's desire for action (Austin 1962: 122).

2. The Concept of Pragmatics

According to Stranzky (2005: 869), semiotics—the comprehensive theory of signs—is where this phrase originated. Pragmatics in this theory deals with the interaction between signals and their users. Pragmatics is the study of verbal signs, words, utterances, and texts, and how people use them to communicate. Greek word "pragma," which meaning "action," is whence the word "pragmatics" originates. A purposeful behaviour is referred to as an action. Verb communication is studied by pragmatics as a sophisticated kind of deliberate behaviour that is symbolic, or traditional and culture-specific, and interactive, or partner-oriented.

The following definitions are provided by Levinson (1983: 6). First, he defines pragmatics as "the study of those principles that will account for why a certain set of sentences are anomalous, or not possible utterances." A different definition is that "pragmatics is the study of language from a functional perspective that it attempts to explain facts of linguistic structure by reference to non-linguistic pressure and causes." Thus, the description of linguistic structure has no bearing on pragmatics, which is only concerned with the rules of language usage.

3. Speech Acts Theory

This idea has an intriguing application to language philosophy. Pragmalinguists (Leech, 1983; Levinson, Malinowski, 1922; Verschueren, 1999), anthropologists (Prawson, 1952; Grice, 1957; Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969), Linguists (de Saussure, 1916), and Semanticists (Palmer, 1981; Lyons, 1979) are the groups with the greatest interest in it. Consequently, from the time this hypothesis initially surfaced until the present, a significant quantity of literature on the topic has been published due to the broad interest in it. The speech act theory was developed and refined by Grice (1975), Searle (1969), and other scholars. Indeed, it is necessary to start any investigation into speech acts with the two pioneers, Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). This is because Searle expanded on Austin's classifications, which were made first by Austin, who was the first to classify speech acts. While Searle's and Austin's classifications appear to differ, they don't signify a significant shift in either theory or categorization.

Grice's (1957 and 1969) concept of the speaker's meaning is credited with contributing to speech act theory, according to Davis (1984: 496). According to him, phrase meaning (natural meaning, or literal meaning) comes after speakers' meaning (non-natural meaning, or intention).

"A speech act is an intentional act directed at states of affairs in the world of communication," according to Searle and Vanderveken (1985: 116). Searle and Vanderveken define the different components of illocutionary force: the illocutionary point, degree of strength, propositional content, preparatory and sincerity conditions, even they formulate suitable illocutionary force. In contrast to Austin, who views the notion of illocutionary force as a primitive notion.

According to Mey (1993: 109–10), the idea of speech actions was first developed in opposition to previous linguistic theories that did not recognize language as an activity. The British philosophy is where this theory first appeared. J.L. Austin, a British philosopher, first proposed it as a theory of thought (1911–1966). Over time, this theory was refined and expanded to become known as Speech Act Theory.

These days, the terms "speech act" and "illocutionary act" are interchangeable. The phrases "speech act," "illocutionary act," "illocutionary force," "pragmatic force," and simply "force" can all refer to the same thing; yet, using one over the other may indicate differing theoretical stances (Thomas, 1995: 5).

According to Malmkjaer (2002: 486), Oxford philosopher J.L. Austin originated this idea in the 1930s and elaborated on it in a series of lectures he gave at Harvard University in 1955 on William James. These lectures, totaling twelve, were later released in 1962 under the heading *How to Do Things with Words*. According to Austin's approach, when a speaker speaks, they are performing an act.

4. Performative and Constatives

A pleasant, or felicitous, performative must meet specific felicitous requirements in addition to being appropriate in the circumstances in which it is delivered, according to Austin (1962: 14–15). Something has gone wrong in the relationship between the utterance and the conditions in which it is made if the performative is unpleasant or indiscreet. For this reason, the following four primary categories of conditions can be observed to be necessary for a performative to function happily:

1. A conventional process with a conventional outcome is required.
2. Both the people and the situation must be suitable.
3. The process needs to be carried out (i) accurately and (ii) entirely.

4. Frequently, (i) the individuals must possess the necessary attitudes, sentiments, and intentions; and (ii) if subsequent behaviour is required, then the pertinent parties must comply.

According to Blakemore (2002: 39), Austin makes two significant findings. Firstly, he points out that many words in everyday language—like "Good morning!"—do not serve as statements and therefore cannot be classified as true or untrue. Are they Republicans? Austin calls these declarative sentences "performatives" and distinguishes them from assertions or statement-making utterances, which he calls "constatives." Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, Austin notes that there are ordinary language declarative sentences that similarly resist a truth conditional analysis. Such utterances have both a descriptive and an effective aspect, i.e. the point of uttering such sentences is not just to say things, but also to actively do things. Austin calls them 'performatives' and distinguishes them from assertions statement-making utterances, which he calls them 'constatives'.

