

- Gulick, R. (eds.) John Searle and His critics, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., PP. 81-102.
- 16- Searle, J.R. & Vanderveken, D. (1985): Foundations of Illocutionary Logic, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 17- Stalnaker, R.C. (1978): "Assertion". In: Cole, p.(ed.). Syntax and Semantics: Vol:9:Pragmatics, New York: Academic Press.
- 18- Al-Sulaimaan, M.M. (1997): A Study of Three Speech Acts: Promise, Threat and Warning in Three Shakespearean Tragedies with Reference to their Realizations in Arabic. (Unpublished ph. D.Thesis. Mosul University).
- 19- Al-Sulaimaan, M.M. (1998): "Setting Felicity Conditions Deriving Semantic Rules for Speech Act of Advising". In: Adab Al-Rafidayn. Vol. 31, pp. 29-37.
- 20- Vanderveken, D. (1990): Meaning and Speech Acts: Vol. I: Principles of Language Use, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 21- Verschueren, J. (1998): Understanding Pragmatics. London: Edward Arnold.

- 3- Bach, K. & Harnish, R.M. (1979): Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts, Cambridge: Mass: The MIT Press.
- 4- Clark, H.H. & Clark, E.V. (1977): Psychology and Language, Harcourt Brace Jovanich.
- 5- Crystal, D. (1985): A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- 6- Hassan, J. & Al-Sulaiman, M.M. (1998): "A Semantic Analysis of Arabic Commissive Verbs". In Adab Al-Rafidyan, Vol. 31, pp. 19-29.
- 7- Haverkate, W.H. (1984): Speech Acts, Speakers and Hearers, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- 8- Leech, G.N. (1983): Principles of Pragmatics, London: Longman Group Ltd.
- 9- Levinson, S.G. (1983): Pragmatics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 10- Mey, J.L. (1993): Pragmatics: An Introduction. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- 11- Recanati, F. (1987): Meaning and Force: The Pragmatics of Performative Utterances. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 12- Searle, J.R. (1979): Expression and Meaning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 13- Searle, J.R. (1986): "Meaning, Communication, and Representation". In ناقص
- 14- Searle, J.R. (1986): "Meaning, Communication, and Representation". In: Grandy, R.E. & Warner, R.(eds.), Philosophical Grounds of Rationality, Intentions, Categories, Ends, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 209-226.
- 15- Searle, J.R. (1991): "Response, Meaning, Intentionality, and Speech Acts". In: Lepore, E. & van

the a present paper predict for Arabic assertive illocutionary forces by presenting the following diagram.⁽¹⁾

Conclusions and Suggestions:

1. Our semantic analysis show the relations of comparative strength between Arabic assertive illocutionary force correctly arranged so as to predict actual illocutionary entailments and incompatibilities between assertive speech act verbs.
2. Our descriptive list shows how the set of assertive illocutionary force is lexicalized in the Arabic vocabulary this will enable semanticists to make a logical dictionary of illocutionary verbs of actual natural languages by way of a systematic breakdown of lexicalized forces into their components.
3. Further research can also be carried out to give semantic analysis of the fifth type of performative verbs which is the declarative act verbs⁽¹⁾.
4. A Contrastive study of assertive verbs in English and Arabic can be carried out.

References:

- 1- Alston, W. (1991): " Searle on Illocutionary Acts". In: Lepore, E & Van Gullick, R (eds.), John Searle and his Critics, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., pp.57-80.
- 2- Austin, J.L. (1962): How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Clarendon press.

⁽¹⁾ All nodes of our modified diagram are speech act verb naming illocutionary forces with the same designated illocutionary point. A verb is the immediate successor of another verb in our diagram iff the force that it name can be obtained from the force named by the other verb by adding new components or increasing the degree of strength (Vanderveken, 1990:181).

⁽²⁾ Similar studies were carried out by the same researcher on "commissives", "expressives" and "directives".

himself to achieve the proposition. In the assertive sense, to swear is to attest with a high degree of solemnity to the mode of achievement (particularly high of one has already sworn to tell the truth.

25- "يُعترف" means "to recognize". This verb has the illocutionary force of asserting that a proposition is true with a preparatory condition to the effect that it has been proposed by someone else and may run against what the speaker would otherwise have thought. (of. Vanderveken, 1990:178).

