AL-ABBAS HOLY SHRINE

AL-AMEED

Quarterly Adjudicated Journal
For
Humanist Studies and Research

P-ISSN 2227-0345
E-ISSN 2311-9152

First & second issue
Ramadhan1433/August 2012

Mobile: +964 7719487257
http://alameed.alkafeel.net
Email : alameed@alkafeel.net

Al-Abbas Holy Shrine
AL AMEED: Quarterly Adjudicated Journal for Research and Humanist Studies / Al-Abbas Holy Shrine. – Karbala : *secretary general* for Al-Abbas Holy Shrine, 2012
Volume; 24 cm.
Quarterly – first and second number (2012-)
P-ISSN 2227-0345
E-ISSN 2311-9152
Bibliography.
Text in Arabic ; Summaries in Arabic and English language
1. Humanist—periodicals. 2. Humanist—Iraq—periodicals. A. title.
AS589.A1 A8 2012.V1

AL-AMEED

ARBITRATOR QUARTERLY MAGAZINE

Deels with
HUMAN RESEARCH & STUDIES

Issued by
AL-ABBAS HOLY SHRINE

Approval of the Ministry of
Higher Education and Scientific Research
REPUBLIC OF IRAQ

Credit for
the purposes of scientific upgrade

ISSN: 2227-0345

Filing No. in Iraqi Library and Archives:1673/2012

First & second issue
Ramadhan 1433 / August 2012

General Secretariat of AL-Abbas holy shrine
Holy Karbala - Republic of Iraq
Mobile: +964 780 186 3654 / 770 047 9141
http://alameed.alkafeel.net
Email : alameed@alkafeel.net

Published Rules in the Magazine

As Abu Alfadil Al-abbas (peace be upon him) welcomes his visitors from different nationalities and doctrines of humanity, Al-ameed Magazine welcomes to publish considerable researches, according to the following conditions:

1. The magazine publishes the considerable scientific researches of various fields of humanitarian sciences, which have to be based on scientific research and global Criteria. Furthermore, the researches have to be written in either Arabic or English and not published previously.
2. The original research has to be printed on (A4) paper with one copy and CD about (10000-15000) words. The font has to be (Simplified Arabic) and pages must be numbered sequentially.
3. Providing a summary of research in Arabic and English. In addition, each research has to be independent, carried a topic and the words have to be about 300 to 500.
4. The research first page must include the topic, researcher or researchers› names, telephone number, e-mail and work location identity. Furthermore, the researcher›s name must not be mentioned in the essence of the research.
5. There must be a referring for the references with numbers and margins. The usual scientific rules have to be used in mentioning: author, publisher, publishing location, editing number, editing year and page number. This means that there must be a referring for the reference, writer›s name and page number when there is a repetition of using.
6. The research must include a list of references independent of margins. In the case, there is a foreign reference; there must be

The General Supervisor

Al-sayed Ahmed Al-safi

The General Secretary Of Al-abbas Holy Shrine

Advisory Commission

Dr. Tarek Abid Aoun Al-janaby

Dr. Riyadh Tariq AL-Ameedi

Dr. Kareem Hussein Nasih

Dr. Khadim Jebour Al-jubouri

Dr. Alaa Jebour Al-musawi

Dr. Abbas Rashid Eldehdeh

Dr. Mushtaq Abbas Maan

Editor In Chief

Al-sayed Laith Al-musawi

The president of department of intellectual and cultural affairs

Editing Manager

Dr. Sarhan Chefat (Al-qadysye University)

Editing Secretary

Radwan Abid Al-hadi Al-salami

Editing Commission

Dr. Ali Al-maslawi (Karbala University)

Dr.Adil Nathyer (Karbala University)

Dr. Shawki Al-musawi (Babylon University)

Dr. Heider AL-Musawi (Babylon University)

Design & layout

raedalasadi

a list of references independent of Arabic list. In addition, there has to be an alphabetical order of books name or researches in the magazines.

7. Tables, photos and paintings have to be printed on independent papers and there must be a referring for the references. Furthermore, there must be a referring of their existence inside the content.
8. Attaching a copy of scientific curriculum vita if the researcher publishes his research for the first time in the magazine. Also, the researcher has to mention whether his research has been producing in a conference or symposium or within its works. In addition, there must be a referring for the name of the scientific work identity location or non-scientific have funded the research or helped in preparing it.
9. The research must not be taken from a thesis or been published before, so the researcher must produce independent pledge.
10. All the published ideas in the magazine express authors› views and not necessarily reflecting the view of the issuer. Furthermore, the arrangement of research is subjected to technical obligations.
11. The research is subjected to secret evaluation to show its suitability for publishing. It is important to mention that researches are not given back to their owners whether they are accepted or not. So there is certain arrangements will be practiced:

    a- The researcher must be told of receiving his research for publishing within two weeks from the date of receipt.

    b- Owner of accepted research will be told by the editor in chief of the time of publishing.

    c- When the evaluators find that there are certain researches

need adjustments or additions, they will be given back to their owners with notes in order to prepare them for final publishing.

d- The owners of rejected researches will be told and it is not necessary given the reasons of rejection.

e- The researcher will be given a copy of the published magazine and five copy of his research and a reward about 250000 dinars.

12. The Primacy of Publishing:

    a- The researches have participated and evaluated in the conferences by their issuer.

    b- Date of receipt by the editor in chief.

    c- Date of submission of researches that are modified.

    d- Diversification of researches fields.

13. It is not permitted for the researcher to stop publishing his research while his research is given to editor›s commission; just if there are acceptable reasons. Thus, the researcher must inform the editors› commission within two weeks of receipt date.

PROMISE AND THREAT IN ENGLISH AND ARABIC RELIGIOUS TEXTS: A PRAGMATIC TUDY

Prof. RIYADH TARIQ KADHIM AL-AMEEDI
LECTURER HASHIM ALIWEY MOHAMMED
(Ph.D in Linguistics and Translation)
AL-HUSSEINI
College of Education College of Education
University of Babylon University of Wasit

CONTENTS

1- Introduction
2- The Speech Act of Promise in English and Arabic
2-1 Semantic View
2-1-1 in English
2-1-2 in Arabic
2-2 Syntactic View
2-2-1 in English
2-2-2 in Arabic
2-3 Pragmatic View
2-3-1 in English
2-3-2 in Arabic
2-4 Felicity Conditions of Promise in English and Arabic
2-5 Analysis
2-5-1 Analysis of English Texts
2-5-2 Analysis of Arabic Texts
3- The Speech Act of Threat in English and Arabic
3-1 Semantic View
3-1-1 in English
3-1-2 in Arabic
3-2 Syntactic View
3-2-1 in English
3-2-2 in Arabic
3-3 Pragmatic View
3-3-1 in English
3-3-2 in Arabic
3-4 Felicity Condition of Threat in English and Arabic
3-5 Analysis
3-5-1 Analysis of English Texts
3-5-2 Analysis of Arabic Texts
4- Promise and Threat in English and Arabic
4-1 in English

4-2 in Arabic
5- Conclusions

References
ABBREVIATIONS
A(s) Act(s)
CCs Cooperative Conditions
CmCs Comprehensive Conditions
DC(s) Definitive Conditions
EC Ethical Condition
FCs Felicity Conditions
H Hearer
IAs Illocutionary Acts
IF Illocutionary Force
MC(s) Moral Condition
P Proposition
PCs Preparatory Conditions
PCCs Propositional Content Conditions
S Speaker
SAs Speech Acts
SC Sincerity Condition
U Utterance

1- Introduction

Promise and threat are two speech acts that are found in most languages. They are regarded as two important acts in maintaining social relationships between the individuals in any society. These acts can be performed and interfered in different aspects of life such as social, pedagogical, political, and religious relationships. The use of these two acts, whether explicitly or implicitly, differs from culture to culture and from society to another.

Sometimes ambiguity may arise when applying these two speech acts to literary texts and particularly to religious ones with regard to the fact that these texts are regarded as communicative acts between the Addresser 'Allah (ﷻ)' and the common people. Thus analyzing the text according to the pragmatic meaning behind such texts can solve such ambiguity.

For the sake of presenting and discussing these two acts in English and Arabic explicitly, the present study tries to achieve the following goals: (1) investigating the linguistic forms (semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic) that can be used in expressing these two acts in both English and Arabic; (2) showing to what extent we can apply the felicity conditions of these two acts to religious texts, and (3) exploring the close relationship between these two acts as well as other branches of study. The study has been conducted on the bases of the following hypotheses: (1) the acts of promising and threatening can be applied to certain religious texts on the basis of being communicative acts; (2) the act of promise may face some points of differences between English and Arabic in some linguistic aspects; (3) the act of threat can be realized similarly in some structural aspects in both languages;(4) both acts cannot be

separated from each other since they are in complementary distribution.

To investigate the validity of these hypotheses, theoretical and practical analyses have been adopted. The theoretical part deals with investigating the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic aspects of these acts as well as their felicity conditions. The practical part deals with analyzing and assessing selected religious texts from the Glorious Quran and the Holy Bible. This analysis is based on the two modified models of felicity conditions for the two acts of promising and threatening.

Most importantly, the researchers' point behind choosing these religious texts is that such texts are regarded as acts of communication between the Sender (ﷻ) and the public. In these texts, Allah (ﷻ) communicates with us through His messengers. We believe that these religious texts are fully communicative acts since they carry messages of speech acts, illocutionary acts, which are generally descended to address all people without any exception. The perlocutionary force of such texts is to elevate and soothe the soul of people, and the contextual factors of these texts may be extended to the future events.

The framework of this study is organized in three sections. The first two sections deal with the speech acts of promising and threatening in both English and Arabic, discussing their semantic, syntactic and pragmatic views. These two acts are followed by the practical analysis of some Quranic (Arabic) and Biblical (English) texts according to the models of felicity conditions discussed at the end of each section. The third section focuses on studying the close relationship between promise and threat. The conclusions finalize this study.

It is worth mentioning that these two speech acts are so

closely related to each other that it seems somehow illogical to deal with one act leaving the other. This may justify the length of this study. However, the following list of abbreviations will be followed for economy.

2-The Speech Act of Promise in English and Arabic

2-1- Semantic View

2-1-1- in English

By semantic view, we mean the commissive verbs as acts of obligating oneself or of proposing to obligate oneself to do something specified in the propositional content. Thus, in committing oneself to doing an act , one expresses the intention to do the act and the belief that one's utterance commits one to doing it.

Commissives are firstly recognized by Austin (1962:151) who mentions that commissives are typified by promising or otherwise undertaking; they commit the Speaker to doing something but also including declaration or announcements of intention. Many linguists such as Searle (1979:14), Fraser (1975:193), Traugott and Pratt (1980:230), Allan (1986:195-6), Hamblin (1987:33), Hurford and Heasley (1996:262) agree that the whole point of a commissive is to commit the speaker to a certain course of action such as promise, pledge, threat, vow, swear and others which form a family of commissive. Partridge (1982:115) and Leech (1983:106) acknowledge that commissives are uncontestably future-oriented.Hurford and Heasley (1996:262) and Searle (1979:14) state that commissives and directives are the most important activities in maintaining the social fabric of everyday lives as they both operate a change in the world by means of creating an obligation which is cre-

ated in the S not in the Hearer as in the case of directives.

2-1-2- in Arabic

commissive verbs in Arabic are called "أفعال الوعود أو (العهود)" (acts of covenants). These verbs in Arabic include: "يعد" (promise),«يتعهد" (undertake), "يهدد" (threaten), "يقسم"(swear), "يلتزم"(abide), "يعاهد"(covenant), "ينذر"(vow), "يخطب"(engage), and "يتوعد"(threaten). Similar to English as they both have an illocutionary point as part of their meaning, these verbs are used in Arabic to commit the S to doing something to some future act. Thus they may carry the illocutionary force marker of the utterance. It is important to mention that in the Glorious Quran Allah (ﷻ) stresses the obligatory aspects of these acts (for further details, see Hasan and Al Sulaiman,1998: 19-28):

1- يا أيها الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَوْفُوا بِالْعُقُودِ (الما ئده:1)

Here, this Quranic verse orders Muslims to perform their obligations. The Arabic word 'عقود'(undertakings) here includes different acts of commitments such as contracts, treaties, covenants, engagements, leagues, vows, agreements and subscription (28- 523: 1957 ،ابن العربي).

The Arabic commissive verbs as well as other performative verbs can appear in two tenses, i.e., perfect and imperfect, without affecting the futurity aspect of the utterance. Hence we can use the perfect tense to indicate future time according to the contextual rules (50-52 :1966 حسن):

2- وإذ يَعِدُكُمْ اللَّهُ إِحْدَى الطَّائِفَتَيْنِ ... (الأنفال:7) (imperfect tense)

3- وَعَدَكُمْ اللَّهُ مَغَانِمَ كَثِيرَةً تَأْخُذُونهَا (الفتح:20) (perfect tense)

Arab rhetoricians and linguists emphasize the fact that the

use of the perfect tense to indicate futurity can be attributed to the obligatory occurrence of events (أبو موسى، 1976: 66).

The Glorious Quran is the highly stylistic religious text that involves highly selective set of commissives which can be analyzed in terms of success and satisfaction, i.e., Felicity Conditions for illocutionary acts.

2-2- Syntactic View

2-2-1- in English

Some philosophers and linguists have given futurity verbs a considerable attention. The verb promise is one of these verbs which indicate futurity. Traugott (2002:2) denotes that promise is a deverbal noun in Latin, which is borrowed from French. Palmer (1963: 276-283) proposes four patterns for promise:

a- [Sub] + V + Oi + Od

4- I promise you a present.

b- [Sub] + V + Od + prep + prep. Object.

5- I promise a book for you success.

c- [Sub.] + V + 'to' + infinitive

6- I promise not to visit you.

d- [Sub.] + V + Od + that clause

7- I promise you that the work will be finished before evening. Similarly, Hornby (1968:206) says that the verb 'promise' can be used with (not) to-infinitive, with two objects, and with that-clause. Palmer (1976:189) suggests two constructions:

a- NP1 + V + [(NP1) + V]

8- I promise to come tomorrow.

b- NP1 + V + NP2 [NP1 + V]

9- I promise John to meet Mary. (I promise John that I should meet Mary). Likewise, Leech (1983: 206) believes that commissive verbs occur in one of two constructions:

a- Sub. + V + (you) that + X. (where X is non-indicative clause).

b- Sub. + V + (you) to + Y. (where Y is an infinitive construction).

Grammarians such as Jespersen (1954:270); Eckersley (1961:84); Bright (1964:79), Wood (1965:171); Ward (1972:21-22); Eckersley and Eckersley (1980:164-5); Swan (1987:110), and Eastwood and Mackin (1989:60) agree that there is a close relationship between the future modals 'shall' and 'will' and the act of promising in the sense that these verbs can be used to express a promise in certain conditions. They mention that a promise in the first person is expressed by 'will' :

10- I (we) will meet you at ten o'clock.

However, the same sentence with 'shall' is certainly no less of a promise. Nor is it if it is prefixed by certain sentence adverbs such as 'probably' and 'possibly':

11- Possibly I'll meet you at ten o'clock.

The second and the third persons are expressed with 'shall' to denote a promise on the part of the S (Ward, 1972:21):

12- You shall have the money as soon as I get it.

13- My son shall bring you the money.

Jespersen (1954:270-1)thinks that with promises in the second person there is no obligation on the part of the subject

'you', but on the part of the S himself.

2-2-2- in Arabic

Generally speaking, the grammatical system of Arabic verb is based on the root–and-pattern structure. The majority of Arabic words have a stem and pattern. The stem consists of two parts fitted together: the root and the pattern. The root is generally of three consonants and provides the basic lexical meaning of the word. The pattern consists of vowels interlocked with the root consonants and gives the more specific grammatical meaning of the words (Beeston, 1970:71-86).

The Arabic verb 'وعد' (promise) is three-radical verb (root) and represents the original form. The full extent of this verb becomes apparent from a list of other words sharing either the root or the pattern:

1- وعد (he promised) past verb +root.
2- يعد (he promises) present verb.
3- أعد (I promise) present verb.
4- وعد (a promise) verbal noun or 'مصدر'.
5- أوعد (he promised \ threatened) past verb.
6- موعد (time and place of an appointment).
7- واعد (agreement among each other)
8- ميعاد (time and place of an appointment)

Arabic verbs have two tenses: perfect, formed by the addition of suffixes; and imperfect, formed by the addition of prefixes. In addition, there are imperative forms, active participle, passive participle, and verbal noun or 'مصدر'. The perfect generally refers to the past time, the imperfect to the present or future. Some Arab grammarians believe that the appropriate tense of the Arabic verbs is the perfect since it can be used

in different aspects, i.e., past, present and future (ibid, 1970: 78-9).