5. Explicit and Implicit Performatives

According to Austin (1962: 64–66), performative verbs do not serve as sufficient textual requirements for performative utterance, but they do reflect some aspects of speech situations, such as the actor and the activity being performed. The challenges of determining grammatical requirements for performatives are not entirely resolved by the validity of performative formulas. Sometimes the criteria are difficult in and of themselves. For example, the present tense need not always indicate an activity occurring at the same time as the speaker. Furthermore, one cannot be certain that implicit and explicit performatives are equivalent.

e.g. I am sorry may not really be the same as I apologize.

Sometimes, even we are capable of acting out words (like insults) without using a performative verb. Verschueren (1999: 25) states that Austin distinguishes between explicit performative and primary performatives. Explicit performatives are simply, and somewhat confusingly, called "performatives," which are speech acts. I promise to Como or I baptise this ship to Como. This kind of acts contains verbs like "promise" and "baptise" in the first person singular present indicative active," describing the kind of act that is being performed. On the other hand, he shows other forms of utterance.

e.g. I will go to Como.

which is referred to as "implicit performative" or "primary performatives," and which is stated with the same "promise meaning."

Austin (1962: 40) gives up on the difference between constative and performative speech acts throughout *How to Do Things with Words* because he recognises that even constative utterances contain a performative component. They can be employed to make felicitous or imprudent claims.

Austin separates performatives into two categories: "explicit performatives and implicit performatives" for the reasons mentioned above. According to Austin, as language and culture have advanced, hidden performatives have given way to explicit ones (Malmkjaer, 2002: 489).

6. Locutionary, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Acts

We must use a specific illocutionary force to convey propositions in order to communicate, and when we do this, we take specific acts like "stating," "promising," "warning," and so forth. To be clear, there are three types of things that can occur during the production of an utterance. The phrases locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts are typically used to distinguish between these. According to Austin (1962), referenced in Cruse (2000:231-36), every speech performs particular acts by the unique communicative force of the utterance in addition to expressing whatever it means. Because of this, he presents three differences in the actions one takes when speaking.

1. Locutionary Act: The Literal Meaning:

e.g. *The sky is blue* has a locutionary act of stating a fact about the color of the sky. This meaning is independent of the speaker's intention or the listener's reaction.

2. Illocutionary Act: The Speaker's Intent:

The same example of *The sky is blue* could be an illocutionary act of informing, commenting, or even suggesting that we go outside and enjoy the weather. The same words can carry different illocutionary forces depending on the context and tone.

3. Perlocutionary Act: The Effect on the Listener:

Here the example of *The sky is blue* might persuade the listener to agree, feel inspired to paint a blue sky, or simply register the information without any particular reaction. The perlocutionary effect is not guaranteed; it depends on the listener's interpretation, pre-existing beliefs, and other contextual factors.

7. Searle's Categories of Speech Acts

Five types of illocutionary acts, also known as illocutionary points, are introduced by Searle (1979: 12–18) and they correlate to four distinct directions of fit. They're

listed below:

1. **Assertion:** The objective of these assertions is "to commit the speaker... to the authenticity of a statement made." They have the direction of fit between the speaker's words and the world, meaning that they are intended to fit the world.
2. **Directives:** they are statements, which represent the speaker's attempts to persuade the hearer to top illustration in this category. an They follow the world-to-word fit direction, in which the speaker attempts to align his words with reality. These include making requests, making commands, issuing orders, inviting others, and so on.
3. **Commissives:** "To commit the speaker... to some future course of action" is the primary purpose of these acts. Their direction of fit is world-to-word. Directives and commissions are illocutionary because they provide an excuse for the speaker or listener to alter the course of events (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985:94). This group contains assurance, intimidation, and so on.
4. **Expressives:** they convey the sentiments and feelings of the speaker towards a situation that is mentioned in the propositional content. Expressives don't have a fit direction. The following verbs, among others, express these actions: thank you, congratulations, apologise, welcome, etc.
5. **Declarations:** This category's goal is to make the propositional content consistent with reality. The world and the propositional content are equivalent when felicity conditions are present. These consist of the acts of marriage, etc.