26- "يُعترف" means "to acknowledge". This verb has the illocutionary force of confessing, admitting the truth, existence or reality of something. Its mode of achievement is recognizing openly.

27- "يُعزى" means "to praise". This verb has the illocutionary force of asserting to speak with approval of something. Its prepositional content condition is to assert that a state of affairs that concerns him or it is good while expressing approval of that state of affairs (sincerity condition) (of Vanderveken, 1990:179).

28- "يُعزى" means "to blame". This verb has the illocutionary force of asserting to fix on somebody the responsibility for something done (badly or wrongly) or not done. Their prepositional content condition is to criticize him in asserting that he is responsible for something. Its preparatory condition is that something is bad. Blame is laid upon people. One can blame people without saying so

In conclusion, we will show the relations of comparative degree of strength that the semantic analysis of

clear that one has reasons to support it. "يساند" has also the directive use.

20- "يصر على" means "to insist". It has the illocutionary force of asserting urge with emphasis , against opposition or disbelief. This primitive has a higher degree of strength than sustaining.

21- "يضمن" means "to assure" ". This verb has both a commissive and an assertive use. In the assertive use, one can assure the hearer that a proposition is true. However, in the commissive use, one can assure somebody that he will do something. In the assertive use, it is to sustain with the perlocutionary act of persuading the hearer of the truth of the proposition. Its preparatory condition is that the hearer has some doubts about the truth of the proposition.

22- "يشهد رسمياً على صحة شيء" means "to certify". This verb has both a commissive and an assertive use. In the commissive sense to certify means that a certain task will be completed on time. While, in the assertive sense, to certify is to assure that a proposition is true , in a formal way the perlocutionary act of having the hearer feel "certain" of the truth of the proposition (e.g. a University Certificate, a supervisor's certification).

23- "يشهد على، يصدق على" means "to attest". This verb has the illocutionary force of giving clear proof of about the assertion of something. To "يشهد على" (attest) to a proposition is to assert a proposition with a serious mode of achievement and with a preparatory condition to the effect that a proposition is in question.

24- "يقسم، يخلف" means "to swear". This verb has both a commissive and assertive use. In the commissive use, one can swear that he will do something, i.e. he commites

Its prepositional content condition is that some danger is imminent (e.g., a military alert).

14- "ينبه الى وحرد خطر" means "to alarm". This verb has the illocutionary force of a particular type of warning in the assertive sense which is of immediate danger (special propositional content condition, e.g. a fire alarm).

15- "يذكر" means "to remind". This verb has the illocutionary force of asserting to cause somebody to remember to do something or to think of something. To remind somebody of something is to assert it while presupposing (preparatory condition) that the hearer has forgotten. Reminding is essentially hearer directed.

16- "dw" means "to describe". This verb has the illocutionary force of asserting to give a picture of something or certain scene in words. Thus, to describe something is to make an assertion or a series of assertions about it. Consequently, a description is a speech activity that involves more than a single isolated assertive illocutionary act (of Vanderveken, 1990:175).

17- "يعلم" means "to inform:". This verb is hearer directed in that it is to assert with the preparatory condition that the hearer does not already know a certain proposition.

18- "يبرح" means "to reveal". This verb has the illocutionary force of asserting to inform with the added preparatory condition that the information has been hidden, and that "برح" (revelation) is removing the veil or cover that has hidden it from view (of Vanderveken, 1990:175).

19- "يساند، يوازر" means "to sustain". This verb has the illocutionary force of asserting to give a decision in favor of something or somebody. It is to assert a proposition publicly, generally with a high degree of strength, making

this future action on the part of the hearer will benefit him(for further details, see also Al-Sulaimaan, 1998:34).

13- “ينذر بغارة جوية” means “to alert”. This verb has the illocutionary force of warning (for instance, troops) to watch for danger and to be ready to act.

that the speaker is expected to have good reasons and evidence for believing what is predicted.

9- "يتنبأ بحالة الجو" means "to forecast". It says something in advance about weather and what is likely to happen. This has the illocutionary force of a special kind of prediction in that it is based on relatively clear signs of how the weather seems to be shaping up (additional propositional content conditions).