In this respect 'promise' can be expressed explicitly by the perfect verb "وعد" (promise) as well as the imperfect verbs "أعد ، يعد" . As for transitivity, the perfect verb "وعد", and its derivatives, is a transitive one which needs one or two objects. The most common word order in Arabic clauses of 'promise' is ' verb+subject+object ' which produces a verbal sentence as in (14). Sometimes there is another construction of the form 'subject+verb+object' as in (15) (Cowan, 1958:57; Wright, 1974:46-7):

14- وَكُلًّا وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الْحُسْنَى (النساء:95)

15- وَاللَّهُ يَعِدُكُمْ مَغْفِرَةً مِنْهُ وَفَضْلا (البقرة:268)

As far as futurity is concerned, Arabic has two particles that indicate futurity called «particles of futurity». They usually make the imperfect verb, which is common to present and future, peculiar to the future. These particles are / -س / and / سوف /. The former is normally prefixed to an imperfect verb, whereas the latter is an independent word usually preceding an imperfect verb (Cowan, 1958:88; Beeston, 1970:79). These particles may be called particles of amplification or widening since they convert the verb from narrow time, i.e., present, to the wide one (future). These two particles are also used to indicate a promise according to certain contexts (see3-2-2):

16- وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ سَنُدْخِلُهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنهَارُ (النساء:57)

17- وَمَنْ يُقَاتِلْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ فَيُقْتَلْ أَوْ يَغْلِبْ فَسَوْفَ نُؤْتِيهِ أَجْرًا عَظِيما (النساء:74)

2-3- Pragmatic View

3-3-1- in English

When someone says, for example, 'I promise to meet you tomorrow' he is not stating a fact or expressing his feeling but he is trying to perform an action. Hayakawa (1978:91) terms such use of language as directive. In the speech act of promising, as one of the directive utterances that can say something about future, the speaker is morally obliged himself to be as certain as possible.

Austin (1962:10) believes that "promising is not merely a matter of uttering words It is an inward and spiritual act". When uttering a promise, a promisor should have a certain intention as well as a moral obligation to keep his ward in order to get a sincere promise. If such an intention and obligation are absent, the S will perform a false promise. (ibid:11).

Austin (ibid:69) distinguishes between explicit and implicit performative. The former contains a performative expression that makes explicit what kind of act is performed whereas the latter contains no performative expression in the utterance which names the illocutionary force of that utterance.

18- I promise to visit you tomorrow. (explicit)

19- I'll visit you tomorrow. (implicit)

Leech (1983:107) suggests using the tact maxim as one kind of politeness, as 'cost' and 'benefit' to reach the purported degree of politeness. It is the promisor who deliberately undertakes a course of action in the future for the only benefit of the promisee, with the cost of the act at the promisor's expense and totally incumbent on him. By the same token, Searle (1969:58) believes that a promise is "a pledge to do

something for you, not to you".

Pragmaticians such as Fraser (1975: 187-210), Partridge (1982:120-126), Matreyck (1983:61) and Allan (1986: 172-173) agree that the act of promising can be expressed by the progressive aspect as in (20); it can be emphasized (21); it can be hedged by the modal auxiliaries (22); and it can be nominalized (23).

20- I am hereby promising you to stop telling lies.

21- I do promise to come early.

22- I will promise you that we will not be late.

23- I'll make you a promise, I'll never lie again.

Ise (1998:17) states that whenever the S expresses his intention by an intentional sign in an appropriate context, that expression will constitute a promise. Promises are inseparable from the context of common life. Every new promise will impose a new obligation of morality on the person who promises (ibid: 7).

In certain cases, the speech act of promising may be accompanied by another speech act.

24- It won't happen again, I promise.(apologizing of promising) Trosborg (1995: 383).

25- By Heaven, I'll meet you tomorrow. (vowing of promising) Lyons (1981: 186).

Some linguists like Lyons (1981:187), Trosborg (1995:19) and Egner (2002:3) believe that a promise is culture-specific in the sense that it depends on the legal, religious, or ethical conventions. Egner (2002:4) asserts that promising is universally understood as a commitment to do something. He states

that in Western culture the S is bound by a promise. He believes that in order to save one's face when making a promise, he should have the ability to do what he promises. Thus, giving a promise without having the ability to fulfill it constitutes a serious risk to the S's face. In some other cultures, the S will produce a non-binding promise or what he calls 'a polite promise' which is mainly used to save one's face or to politely close a conversational exchange.

In most cases, the act of promising can be expressed by the conditional construction. In this respect, Beller (2002:113) points out that in conditional speech acts the speaker wants an addressee to show a certain goal behaviour (i.e., to perform a certain action or to refrain from performing an action) with a positive value for himself:

26- If you lend me your bike, then I will help you with your homework.

Believing that the addressee needs help with his homework, the S here announces that he will react positively, i.e., make a promise, if the addressee shows a desired behaviour and negatively, i.e., make a threat, otherwise (ibid).

2-3-2- in Arabic

The act of promising in Arabic can be expressed explicitly by the lexical verb "وعد"(promise) and its derivatives.This verb has the characteristic of being hearer-oriented and performed in the benefit to the promisee. It commits and puts the promisor under a moral obligation to do such an act. Arab rhetoricians mention that promise should be associated with a sincere intention of the speaker otherwise it will be meaningless, a body without a soul. (الطوسي، 1979: 180) says that promise may be

accompanied by three acts: praising, rewarding, and thanking. Thus by declaring speaker>s promise, the H may expect something pleasant to him such as a reward, a praise or a thank. Hence we can say that promise is commonly looked upon as a safeguard for the promisee against some state of affairs he would regard as evil, harmful, damaging, causing a kind of suffering, pain, or at least inconvenient to him (ibid: 180-5).

The Arabic performative verb " وعد " (promise) can be expressed in both tenses, perfect and imperfect:

27- أنا أعدك أني سوف أسافر غدا

(I promise you that I'll travel tomorrow.)

28- وعدتك باني سوف أسافر غدا

(I promised you that I'd travel tomorrow.)

The Arabic performative verb 'وَعَدَ' can be nominalized to indicate a specific meaning according to the context of the utterance:

29- وَاقْتَرَبَ الْوَعْدُ الْحَقّ (الأنبياء:97)

On the other hand, the act of promising can be expressed implicitly by using the particles of futurity / س- / and / سوف / which are similar to the English modals will and shall. We can notice that the non-performative U using particles of futurity can be converted into a performative one if we succeed in recognizing the IF of the U.Thus sentence (17) may be intended to perform the IF of promising and its deep structure is " Allah (ﷻ) promises whoever fights for the cause of Him a richly reward".

Promise can also be expressed implicitly by using some

perfect verbs other than the verb "وعد".

This happens when the U refers to future. Here, such verbs are syntactically perfect but semantically future:
(حسن ، 1966: 51)

30- إِنَّا أَعْطَيْنَاكَ الْكَوْثَرَ (الكوثر:1)

This verse refers to the fact that Allah (ﷻ) promises His Prophet Mohammed (r) the heavenly fountain of unbounded grace and knowledge in the Hereafter (الخوئي ، 1988: 112). Here the verb 'أعطى'(give) is used in perfect aspect to indicate the futurity occurrence of such an act rather than the perfect time. Such a device of using the perfect tense to indicate futurity is used in the Glorious Quran to indicate the inevitable occurrence of such events in the future (عرفة ، 1984: 204)

Similarly, some imperfect verbs are sometimes used to indicate future events. Such future events may denote an implicit act of promising according to the contextual considerations:

31- وَنُرِيدُ أَنْ نَمُنَّ عَلَى الَّذِينَ اسْتُضْعِفُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَنَجْعَلَهُمْ أَئِمَّةً وَنَجْعَلَهُمْ الْوَارِثِينَ (القصص:50)

In this Quranic verse, Allah (ﷻ) promises the oppressed that He will make them the leaders of the land. Such a promise is expressed by some imperfect verbs which indicate some future events such as 'نريد', 'نمن', and 'نجعل'.

Promise in Arabic can also be realized implicitly by the conditional utterances. Conditional sentences contain two propositions of which one conditions the validity of the other: 'جملة فعل الشرط'(the conditioning proposition or the subordinate clause) and 'جملة جواب الشرط'(the conditioned proposition or the main clause). If the subordinate clause is validated, the main

clause will be so also; if it is not, the main clause is invalidated. Whether validated or invalidated, a conditional proposition cannot truly exist in the past. Thus a conditional sentence can only be cited in the future (Beeston, 1970:104).

Conditional sentences can be introduced by different particles such as 'إن ' (if) as in (32),' إذا ' (if) (33), ' من ' (who)(34), 'ما ' (what)," مهما" (whatever) and some relative pronouns. They can also be expressed by an imperative verb followed, without a coordinator, by a prefix set verb in the short form as in (35) (حسن ، 1966 : 320-4):

32- إِنْ تُقْرِضُوا اللَّهَ قَرْضًا حَسَنًا يُضَاعِفْهُ لَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ... (التغابن:17)

33- إذا زرتني سوف أكرمك (If you visit me, I'll reward you.)

34- من يساعدني سوف أساعده (Whoever helps me, I'll help him.)

35- تعال معي تجد ما يسرك (Come with me and you'll see what pleases you.)

We can notice that in (32) the proposition 'يضاعفه لكم ويغفر لكم' is the main clause (promise to reward) which will not be validated or achieved unless the subordinate clause 'إن تقرضوا الله قرضا حسنا' turns out eventually to be valid. Here the reward (promise) should be under the addresser's control and shall not occur for any other reason.

It is worth mentioning that the binding promise in Arabic may be accompanied by some lexical expressions such as the particles of vow (باللهِ ، واللهِ، تاللهِ، أقسم) as in (36) and some particles of emphasis such as 'لَ، إنّ، نّ، نْ' as in (37):

36- وَأَقْسَمُوا بِاللَّهِ جَهْدَ أَيْمَانِهِمْ لَئِنْ جَاءَتْهُمْ آيَةٌ لَيُؤْمِنُنَّ بِهَا (الأنعام: 109)

37- وَإِنْ قُوتِلْتُمْ لَنَنْصُرَنَّكُمْ (الحشر:11)

But sometimes Arab people tend to avoid the obligatory

aspect of the promise by using the formula 'إن شاءَ الله'(If Allah will). Such a use of this formula can be attributed to the belief that in Arabic culture and in everyday conversation the S may utter his promise followed by this formula so as to avoid committing a binding promise or to end a boring conversation.

2-4- Felicity Conditions of Promise in English and Arabic

The felicity conditions of an illocutionary act are those "conditions that must be fulfilled in the situation in which the act is carried out if the act is to be said to be carried out properly, or felicitously" (Hurford and Heasley, 1996: 251). So far, we have outlined a way of looking at the speech act of promising. In this section we will offer an analytic statement of the necessary and sufficient conditions for this speech act. Searle (1969:57-61 and 1972:142-52) gives a number of conditions for the performance of the act of promising. He believes that such conditions should be met if the act is to be felicitous. We believe that Searle's conditions can be applied to both English and Arabic with some other modifications.

In this respect we will summarize these conditions as they appear in Searle's analysis of promising and then comment on each one. Searle (1969:57) says "Given that a speaker S utters a sentence T in the presence of a hearer H, then, in the literal utterance of T, S sincerely and non-defectively promises that P to H if and only if the following conditions 1-9 obtain":

1-Normal input and output conditions:

Communication is supposed to be literal and serious and to take place between a S and a H who are physically and physiologically able to communicate. Here it is necessary to mention two important points. The first is that promising can

be achieved verbally and non-verbally (gestures). The second point is that the participants should not only be able to use language linguistically but also appropriately according to the contextual factors. Since this condition requires a sort of communication between S and H, the researcher suggest to term condition (1) as the "cooperative condition".

2-and 3- Propositional content conditions:

2-The utterance act should express a proposition which must have a content and represents a fact that remains as the kernel of the U.

3-The proposition predicates a future action of the speaker. Such a predication is merely a consequence of the meaning of the word 'promise'. Hence at the moment of the U, the content of the promise has to do with a future possible action of the S.

4-and 5- The preparatory conditions:

4-The S assumes that the H wants him to perform this action; and the H actually does want him to perform it. Here, what is being promised must be to the advantage of the promisee. It seems that promising, as opposed to threatening, does seem to be a communicative action that requires the speaker's ethical consideration of the receiver.

5- It is not obvious to both S and H that the S will perform the action anyway. Such a condition is due to a much more general tendency in human behaviour, namely that one's behaviour should have purpose and point and that one should not spend more energy than necessary on anything.

6-The sincerity condition:

The S intends to perform the act of promising. This implies

that sincere promisor, as opposed to the insincere one, must have an intention and a certain attitude of mind or motive that are supposed to be expressed by the communicative act in question. Such a condition is really a general ethical requirement on communication to the effect that it should not be deceptive.

7-The essential condition:

The S intends that his utterance should place him under an obligation to perform the action in question. This condition is derived directly from the meaning of the word promise and the fact that the S is making a claim about himself. Thus we can say that promise and obligation are not separate entities as one completes the other. Hence without the notion of obligation one would only have a declaration of intention which need not be a promise. We believe that to place oneself under obligation is a social phenomenon that is created by convention. Hayakawa (1978:100) believes that such an obligation of a promise should be more specific and concrete in order not to break such a promise. Thus we can say that promising tends to establish a moral obligation which cannot be irrevocable. Accordingly, the researchers prefer to call this a condition as moral since it commits the S to a "moral" obligation (for further details, see Boguskawsk, 1983a: 607-27; 1983b: 633-35;and Smith, 1990:29-61).

8-The non-natural meaning condition:

The S intends the H to realize that the S is placed under an obligation to perform the action in question by his U and that the H's realization of this should be by virtue of his knowledge of the meaning of the speaker's U. Mey (1993:121) relates this condition to the fact that the circumstances of uttering a promise must be conventionally (linguistically, culturally, and

socially) right. Since this condition requires the same notion of obligation, we can say that conditions (7) and (8) are related to each other.

9-The wrap-up condition:

The speaker's utterance is a correct and sincere promise if conditions 1-8 obtain. Condition (9) is correct but this is not due to any specific conventions for promising. Rather, it is due to the lexical meaning of 'promise' in conjunction with certain general features of action and communication. Such a condition will be labeled as definitive since it depends on the achieving of all the above conditions.

We think that Searl's analysis could be seen as an elegant characterization of how certain general conditions on action and communication interact with certain speech act verbs. Such an analysis is valuable since it can be generalized to analyze any Speech Acts (SAs). However, there are some other points that can be added to this analysis, some of which are related to social conventions. These social conventions may involve the dimension of 'power', on which the addressee is subordinate, equal, or superior to the S, and the dimension of 'solidarity', which distinguishes relatively intimate relations from more distant ones.

The other point should focus on the study of social and religious consequences of acts of communication. For example, what rewards are promised to those who keep their promises, and what punishments are threatened to those who do not.

In accordance with the above conditions we will set the following modified model of Felicity Conditions (FCs) for the purpose of our analysis in both languages. This model is based on all the other models particularly Searle's as well as the re-

searchers' propositions and adjustments. These conditions contain the following:

1-The Cooperative Conditions (CCs):

a. S and H have the ability to use and understand the verbal U.

b. The act must distinguish a particular addressee or audience.

2- The Propositional Content Conditions (PCCs):

a. The Proposition (P) expressed must predicate a future Acts (A) of the S.

b. The A must predicate a particular consequence in a future time.

3- The Preparatory Conditions (PCs):

a. a-The S must have a social position or an authority to commit himself to do an A.

b. b-The A expressed should be under the S's control.

c. c-The A should be in the interest of the H.

d. d-The S will not do the A in the normal course of events.

4-The Sincerity Condition (SC):

The S must declare his intention to do the A voluntarily, appropriately and publicly.

5-The Moral Conditions (MCs):

a. The S is committed by his promise to certain belief or intention.

b. The promisor puts himself under a moral obligation to

do an A.

c. The A promised must be morally good.