8. Directive Speech Acts

Lasheen (1987: 164-65) categorizes directives into five micro speech acts: command, prohibition, optative, query, and vocative, with examples in the Qur'an. Al-Sakaaky (1980: 424-25) further distinguishes optative speech acts, which express wishes for unlikely events (e.g., /Layta Al-Shabab ya wd/ expresses a wish for youth's return, though impossible), from others like command and prohibition, which assume the addressee's ability to act (e.g., /La -Tatahark/ asks the listener to stop moving, implying they can comply).

9. Command

Wierzbica (1987:194) said "Command is the directive speech act which is used to direct, guide or give instructions." He argued that the command and all directives have the same illocutionary point, but it is not the same as other directives, like the order. In other words, for it to be carried out successfully, authority, or at the very least,

institutionalised power is necessary. Therefore, issuing a command is simply giving an order from a position of authority, but giving an order involves demanding that the hearer do something while claiming a position of authority or power over them.

According to Kreidler (1998:190), a command can be given with varying degrees of explicitness, but it is only effective when the speaker has some degree of control over the hearer's conduct. The statement 83, which states, "I (hereby) command you to come in time," is a clearer directive than the sentence 84%, which states, "you must come in time." According to him (ibid), in order for a command to be successful, the hearer must respect the speaker's authority.

Regarding the effective execution of commands in a particular manner and directives in a general one, there is a crucial fulfilment condition that relates to the hearer's capacity for action. As a result, the speaker cannot order the hearer to perform an impractical task. For example:

Read the 100-page book in five minutes.

By making this speech, the speaker is unable to give the hearer the instructions he needs to follow (Hurford, et al., 2007:297). As a result, the speaker may not effectively carry out a command if the speaker knows that the hearer is incapable of doing as instructed and if the necessary action has already been carried out; additionally, if the speaker gives the hearer a command, the speaker may not anticipate that the hearer will carry it out (Al-Hindawy, 1999:58).

10. Explicit and Implicit Command

According to Searle (1969: 85), an explicit command, in pragmatics, refers to a direct and clear expression of a request or directive. It is a speech act that leaves little room for interpretation, conveying the speaker's intentions straightforwardly. For example, saying "Please close the door" is an explicit command.

An explicit command is a speech act where the speaker directly instructs the addressee to perform an action. Explicit commands hold a critical role in communication, serving as clear and straightforward directives guiding the actions of others. In English, these utterances take various forms, each shaping the interaction and conveying nuanced meanings (Searle 1969: 165).

Implicit commands are directives expressed without using imperative verbs like "close" or "do." They rely on context, intonation, and pragmatic cues to convey the speaker's desire for action. Consider the phrase "The trash is full." While seemingly a declarative statement, it often carries the implicit illocutionary force of a command,

urging the listener to take it out (Austin 1962: 122).

Implicit commands, on the other hand, requires recognizing these cues, for instance, a raised eyebrow after saying "It's getting late" might imply an expectation for the listener to leave. Similarly, a question like "Can you pass the salt?" often functions as an indirect request, leveraging the illocutionary force of a question to achieve the desired outcome (Searle 1975: 91).

The use of implicit commands offers several advantages. They can be more polite and indirect than direct orders, fostering social harmony and avoiding perceived bossiness. Additionally, they can be strategically ambiguous, allowing the speaker to deny intent if the request is not fulfilled (Verschuieren 1999: 55).

11.The Form of Explicit and Implicit Command

Explicit Command

Holmes (2001: 290) states that commands and instructions are generally expressed in the imperative form. Additionally, he says that polite attempts to get someone to do something tend to use interrogative and declarative sentences. According to Holmes' Richards and Schmidt (1983), there are six structural variants of imperative indicative speech acts, including imperative commands. The first is **the base form of the verb**. Examples include "Speak louder" and "Put your hands down." The words "speak" and "put" are verbs. The second one is **you + imperative sentence**. The imperative is a form of verb that expresses a command. Examples are "You look here." and "You go with your work." The third is **present participle form of verb**. The present participle is the form of a verb ending in -ing. Examples are "listening" and "looking at me." "Listen" and "look" are verbs. The fourth is **verb ellipsis**. The omission of a word or form of a verb. Examples include "Hands Up" and "Blackboards." Fifth is an **instruction + modifier**. The imperative is a form of verb that expresses a command. A modifier is a word or phrase that modifies another word or phrase, such as "please." Examples are "Children, please look at me. Please." and "Please turn around." The last word is Let + first person pronoun. A pronoun is a word used in the place of a noun or noun phrase. Examples: I, I, she, they, he, his, we, us, you, they, she, it, there. Examples include "Let's stop there," "Let's do it," and "Let's find her a girlfriend."