"ينقل قولاً حسيراً أو رسالة" means "to report". It means to give an account of something seen, heard, done, act. This verb has the illocutionary force of asserting something with the propositional content condition to the effect that the propositional content is about either the past in relation to the time of utterance, or, in some cases, the present. Reporting is based on what has happened or on what is happening now (of Vanderveken, 1990:173).

"يخذر" means "to warn". This verb is systematically ambiguous between an assertive and directive use (for details, see Al-Sulaimaan, 1997:144). It means that the speaker attempts to direct the hearer to a course of action more favourable to him. Its propositional content condition is that, speaker conveys the proposition of his warning in his utterance, and predicates a future action. Its sincerity condition is that, speaker wishes hearer to do some action to avoid the event.

12- "ينصح" means "to advise". This verb like to warn, except that the additional presupposition is to the effect that what is advised is good for the hearer. Its propositional content condition is that, speaker expresses the proposition of his advice in his utterance, and predicates a future act of the hearer. Its sincerity condition is that, speaker believes that

- achievement, degree of strength, prepositional content, preparatory and sincerity conditions.
- 4- “ينفي” means “to negate”. “النفي” (negating) a proposition is simply asserting the truth functional negation of that proposition. The “نفي” (negation) of the assertion that partick is sick is the assertion that partick is not sick.
- 5- “يقترح” means “to suggest”. It has both directive and assertive uses. One can suggest both that one should do something and that something is the case. “يقترح” something means bringing it to the mind of the hearer without necessarily explicitly affirming it and without a strong commitment to its truth. In this sense, to suggest is to assert with a weak degree of strength. The mode of achievement is implicit. Sometimes, it is explicit as in “أقترح بأنه ينبغي عليك أن تقرأ” (I suggest you should read).
- 6- “يُظن” means “to guess”. This verb has an illocutionary use in which it means to assert a proposition weakly. There is no high level of commitment to its truth. Its preparatory condition is that one presupposes its probability. There is no clear evidence that can be called upon. For instance, I may guess that “he has fifty books”.
- 7- “يفترض” means “to hypothesize”. It means to make a weak assertion. It presupposes that although it is not certain, it is nonetheless reasonable, and that it might prove useful to further discussion or investigation. Its mode of achievement may or may not be more or less formal.
- 8- “يتكهن” means “to predict”. This primitive has the illocutionary force of a predication which is that of an assertion. Its illocutionary condition is characterized by having a special condition to the effect that the prepositional utterance. Its preparatory condition means

Our interest here is the “paradigmatic central illocutionary meanings” of arabic assertive speech act verbs “أفعال التأكيد لأفعال القول” and the idealization of these meanings somewhat in our semantic analysis. This important thing, from a logical point of view, is to get the relations of comparative strength between Arabic illocutionary forces correctly ordered so as to predict actual entailments and incompatibilities between performative sentences.

The Description of Arabic Assertive Verbs”أفعال التأكيد”

Our list of Arabic assertive verbs that will be described are as follows:

- 1- “يؤكد” means “to assert”. The primitive “التأكيد” in Arabic is “يؤكد” which names the illocutionary force of “التأكيد”. Sometimes, it is used in the stronger sense of positively asserting as opposed to the speech act verb “to deny”, in which case it is a strong “تأكيد” relative to its primitive use.
- 2- “ينكر” means “to deny”. In assertion sense “to deny” (الإنكار) is a proposition which means to negate (ينفي) that proposition by asserting the opposite proposition. The preparatory condition is that “الإنكار” (the denial) is a denial of something that has been affirmed. “إنكار” (denial) seems to be related to matters of some importance and also related to accusation (further preparatory conditions).
- 3- “يدّعي” means “to claim”. It also names the illocutionary force of “التأكيد أو الجزم” (asserting or affirming) in as much as it has the same illocutionary point, mode of

The basic theoretical distinctions in the analysis of English speech act verbs are as follows:

- 1- Many performative verbs do not name an illocutionary force, but rather a Kind or a set of illocutionary act.
- 2- Some performative verbs like "swear" and "vow", which name the same illocutionary force, are not synonymous. Their difference of meaning derives from "conversational features" which are independent of their logical forms.
- 3- Some speech act verbs which name illocutionary forces do not have a "performative use".
- 4- Many speech act verbs have several uses and can name different illocutionary forces.
- 5- Some performative verbs are systematically ambiguous between several illocutionary points.
- 6- One must distinguish between speech act verbs like "order" and "promise" that are "essentially hearer directed" and others like "assert" and "conjecture" which name illocutionary force of speech acts that are not necessarily aimed at someone in particular.
- 7- One must also distinguish between speech act verbs like "accuse" which name illocutionary acts which can only be performed in public and those like "blame" which can be performed in "thought" alone and in silent soliloquy.
- 8- Some illocutionary verbs like "bet" and "contract" name speech acts which cannot be performed by the speaker alone, but which require "a mutual joint performance" by both a speaker and a hearer.
- 9- Finally, performative verb can have non-illocutionary meanings. For example, the verb "allow", which has performative uses, can also name events which are not speech acts.

The problem with assertive speech acts is that they often, perhaps even always, represent a subjective state of mind:

The speaker who asserts a proposition as true, is not so based on his or her belief (the belief may have different degrees of "force"). It makes a difference whether I postulate something or merely hypothesize; however, the point of the speech act remains the same.

Vanderveken (1990:125) summarizes the main features of assertive speech acts. He says that the force of assertion has the assertive point, the neutral mode of achievement, the neutral propositional content condition, the preparatory condition that the speaker has reasons or evidence for the truth of the propositional content; the sincerity condition that the speaker believes the propositional content, and the neutral degree of strength. This primitive illocutionary force is named in English by the performative verb "assert", and is realized syntactically in the declarative sentential type.

Simple declarative sentences whose illocutionary force marker is identical with their sentential type, serve to make assertions.

After this brief review of the assertive speech acts and speech act verbs, we will present the main theoretical distinctions in the analysis of English speech act verbs that have been made by Searle and Vanderveken (1985), and Vanderveken (1990). Some of these distinctions derive from the fact that there is no one-to-one correspondence between actual illocutionary forces and speech act verbs. Other are relative to linguistically important aspects of utterances (of Vanderveken, 1990:167)

Searle's and Vanderveken's Basic Theoretical Distinction in the Analysis of English Speech Act Verbs:

Searle (1986:219) says that assertives point or purpose is to commit the speaker in varying degrees to something being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition. All of the members of this class are assessable on the dimension of assessment which includes "true" and "false". This class includes inter alia statements, assertions, explanations, descriptions, and characterizations. All the members of this class have the word-to-world direction of fit (of. Schiffrin, 1994:57-58).

Searle (1991) and Habermas(1991) believe that assertive speech acts are governed by the following conditions:

- (1) The essential condition on assertion is that a statement is a commitment to the truth of a proposition.
 - (2) The sincerity condition is that in making a statement the speaker expresses a belief in the truth of the proposition expressed.
 - (3) The preparatory condition is that the speaker is required to have evidence or reasons for a statement.
- Alstone (1991:68) states that the psychological state expressed for assertives is belief, the illocutionary point is to commit the speaker to something being the case. For him assertives have words-to-world direction of fit (for a similar view, see Verschueren 1998:28).

Mey (1993:163-164) claims that representative speech acts are assertions, in the classical sense of Frege. and thus carry the values "truth" or "false". This is their "point"; as to "fit", they should, of course, match the world in order to be true.

- (1) predictive assertive verbs (e.g. predict, foretell, forecast) from retrodictive ones (e.g. report, narrate, recount).
- (2) Public assertive verbs (e.g. declare, proclaim and announce) from private assertive verbs (e.g. intimate, imply, hint).
- (3) Confident assertive verbs (e.g. suggest, postulate, hypothesize).
- (4) Informative assertive verb (e.g. tell, report) from argumentative assertive verbs (e.g. claim and disagree) (for further details, see leech, 1983:224, Levinson, 1983:226, and Recanati, 1987:156).

Haverkate (1984:18) gives a much more comprehensive definition saying that assertive acts are not constrained as their propositional content is concerned; they may express "any proposition P", which is equivalent to stating speakers uttering an assertive are in a position to assign properties not only to themselves or to their hearers, but also to any other person. Assertive are radically different from commissives and directives in that their performance does not call forth any commitment or obligation on the part of the speaker or the hearer to undertake a future action for the benefit of either of them. It is precisely assertive speech acts which are characterized by the widest variety of speaker-and hearer-referring expressions, which is certainly due to assertive being favorite candidates for expressing conversational implicatures (Haverkate, 1984:18).