6-The Definitive Conditions (DCs):

a. The structure of the U must be used to make a promise.

b. The S's utterance is a sincere promise if conditions 1-6 obtain.

2-5- Analysis

2-5-1- Analysis of English Texts:

1- "Those who have been faithful will receive eternal life" (John, 5:29)

This Biblical verse mentions that the Prophet Jesus (u) tells his disciples that Allah (ﷻ) promises implicitly and conditionally whoever believes in Him and His Prophet the eternal life in the Hereafter. The S 'Jesus' is speaking on behalf of an authorized agent 'Allah (ﷻ)'. Since Allah (ﷻ) is a covenant-keeping One, faithful in all His promises, thus His Prophet is called to be a dependable person, absolutely trustworthy, faithful in keeping his promise both to Allah (ﷻ)and to his fellow beings (Hardinge and Holbrook, 1989:77). The A of promising is expressed by the future particle 'will'. The deep structure of this verse will be: Allah (ﷻ) promises those who have been faithful the eternal life. The following can be said about each of the FCs for this verse:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since the S 'Jesus' (عليه السلام) and the particular audience 'the disciples' have the ability to use and understand the language.

2- The PCCs are also satisfying, since the P 'will receive

eternal life' predicates a future A with a positive value to the disciples in the Doomsday.

3- The PCs seem also persuasive, since an authorized agent 'Allah(ﷻ)' utters promise and the A is under His control. In addition, the A is pleasing to the disciples but would not happen in the normal course of events.
4- The SC is satisfying, since the declaration of Allah's intention is always declared voluntarily, appropriately, and publicly.
5- The MCs are convincing, since the promise of Allah(ﷻ) will never be broken and the A promised is morally good for the disciples.
6- The DCs are also convincing, since the sentence uttered is conventionally used to make an A of promising in English, but the sincerity of promise is conditioned by the availability of the given condition 'if they are faithful'.

2- "Verily I say unto you, There is no man that have left house, or wife, or brethren, or… for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this time, and in the world to come eternal life. (Luke, 18:29-30).

Jesus (ﷺ) is addressing his disciples when they are walking to the Jerusalem. He implicitly promises them with an oath 'verily' that Allah (ﷻ)will reward those who sacrifice their physical possessions for His sake a double grant in this life and eternal life in Paradise. Jesus(ﷺ) urges his followers to follow his commandments since he is the messenger of the Lord(Y). The S 'Jesus(ﷺ)' is speaking on behalf of an authorized agent "Allah(ﷻ)"(Hardinge and Holbrook, 1989:72). In this U promise is expressed implicitly by the modal verb 'shall' and emphasized by an oath 'verily'. The deep structure

of this U may have a conditional meaning: 'Allah (ﷻ)promises you (the believers) manifold more in this time…if you'll give up your physical possessions for the sake of Him'. The FCs of this U are the following:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since the S 'Jesus(عليه السلام)' and the disciples have the ability to use and understand the language.
2- The PCCs are also convincing, since the P 'will give you manifold more…' predicates a future A with a conditional consequence to the disciples in the earthly and eternal life.
3- The PCs are sufficient, since an authorized agent 'Allah(ﷻ)' utters the implicit promise and the A is under Allah's control. The A is also pleasing to the disciples but would not happen automatically in the normal course of time.
4- The SC is satisfying, since Allah's promise is always true and sincere.
5- The MCs seem also satisfying, since Allah's promise will never be broken and the A promised is morally good.
6- The DCs are convincing, since all the above conditions are met and the structure of the U is conventionally used to denote an implicit conditional promise.

3- "When thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom." (Samuel, II, 7:12).

In this verse, Allah (ﷻ) implicitly promises His Prophet David (عليه السلام)that He will establish a kingdom forever to his seed. Christians believe that Jesus is the seed of David that he will

sit on his kingdom. They believe that Jesus(عليه السلام) will return back to the earth to establish such a kingdom. (Scott, 2002:4). According to the Islamic traditions, Jesus(عليه السلام) will descend from the heaven and espouse the cause of the Imam Al-Mahdi (عليه السلام) but he will not be following the Christian Law. The A of promising is expressed by the future modal 'will'. The FCs of this speech are the following:

1- The CCs are persuasive, since the promisor 'Allah (جل جلاله)' and His addressee 'David (عليه السلام)' have the ability to use and understand the U.
2- The PCCs are also persuasive, since the P 'will set up a kingdom' predicates a future A with a positive value to David in the future.
3- The PCs are satisfying, since the promise is made by an authorized agent 'Allah (جل جلاله)' and the A is under the Promisor's control. David (عليه السلام) prefers the A to be done but would not happen in the normal course of time.
4- The SC is convincing, since Allah (جل جلاله) declares His intention voluntarily.
5- The MCs are also convincing, since Allah's promise is always sincere and the thing promised is morally good.
6- The DCs seem also satisfying, since the structure of the U is conventionally made to establish a promise, and all the above conditions are met in this U.

4-" For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you" (Math.,6:14).

In this U the S (Jesus(عليه السلام)) is addressing his disciples by giving them some commandments. He implicitly and conditionally promises them that Allah (جل جلاله)will forgive their sins in the Doomsday if they forgive the sins of people in this life. In this

conditional promise Jesus(عليه السلام) wants the disciples to show a certain goal-behaviour (forgive the sins of people) with a positive value for themselves. The A of promising is expressed by the conditional construction which indicates future. Thus if the addressees fulfill the S's goal, then subsequently the S may reward the addresses. Jesus is speaking on behalf of an authorized agent (Allah(جل جلاله)). The FCs of this text are:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since Jesus and the disciples have the ability to use and understand the U.
2- The PCCs are convincing, since the proposition 'Allah(جل جلاله) will forgive you' predicates a future A with a positive value to the addressees in the Doomsday.
3- The PCs are also persuasive, since the promise is made by an authorized agent and the promise is under the promisor's control. The action is pleasing to the promisees but would not happen automatically in the normal course of time.
4- The SC is satisfying, since Allah's promise is always true.
5- The MCs seem also satisfying, since Allah's promise will never be broken and the thing promised is morally good.
6- The DCs are convincing, since the structure of the U 'conditional construction' permits establishing a SA of promising. The promise is conditioned by the fulfilment of the speaker's goal.

5- "The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein forever." (Psalms, 37:29).

In this verse the Prophet David (عليه السلام) is preaching his folk. He implicitly promises them, on behalf of Allah(جل جلاله), that the righteous will inherit the power and authority of the land. Thus

he urges them to be faithful and pious (Scott, 2002:7). The A of promising is expressed implicitly by the particle of simple future 'shall'. The non- performative sentence can be converted into a performative one by adding the performative verb 'promise'. Thus the deep structure of this U could be 'Allah(ﷻ) promises the righteous to inherit the land forever'. The FCs of this text are the following:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since the S 'David (عليه السلام)' and the Hs 'the folk' have the ability to use and understand the U.
2- The PCCs are satisfying, since the proposition 'shall inherit the land' predicates a future A with a positive reward for the addressees in future.
3- The PCs are also satisfying, since the implicit promise is expressed on behalf of an authorized agent 'Allah (ﷻ)'and the promise in under His control. The folk prefer the A to be done but would not happen in the normal course of events.
4- The SC is satisfying, since Allah's promise is intentionally true being uttered by the Most Holy Prophet 'David (عليه السلام)'.
5- The MCs are satisfying, since Allah's promise will never be broken, and the A promised is morally good.
6- The DCs seem also satisfying, since all the above conditions are met and the structure of the U is indicated to express a sincere promise.

6- "But when Herod's birthday come, the daughter of Herodias danced in the midst, and pleased Herod; whereupon he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she should ask." (Math.,14-7).

In this Biblical verse the daughter of Herodias tempts the

King Herod by her dance. As a result of her temptation, the King Herod explicitly promises to give her whatever she asks. Thus she asks him to kill the Prophet 'John' (عليه السلام) for the sake of her mother. Hence the King orders to kill the Prophet John. We can notice that such an U produces an A of promising at the time of uttering only since the U is expressed in the past tense. Such a violation to the formula of the performative U may be attributed to the fact that the IA of the written discourse is appropriate even though its appropriate conditions may not be fulfilled. The FCs of this U are the following:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since the King and Herodias' daughter have the ability to use and understand the U.
2- The PCCs are convincing, since the proposition 'to give her whatever she asks' predicates a future A with a positive value to the promisee.
3- The PCs seem also satisfying, since an authorized agent 'the King' makes the promise and the A is under his control. Herodias' daughter prefers the A to be done but would not happen in the normal course of events.

4-The SC is satisfying, since the King emphasizes his intention by an oath to do the A , i.e.,kill the Prophet John (عليه السلام).

5-The MCs are also persusive, since the King Herod is obliged by his promise and oath to do the A.

6-The DCs seem also satisfying, since the structure of the U at the time of uttering permits establishing a SA of promising and all the above conditions are met and satisfying. The genuinity of the promise is conditioned by the time of uttering the U only.

7- "And as for Ishmael or I have heard thee: behold, I

have blessed him and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation." (Genesis, 17:20).

In this U, Allah (ﷻ) is addressing His Prophet Ibraham (عليه السلام). He inspires him His covenant that He will bless his son 'Ishmael (عليه السلام)'. He implicitly promises him that the seed of his son will establish a great nation 'Mohammed's Community' in the future. The act of promising is expressed implicitly by the particle of future 'will'. The FCs of this U are:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since the addresser 'Allah ﷻ' and the addressee 'Ibraham(عليه السلام)' have the ability to use and understand the U.
2- The PCCs are also convincing, since the Ps 'will make him fruitful', 'will multiply him exceedingly' and 'will make him a great nation', predicate a future A with a positive value to Ibraham in the future.
3- The PCs are convincing, since an authorized agent 'Allah ﷻ' declares the implicit promise and the A is under His control. The promise is pleasing to Ibraham (عليه السلام) but would not happen in the normal course of events.
4- The SC is satisfying, since Allah's promise is always true.
5- The MCs seem also satisfying, since each P imposes a moral obligation to be done by the Lord Y, and the things promised are morally good.
6- The DCs are satisfying, since the structure of the U permits making a promise and all the above conditions are met and satisfing.

2-5-2- Analysis of Arabic Texts:

1- وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنْكُمْ وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُم فِي الْأَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِينَ مِنْ قبلهمْ وَلَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِينَهُمْ الَّذِي ارْتَضَى لَهُمْ وَلَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُم مِنْ بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِم أمنا...(النور:55)

In this Quranic verse, Allah Yexplicitly promises the believers that a day is to come when truth will prevail and the righteous will come to power. Here, three things are promised by the Lord Yto those believers who have faith and obey Allah's law: (1) that the believers will inherit power and authority in the land; (2) that the religion of Right, which Allah (ﷻ) has chosen for them, will be openly established, and will suppress all wrong and oppression; (3) that the righteous will live in peace and security. Such a promise will happen at the time of the appearance of the Awaited Savior (عليه السلام) (الطباطبائي ، 1974: 172). The A of promising is expressed by the performative perfect verb 'وَعَدَ'. In this U promise is accompanied and emphasized by some particles of emphasis such as '-ل' and '-ن' as in 'ليستخلفنهم', 'ليمكنن', and 'ليبدلنهم'. The FCs of this text are:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since the addresser 'Allah (ﷻ)' and the addressees 'the believers' have the ability to use and understand the language.
2- The PCCs are also satisfying, since the three Ps 'لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُم فِي الْأَرْضِ', 'ليمكنن لهم دينهم', and 'ليبدلنهم من بعد خوفهم أمنا' predicate a future A with a positive value to the believers.
3- The PCs seem also convincing, since the promise is made by an authorized agent 'Allah (ﷻ)' and the A is under the Promisor's control. The action is pleasing to the believers but would not happen in the normal course of events.
4- The SC is satisfying, since Allah's promise is

declared appropriately, explicitly and publicly with a genuine intention.

5- The MCs are persuasive, since Allah's promise will never be broken and the thing promised is morally good.

6- The DCs are satisfying, since the structure of the U in the Arabic language permits making a SA of promising and all the above conditions are met in this text.

2- الشَّيْطَانُ يَعِدُكُمْ الْفَقْرَ وَيَأْمُرُكُمْ بِالْفَحْشَاءِ وَاللَّهُ يَعِدُكُمْ مَغْفِرَةً مِنْهُ وَفَضْلًا..

(البقرة : 268)

We can notice that there are two acts of promising in this Quranic verse. The first one ' الشيطان يعدكم الفقر' is a defective and infelicitous promise since Satan's promise threatens Muslims with poverty and the thing promised is morally bad. Moreover, Satan tends to support any tendency to selfishness and greed to people. Thus many of the FCs are not met in this promise (see 4-2). The second promise 'أالله يعدكم مغفرة...' is a sincere one since Allah (ﷻ)urges Muslims to give the poor from the best parts of their earnings and promises them His forgiveness and bounties. Hence Allah(ﷻ) promises the believers the most attractive thing which is morally good. The promise, here, is expressed explicitly by the imperfect performative verb 'يعدكم '(شبر،1965 : 81). The FCs of the second promise will be the following:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since the addresser 'Allah(ﷻ)' and the addressees 'the believers' have the ability to use and understand the language.

2- The PCCs are convincing, since the content of the U

predicates a future A of the S with a positive value to the believers in the Doomsday.

3- The PCs seem satisfying, since the promise is uttered by an authorized agent 'Allah (ﷻ)' and the A is under the promisor's control. The believers prefer the A to be done but would not occur in the normal course of time.
4- The SC is satisfying, since Allah's promise is certainly true.
5- The MCs are persuasive, since the believers believe that Allah (ﷻ) will never break His promise and the thing promised is morally good and attractive to the believers' attention.
6- The DCs seem also convincing, since the structure of the U permits establishing a genuine promise, and all the above conditions are met.

3- فَأَمَّا مَنْ أُوتِيَ كِتَابَهُ بِيَمِينِهِ ❋ فَسَوْفَ يُحَاسَبُ حِسَابًا يَسِيرًا (الانشقاق:8-7)

In this Quranic verse, Allah (ﷻ) implicitly promises those who spent their lives in goodness and truth to pass an easy account and will receive more than their merits deserve in the eternal life. The A of promising is expressed by two expressions: the conditional construction 'أما' (if) and 'من' (who); and the particle of futurity 'سوف' (will). This conditional text is expressed by the passive voice, which has the purpose of leaving the agency unspecified.

We can notice that the proposition of this conditional promise فسوف يحاسب حسابا يسيرا is a conditional one (promise to reward) which will not be validated unless 'أوتي كتابه بيمينه' turns out to be valid. The tense of this U is indicated by the simple future 'سوف' (shall).

The FCs of this text are the following:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since the promisor 'Allah(ﷻ)' and the promisee 'unspecified Man' have the ability to use and understand the U.

2- The PCCs are convicing, since the proposition 'فسوف يحاسب حسابا يسيرا' predicates a future A but with a conditioned positive consequence in the Hereafter.

3- The PCs are satisfying, since the promise is uttered by an authorized agent 'the Almighty(ﷻ)' and the A is under Allah's control. The promise is pleasing to the promisee (Man) but would not happen in the normal course of events.

4- The SC is satisfying, since Allah's promise is sincere.

5- The MCs are persuasive, since Allah's promise will never be violated and the A promised is morally good for the addressee.

6- The DCs seem also convincing, since the structure of the U 'conditional construction and particle of futurity' permits establishing a promise, and all the above conditions are met. The sincerity of this text is conditioned by the achievement of the conditional proposition 'من أوتي كتابه بيمينه'.

4- "وَلَقَدْ كَتَبْنَا فِي الزَّبُورِ مِنْ بَعْدِ الذِّكْرِ أَنَّ الْأَرْضَ يَرِثُهَا عِبَادِيَ الصَّالِحُونَ" (الأنبياء:105)

In this Quranic verse, Allah (ﷻ) implicitly promises that the righteous will inherit the earth and take the world administration in their hands by the appearance of the Imam Al-Mahdi (عليه السلام) (شبر ، 1965 :322). Such a promise is declared in the early divine books such as 'Zabur' (the Book of the Psalms of Da-

vid) and the Scriptures (see English text no. 5). The promise may be understood both literally, as referring to power and authority on this earth, and figuratively, as referring to the new and real world of the spirit. The A of promising is expressed implicitly by the imperfect verb 'كتب' (wrote) which indicates a future occurrence of the event. The deep structure of this text may be 'Allah (عليه السلام) promises that His righteous servants will inherit the land'. The FCs of this text are the following:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since the S 'Allah (جل جلاله)' and the believers have the ability to use and understand the U.
2- The PCCs are satisfying, since the proposition 'إن الأرض يرثها عبادي الصالحون' predicates a future act with a positive value to the addressees at the time of the appearance of the Promised Saviour (peace be upon him).
3- The PCs are also persuasive, since the promise is declared by an authorized agent 'Allah (جل جلاله)' and the act is under Allah's control. The A is pleasing to the believers but would not occur in the normal course of time.
4- The SC is convincing, since Allah's promise is true.
5- The MCs are satisfying, since there is no doubt of Allah's promise and the thing promised is morally good.
6- The DCs seem also convincing, since the structure of the U permits making a promise and all the above conditions are met and satisfied.