Implicit Command

The form of implicit commands in English is diverse and context-dependent. And here are some common forms of implicit commands:

- a) **Modal Verbs:** Modal verbs like "can," "could," "may," "might," "must," "should," and "ought to" can be used to express commands indirectly. For example, "Can you pass the salt?" (Instead of: "Pass the salt.") And "She ought to apologize for what she said." (Instead of: "Apologize for what you said.") (Trask 2000: 40).
- b) **Wh-questions:** Wh-questions like "who," "what," "when," "where," "why," and "how" can be used to make indirect requests. For example, "Who can take out the trash?" (Instead of: "Take out the trash."). And "What should I do with this old furniture?" (Instead of: "Get rid of this old furniture."). And also "When are you going to finish that report?" (Instead of: "Finish that report soon.") (Leech 2014: 35).
- c) **Suggestive Phrases:** Certain phrases can suggest a course of action without directly commanding it. For example, "It might be a good idea to call her." (Instead of: "Call her."). And "Perhaps you should reconsider your decision." (Instead of: "Don't do that.") (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 101).
- d) **Hints and Intimations:** Sometimes, speakers can convey commands through nonverbal cues, such as facial expressions, gestures, or changes in intonation. For example, a raised eyebrow might be an implicit request for clarification, while a sigh could be interpreted as a plea for help (Goffman 1967: 71).

12. Explicit and Implicit Commands as Performative Acts

In the realm of language, utterances can sometimes transcend mere statements and function as actions themselves. This is the essence of performative utterances, where saying something does something. One prominent type of performative utterance is the explicit command. Explicit commands directly express their illocutionary force of ordering or directing someone to do something. They utilize imperative verbs like "open," "stop," or "go," leaving no ambiguity about the speaker's intention. The defining characteristic of explicit commands is their performativity. By uttering the command, the speaker is not just describing a desired action, they are bringing it into existence through the very act of speaking (Austin 1962: 163).

This performative nature brings with it certain features:

- 1. **Felicity conditions:** For an explicit command to be successful, certain conditions must be met. These include the speaker having the authority to issue the command, the listener understanding the language and context, and the action being physically possible (Searle 1975: 32).
- 2. **Sincerity:** The speaker must genuinely intend for the listener to carry out the command. False or playful commands, though grammatically correct, can be

deemed infelicitous (Levinson 1983: 57).

3. Social context: The effectiveness of an explicit command is heavily influenced by the social context and relationship between speaker and listener. A boss giving an order to an employee carries different weight than a friend making a request (Verschuere 1999: 78).

While Implicit commands can also function as performative acts, meaning they don't merely describe an action but actually bring it about through the utterance itself. An implicit command as a performative act involves the speaker conveying a directive without using explicit imperative language. (Austin 1962: 93).

Searle (1969: 87) has discussed performatives, emphasizing that language can not only describe actions but also perform them. Implicit commands rely on context, tone, and indirect language to convey the speaker's intended directive, highlighting the performative nature of language.

For instance, consider the sentence "It would be great if you could pass the salt." While seemingly a statement, it implies a request. The performative aspect lies in the indirectness of the language, where the act of requesting is embedded within the statement. This idea aligns with Austin's theory that language can function beyond mere description, actively shaping actions (Austin 1962: 123).

Furthermore, Searle's concept of illocutionary acts extends this idea by emphasizing the intention behind utterances. Implicit commands fit into this framework as they rely on shared linguistic conventions and context to convey their performative force (Searle 1969: 89).

13. Factors Influencing the Interpretation of Explicit and Implicit Command

Explicit Command:

- 1. Speaker Authority:** Commands issued by individuals with recognized authority (e.g., police officers, teachers, parents) carry greater weight and are more likely to be obeyed (Searle 1969: 137).
- 2. Contextual Factors:** The setting, social relationships, and shared knowledge between the speaker and hearer shape how commands are interpreted. For example, a command given in a military context may be perceived as more urgent than one given in a casual conversation (Mey 2001: 56).
- 3. Linguistic Form:** The specific words and grammatical structures used to issue a

command can influence its perceived politeness and intensity. For example, using modal verbs like "could" or "would" can soften a command, while using imperatives or direct orders can make it more forceful. Brown and Levinson 1987: 209).