Crystal (1985:264) states that representatives (assertives) are terms used in the theory of speech acts to refer to a type of utterance where the speaker conveys his belief about the truth of a proposition, as in I state/hypothesize (for a similar view, see Clark, 1977:chap.3).

Searle (1979:12) says that the illocutionary point of representatives (assertive) is to represent a state of affairs; which have a word-to-word fit, i.e. the intention is to make the words fit the world; in which a belief is expressed; and in which any preposition can occur, e.g. statements.

Bach and Harnish (1979:41) classifies the assertive speech acts as constatives. They believe that constatives express the speaker's belief and his intention or desire that the hearer have or form, e.g. belief. Constatives, for Bach and Harnish (1979) include the following subcategories: assertives, predictives, retrodictives, descriptives, ascriptives, informatives, confirmatives, concessives, retractives, assentives, dissentives, disputatives, responsives, suggestives, and suppositives.

Assertive commit speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, e.g., stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming, reporting, etc. Such illocutend to be neutralas regards politeness, i.e., they belong to the collaborative category of leech's (1983) categories (The illocutionary goal is indifferent to the social goal, e.g. asserting, reporting, announcing and instructing). But there are some exceptions, for instance, boasting is generally considered to be impolite. Semantically, assertives are propositional (of. Leech, 1983:106).

Leech (1983:205) shows that assertive verbs normally occur in the construction "S verb (...) that X", where S is the subject (referring to the speaker), and where "that X" refers to a proposition, e.g., affirm, allege, assert, forecast, predict, announce, insist, etc.

Leech(1983:223) distinguishes between the following types of assertives verbs:

analysis of these verbs will be emphasized. The logical form of these verbs will also be described and the actual components of the illocutionary forces which they name will be specified. Our paper will make use of some theoretical distinction in the analysis of English speech act verbs that have been made by Searle and Vanderveken (1985), and Vanderveken (1990).

The Concept of Assertives:

Assertive speech act verbs have attracted the attention of linguists and philosophers for a long time. This category of speech act verbs has been well-defined by Searle (1979). He states that the illocutionary point of the members of the assertive class is to commit the speaker in varying degrees to something being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition (Searle, 1979:12). This class contains most of Austin's (1962) expositives and many of his verdictives. Examples are: affirm, state, describe, inform, tell, swear, assert, insist, etc.

Stalnaker (1978:315) states that assertions have the following features. First assertions have content; an act of assertion is, among other things, the expression of a proposition (something that represents the world as being a certain way. Second, they are made in a context (a situation that includes a speaker with certain beliefs and intentions, and some people with their own beliefs and intentions to whom the assertion is addressed). Third, sometimes the content of the assertion is dependent on the context in which it is made; for instance, who is speaking or when the act of assertion takes place. Fourth, acts of assertion affect, and are intended to affect, the context, in particular the attitudes of the participants in the situation; how the assertion affects the context will depend on its contents.

A Semantic Analysis of Arabic Assertive Verbs

Dr. Misbah M.D. Al-Sulaimaan
Khalid M. Isam'eel

Abstract:

The aim of the present paper is twofold. First, it attempts to give a descriptive list of Arabic assertive verbs "أفعال التأكيد" so as to show how the set of assertive illocutionary forces is lexicalized in the Arabic vocabulary. Second, it tries to show the relations of comparative strength between the Arabic assertive illocutionary forces correctly ordered so as to predict the actual illocutionary entailments between assertive speech act verbs.

Introduction:

Contrary to Saussure's attempt to establish with his distinction between "langue" and "parole", and Chomsky's distinction between "competence" and "performance", the nature of the primary speech acts that are performed in the use of a natural language is determined by the semantic structure of that language (Vanderverken,1990:166). Natural languages such as English, Russian, French, German, Syriac and Arabic have a great number of speech act verbs whose meanings can determine the possible illocutionary forces of the utterance (of. Hassan and Al-Sulaimaan. 1998:19-28).

This paper will make use of the application of the illocutionary logic of general semantics to Arabic and to proceed to the lexical analysis of about twenty eight important assertive verbs "أفعال التأكيد" which contain an illocutionary point as part of their meaning.

In the present paper, the meaning of the assertive speech act verbs will be described and direct semantic