5 - وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ سَنُدْخِلُهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا وَعْدَ اللَّهِ حَقًّا (النساء:122)

In this Quranic verse Allah (جل جلاله)promises the faithful believers that He will admit them to Gardens in the Paradise. Thus He urges them to be faithful and to do the good deeds.

The A of promising is expressed implicitly by the particle of futurity '-س' in 'سندخلهم' and the promise is emphasized by the nominal expression, verbal noun, 'وعد' (a promise). The verbal noun 'وعد' (a promise) is used with the non- performative U to indicate that Allah's promise is always true. The tense of this text is the future simple(126 :1965 ، شبر). The FCs of this text are the following:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since the Addresser and the addressees have the ability to use and understand the U.
2- The PCCs are satisfying, since the proposition 'سندخلهم جنات...' predicates a future A with a reward to the believers in the Doomsday.
3- The PCs are also satisfying, since the promise is declared by an authorized agent 'Allah(ﷻ)' and the A is under His control. The believers prefer such a promise to be done but the A will not happen in the normal course of events.
4- The SC is convincing, since Allah's promise is emphasized by His intention to do His Promise 'وعد الله حقا'.
5- The MCs are persuasive, since the believers are content with the genuinity of Allah's promise and the thing promised is morally good.
6- The DCs seem also satisfying, since the structure of the U permits making a promise by the particle of futurity '-س' and the verbal noun 'وعد' (promise) and all the above conditions are satisfied and met.

6- مَثَلُ الْجَنَّةِ الَّتِي وُعِدَ الْمُتَّقُونَ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ أُكُلُهَا دَائِمٌ وَظِلُّهَا تِلْكَ عُقْبَى الَّذِين اتَّقَوا (الرعد:35)

In this Quranic verse the Glorous Quran promises that the

righteous will be rewarded by the Paradise in the eternal life. Such a Paradise is full of different kinds of enjoyments and fruits. The joys of heaven are not like the joys of the earth which fade away. The joys of heaven are pure and lasting forever. And that is the sort of thing that Allah (ﷻ) promises and undertakes to give. The A of promising is expressed explicitly by the passive expression 'وُعِدَ' which has the purpose of leaving the agency unspecified only through the context. The deep structure of this verse may be '.. وعد الله المتقين الجنه' (Allah (ﷻ) promises the righteous paradise) (شبر ، 1965: 255).

The FCs of this text are the following:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since both the promisor 'the Almighty (ﷻ)' and the promisees have the ability to use and understand the U.
2- The PCCs are satisfying, since the proposition 'وعد المتقين الجنه' predicates a future A with a pleasing reward to the righteous in the eternal life.
3- The PCs are persuasive, since the promise is declared by an authorized agent 'Allah (ﷻ)' and such a promise is under His control. The goal of the promise is preferable to the addressees but the A will not happen in the normal course of events.
4- The SC is satisfying, since Allah's promise is always sincere.
5- The MCs are satisfying, since Allah (ﷻ) has undertaken to do the A and the thing promised is morally good.
6- The DCs seem also convincing, since the structure of the U permits establishing a promise and all the above conditions are met.

7- إِنَّا لَنَنصُرُ رُسُلَنَا وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فِي الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا وَيَوْمَ يَقُومُ الْأَشْهَادُ (غافر:51)

In this Quranic verse Allah (ﷻ) is addressing His Holy Prophet Mohammed (ﷺ). He implicitly promises him that He will support him and the other believers in this earthly life and in the eternal life. Some of the Quranic interpreters state that such a triumph in the earthly life will happen at the time of the appearance of the Awaited Savior (عليه السلام) (المدرسي ، 1406هـ : 100؛ البحراني ، 1415هـ : 94) . The A of promising is expressed implicitly by the imperfect verb 'ننصر' (support) which indicates a future event. This implicit promise is accompanied and emphasized by the particle of emphasis,i.e., the inceptive 'ل-' in 'لننصر' in order to make a binding promise.

The FCs of this text are the following:

1- The CCs are satisfying, since the addresser 'Allah(ﷻ)' and His Prophet Mohammed (ﷺ) have the ability to use and understand the U.
2- The PCCs are convincing, since the proposition 'إِنَّا لَنَنصُرُ رُسُلَنَا' predicates the future A with a positive value to the addressee in the future.
3- The PCs are also convincing, since the promise is declared by an authorized agent 'Allah(ﷻ)' and the promise is under His control. The A is pleasing to the addressee but would not happen in the normal course of time.
4- The SC is persuasive, since the Promisor intends to do the A.
5- The MCs seem satisfying, since the promise is bound and emphasized by the Promisor and the A promised is morally good.
6- The DCs are also satisfying, since the structure of the U is used to indicate a SA of promising, and all the above conditions are met.

3-The Speech Act of Threat in English and Arabic

3-1- Semantic View

3-1-1- in English

The speech act of threatening may be uttered for many reasons, some of which involve intention or capacity to commit a violent act or a true threat.

Some lexicographers such as Collins (1987:123), Pearsal (1998:1930) and Hornby (2000:1408) define threat as a declaration of an intention to inflict pain, injury, damage, or other hostile action on someone in retribution for something done or not done. Some legislators of civil law, Fein et al, (1995:1), suggest that a statement is a true threat when a reasonable person making the statement in context would foresee that such a statement would be interpreted by those to whom it is communicated as a serious expression of an intent to bodily harm or assault. They believe that threat of violence may arise from feelings or ideas that range from one person to another. Added to this, speech may be put in the realm of threatening when the goal of the speech is to end a legal activity through violence with attempt to injure or intimidate (ibid).

Two points of view about the threat act can be mentioned: the objective view when the person makes a statement with an intention to cause serious harm to the listener and the subjective view when the S makes a statement of threat to the listener regardless of whether the S actually intends to carry out the threat. Thus there is a difference between making and posing a threat.

3-1-2- in Arabic

Arab rhetoricians mention that threat is always associated with a bad thing upon the addressee, it causes harm to a determinate person by means of violence or undesirable act (ابن منظور ، 1955: 463،الرازي،1981: 728) .

Arab legislators illustrate that threat involves the S's more or less coercive attempts to get somebody to do or to refrain from doing something by means of violence, unlawful act or a violation of an absolute right. Such a threat will intimidate the addressee and oblige him to act (or to refrain from acting) in a way detrimental to (or beneficial to) the S (السنهوري ،1952: 334 ؛ سلطان،1962: 183؛الخضري ، 1965: 115 ؛ الخلف والشاوي 1982 : 375).

According to the religious point of view, Islamic jurisprudents mention that man, by nature, is prone to fall into evil and error; and his errors either bring harm only to him or may harm the community as a whole. Some of these errors may be regarded as grave sins by which the legislator associates them with severe retribution in the Hereafter or severe punishment in this world. Therefore, some of these grave errors and crimes, such as murder, adultery, theft, calumny, and drunkenness, were not left to men to decide, but Allah(ﷻ) and His Messenger Mohammed (ﷺ) specify the penalties that the perpetrators of these crimes deserve. Other errors are left to the legislators to decide the suitable punishment for them (Al-Ghazali, 1994:145). One of these punishments is carried out by the act of threat. Thereby some legislators regard the act of threatening as a means of reformation and treatment to the perpetrators of these errors. Furthermore, threat may prevent other people from committing such errors to avoid punishment (الصدر،1970:91). Therefore, some Arab jurists believe that threatening the sinners with punishment is a basic notion of

the Divine Justice since Allah's threat will never be broken or disappointed (البصري و آخرون ، د. ت.: 49)

3-2- Syntactic View

3-2-1- in English

Generally, the act of threatening can be expressed by the word 'threat' which is, as Pearsall (1998:1930) points out, originated from an old English word 'oppression' which is of Germanic origin, 'Verdviessen' (irritate).

Palmer (1963:277-81),(Hornby, 1968:207) and Pearsall (1998:1930) propose some patterns for the verb 'threaten':

[Sub.] +V + Od 1-

38- I threaten you.

[Sub.] + V + Od + preposition + prepositional object 2-

39- I threaten him with punishment.

3- [Sub.] + V + 'to' + infinitive

40- The government threatens to suppress the demonstrate.

Most linguists agree that the verb 'threaten' is rarely used performatively. Thus, this speech act is manifested by different expressions.

Halliday (1973:75) believes that 'threat' is a semantic phenomenon which can be expressed by different situations as in:

41- I'll smack you if you do that again.

42- You'll have to stay indoors if you do that.

This semantic phenomenon can be realized grammatically in terms of Halliday's Systemic Grammar, as a transitive clause of action in simple future tense with 'smack' as process, 'I' as an actor and 'you' as goal, the dependent clause being conditional.

Davies (1986:116) states that there is a close relationship between 'threat' and the imperative mood on the one hand, and the conditional meaning of an 'if-construction', on the other hand. Thus, both of the following are synonymous: 43-Talk and I'll shoot Max.

44-If you talk I'll shoot Max.

The imperative construction in (43) is derived from the ' if-construction' in (44) through ellipsis.

Leech (1989:317) and Fraser (1997:179) illustrate that the relation between the imperative form and 'threat' can be expressed by the use of the coordinator 'or after the imperative. This relation is conditional:

45- Don't make a move, or I'll shoot. (If you move, I'll shoot.)

46-Talk or I'll shoot. (If you don't talk, I'll shoot.)

Similarly, Leech and Svartvik (1975:159) observe that threat can be expressed conditionally by using the conjunctive 'and' which indicates positive condition:

47-Do that, and I'll punish you. (If you do that, I'll … .)

Quirk et al, (1985:139) suggest dare to express threatening rebuke:

48- How dare you do such a thing?

49- Don't you dare tell lies!

Grammarians such as Jespersen (1954:270-72) and Hornby (1968:207) demonstrate that a threat can be performed by the future modals 'will' in the first person and 'shall' or 'should' in the second and third persons:

50- I will punish you if you don't study well.

51- If you do anything stupid you shall be sorry.

52-Tom was told that if he behaves badly he should go to bed without any supper.

3-2-2- in Arabic

Threat in Arabic is expressed explicitly by the following words, all of which are etymologically derived from the original form (root) ' وعد' (promise): 1981 ، الرازي ؛ 186 1979 ، ألا حمدي 728)).The derived verbs should be followed by the preposition (ب-).

1- توعدّ (He threatened) past .

53- (أنا توعدتّه بالعقاب إذا لم ينجح) (I threatened him with punishment if he did not succeed.)

2- يتوعد (He threatens) present.

54- يتوعدنّا الأعداء بالهجوم (The enemies threaten us with an attack.)

3- أوعد (He threatened) past .

55- اوعدتّه بالعقاب إذا لم ينجح (أنا) (I threatened him with punishment if he didn't succeed)

4- أتوعد (I threaten) present.

56- أتوعدّك بالطرد (آنا) (I threaten you with dismissal.)

5- وعيد (A threat) verbal noun. (مصدر)

57- ذَلِكَ لِمَنْ خَافَ مَقَامِي وَخَافَ وَعِيدِ (إبراهيم:14)

Threat can also be performed explicitly by the verb 'هددّ'(threatened) and its derivations. Since both verbs 'توعدّ'and 'هددّ' have the same semantic meaning, the derived verb 'توعدّ' is used here because of its close relationship with the act of promising.

On the other hand, threat can also be performed implicitly by the particles of future '- س' and 'سوف'(will or shall). These two particles are prefixed to the imperfect indicative verbs so as to strengthen the future action of such verbs (ألمخزومي1964،:159). Some Arab linguists argue that the particle '-س' is a contraction of 'سوف' (will) (الثعالبي ، 1938 :520):

58- وَأَمَّا مَنْ بَخِلَ وَاسْتَغْنَى ❋ وَكَذَّبَ بِالْحُسْنَى ❋ فَسَنُيَسِّرُهُ لِلْعُسْرَى (الليل:8-10)

59- إِنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِآيَاتِنَا سَوْفَ نُصْلِيهِمْ نَارًا (النساء:65)

In addition to these declarative sentences, threat can be achieved by interrogative (60),imperative (61) and prohibitive (62):

60- أَفَمَنْ أَسَّسَ بُنْيَانَهُ عَلَى تَقْوَى مِنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانٍ خَيْرٌ أَمْ مَنْ أَسَّسَ بُنْيَانَهُ عَلَى شَفَا جُرُفٍ هَارٍ فَانْهَارَ بِهِ فِي نَارِ جَهَنَّمَ (التوبة: 109)

61- قُلْ تَمَتَّعُوا فَإِنَّ مَصِيرَكُمْ إِلَى النَّارِ (إبراهيم: 30)

62- وَلَا تَرْكَنُوا إِلَى الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا فَتَمَسَّكُمُ النَّارُ (هود: 113)

3-3- Pragmatic View

3-3-1- in English

The act of threatening, as being one of the uses of directive language, can regulate and reinforce the social relationship. It is rarely accepted as a performative speech act. But Austin (1962:131) says that the verb 'threaten' is a commissive which can be used performatively and explicitly in some contexts. He believes that the perlocutionary act of 'threat' is to intimidate the H. Likewise, Hamblin (1987:34) lists threaten can with the commissive verbs as it is made in the same future-tense form. However, this act is mainly expressed implicitly in a conditional forms, and the object is to get the addressee to act in a certain way:

63- If you continue to park across my driveway I'll pour glue in your carburetor.

Mey (1993:137) gives 'threaten' a performative character but the expression 'I threaten you' can have the property of doing what it explicitly is denying:

64- I'm not threatening you, but if I ever see your face again around these parts… .

Here, the S is explicitly denying the act of threatening towards the addressee, but he is implicitly doing the threat (ibid.: 136).

Wunderlich (1979:279) and Trosborg (1995:188-89) think that some SAs including threat are not exclusively determined by the form and content of the U tokens; they may, in certain restricted contexts, be determined by institutional expectations and obligations to act and the person-specific assessments of the communicative situation. Hence the A of threatening can

be performed by other SA forms, other than its form, such as directives and requestives which are often not performed to forward an interest of the addressee:

65-I advise you to shut your mouth. (threat by advice)

66-If you don't cut the grass you won't get your pocket money.

(threat by request).

Here, threat in (65) and (66) is expressed indirectly and implicitly by another form which can be interpreted according to the specific situation (ibid).

In most cases, threat can be expressed implicitly by the use of 'will' and 'shall' since they predicate future course of action. Generally speaking, 'will' is used to express a threat in the first person singular and plural, while 'shall' in the second and third persons. Besides, 'will' and 'shall' are always used in a conditional threat:

67- I (we) will kill you if you confess.

68- You shall be punished if you fail.

69- He (she, it) shall be punished if he comes late.

In accordance with Leech's classification of SAs, the act of threatening has a conflictive function which conflict with the social goal. In terms of Leech's cost and benefit scale, commissive with the modal 'shall' are conflictive. Hence, a threat like 'you shall be punished' means cost for the H, who is going to pay for it, with the benefit of the pleasure of condescension going to the S. However, a threat, like a compulsion, leaves no option for the H, in that S cannot threaten to punish and give choice to the H. Therefore, the following U is pragmatically unacceptable:

70-? You shall be punished, if you don't mind*.

Consequently, we can say that threats violate the Tact Maxim since the course of action which the S predicates of the H is disastrous to the latter. Thus the modal 'shall' denoting a threat can be regarded as a case of negative politeness in being cost for the H and allowing no option for him (Leech, 1983:104-10).

To sum up, we believe that threat may be influenced by some factors which govern the relationship between S and H. Such factors involve the relative power of the S over the H, the social distance between the S and H, i.e., status, age, and sex, the size of imposition according to the degree of the important action, and the relative rights and obligations between the S and H, i.e., whether or not S has the right to make a particular threat and whether the H has the obligation to comply.