4. **Nonverbal Cues:** Body language, facial expressions, tone of voice, and even silence can convey additional information about the speaker's intent and the urgency of the command (Mehrabian 1972: 122).
5. **Cultural Norms:** Different cultures have varying expectations regarding directness, politeness, and the appropriate use of commands. For example, in some cultures, indirect requests are considered more polite than explicit commands (Wierzbicka 2003: 89).
6. **Relationship Between Speaker and Hearer:** The social relationship between the speaker and hearer can influence how a command is interpreted. For example, a command from a friend might be perceived as less demanding than one from a boss (Goffman 1967: 43).
7. **Listener's Perceptions of Speaker's Intention:** Listeners interpret commands based on their understanding of the speaker's goals and intentions. If a listener believes the speaker has their best interests at heart, they may be more likely to comply with a command (Grice 1975: 174).
8. **Shared Goals:** Commands are more likely to be obeyed when the speaker and hearer share a common goal. When both parties understand the purpose of the command and agree on its importance, compliance is more likely (Clark 1996: 104).
9. **Trust:** Listeners are more likely to obey commands from speakers they trust. If a listener believes the speaker is competent and has their best interests at heart, they are more likely to follow their directives (Deutsch 1958: 51).

Implicit Command:

1. **Shared Context and Common Ground:** Mutual knowledge and understanding between the speaker and recipient, based on past experiences, shared culture, and current situation (Clark 1996: 73).
2. **Pragmatic Cues:** Non-verbal hints, such as tone of voice, facial expressions, gestures, and body language (Levinson 2000: 57).
3. **Linguistic Conventions:** Established patterns of speech and language use that

guide interpretation (Searle 1975: 59).

4. **Social Norms and Expectations:** Culturally-dependent rules and expectations that influence how commands are understood (Brown & Levinson 1987: 211).
5. **Individual Factors:** Personal characteristics of the recipient, such as cognitive abilities, social skills, and personality traits (Keysar et al., 2000: 32).
6. **Power Dynamics and Relationships:** The relative authority and social distance between the speaker and recipient (Holtgraves 2010: 24).
7. **Specificity of the Command:** The level of detail and clarity in the command's wording (Gibbs 1981: 431).
8. **Emotional State:** The emotional state of both the speaker and recipient.

14. Politeness Strategies in Explicit and Implicit Command

In explicit commands even when issuing them, English speakers have various strategies to maintain politeness and respect the listener's autonomy. Here are some strategies for expressing politeness in explicit commands in English:

1. **Conditionals:** Frame the command as a conditional statement using "if" or "would" to soften the tone. For example, "If you could please close the door, that would be great." (Blum-Kulka, 1987)
2. **Question forms:** Phrase the command as a question to make it more indirect and less demanding. For example, "Would you mind closing the door, please?" (Brown & Levinson, 1987)
3. **Hedging:** Use hedges like "I'm sorry to bother you," "I wonder if you could," or "if it's not too much trouble" to express politeness and tentativeness. For example, "I'm sorry to bother you, but could you please send me that report?" (Fraser, 1980)
4. **Tag questions:** Use tag questions to seek agreement and soften the command. For example, "Close the door, please, will you?" (Holmes, 1984)
5. **Address terms:** Use terms of endearment or respect. For example, "Honey, could you grab me a glass of water?" (Scollon and Scollon, 1995)
6. **Intonation:** Use rising intonation to make a request sound more polite: "Can you pass the salt?" (Fraser, 1990)

Implicit commands maintain politeness and social harmony by protecting the "face" of both speaker and listener (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Modal verbs like "could" and "would" soften commands, making them less imposing (Blum-Kulka, 1987: 131), e.g.,

“Could you pass the salt?” rather than “Pass the salt.” Questions and hints further add politeness, offering the listener choice or letting them infer actions (Ervin-Tripp, 1976: 25; Blum-Kulka, 1989: 37). Cultural norms also affect indirectness, with varying expectations across societies (Spencer-Oatey, 2008).

15. Data Analysis

This study examines real-life examples to show how commands are used in both languages. It includes examples from everyday language, as well as from the Quran and selected hadiths of Prophet Muhammad, to highlight the religious and cultural context of commands in Arabic. Other examples provide a broader view of the language structures and cultural differences in how explicit and implicit commands work in English and Arabic.

Explicit Command

As it is stated in section three, explicit commands are direct and straightforward in their delivery. They leave no room for ambiguity, clearly stating what action is required. These commands often utilize imperative verbs and are commonly found in instructional manuals, requests, or direct orders. To show how these commands are used in everyday life, I will go into some examples taken from real life situations as below:

- **"Please close the door."**

This command is straightforward and polite, using the word "please" to make the request more polite and respectful. It is commonly used in everyday situations where someone wants to ask another person to perform a specific action, such as closing a door to maintain privacy or regulate temperature.

- **"Do your homework before dinner."**

This command is used to give clear instructions or expectations to someone, in this case, a child, about completing a task (homework) before a specified time (dinner). The use of "do" emphasizes the importance or necessity of completing the homework.