3-3-2- in Arabic

The act of threatening has been given relative attention by Arab scholars. Most of them examine what constitutes a verbal threat, believing that it involves conveying both the intention to perform an act that the addressee will view unfavorably and the intention to intimidate the addressee. Broadly speaking, threat is always accompanied by some acts such as dispraise humiliation and punishment. Therefore, by declaring S's threat, the addressee may be faced by one or all of these acts (75: 1984،عرفة ؛ 179-80: 1979،الطوسي). We can infer that such acts may represent the perlocutionary effect of the threat.

Threat can be expressed explicitly by the lexical verbs 'توعد' or 'هدد' and their derivatives (see 2-2-2). The act of threaten-

ing is one of the commissive verbs 'أفعال الوعود' that commit the threatenor to doing something desirable for him but undesirable for the threatened. It commits the S to some future action or likely to come soon, imminent occurrence, in order to be effective (187 :1962 ، سلطان ؛ 339 :1952 ، السنهوري).

The degree of strength of the threat is different from one person to another. This difference can be attributed to different factors such as the degree of certainty of the S, the authority of S over H, the formality of the U, the age, the sex, the social status of S, time and place of the U and whether threat be verbal, nonverbal or both. (39-44 :1985 ؛ فتيان، 187 :1962 ،سلطان).

Since a future act is predicated by the threatenor, threat can be expressed implicitly by different expressions and forms which denote a future tense. Thus threat can be performed by the particles of future 'س-' and 'سوف' (will or shall) .

It can also be expressed by the conditional clauses. These clauses contain two propositions: 'جمله فعل الشرط'(subordinate clause) and 'جمله جواب الشرط' (main clause). Generally speaking, conditional clauses cannot exist in the past. Furthermore, they can be introduced by certain particles such as 'إن' (if), 'إذا' (if), 'من' (who), 'أما' (if), and some relative pronouns. These particles will transfer the tense of the clause from present into future. The achievement of the threat is conditioned by the achievement of the conditional clause, i.e., the subordinate clause (363 :1988 ، ابن هشام ؛ 432-508 : 1990 ،السامرائى):

71- الْوُجُوهَ وَإِنْ يَسْتَغِيثُوا يُغَاثُوا بِمَاءٍ كَالْمُهْلِ يَشْوِي (الكهف:29)

72- فَإِذَا انسَلَخَ الْأَشْهُرُ الْحُرُمُ فَاقْتُلُوا الْمُشْرِكِينَ حَيْثُ وَجَدْتُمُوهُمْ (التوبة:5)

73- وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقْ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ شَدِيدُ الْعِقَابِ (الأنفال:13)

74- قَالَ أَمَّا مَنْ ظَلَمَ فَسَوْفَ نُعَذِّبُهُ (الكهف:87)

75- إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَأْكُلُونَ أَمْوَالَ الْيَتَامَى ظُلْمًا إِنَّمَا يَأْكُلُونَ فِي بُطُونِهِمْ نَارًا وَسَيَصْلَوْنَ سَعِيرًا (النساء : 10)

In certain cases the conditional clauses of threat are accompanied by the particles of future 'س-' and 'سوف' for the sake of emphasis as in (74) and (75).Here, these particles are only located in the main clause(جملة جواب الشرط) and never exist in the subordinate clause (جملة فعل الشرط). Sometimes, the conditional particles are omitted from the conditional clause of threat without affecting the conditional meaning of the U. The conditional threat will be inferred implicitly according to the contextual meaning (الرفاعى،1983: 363 ؛ المطلبى ، 1981 :71).

76- الزَّانِيَةُ وَالزَّانِي فَاجْلِدُوا كُلَّ وَاحِدٍ مِنْهُمَا مِائَةَ جَلْدَةٍ (النور : 2)

Here, the conditional threat is implied in the particle 'ف-' in 'فاجلدوا'. The deep structure of this conditional threat is 'إن ثبت زناهما فاجلدوا' (they shall be flogged if their aduly is proved) (الرفاعى،1983: 363).

In certain other cases, there are some particles which are used to convert the tense of the U from past or present into future. Thus these particles such as 'لا' (not), 'إذ' (then), 'لم' and 'لن' (not) are sometimes used to express an implicit threat (الجرجاني، 1366هـ : 631 ؛ النحاس ، 1979: 57)

77- سَأُرِيكُمْ آيَاتِي فَلَا تَسْتَعْجِلُونِي (الأنبياء:37)

78- فَسَوْفَ يَعْلَمُونَ إِذْ الأَغْلَالُ فِي أَعْنَاقِهِمْ وَالسَّلَاسِلُ يُسْحَبُونَ (غافر:70-71)

79- وَحَشَرْنَاهُمْ فَلَمْ نُغَادِرْ مِنْهُمْ أَحَدًا (الكهف:47)

Arab rhetoricians illustrate that one of the devices used to express the future events of threat is by the use of some per-

fect verbs. This technique is used, particularly in the Glorious Quran, to emphasize the irrevocable occurrence of the SA. Rhetoricians believe that this use of these verbs will increase the intimidation and terror in the soul of the H (mental threat) (المخزومي ، 1964: 155 ؛ نور الدين ، 1984: 52):

80- أَتَى أَمْرُ اللَّهِ فَلَا تَسْتَعْجِلُوهُ (النحل:1)

In this Quranic verse, Allah (ﷻ) is addressing the pagans and referring to the fact that the decree of Allah, which is expressed by the perfect verb "أتى " (came), will inevitably come to pass and then Allah (ﷻ)will punish them severely. Thus how foolish of pagans to wish such a haste.

In addition to what has been mentioned above, threat can be performed implicitly by some expressions. These expressions such as: 'تمتعوا' (enjoy), 'بَشِّرْ' (delight) and 'وعد' (promise) are ironically used with reference to unpleasant events, i.e., threat. These words are used metaphorically because the usual meaning of them is used with reference to the pleasant consequences to the addressee (الهاشمي ، د0 ت0 325):

81- وَجَعَلُوا لِلَّهِ أَندَادًا لِيُضِلُّوا عَنْ سَبِيلِهِ قُلْ تَمَتَّعُوا فَإِنَّ مَصِيرَكُمْ إِلَى النَّارِ (إبراهيم:30)

82- بَشِّرْ الْمُنَافِقِينَ بِأَنَّ لَهُمْ عَذَابًا أَلِيما (النساء: 138)

83- النَّارُ وَعَدَهَا اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا وَبِئْسَ الْمَصِيرُ (الحج: 72)

Moreover, there are certain words such as 'ويل' (woe) and 'يصلى' (burn) which are always and directly used with reference to the threatening speech:

84- فَوَيْلٌ لِلَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا مِنْ عَذَابِ يَوْمٍ أَلِيمٍ (الزخرف : 65)

85- سَأُصْلِيهِ سَقَرَ (المدثر: 26)

In most cases, threat, explicit and implicit, is accompanied by different particles of emphasis. These particles are mainly used to make a binding threat and to attract H's attention. They include: particles of vow such as 'والله', 'تالله', 'بالله', 'وربكّ' (by Lord), the inceptive '-ل', the emphasizing suffixes '-نّ', and '-ن' as in (86), the particles of future 'س' and 'سوف' (will and shall), the repetition of certain words (87), the particle 'إنّما' or 'إنّ' (surely) (88), and the fronting of the abstract subject (89) (الهاشمي ، د.ت.: 60):

86- وَتَاللَّهِ لَأَكِيدَنَّ أَصْنَامَكُمْ بَعْدَ أَنْ تُوَلُّوا مُدْبِرِينَ (الأنبياء:57)

87- كَلَّا سَيَعْلَمُونَ ❋ ثُمَّ كَلَّا سَيَعْلَمُونَ (النبأ:4-5)

88- إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَأْكُلُونَ أَمْوَالَ الْيَتَامَى ظُلْمًا إِنَّمَا يَأْكُلُونَ فِي بُطُونِهِمْ نَارًا (النساء:10)

89- إِنَّا أَعْتَدْنَا لِلْكَافِرِينَ سَلَاسِلَا وَأَغْلَالًا وَسَعِيرًا (الإنسان:4)

3-4 Felicity Conditions of Threat in English and Arabic

For a speech act of threatening to come off properly, the S must assure himself that certain conditions have to be fulfilled. Fraser (1998:163) proposes three conditions to constitute a verbal threat. Accordingly, a threat made by the S should express to the H:

a-The belief that some unfavorable A will happen.

b-The belief that A is undesirable to the H's best interest.

c-The intent to intimidate the H.

In order for the threat to be effective, Fraser believes that the S has to be either able or willing to carry out the terms of the threat (ibid).

In accordance with his notion of success and satisfaction, Vanderveken (1999: 16) thinks that a threat will be successful according to the following conditions:

1- The illocutionary point: a threat has the things-to-words direction of fit; its point is to have the world transformed by the future course of action of the S.
2- Mode of achievement: The S must invoke a position of authority over the H, and the S puts himself under an obligation to do the A.
3- Propositional content condition: the S will do the A in future.
4- Preparatory Conditions: the S presupposes that he is capable of doing the A, and the A is bad for the H.
5- Sincerity condition: the S intends to do what he commits himself to do.
6- Degree of strength: S's threat has to be expressed with a strong insistence upon the H.

Searle (1972:147-154) lists some conditions for the SA of promising. He believes that such conditions can be applied to the other types of SAs with some modifications:

1- Normal input and output conditions: both S and H should have the ability to use and comprehend the U.
2- Propositional content conditions: the P of threat should predicate a future A of the S, and be uttered in a certain context.
3- Preparatory Conditions: the S must believe that the H does not prefer the A done, and that A has not already been done.
4- Sincerity Condition: the S should have the intention, the ability, and the will to carry out the terms of threat.
5- Essential Conditions: by uttering threat, the S insists on getting H to do A in virtue of his authority over the

H. The S is committed by his U to do A.

6- The wrap-up-condition: the S's threat is real and correct if the structure of the U is syntactically and semantically used to express a threat in that dialect, and if the above conditions obtain.

For the sake of our analysis in both English and Arabic, a unified model will be set according to the above conditions as well as the researchers' propositions:

1-Comprehensive Conditions (CmCs):

a. The S should specify a particular H.

b. Both S and H should have the ability to use and comprehend the verbal threat.

2-The Propositional Content Conditions (PCCs):

a. The P expressed must predicate a future A of the S.

b. The P expressed should denote, syntactically or semantically, a particular threat.

c. The P should specify means of punishment, and the desired behaviour from threat if possible.

3-The Preparatory Conditions (PCs):

a. The S must believe that the H does not prefer the A done.

b. The S should be in a position of authority over the H.

c. The H prefers the A not to be done since the A is bad for him.

d. The A will not occur in the normal course of events.

4-The Sincerity Condition (SC): The S intends to intimidate the H and to punish the undesired behaviour of the H.

5-The Ethical Condition (EC): The S should have the ability to perform or cancel his threat, since it is harmful to the H, if the H shows the desired behaviour.

6-The Definitive Condition (DC): The A of threatening is correct and real if the above conditions obtain.

3-5 Analysis

3-5-1 Analysis of English Texts

1-"And Jonah began to enter into the city a day's journey, and he cried, and said, yet forty day's, and Nineveh shall be overthrown" (Jonah, 3:4).

In this Biblical verse, Prophet Jonah (عليه السلام) is addressing his people of Nineveh. He implicitly threatens them with punishment because they refuse to accept his Divine Call. He limits the time of punishment to forty day if they do not repent. Then he departs them in wrath forgetting that Allah(جل جلاله) has mercy as well as forgiveness (Moulton, 1907:1422). The threat is expressed by Jonah on behalf of an authorized agent (Allah(جل جلاله)). The A of threatening is expressed implicitly by the particle of future 'shall'. For the sake of increasing its effectiveness, threat is appointed by a limited time. i.e., forty days.

The FCs of this U are:

1-The CmCs: Jonah(عليه السلام) is addressing the people of Nineveh and both of them have the ability to use and comprehend the U.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'Nineveh shall be overthrown' predicates a future A by forty days.

b. The P of threat is expressed by the syntactic particle 'shall' and by the word 'overthrown' which presupposes threat.

c. The P of threat specifies the overthrow of the city as the means of punishment, and the acceptance of Jonah's call as the desired behaviour.

3-The PCs:

a. Jonah(عليه السلام) believes that his people do not want the threat done.

b. Jonah(عليه السلام) is expressing his threat on behalf of an authorized agent (Allah(جل جلاله)).

c. Jonah's tribesmen prefer not to be punished.

d. Punishing the tribesmen of Nineveh will not happen if they accept Jonah's call.

4-The SC: Jonah(عليه السلام) intends to call His Lord (جل جلاله) to punish his people since they refuse to accept his call.

5-The EC: The punishment of Jonah's people will be preformed or canceled since the threat is expressed by Jonah(عليه السلام) on behalf of an authorized agent 'Allah(جل جلاله)' who has the ethical choice to A or not.

6-The DC: The A of threatening is correct and real since all the above conditions are met.

2-"When thou shalt … do that which is evil in the sight of the Lord thy God, to provoke him to anger: I call heaven and earth to witness you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish … and the Lord shall scatter you among the peoples, and ye shall be left few in number among the nations" (Deuteronomy, 4:25-27).

Allah (ﷻ) is addressing the Children of Israel by giving them some commandments. He threatens them implicitly with continuous punishments if they keep on disobeying Allah's commandments. Furthermore, He will scatter them among the countries and will punish them with different means of torture. In this conditional threat Allah(ﷻ) will punish the undesired behaviour of the addressees, i.e., making the evil with negative consequences to them. Threat is expressed by the conditional construction as well as the particle of future 'shall'.

The FCs of this speech are:

1-The CmCs: The S 'Allah(ﷻ)' is addressing the H (the Children of Israel) and both S and Hs have the ability to use and comprehend the U.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P "shall perish, scatter, and be left few in numbers" predicates a future A.

b. The P of threat is expressed syntactically by the conditional construction and the particle of future 'shall'.

c. The P of threat specifies the scattering of the Children of Israel among nations as the means of punishment, and the obedience of Allah's commandments as the desired behaviour.

3-The PCs:

a. Allah(ﷻ) knows that the Children of Israel do not prefer to be punished.

b. Allah(ﷻ) has the authority over the Sons of Israel.

c. The Son's of Israel prefer not to be punished.

d. Scattering of the Sons of Israel among nations will not

occur if they neglect the evil.

4-The SC: Allah (ﷻ) intends to intimidate the Sons of Israel and to punish them if they don't obey His commandments.

5-The EC: Allah (ﷻ) intends to perform His threat in virtue of His authority over the Children of Israel. But Allah (ﷻ) will cancel His threat if they show good behaviour.

6-The DC: Threat is correct and satisfactory since all the above conditions obtain.

3-"Whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come" (Matthew, 12:32).

In this Biblical speech, Jesus (عليه السلام) is addressing the Pharisees when they accuse him of being the prince of the devils. He tells them that he will forgive their accusation to him. Then he implicitly and conditionally threatens them that Allah (ﷻ) will not forgive any blasphemy against His Glory (Moulton, 1907: 1695). The A of threatening is expressed by the conditional construction and the particle of future 'shall'.

The FCs of this speech are:

1-The CmCs: The 'Jesus (عليه السلام)' is addressing the Pharisees and both have the ability to use and comprehend the verbal U.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'shall not be forgiven him' predicates a future A.

b. The P of threat is expressed syntactically by the conditional form and the particle of future 'shall'.

c. The P of threat specifies a mental punishment to the Pharisees in this world and in the Doomsday.

3-The PCs:

a. Jesus (عليه السلام) believes that the Pharisees do not prefer the A done.

b. Jesus (عليه السلام) is talking on behalf of an authorized agent 'Allah(جل جلاله)'.

c. The Pharisees prefer the A not to be done.

d. The punishment will not occur if the Pharisees do not speak against the Holy Spirit(جل جلاله).

4-The SC: Jesus (عليه السلام) intends to intimidate the Pharisees.

5-The EC: Jesus (عليه السلام) expresses his threat on behalf of Allah (جل جلاله) who is able to punish the blasphemy of the Pharisees against Him or may forgive them if they repent.

6-The DC: Threat is real since all its conditions are available.