- **"Turn off your cell phones during the movie."**

This command is used to establish rules or guidelines for behavior in a specific situation (watching a movie). It emphasizes the need for everyone to turn off their cell phones to avoid disrupting the viewing experience for others. The use of "turn off" is direct and specific, leaving no room for ambiguity..

- **"Stand up straight and pay attention."**

This command is used to give instructions or guidance on behavior, in this case,

posture and focus. It is often used by authority figures, such as teachers or supervisors, to ensure that individuals maintain proper posture and are attentive to what is being said or taught.

- **"Pull over to the side of the road, please."**

This explicit command is used for directing behavior in a potentially dangerous situation. It is clear, concise, and leaves no room for misinterpretation. The officer uses "please" to soften the tone while maintaining authority.

In each of these examples, explicit commands are used to convey specific instructions or expectations to others. They are clear, direct, and often used in situations where clarity and compliance are important. The use of politeness markers, such as "please," can vary depending on the context and relationship between the speaker and the listener.

- *In the name of Allah, the entirely merciful, the especially merciful*

(اقْرَأْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ)

(Read! In the Name of your Lord Who has created (all that exists)) (Muhammad Taqi-ud Din Al-Hilali and Muhammad Muhsin Khan, 1984, 682)

Surat Al-Alaq (30:1)

Analysis:

The verse "اقْرَأْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ" (Read in the name of your Lord who created) from the Quran (Surah Al-Alaq, 96:1) contains an explicit command according to Searle's categories of speech acts, particularly within the directive category.

In this verse, the verb "اقْرَأْ" (Read) is in the imperative form, directly instructing the Prophet Muhammad to perform the action of reading or reciting. Since the verse uses an imperative verb without any indirection or vagueness, it constitutes an explicit command.

The use of the imperative form "اقْرَأْ" makes the command unambiguous and direct, fitting Searle's explicit directive category. There is no need for inference or interpretation to understand that the action (reading/reciting) is being commanded.

- *In the name of Allah, the entirely merciful, the especially merciful*

(وَأَنْفِقُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَلَا تَتْلُوا بآيَاتِهِمْ إِلَى التَّهْلُكَةِ وَأَحْسِنُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُحْسِنِينَ)

And spend in the Cause of Allah (i.e. Jihad of all kinds) and do not throw yourselves into destruction (by not spending your wealth in the Cause of Allah), and do good. Truly, Allah loves Al-Muhsinun (the good-doers) (Muhammad Taqi-ud Din Al-Hilali and Muhammad Muhsin Khan, 1984, 37)

Surat Al-Baqarah (2:195)

Analysis:

- "وَأَنْفِقُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ" (Spend in the Cause of Allah):

The verb "أَنْفِقُوا" (spend) is in the imperative form, directly commanding believers to spend their wealth for the sake of Allah. This is a clear directive to perform a specific action. This is an explicit command because it directly and unambiguously instructs believers to give in charity or spend in Allah's cause.

- "وَلَا تُلْقُوا بَأْيَدِكُمْ إِلَى الْهَلَكَةِ" (and do not throw yourselves into destruction):

The verb "تُلْقُوا" (throw) is also in the imperative form but is preceded by "لا" (do not), creating a direct prohibition. It commands believers not to engage in self-destructive behavior.

This is an explicit command as it clearly forbids a specific action (self-harm or ruin), leaving no ambiguity.

- "وَأَحْسِنُوا" (And do good):

The verb "أَحْسِنُوا" (do good) is again in the imperative form, instructing believers to act kindly and righteously. This is another explicit command, directly instructing believers to perform good deeds.

- The Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) said:

(صلوا كما رأيتموني أصلي)

"Pray as you have seen me praying." (Sahih al-Bukhari, 631)

Analysis:

This Hadith contains an explicit command based on Searle's categories of speech acts. The verb "صلوا" (pray) is in the imperative form, which directly instructs the audience to perform a specific action, making it an explicit directive. The Prophet Muhammad clearly commands his followers to pray as he does, and the phrase "كما رأيتموني أصلي" (as you have seen me pray) adds clarity to how the action should be

carried out.

- (من راقب الناس مات هماً)

(He who watches people dies of worry)

This proverb is an implicit command per Searle's speech act categories, aiming to influence behavior indirectly. Rather than directly telling the listener to stop observing others, it implies it through the negative consequence of "dying of worry." Searle's framework classifies this as an indirect directive, using implication rather than explicit instruction to guide behavior.