4-"If a man be found lying with a woman married to an husband, then they shall both of them die" (Deuteronomy, 22:22)

In this Biblical verse, Allah (جل جلاله) through His Messenger 'Moses (عليه السلام)' threatens the adulterers (only married persons) with death in this life. Such an U is one of Moses' commandments to the Children of Israel. This verse states that the punishment for the guilty of fornication is death for both the married adulteress and the married adulterer (Moulton, 1907:1370). The A of threatening is expressed implicitly by the conditional construction.

The FCs of this verse are:

1-The CmCs: The S 'Moses (عليه السلام)' is addressing the adul-

terers of the Children of Israel and both have the ability to use and comprehend the verbal threat.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'shall both of them die' predicates a future A.

b. The P of threat is expressed implicitly by the conditional form.

c. The P specifies the punishment of death as the means of punishment to the adulterers.

3-The PCs:

a. Moses (عليه السلام) believes that the adulterers do not prefer to be punished.

b. Moses (عليه السلام) is expressing his provision of the punishment through an authorized agent 'Allah (جل جلاله)'.

c. Those who will make adultery prefer not to be punished.

d. The punishment is conditioned by the occurrence of the guilty of adultery and the fulfilment of certain conditions.

4-The SC: Moses (عليه السلام) intends to intimidate those who will commit the crime of adultery.

5-The EC: The punishment of death is declared by an authorized agent 'Allah (جل جلاله)' in order to prevent such a crime of adultery.

6-The DC: Threat is real since all the above conditions obtain.

5-"And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence

through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth" (Genesis, 6:13).

In this Biblical verse, Allah (ﷻ) implicitly threatens the people of Noah(u) since they make evil in the sight of Allah (ﷻ); and they fill the earth with violence, injustice, and blasphemy. Allah (ﷻ) tells His Messenger that He will punish his people with flood. Thus Allah (ﷻ) will destroy them and all the sinners by a great flood. It is noticed that the development of wickedness in the world at that time leads to the flood (Moulton, 1907:1544). The A of threatening is expressed by the modal verb 'will'.

The FCs of this verse are:

1-The CmCs: Allah (ﷻ) is addressing the wicked of Noah's folk through His Messenger 'Noah' and both S and Hs have the ability to use and comprehend the verbal threat.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'will destroy them with the earth' predicates a future A.

b. The P of threat specifies the destruction through flood as the means of punishment.

c. The P of threat is performed by the syntactic particle of future 'will'.

3-The PCs:

a. Allah (ﷻ) knows that the wicked of Noah's people do not prefer to be punished.

b. Allah (ﷻ) has a superior authority over everything in this world.

c. The wicked of Noah's people do not prefer to be pun-

ished.

d. The punishment is determined owing to the development of wickedness in the world.

4-The SC: Allah (ﷻ) intends to intimidate the people of Noah so as to repent and to punish them if they do not show the desired behaviour.

5-The EC: Allah (ﷻ) has the ability to perform His punishment upon the wicked if they do not show their repentance to Allah (ﷻ).

6-The DC: Threat is imminent because all the above conditions are available.

6-"But if ye worship not, ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace." (Daniel, 3:15).

Nebuchadnezzar the King has been told by the Chaldeans that Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, some Jews believers, refuse to worship the golden image which the king has set up. Thus the king implicitly and conditionally threatens them to be thrown into a burning fiery furnace if they will not fall down and worship this idol. The A of threatening is expressed by the conditional construction and the particle of future 'shall'.

The FCs of this verse are:

1-The CmCs: The S 'Nebuchadnezzar the king' is addressing Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego and both participants have the ability to use and comprehend the verbal U.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'shall be cast into a burning fiery furnace' predicates a future A.

b. The P of threat is expressed by the syntactic forms of

the conditional construction and the particle of future.

c. The P specifies the throw into the midst of the fire to the three Jews as the physical punishment.

3-The PCs:

a. Nebuchadnezzar the King believes that the three Jews do not prefer to be punished.

b. The King has a superior authority over the three Jews.

c. The three Jews prefer not to be punished.

d. The punishment will not occur if the three Jews worship the King's idol.

4-The SC: The King intends to intimidate the three Jews by his threat and to perform his threat if they refuse to obey his orders.

5-The EC: The King has the ability and authority to perform his threat.

6-The DC: Threat is genuine since all the above conditions are met.

7-"Whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death" (Exodus, 31:15).

Allah (ﷻ) is addressing, through His Prophet Moses (عليه السلام), the Children of Israel by giving them some commandments. Here, Allah (ﷻ) implicitly threatens them with the punishment of death if they breach the Sabbath, the sacred day of Jews. Such a punishment would be, not for the breach of the Sabbath in itself, but for their contumacious defiance of the Divine Law. Threat is expressed by the conditional construction and emphasized by the particle of emphasis 'surely'.

The FCs of this verse are:

1-The CmCs: The S 'Allah (ﷻ)' is addressing the Hs 'the Children of Israel' and both S and Hs have the ability to use and comprehend the U.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'shall surely be put to death' predicates a future A.

b. The P of threat is expressed by the syntactic construction of condition.

c. The P of threat specifies the death as the means of punishment to those who breach the Sabbath.

3-The PCs:

a. Allah (ﷻ) knows that the Children of Israel prefer not to be punished.

b. Allah (ﷻ) has a superior authority over all creatures.

c. The Children of Israel prefer not to be punished.

d. The punishment will not happen if the Children of Israel do not break the Sabbath.

4-The SC: Allah (ﷻ) intends to intimidate the Children of Israel so as not to breach the Sabbath.

5-The EC: Allah (ﷻ) has the ability and authority to perform His threat or to cancel it if the Hs show the obedience of Allah's Law.

6-The DC: Threat is correct and real since all the above conditions are met.

3-5-2 Analysis of Arabic Texts:

1- وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الْمُنَافِقِينَ وَالْمُنَافِقَاتِ وَالْكُفَّارَ نَارَ جَهَنَّمَ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا (التوبة:68)

In this Quranic verse, Allah (ﷻ) implicitly threatens the hypocrites and the unbelievers with a severe punishment in the Hereafter. He will deprive them from His grace and mercy since He assures His threat by the word 'خالدين' (eternal) which means that the punishment will last forever without any forgiveness. The A of threatening is expressed by the perfect verb 'وعد' which is used ironically to denote a threat and to emphasize the irrevocable occurrence of the punishment (مغنية، 1978: 67) .

The FCs of this verse are:

1-The CmCs: The S 'Allah (ﷻ)' is addressing the Hs 'the hypocrites and the unbelievers' and both S and Hs have the ability to use and comprehend the verbal threat.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'وعد المنافقين والكفار بنار جهنم' (a promise with the fire of Hell to the hypocrites and unbelievers) predicates a future A in the Hereafter.

b. The P of threat is expressed by the perfect verb 'وعد'.

c. The P of threat specifies the fire of Hell as the means of punishment to the addressees.

3-The PCs:

a. Allah (ﷻ) knows that the unbelievers do not prefer the A done.

b. Allah (ﷻ) has the superior authority over the unbelievers.

c. The unbelievers prefer not to be punished.

d. The punishment will not occur if the unbelievers repent.

4-The SC: Allah (ﷻ) intends to intimidate the unbelievers and to punish them if they do not repent.

5-The EC: Allah (ﷻ) should perform His threat in virtue of His authority over the unbelievers and He will not cancel His threat if they do not repent.

6-The DC: Threat is correct since all the above conditions are met.

2 - وَأَمَّا مَنْ أُوتِيَ كِتَابَهُ وَرَاءَ ظَهْرِهِ فَسَوْفَ يَدْعُوا ثُبُوراً وَيَصْلَى سَعِيرًا
(الانشقاق:10-12)

(But he that is given his book from behind his back shall call down destruction on himself and burn in the fire of Hell) (Zayid, 1980:448).

In this Quranic verse, Allah (ﷻ) implicitly and conditionally threatens the wicked with woe and the fire of Hell. Here, Allah (ﷻ) uses the phrase 'من أوتي كتابه وراء ظهره' metaphorically to denote the sinners and the wicked. Thus the wicked will be given their record in their left hand in the Doomsday. The A of threatening is expressed by three expressions: the conditional construction 'أما من أوتي كتابه', the particle of future 'سوف' (shall) and the lexical word 'يصلى' (burn). The conditional particle 'أما' is used also to emphasize the passive verb 'أوتي' which is used to specify the addressee who is going to be punished. In addition, the particle 'سوف' is used to emphasize the threat in the main clause of the conditional clause.

The FCs of this speech are:

1-The CmCs: The S 'Allah (ﷻ)' is addressing the wicked and both S and Hs have the ability to use and comprehend this verbal threat.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'فسوف يدعوا ثبورا ويصلى سعيرا' predicates a future A in the Doomsday.

b. The P of threat is expressed by the conditional form 'أما', the particle of future 'سوف' and the word 'يصلى' which is semantically used to denote a threat.

c. The P of threat specifies 'يدعوا ثبورا' (call with woe) and 'يصلى سعيرا' (burn in the fire of Hell) as the means of punishment to the Hs 'the wicked'.

3-The PCs:

a. Allah (ﷻ) knows that the sinners do not prefer to be punished.

b. Allah (ﷻ) has the superior authority over the sinners.

c. The sinners prefer not to be punished.

d. The punishment will not happen if the sinners repent and become righteous.

4-The SC: Allah (ﷻ) intends to intimidate the sinners and to punish their sin and wickedness.

5-The EC: Allah (ﷻ) has the ability to perform His threat upon the sinners but His threat may be cancelled if the sinners abandon their wickedness .

6-The DC: Threat is satisfactory since all the above conditions are met.

3- أَتَى أَمْرُ اللَّهِ فَلَا تَسْتَعْجِلُوهُ (النحل:1)

Allah (ﷻ) implicitly threatens the pagans when they make fun of Allah's Messenger Mohammed (ﷺ). Here, the speech is a response to the pagans'mock claim that "if there is One True God with unified control, why does He not punish the wrong-doers at once?". Therefore Allah (ﷻ) answers them that His punishment, ' أمر الله ' to them will inevitably come sooner or later. Then the pagans will wish to avoid such a punishment (مغنية، 1978: 496). The A of threatening is expressed by the perfect verb 'أتى' which is used to denote a threat according to the context of the U.

The FCs of this U are:

1-The CmCs: The S 'Allah (ﷻ)' is addressing the pagans (Hs), and both S and Hs have the ability to use and comprehend the verbal threat.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'أتى أمر الله' predicates a future A in the Doomsday.

b. The P of threat is expressed by the perfect verb 'أتى' which indicates a future occurrence of the A.

c. The P of threat specifies an implicit punishment.

3-The PCs:

a. Allah (ﷻ) knows that the pagans do not prefer to be punished.

b. Allah (ﷻ) has a superior authority over the pagans.

c. The pagans prefer not to be punished.

d. The punishment will not occur in the normal course of events.

4-The SC: Allah (ﷻ) intends to intimidate the pagans so as to urge them to discard their paganism.

5-The EC: Allah (ﷻ) has the ability to perform his threat if the pagans continue to show their bad belief, i.e., paganism.

6-The DC: Threat is correct since all the above conditions obtain.

4- وَالسَّارِقُ وَالسَّارِقَةُ فَاقْطَعُوا أَيْدِيَهُمَا جَزَاءً بِمَا كَسَبَا (المائدة: 38)

The Quranic verse illustrates that the punishment of amputation of hand is declared by Allah (ﷻ) as retribution for the thieves. Here, Allah (ﷻ) makes a conditional threat to those who want to steal. Thus the punishment of amputation of hand is conditioned by the A of stealing in certain cases. The conditional particle is omitted in this verse; it can be implied according to the context of U. Hence, the phrase 'السارق والسارقة' represents the subordinate clause which has an implicit conditional meaning 'إن ثبتت سرقتهما'. The phrase 'فاقطعوا أيديهما' represents the main clause according to the context of the U and the occurrence of the particle '-ف' which is used in the main clause to denote the result of the conditional clause (الرفاعي، 1983: 363). The deep structure of this speech will be 'إن ثبتت سرقتهما فاقطعوا أيديهما' (if they surely steal, cut off their hands). The A of threatening is expressed implicitly by the conditional form as well as the imperative form which is expressed by the word 'أقطعوا'.

The FCs of this verse are:

1-The CmCs: The S 'Allah (ﷻ)' is addressing the thieves, both have the ability to use and comprehend the verbal threat.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'فاقطعوا أيديهما' predicates a future A.

b. The P of threat is expressed by the conditional form.

c. The P of threat specifies the punishment of amputation of hand as the means of punishment to the thieves in certain cases.

3-The PCs:

a. Allah (ﷻ) knows that the thieves do not prefer to be punished.

b. Allah (ﷻ) has an authority to legislate such a provision of punishment.

c. The thieves prefer not to be punished.

d. The punishment is conditioned by the existence of certain conditions.

4-The SC: Allah (ﷻ) intends to intimidate those who prefer to steal and to punish their criminal A of theft.

5-The EC: The punishment of amputation of hand will be performed or cancelled according to certain conditions. Such a punishment is awarded by Allah (ﷻ) to protect innocent people from the crime of theft.

6-The DC: Threat is correct since all the above conditions obtain.

5- وَيْلٌ يَوْمَئِذٍ لِلْمُكَذِّبِينَ أَلَمْ نُهْلِكْ الْأَوَّلِينَ ثُمَّ نُتْبِعُهُمْ الْآخِرِينَ
(المرسلات: 17-15)

Allah (ﷻ) is threatening the rejecters of truth with woe in the Doomsday. Arab interpreters say that 'ويل' (woe) is always associated with the threat of punishment; it is a valley in the middle of the Hell which is devoted to the greater oppressors and disbelievers. (شبر، 1965: 51). The A of threatening is expressed by two forms: the declarative sentence 'ويل يومئذ للمكذبين' and the interrogative sentence 'ألم نهلك الأولين'. The threat in the

declarative sentence is expressed by the word 'ويل' (woe) which presupposes a threat. Furthermore, the threat in the interrogative sentence is performed by the interrogative construction 'ألم نهلك الأولين ' which has an implicit threat to those who refuse or will refuse the religion of truth (490 :1978 ،مغنية)

The FCs of these verses are:

1-The CmCs: The S 'Allah (ﷻ)' is addressing the unbelievers of truth, and both have the ability to use and comprehend the U.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'ويل يومئذ للمكذبين' predicates a future A in the Doomsday.

b. The P of threat is expressed by the word 'ويل' which implies threat, and the interrogative form which carries also a threat.

c. The P of threat specifies the 'woe' as the means of punishment to the unbelievers and to be faithful as the desired behaviour.

3-The PCs:

a. Allah (ﷻ) knows that unbelievers do not prefer to be punished.

b. Allah (ﷻ) has an authority over the unbelievers.

c. The unbelievers prefer not to be punished.

d. The punishment will not occur if the unbelievers become faithful.

4-TheSC: Allah (ﷻ) intends to intimidate the unbelievers and to punish them if they insist on rejecting the Religion of Truth.

5-The EC: Allah (ﷻ) has the ability to perform his punishment on the disbelievers if they continue rejecting the truth.

6-The DC: Threat is correct and real since all the above conditions are met in this U.

6- فَلَسَوْفَ تَعْلَمُونَ لَأُقَطِّعَنَّ أَيْدِيَكُمْ وَأَرْجُلَكُمْ مِنْ خِلَافٍ وَلَأُصَلِّبَنَّكُمْ أَجْمَعِينَ (الشعراء: 49)

When the magicians of Pharaoh perceive the power of Allah (ﷻ) through Moses' rod, they fall down to the ground in adoration of the Lord (ﷻ) of the worlds, and confess their faith. Thereby, Pharaoh implicitly threatens the repentant magicians with the extreme punishment for their apostasy. The A of threatening is emphasized by some particles of emphasis such as 'ل-' in 'لاقطعن', 'لسوف' and 'لاصلبنكم' and 'ن-' in 'اقطعن' and 'أصلبنكم'. Threat is expressed by the particle of future 'سوف' (shall).

The FCs of this speech are:

1-The CmCs: The S 'Pharaoh' is addressing the Hs 'the magicians', both participants have the ability to use and comprehend the verbal speech.

2-The PCCs:

a. The P 'لاقطعن أيديكم وأرجلكم من خلاف000' predicates a future A.

b. The P of threat is expressed by the particle of future 'سوف'.

c. The P of threat specifies the punishment of cut and crucifixion as the means of torture to the magicians and the obedience of Pharaoh's orders as the desired behaviour.