Implicit Command

Also we are acquainted with the implicit commands in section three that they rely on context, tone, or non-verbal cues to convey the desired action without explicitly stating it. They often involve suggestions, hints, or indirect requests, allowing the listener to infer the intended action. And they are prevalent in social interactions, where politeness or subtlety is valued. As I did with the explicit commands, I also going to take some examples from real life situations like below:

- **"Why don't we move to the living room?"**

This suggestion subtly encourages guests to relocate without directly instructing them to do so. It maintains a casual and inviting tone while steering the flow of the gathering, demonstrating social cues for a change in location without being overly directive.

- Parent says to their child at night, **"It looks like it's getting late. We have a lot to do tomorrow."**

By suggesting that it's getting late and implying that it's time for bed, the parent is indirectly instructing the child to start preparing for bedtime without explicitly stating it. This approach can be more persuasive and less confrontational than a direct command.

- Friend says to another friend, **"I'm feeling a bit hungry. Do you want to grab something to eat?"**

By expressing their own hunger and suggesting getting food together, the friend is indirectly proposing the idea of eating without explicitly stating, "Let's go eat." This approach allows for a more casual and inviting way to initiate plans.

- A father **points** towards the trash can while making **eye contact** with his son who has finished his snack.

The father is indirectly instructing his son to throw away their trash without verbalizing the command. The gesture and eye contact serve as cues for the desired action.

- Manager mentions during a team meeting, **"It's important for us to stay on top of our deadlines."**

The manager is indirectly signaling to the team that they need to prioritize meeting deadlines without explicitly saying, "Make sure you meet your deadlines."

- *In the name of Allah, the entirely merciful, the especially merciful*

(النَّبِيُّ أَوْلَىٰ بِالْمُؤْمِنِينَ مِنْ أَنفُسِهِمْ وَأَزْوَاجُهُ أُمَّهَاتُهُمْ)

(The Prophet is closer to the believers than their own- selves, and his wives are their (believers') mothers (as regards respect and marriage)) (Muhammad Taqi-ud Din Al-Hilali and Muhammad Muhsin Khan, 1984, 465)

Surat Al-Ahzab (21:6)

Analysis:

"النبي أولى بالمؤمنين من أنفسهم" (The Prophet is closer to the believers than their own selves): This part of the verse is a statement of fact that establishes the Prophet's authority and priority over the believers. While it does not use an imperative verb (such as "Obey the Prophet"), it implies a directive: believers are expected to follow and prioritize the Prophet's guidance above their own desires and interests. Therefore This part of verse is an implicit command because it does not directly order the believers to obey the Prophet.

"وأزواجه أمهاتهم" (and his wives are [like] their mothers):

The second part, "وأزواجه أمهاتهم" (and his wives are their mothers), while being an assertive statement, carries an implicit command. By declaring that the believers should treat the Prophet's wives with respect, similar to how they would treat their own mothers, it implicitly forbids the believers from marrying them. In Arabic culture and Islamic law, it is impermissible to marry one's mother or a figure like a mother. Thus, this part of the verse implies a prohibition without using direct language, which makes it an implicit directive according to Searle's categories of speech acts.

- (يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا كُتِبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الصِّيَامُ كَمَا كُتِبَ عَلَى الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُونَ)

(O you who have believed, fasting is prescribed for you as it was prescribed for those before you, that you may become righteous) (Muhammad Taqi-ud Din Al-Hilali and Muhammad Muhsin Khan, 1984, 33)

Surah Al-Baqarah (2:183)

Analysis:

The verse begins with "O you who have believed" (يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا), addressing the believers directly, creating an obligation toward them.

The core of the message is "decreed upon you is fasting" (كُتِبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الْإِسْلَامُ), which informs believers that fasting has been prescribed or obligated on them.

Although this verse does not use an imperative verb like "fast," it implies a command through the phrase "decreed upon you". This structure creates an obligation without directly commanding, making it an implicit directive.

The directive nature comes from the context and phrasing, which places fasting as a requirement rather than simply a suggestion, but it avoids direct, imperative language.

- The Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) said:

(خيركم من تعلم القرآن وعلمه)

"The best among you are those who learn the Quran and teach it." (Sahih al-Bukhari, 5027)

Analysis:

This hadith contains an implicit command according to Searle's categories of speech acts. While it does not use direct imperative language to command learning and teaching the Qur'an, it implicitly encourages these actions by praising those who engage in them as the "best" among the believers. This praise serves as a form of indirect motivation, suggesting that others should strive to emulate this behavior. Thus, the Hadith uses an implicit directive to encourage learning and teaching the Qur'an by highlighting the virtue of those who do so.