3-The PCs:

a. Pharaoh believes that the magicians prefer not to be punished.

b. Pharaoh has a superior authority over the magicians.

c. The magicians prefer not to be punished.

d. The torture will not occur if the magicians obey Pharaoh's tyranny.

4-The SC: Pharaoh intends to intimidate the magicians and to punish their repentance.

5-The EC: Pharaoh has the ability to perform his threat or to cancel it if the magicians obey Pharaoh's orders.

6-The DC: Threat is real and correct since it matches with the above conditions.

7- قَالَ لَئِنْ اتَّخَذْتَ إِلَهًا غَيْرِي لَأَجْعَلَنَّكَ مِنْ الْمَسْجُونِينَ (الشعراء: 29)

When the Prophet Moses (عليه السلام) calls Pharaoh to believe in the One True God, Pharaoh refuses to accept this call. Moreover, Pharaoh, in this verse, implicitly and conditionally threatens Moses with prison if he puts forward the name of the One True God as against Pharaoh's pretended godhead. The A of threatening is emphasized by some particles of emphasis such as the inceptive '-ل' in 'لئن' and 'لاجعلنك' and the emphasizer '-نّ' in 'لاجعلنك'. Threat is expressed by the conditional construction.

The FCs of this verse are:

1- The CmCs: The S 'Pharaoh' is addressing and threatening the H 'Moses (عليه السلام)' and both the S and H have the ability to use and comprehend the verbal speech.

2- The PCCs:

a. The P 'لاجعلنك من المسجونين' predicates a future A.

b. The P of threat is expressed by the conditional construction.

c. The P of threat specifies the punishment of prison to Moses as the means of punishment.

3-The PCs:

a. Pharaoh believes that Moses prefers not to be cast into prison.

b. Pharaoh has an authority over Moses since he is the ruler.

c. Moses (عليه السلام) prefers not to be cast into prison.

d. Punishing Moses (عليه السلام) will not happen if he obeys Pharaoh's order.

4-The SC: Pharaoh intends to intimidate Moses (عليه السلام) so as to make him discard his divine call.

5-The EC: Pharaoh has the ability to perform his threat since he is a tyrannical ruler.

6-The DC: Threat is correct and real since all the above conditions are met in this speech.

4- Promise and Threat in English and Arabic

4-1 in English

Many linguists agree upon the idea that there is an apparent relationship between promise and threat. Therefore, they assure the fact that promises should not be kept distinct from threats. Egner (2002:3) believes that promising and threaten-

ing are universally understood as a commitment to do something. For this reason both acts are grouped together as two members of the same class, i.e., commissives. In spite of their universality, we believe that the acts of promising and threatening are culture-dependent in that they depend upon the legal, religious or ethical conventions in a particular dialect.

Jespersen (1954:270) states that a threat is a promise of something disagreeable, which can be expressed in future. Searle (1969:58; 1972:148) mentions that the crucial difference between promise and threat is that a promise is a pledge to do something for H, not to H, whereas a threat is a pledge to do something to H, not for H. He believes that threat is something the threatened does not want it to be done. Sometimes, it is possible to use the locution 'I promise' to express a threat because it has the strongest IF indicating devices for the degree of commitment. From this, it would follow that a threat remains a threat even though its wording is that of a promise (ibid.):

90- I promise to fail you if you do not hand in your essay on time.

Similar to what has been mentioned above, Allan (1986:195) draws a distinction between 'true promises' and threats. Such a distinction can be attributed to the background knowledge and belief of both the S and H. This distinction can be clarified by the following examples:

91- I promise I'll give you a good mark if you are polite.

92- I promise I'll call the police if you do not go.

We can infer unambiguously that (91) is a true promise since it is pleasing to the H, whereas (92) is a threat since

the word 'promise', here, is ironically used in reference to unpleasant events.

Allan believes that " the difference between 'true promises' and threats is a matter of contrary conclusion about H's preferences with respect to S's undertaking to do A". He states that some utterances may be ambiguous or indeterminate between a promise and a threat. Such an ambiguity may be attributed to the fact that the S may be uncertain whether the H would prefer the promise or not as in the following examples (ibid: 196):

93- I promise to let you work overtime.

94- I promise to report you to the boss.

It is obvious at the first glance that the above utterances are irresolute between a promise and/or a threat. Such an irresolution can be solved according to the context of the U. Thus if the acts uttered in the above Us are preferable and beneficial to the addressees, then the IFs of such Us will be acts of promising. Besides, the FCs of promising can be applied appropriately to these acts. On the contrary, if the acts uttered are unpleasant and harmful to the addressees, then the IFs of these Us will be acts of threatening. Moreover, the FCs of threatening can be applied confidently to such acts.

Similarly, as both acts of promising and threatening can be expressed implicitly by the modals 'will' and 'shall', it is noticed sometimes that certain speech acts expressed by the modals may oscillate between a promise or a threat. This hesitation between these two acts can be distinguished according to the contextual factors and the social relationship between the participants:

95- I'll come back and see this machine tomorrow.

Here, it is not clear whether the illocution of this utterance is a threat or a promise. But, on the one hand, if the factory inspector addressing the employee whom is to be the cause of the machine failure utters the above U, then the illocution of this U is a threat. Therefore, by applying the FCs of this speech, will find that the FCs of threat will validate this U. Thus the proposition of this U predicates a future act of the S, and it is not pleasing to the H. Moreover, the S has a superior authority over the H. On the other hand, if this U is uttered by the mechanician who is able to repair the machine addressing the owner of the machine, then the illocution of this U is a promise. Thereupon, if we apply the FCs of this U, will find that the FCs of promise will prove this speech. Hereupon, the proposition of this U predicates a future act of the S, and the act promised is pleasing to the H.

Hamblin (1987:34) illustrates that threats are no more than unwelcome promises or statements of unwelcome intention. We can notice from the above definitions that promise and threat cannot be separated from each other.

By the same token, Lyons (1977:737) and Verschueren (1983:737) point out that promise and threat may share similar preparatory, sincerity, and essential conditions. Furthermore, both acts can be expressed linguistically as well as non-linguistically; and they can, in certain cultures, oblige people to carry out the respective actions so as not to lose face.

It is noticed that both acts can denote a conditional speech act. Hence, conditional promises and threats are speech acts that can be used to exercise the behavioural of other persons (Beller, 2002:113). Leech (1983:226-7) believes that 'threaten', as well as 'promise', can denote a conditional SA in the sense that "'S threatened h with x' is roughly ' s undertook to

see to it that something unpleasant (x) would happen to h, if h did not do some act A desired by s.'"

96-If you make any noise you'll be sent home.

This example illustrates that the S will react negatively, i.e., threat, if H shows undesired behaviour (make a noise), but the S will react positively, i.e., promise, if H shows the desired behaviour (be quiet). Beller (2002:114) suggests that the canonical formulations for the conditional promise and threat would be:

"If you do (desired behaviour), then I will reward you with (promise)" vs.

"If you do (undesired behaviour), then I will punish you by (threat)".

By these formulations, Beller believes that there are two action sequences: a cooperative one (promise) and a not cooperative one (threat).

The former sequence is formulated according to the belief that if the addressee cooperates and fulfills the S's goal (showing a desired behaviour), the promisor is obliged to cooperate and to give reward (promise). The promisor himself declares 'his promise' to be a necessary consequence of condition (showing a desired behaviour), so he must guarantee the reward (ibid).

The latter sequence includes two lines of argumentation: First, the S is obliged to punish the addressee (threat) if the addressee does not cooperate (showing undesired behaviour). The S declares his threat of punishment to be a necessary consequence of condition (showing undesired behaviour), so he must react consequently in order to keep his credibility.

Second, it can be argued that the threat implies a complementary promise that determines the following interpretation: " if the addressee refrains from doing the desired behaviour, then the S must refrain from the punishment since there is no cooperation between them" (ibid: 115).

Verschueren (1979:458) finds out that what makes some SAVs performatives and others non-performatives is not to be found in the semantic structure of the verbs but in the pragmatic restrictions on their uses. He believes that in certain cultures, the act of threatening is not readily accepted since the formula 'I threaten you' would place the SA in a particular moral perspective. It would account as passing a negative moral judgment on the act, and as a result the act could not be performed seriously. Thus the S may use a euphemistic explicit performative, 'I promise you' to perform an act of threatening. Such use of 'promise' instead of 'threaten' would be attributed to some pragmatic constraints. This substitution of the performative verb 'threaten' by another 'promise' means that we are dealing with a performativity continuum (ibid.). In this respect, Allan (1986:196) affirms that both acts of promising and threatening are two sides of the same coin. He believes that both acts are derived from one illocution, i.e., promising. Allan believes so because he thinks that there is a performative verb 'promise' but no performative verb 'threaten' (ibid.).

Davies (1986:166-72) and Beller (2002:114) point out that both promises and threats can be formulated conjunctively. The following conjunctive formulation will express the connection between the new consequences set by the S and the addressee's behaviour:

"Do P (desired behaviour) and I'll reward you with (promise)" vs.

"Do P (undesired behaviour) and I'll punish you by (threat)".

97- Be polite and I'll reward you.(If you're polite, I'll reward you.)

98-Be impolite and I'll punish you.(If you're impolite, I'll punish you)

More interestingly, there is a relative relationship between promising and threatening on the one hand and politeness theory on the other. Politeness theory is based on the concept of 'face'. This theory claims that speakers avoid threat to the 'face' of those they address by various forms of indirectness, vagueness and promises. Face has two aspects: positive and negative. An individual's positive face is reflected in his desire to be appreciated by others. An individual's negative face is the desire to remain undisturbed by others (Brown and Levinson, 1987:66).

According to Brown and Levinson, certain IAs are liable to threaten face; such acts are known as 'face-threatening acts' (FTAs). Hence, orders and requests, for example, threaten negative face, whereas criticism and disagreement threaten positive face. They maintain that promises can be regarded as a positive politeness strategy (ibid: 128).

4-2 in Arabic

Generally, Arab scholars agree that promise and threat cannot be isolated from each other as they share certain features. Most religious legislators believe that the relationship between promise and threat is regarded as one principle of the Islamic Religion and the Divine Justice. They think that Allah, the Almighty, is truthful and sincere in His promise as

well as His threat (47 :.البصري وآخرون،د.ت). Legislators propose that since Allah promises believers with reward and threatens unbelievers with punishment, He should not violate neither His promise nor His threat. Thus it is a matter of justice to live up to one's promise and threat (ibid: 49). Therefore, Almighty Allah assures that He is sincere in His promise and threat in different emphatic Quranic verses:

99- وَعْدَ اللَّهِ لَا يُخْلِفُ اللَّهُ وَعْدَهُ (الروم:6)

100- فَلَا تَحْسَبَنَّ اللَّهَ مُخْلِفَ وَعْدِ رُسُلَهُ (إبراهيم: 47)

101-وَيَسْتَعْجِلُونَكَ بِالْعَذَابِ وَلَنْ يُخْلِفَ اللَّهُ وَعْدَهُ (الحج: 47)

We can notice from the above examples that Allah (Y)on the one hand promises that He will aid His Prophet(u) and the believers over the oppressors sooner or later. Then He gives an assurance to them that He will never depart His promise. On the other hand, He threatens, in the same verses, the unbelievers and the oppressors with a severe punishment. Such a punishment will not be cancelled since it is expressed and assured by the binding word of promise 'لا يخلف الله وعده'.

It is noticed that promise in Arabic may be metaphorically or figuratively used to indicate a threat to the addressee. Here, the performative promise is used to commit the S to do something bad to the addressee with the intention of threatening him rather than pleasing him. Since promise has the effect of being good to the H, Arab rhetoricians state that the promise denoting threat is called 'وعد تهكمي' (ridiculous promise) (عبده ، 63 :1973) as in the following Quranic verses:

102- وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الْمُنَافِقِينَ وَالْمُنَافِقَاتِ وَالْكُفَّارَ نَارَ جَهَنَّمَ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا (التوبة : 68)

103- الشَّيْطَانُ يَعِدُكُمْ الْفَقْرَ وَيَأْمُرُكُمْ بِالْفَحْشَاء (البقرة: 268)

104- فَوَيْلٌ لِلَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْ يَوْمِهِمْ الَّذِي يُوعَدُونَ (الذاريات: 60)

According to the researchers' point of view, such a use can be attributed to the fact that promise is more commitment than threat. Thus if someone threatens another by the act of 'promising', he is obliged to perform his threat since 'promise' carries a sense of obligation for the S to fulfill his threat.

Linguistically, we can notice that both promise and threat (الوعد والوعيد)are derived from the same root ' وعد' (promise). Therefore, they should have common features of commitment but 'وعد' (promise) is more commitment than 'توعد' (threaten) and also 'الوعد' is associated with telling good news to the H while 'الوعيد' with telling bad news. Arab rhetoricians state that the verb 'وعد' (promise) can be used in good news as well as bad news when it is followed by an object (ابن منظور ، 1955: 463 ؛ ألاحمدى ، 1979: 186) :

105- وعدت الرجل خيرا (I promise the man with good.)

106- وعدت الرجل شرا (I promise the man with evil.)

But one cannot use ' وعد' (promise) in both cases if it is uttered without an object. In order to distinguish between the two cases, Arab rhetoricians mention that some prefixes, such as ' أ' or ' ت', should be added to the root ' وعد' (promise) followed by the preposition ' ب' to indicate a threat ' أوعد ب' or 'توعد ب', (ibid):

107- أوعدني بالسجن (He threatens me with prison.)

108- توعدني بالسجن (He threatens me with prison.)

According to the futurity aspect of these two acts they can be expressed by the particles of future ' - س' and ' سوف' (will or shall), Moreover, these particles are only used with promise and threat as emphasizors. Here, both particles are used as

emphatic devices within the structure of the U (الهاشمي ،د.ت0 59،):

109- (قَالَ سَلَامٌ عَلَيْكَ سَأَسْتَغْفِرُ لَكَ رَبِي مريم : 47) (implicit promise)

110- (إِنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِآيَاتِنَا سَوْفَ نُصْلِيهِمْ نَارًا النساء : 56) (implicit threat)

The use of these particles in expressing promise or threat depends mainly on the contextual factors which are related to the physical or social setting of the U. Thus the U, for instance,:

111- سيصل أبي قريبا (My father will come soon.)

may be interpreted as a 'threat' to the H if H does not prefer the coming of S's father as there is a sort of misunderstanding between S and H. By contrast, the same U may denote a 'promise' to the H if H prefers the coming of S's father since they are friends. Here, such a difference between promise and threat can be disambiguated according to the background knowledge of both S and H (السامرائي ، 1990: 404-408 ؛ حسان ، 1998: 336 - 372).

Sometimes, certain SAs, whether explicit or implicit, can denote either promise or threat when the context of the U includes persons, who are supposed to hear without being directly addressed, other than the addressees. Therefore, the following Quranic verses may denote a promise to particular addressees and/or a threat to the other persons:

112- (إِنَّمَا تُوعَدُونَ لَصَادِقٌ) الذاريات: 5

113- (سَنُرِيهِمْ آيَاتِنَا فِي الْآفَاقِ) فصلت: 53

We can notice in the (112), for example, that Allah (Y ﷻ)

is addressing the believers as well as unbelievers at the same time but in two directions. On the one hand Allah (ﷻ) promises His Prophet Mohammed (ﷺ) and the believers that He will conquer all the world to the Religion of Islam at the time of the appearance of the Promised Savior 'peace be upon him'. On the other hand Allah (ﷻ) threatens unbelievers with different signs of punishment such as floods, diseases, earthquakes and so on in this life. Such signs of torture are decreed so as to make the unbelievers repent and worship the Lord. Hence, both FCs of promise and threat can be applied to the same U but in different contexts according to certain addressees or hearers (الطباطبائي ، 1974: 430-33).

It is worth mentioning that threat, unlike promise, cannot put the threatenor under a severe obligation to perform what he threatens to do. Here, since the threatenor has the ability and authority to do the A, then he has a choice either to do A or to refrain from acting. Therefore, the threatenor will not be blamed or rebuked, as in promise, for breaking his threat but he may be praised (مغنية، 1978: 402 ؛ الصدر ، 1970: 206).

5- Conclusions

1- The analysis shows that the SAs of promising and threatening in both English and Arabic can be applied to religious texts by analyzing their FCs. This means that religious texts can be regarded as acts of communication.