12. Conclusion

In conclusion, this research delves into the multifaceted realm of explicit and implicit commands in English, examining them through the lenses of directive speech acts, performative verbs, illocutionary force, interpretation, and influential factors. By

dissecting commands as directive speech acts, the study underscores the communicative nature of commands, emphasizing the speaker's intention to prompt a specific action. Analyzing commands as performative verbs unveils their transformative power, making language both an expression and an enactment.

The exploration of illocutionary force reveals the underlying strength within commands, showcasing their ability to shape behavior and elicit responses. Understanding the interpretation of these commands provides valuable insights into the complex interplay between linguistic structures and contextual cues. The research underscores the significance of contextual factors, social dynamics, and cultural nuances in shaping the nature of explicit and implicit commands.

The research highlights the nuanced differences between explicit and implicit commands, emphasizing their distinct strategies and implications. Explicit commands, overt in their language, leave little room for ambiguity, while implicit commands rely on subtlety and context, fostering a nuanced communication style. Recognizing these distinctions enriches our comprehension of the intricate ways in which language functions as a tool for directive communication. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of the pragmatic intricacies inherent in issuing and interpreting commands, paving the way for further exploration in the dynamic landscape of language.

The distinction between explicit and implicit commands in both English and Arabic lies in their articulation and interpretation. In both languages, commands can be explicit (clearly articulated) or implicit (requiring inference). However, while the linguistic structures are similar, cultural context and norms play a significant role in how implicit commands are interpreted. English tends to use politeness strategies for indirect commands, while Arabic often relies on religious or cultural allusions, particularly when invoking implicit commands.

References

- Al-Hilali, Muhammad and Khan, Muhammad (1984). Translation of the Meanings of the Noble Quran in the English Language.
- Al-Hindawy, F. (1999). Iraqi EFL Learners' Use of the Speech Acts of Command and Request. (Unpublished Ph. D).
- Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Harvard University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? Journal of Pragmatics.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1989). Playing it safe: The role of conventionality in indirectness. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies. Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of requests. In R.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals and universals. Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). Using language. Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, W. A. (1984). Exploring Speech Act Theory. Language Studies Quarterly, 10(3).
- Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2(4), 265- 279.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. Language in Society, 5(1), 25-66.
- Fraser, B. (1980). Conversational mitigation. Journal of Pragmatics. Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. Journal of Pragmatics.
- Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior. Anchor Books.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. Academic Press.
- Holmes, J. (1984). Modifying illocutionary force. Journal of Pragmatics.
- Holmes, J. (2001). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Edinburgh: Longman Pearson Education Ltd.
- Holtgraves, T. (2010). The interplay of power, status, and politeness in language. Journal of Language and Social Psychology.
- Hurford, J. Heasley, B. and Michael B. (2007). Semantics. 2 Cambridge"Cambridge University Press.
- Keysar, B., Barr, D. J., Balin, J. A., & Brauner, J. S. (2000). Taking perspective in conversation: The role of mutual knowledge in comprehension. Psychological Science.
- Kreidler, Charles W. (1998). Introducing English Semantics. London: Routledge. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. University of Chicago Press.
- Lasheen, M. A. (1987). An approach to the category of speech acts. Journal of Pragmatics, 11(3-4).
- Leech, G. N. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. Longman. Leech, G. N.

(2014). Meaning and grammar. Routledge.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (2000). Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature. MIT Press.

Malmkjaer, K. (2002). The Linguistic Encyclopedia, 2nd edition. Routledge: London. Mey, J. L.

(1993). Pragmatics: An Introduction. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Mey, J. L. (2001). Pragmatics: An introduction (2nd ed.). Blackwell. Mehrabian, A.

(1972). Nonverbal communication. Aldine Transaction.

Richards, J.C. and Schmidt, R.W. (1983). Language and Communication. New York: Longman Inc.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (1995). Intercultural communication: A discourse approach. Oxford: Blackwell.

Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. and Vanderveken, D. (1985). Foundations of Illocutionary Logic Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts (pp. 59-82). Academic Press.

Searle, J. R. (1975). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge University Press.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across

cultures. Continuum.

Stranzy, Philipp (2005). Encyclopedia of Linguistics. Voll. Great Britain: Taylor and Francis Group.

Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. London: Longman.

Trask, R. L. (2000). Modality in grammar and discourse. Cambridge University Press. Verschueren,

J. (1999). What Does It Mean to Understand an Implicit Speech Act?

Journal of Pragmatics.

Wierzbicka, A. (2003). Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction (2nd ed.).
Mouton de Gruyter.