2- It has been found that in most cases of English texts, the performative verbs of promising are expressed implicitly by the modal verbs 'will' and 'shall' as well as the conditional form; while in Arabic texts promising is expressed explicitly as well as implicitly by different

lexical, semantic, and pragmatic forms. Thus one can conclude that the SA of promising is performed more explicitly in Arabic texts than in English.

3- The study shows also that the SA of promising in Arabic culture does not always imply a commitment to do something to the H, as in English culture. Thus it can be used for the purpose of terminating the conversation between the participants, and to satisfy cultural expectations or to save face.
4- As for the performative verb of threatening, the analysis shows that in both languages threat is mainly expressed implicitly by different syntactic and semantic forms. This fact reveals that both languages have a similar point of view as to the implicit nature of the A of threatening.
5- The study finds out also that threat in both English and Arabic cannot only be determined by the declarative form since it can be expressed in more than one structure such as imperative, prohibitive, and interrogative.
6- Concerning the tense of the performative verbs of promising and threatening, English and Arabic are different in using the performative verbs. The study reveals that English performative verbs of these two acts can be expressed only by using the present tense; while Arabic tends to use the present or/and the past tense. Moreover, Arabic can use some past verbs to express a promise or a threat in given contexts.
7- The study has arrived at a significant conclusion that both acts of promising and threatening have been found to be closely related in both languages since the A of threatening is derived from the same illocution, i.e., promising. It is also concluded that both acts can

share some FCs and some syntactic forms. The differences between the two languages behind using the formula 'I promise you' to express a threat can be attributed to the following points:

a-English tends to avoid using the formula 'I threaten you' by a euphemistic formula 'I promise you' owing to the fact that this formula of threatening is rarely accepted as a performative and has a pragmatic restriction or an offensive meaning in English culture.

b-Arabic tends to use the performative verb ' وعد' (promise) to express a threat since it has the strongest degree of commitment of the S, and to emphasize the degree of punishment in a metaphorical way.

References

English References:

- Al-Ghazali, M.(1994) Islam, Our Religion, (trans. By Galal, A.).ISESCO.
- Allan, K. (1986) Linguistic Meaning : Vol.2. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Inc.
- Austin, J.L.(1962) How to Do Things with Words. Oxford : Clarendon Press.
- Beeston, A.F.L.(1970) The Arabic Language Today. London: Hutchinson University Library.
- Beller, S. (2002) "Conditional Promises and Threats-Cognition and Emotion". In Gray, W.D. and Schunn, C.D.(eds), Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society (pp. 113-18).
- Boguslawski, A. (1983a) "An Analysis of Promise." In: Journal of Pragmatics,7,pp. 607-27.
- (1983b) "A Reply to Jef Verschueren." In J. of Pragmatics ,7, pp. 633-35.
- Bright, J.A. (1964) English Usage for Arab Students.London: Longmans.
- Brown, p., and Levinson, S.C. (1987) Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: CUP.
- Collins, (1987) Cobuild English Language Dictionary. Collins, London and Glasgow: Collins Publisher.
- Cowan, D.(1958) An Introduction to Modern Literary Arabic. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, E. (1986) The English Imperative. London: Croom Helm.
- Eastwood, J. and Mackin , R. (1989) A Basic English Grammar with Exercises. Oxford: OUP.
- Eckersley, C.E. (1961) Essential English for Foreign Students:Book Two.
- Hong Kong: Hong Kong Printing Press Ltd.
- Eckersley , C.E. and Eckersley , J.M. (1980) A Comprehensive English Grammar for Foreign Students. London: Longman.
- Egner , I. (2002) " The Speech Act of Promising in an Intercultural Perspective." Internet: www.silewp/2002/001/SILEWP.
- Fein, R.A., Vossekuil, D.B.,and Holden, G.A.(1995) "Threat

Assessment: An Approach to Prevent Targeted Violence ." National Institute of Justice. Washington: US. Department of Justice.

- Fraser, B. (1975) "Hedged Performatives." In: Cole, P. and Morgan,J.L., (eds.) , Syntax and Semantics : Vol. 3 : Speech Acts . New York : Academic Press. pp. 187-210.
- (1997)"Pragmatic Markers."In:J. of Pragmatics,vol.6,no.2,pp.167-90.
- (1998) "Threatening revisited ."In: Forensic Linguistics.Vol.5, No.2, pp. 159-73.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1973) Explorations in the Functions of Language .
- London : Edward Arnold.
- Hamblin, C.L. (1987) Imperatives. London: Basil Black-Well Ltd.
- Hardinge , L., and Holbrook , F. (1989) Leviticus and Life . England , Grantham: The Stanborough Press Ltd.
- Hasan, J.M. and Al-Sulaiman, M.M.D. (1998) "A Semantic Analysis of Arabic Commissive Verbs".Adab Al-Rafidayn.Vol.13, University of Mosul. pp. 19-28.
- Hayakawa, S.I. (1978) Language in Throught and Action . New York : Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, INC.
- Hornby,A.S. (1968) A Guide to Patterns and Usage in English. London : OUP.
- (2000) Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, (6th edn). Oxford: OUP.
- Hurford,J.R., and Heasley, B. (1996) Semantics: A Coursebook. London: CUP.
- Ise, T.(1998)"How Conventional is a Promise". University of Edinburgh: www.Edin. Univ/ Edu. / 1998.
- Jespersen, O.(1954)A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles.
- Part iv: Syntax. London: Bradford and Pickens Drayton House.
- Leech, G. (1983) Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- (1989) An A---Z of English Grammar and Usage. Hong Kong: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd.
- Leech,G.w and Svartvik,J. (1975) A Communicative Grammar of English. London: Longman.
- Lyons, J. (1977) Semantics,Vol.2. Cambridge: CUP.
- (1981) Language , Meaning and

Context. Bungay, Suffolk The

- Chaucer Press. Matreyek, W.(1983) Communicating in English : Examples and Models. London: Pergam on Press Inc.
- Mey,J.L.(1993)Pragmatics: An Introduction. Oxford:Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Moulton, R.G.(1907)Holy Bible: The Modern Reader's Bible. New York: Holt.
- Palmer, H.E. (1963) A Grammar of English Words. London: Longman.
- Palmer,F.R.(1976) The English Verb. London: Longman.
- Partridge , J.G. (1982) Semantic , Pragmatic and Syntactic Correlates.
- Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag Tubingen.
- Pearsal, J.(1998) The New Oxford Dictionary of English. Oxford:OUP.
- Quirk, R.; Greenbaum, S.; Leech, G.; and Svartvik.J (1985) A Compre- hensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman.
- Scott, M.(2002)"Christ is Coming Again!".Printland Publishers. Internet: www.ISPN. Scott/ G.P.O./ 2002/.
- Searle, J.R.(1969) Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: CUP. (1972)"What is a Speech Act?" In: Giglioli, P.P.,(ed.),Language and
- Social Context . Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin Books Ltd.,
- pp.136-54. (1979) "Metaphor". In Ortony, (ed.) pp. 92-123.
- Smith,B.(1990)"Towards a History of Speech Act Theory".In: Burkhardt,
- A. (ed.). Speech Acts, Meanings and Intentions: Critical Approaches To the Philosophy of John Searle. Berlin: New York: de Gruyter. pp. 29-61.
- Swan, M, (1987) Basic English Usage. Oxford: OUP.
- Trougott, E.C. (1972) A History of English Syntax . New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Traugott, E.C.and Pratt,M.L.(1980) Linguistics for Students of Literature.
- New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch.
- Trosborg, A. (1995) Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints And Apologies. Berlin: Mouton de Cruyter.
- Vanderveken, D. (1999) "Success, Satisfaction and Truth in the

Logic of Speech Acts and Formal Semantics". In: Davis, S. and Gillan, B.(eds.).

- A Reader in Semantics at Oxford University Press . Depa. Of Philosophy: University of Quebec. Internet, www.htp/ vanderveken-@ Univer.Qub.
- Verschueren, J. (1979) "The Analysis of Speech Act Verbs: Theoretical Preliminaries". In: J. of Pragmatics, 3, pp. 457-60. (1983)"On Boguslawski on Promise".In:J.of Pragmatics,7,pp.629-32 Ward, J.M.(1972) The Use of Tenses in English-London: Longman.
- Wood, F.T. (1965) A Remedial English Grammar for Foreign Students.
- Hong Kong: The Macmilian Press Ltd.
- Wright, W. (1974) A Grammar of the Arabic Language. Cambridge:CUP.
- Wunderlich, D. (1979) Foundation of Linguistics , By Lass, R.(trans.) London: CUP.

Arabic References

- القران الكريم.
- الاحمدي، موسى بن محمد الملياني. 1979 . معجم الأفعال المتعدية بحرف :ط1 . بيروت: دار العلم للملايين
- ابن العربي. أبي بكر محمد بن عبد الله/ أحكام القران / أربعة أجزاء / ط1 1957 تحقيق علي محمد البجاوي، بيروت: دار إحياء الكتب العربية.
- البحراني، هاشم الحسيني 0 1415هـ . البرهان .ج 5 .طهران : مؤسسة البعثة.
- رسائل العدل والتوحيد. ج1. دراسة وتحقيق: محمد عمارة. دار الهلال.
- الثعالبي، أبو منصور عبد الملك بن محمد. 1938. فقه اللغة وسر العربية. القاهرة: المكتبة التجارية.
- الجرجاني، عبد القاهر (1366هـ) دلائل الإعجاز. القاهرة : دار المنار .
- حسان، تمام. 1998.اللغة العربية معناها ومبناها ط2.القاهرة: عالم الكتب.
- حسن، عباس. 1966. النحو الوافي ج1،ج4. القاهرة: دار المعارف.
- الخضري، محمد. 1965. أصول الفقه ط5. القاهرة: المكتبة التجارية الكبرى .
- الخلف، علي حسن ؛ والشاوي، سلطان عبد القادر.1982.المبادئ العامة في قانون العقوبات. بغداد: مطبعة الرسالة.
- الخوئي، أبو القاسم الموسوي. 1988 . البيان في تفسير القران. بغداد: مطبعة العمال المركزية.
- الرازي، محمد بن أبي بكر بن عبد القادر. 1981 . مختار الصحاح. بيروت: دار الكتاب العربي.
- الرفاعي، أسامة طه. 1983 . شرح كافية ابن الحاجب، ج1 . بغداد: مطبعة وزارة الأوقاف والشؤون الدينية.
- السامرائي، فاضل صالح. 1990 . معاني النحو، ج4 . الموصل: مطبعة دار الحكمة للطباعة والنشر.
- سلطان،انور. 1962 . النظرية العامة للالتزام: مصادر الالتزام. القاهرة: دار المعارف.
- السنهوري، عبد الرزاق احمد.1952. الوسيط في شرح القانون المدني: نظرية الالتزام بوجه عام. مصادر الالتزام ج1. بيروت: دار إحياء التراث العربي.
- شبر،عبدالله. 1965 . تفسير القران الكريم (تفسير شبر). بيروت: دار البلاغة للطباعة.
- الصدر، اسماعيل. 1970 . التشريع الجنائي الاسلامي في المذاهب الخمسة مقارنا بالقانون الوضعي، ج1 : القسم العام. النجف: مطبعة النعمان.
- الطباطبائي، محمد حسين. 1974 .

الحديثة.

- مغنية، محمد جواد. 1978 . التفسير الكاشف،ج1،ج2،ج4،ج6،ج7 . بيروت: دار العلم للملايين.
- ابن منظور، أبو الفضل جمال الدين محمد بن مكرم0 1955 . لسان العرب،ج3 . بيروت: دار صادر للطباعة والنشر.
- أبو موسى، محمد.1976. من أسرار التعبير القرآني: دراسة تحليلية لسورة الاحزاب. القاهرة:دار الفكر العربي.
- النحاس، مصطفى. 1979. دراسات في الأدوات النحوية. الكويت: شركة الربيعان للنشر والتوزيع.
- نور الدين، عصام . 1984 . الفعل والزمن. بيروت: المؤسسة الجامعية للدراسات والنشر والتوزيع.
- الهاشمي، احمد. د.ت.. جواهر البلاغة في المعاني والبيان والبديع0 بيروت: دار إحياء التراث العربي.
- ابن هشام، الانصاري. 1988 . شرح شذور الذهب في معرفة كلام العرب. تحقيق: ح-الفاخوري0 بيروت: دار الجيل.

الميزان في تفسير القران،ج5 ،ج17 . بيروت: مؤسسة الاعلمي للمطبوعات.

- الطوسي، محمد ابن الحسن. 1979 . الاقتصاد فيما يتعلق بالاعتقاد. النجف الاشرف: جمعية منتدى الشعر.
- عبدة، محمد. 1973 . تفسير المنار،ج2 : عدد11 . القاهرة: الهيئة ا لمصرية العامة للكتاب .
- عرفة، عبد العزيز عبد المعطي. 1984 . من بلاغة النظم العربي: دراسة تحليلية لمسائل علم المعاني، ج1 ، ج2 . بيروت: عالم الكتب .
- فتيان، فريد. 1985 . التعبير عن الإرادة في الفقه ألا سلامي والفقه المدني. بغداد: معهد البحوث والدراسات العربية .
- المخزومي، مهدي . 1964 . في النحو العربي: نقد وتوجيه. بيروت: منشورات المكتبة العصرية.
- المدرسي، محمد تقي. 1406هـ. من هدي القران، ج12 . بيروت: دار الهدى .
- المطلبي، مالك يوسف. 1981 . في التركيب اللغوي للشعر العراقي المعاصر. بغداد: دار الرشيد للنشر.
- المعيني، محمد سعود 1985 الإكراه وأثره في التصرفات الشرعية: بحث مقارن بين الفقه الإسلامي والقانون الوضعي الموصل: مطبعة الزهراء

Objective Explanation of the Nobel Qur'an

This research tries to expose the concept of an objective interpretation of the Nobel Qur'an between thematic and rhetoric script phenomenon. depending on the four acts pouring in the forming of concept and its dimensions. the first act represented in objective explanation as an outlook of text and historical backgrounds. the second act defined objective explanation between descriptive and explanatory one. the third act came to clarify the Qur'anic subject between the objective and structure unity. the last took charge of displaying the text structure to the subject between temporal and spatial dimensions.

These acts followed by research abstract in which the researcher showed the most important pillars extracted from his presentation.

Problems of the Grammatical Terms

This research tries to study the Problems of the grammatical terms. after tracking a wide range of dictionaries and books that focused on perfecting the term in general and grammatical term in particular. The research is divided into three axes: the first axis takes care of clarifying some of problematic terms like plurality of grammatical terms in one subject. the grammatical difference between the Basra and Kufa linguists. and the common terms in more than one word. The second axis specifies al-Kufi-term making counterpoise and corrective additions of a group of terms. The third axis presents groups of terms which are not Kufi in its explanation denials reduction and others. The aim behind presenting those problems is to motivate researchers to work on independent studies to extrapolate all the terms, and consider provide effective solutions to them.

Emotional experience in Andalusian poetry (Expatriation of Ibn Hamdis Sicilian as a Model)

This research shed highlights on important emotional experience to an Andalusian poet who is Ibn Hamdis Sicilian who explained in his poetry the phenomenon of emotional alienation. The researcher predestined it making a plan its substratum is an introduction and a basic study and a conclusion. The introduction presented the theoretical concept of the term (emotional experience) as the contemporary critics dealt with it then its relationship to the poetic text and its artistic impact. The basic study includes a study of the expatriation to Ibn Hamdis Sicilian, it is an emotional experience through two correlated axes: The first dealt with the fact of expatriation to the Andalusian poet actually. The second axis studied the emotional experience embodied in his variation of poetry in its presence motivation and artistic influence. The conclusion came to state results reached through the research.

Al – ilm Journal
by Al–Sayyid Hibatul – Deen Al – Shahristani
An Analytic of its Literary Texts

This research sheds light on this journal and its role in patronizing poets and writers by publishing their literary productions, serving the reality of the Iraqi scientific revival in particular and the Islamic one in general.

The research investigates the literary productions distributed in the issues of the journal. It includes an introduction,which tackles the political and cultural conditions at that period , and two sections. The first section involves two subjects. The first is an information about the journal and the second is about its founder. The second section includes a study of the poetic productions in the journal followed by a second study for the various prose productions such as essays orations and novels, ending by a conclusion .