Pragmatic Study of Swearing in Arabic with Reference to English

Dr. Omar Ahmed Shihab

Tikrit University, College of Arts
Hyousif@tu.edu.iq

Abstract: The current study is concerned with the analytic pragmatic level of swearing in Arabic with reference to English .It tests the behavior of oath in both languages. The analysis of swearing aligns with the speech act theory developed firstly by Austin (1962) and developed later by Searle (1975). Giving oath is about giving a promise or a commitment by which the speaker obliges to a future action. The performative act of swearing in both English and Arabic is illocutionary with maintaining the locutionary and the perlocutionary acts. The study also proves that the felicity condition is satisfied through having a happy utterance in terms of swearing. In addition, as long as the cooperative principle is met, the Gricean maxims are well-established throughout this study.

دراسة تداولية للقسم في العربية والإنكليزية

أ.م.د. عمر أحمد شهاب   كلية الآداب-جامعة تكريت

الخلاصة: تختص الدراسة الحالية بدراسة المستوى التداولي التحليلي للقسم في اللغة العربية مع الاشارة الى اللغة الإنجليزية، وذلك لتحليل المعنى التداولي والبنية التركيبية للقسم في اللغتين وتوضيح مدى الإختلاف بينهما. من خلال البحث القائم، تبين أن القسم في اللغة

العربية، يتماشى مع نظرية أوستن عام (1962) والتي قام العالم سيرل بالإضافة عليها عام
(1975)

ان الفعل الادائي للقسم في كل من اللغتين الانكليزية والعربية هو فعل المغزى المقصود
من القول مع الحفاظ على فعل القول وفعل نتاج القول .وتثبت الدراسة كذلك ان شرط المناسبة
في الحديث متحقق من خلال حديث سعيد في ما يتعلق بالقسم. وبالاضافة لذلك، طالما ان مبدا
التعاون متحقق، فان ثوابت غرايس متحققة من خلال هذه الدراسة.

List of Phonetic Symbols and Abbreviations:

Symbol	Description	Example	Abbreviation	Meaning
/ʔ/ أ	A glottal Stop Consonant	ʔanna: that	SAT	Speech Act Theory
/ħ/ ح	A pharyngeal fricative voiceless	Ħaywan: animal	GEN	Genitive Case
/ς/ ع	A laryngeal fricative voiced	Çayn: eye	NOM	Nominative Case
/ð/ ذ	An interdental fricative voiced	Haðaa: this	ACC	Accusative Case
/θ/ ث	An interdental fricative voiceless	θawb: dress	OBL	Oblique Case
/i/	A high front long vowel	Li: for me	MB	*Muqsam Bɪhi:*
/ɪ/	A high front short vowel	bɪ: by	MA	*Muqsam çali:hi:*

1. Introduction
1.1. Statement of the Problem and its Significance

Language is the most important means of communication used by human beings. However, language as a semiotic system cannot be used to construct meaning and perform acts without returning back the context-based background. Therefore, it is believed that language and context are inseparable (Yule, 2006: 129). Analytically, Arabic language is a very rich language morphologically, syntactically and semantically. Each lexeme has morphological, syntactic and sematic properties. From the semantic-perspective, there are two distinctive terms; they are called connotation and denotation. The same word may have more than

one meaning like the word swearing itself. It has more than one entry in the lexicon.

One is concerned with the meaning of praying to Allah which is called '*?aymaan*أيمان/*qasam* قَسَم : *oath*'. On the other hand, it has another entry which means '*sab* سب : *insulting*'. This paper is mainly concerned with the former meaning, '*?aymaan*' which is enlisted under the identity of the word 'swear' itself in the English lexicon. The difference between swearing '*taboo: qaðf* قذف' and swearing '*?aymaan: oath*' is that the former always implies a connotative meaning. That is, the word itself has a certain meaning but its connotation is totally different. On the other hand, the latter swearing almost implies the denotative meaning and the function of the letter, word or the phrase itself.

?al-Zarkaʃi الزركشي (1957: 40) defines an oath as a phrase that affirms a notion stressing focus on this notion. ?al-Suyu:ti: السيوطي (1974: 133) states that the purpose of an oath is to confirm an utterance with emphasis. In other words, the *Muqsam Bıhi:* المقسم به (object of oath) (henceforth *MB*) serves to emphasize the point made in the *Muqsam ʕali:hi:* المقسم عليه (complement of oath) (henceforth *MA*). The major problem with the Arabic traditional interpretation is that it fails to address the question of the relationship between the object of oath and the complement of it.

1.2. Aim of the Study

The aim of this research is to enhance a pragmatic framework to elaborate on how swearing is directly expressed or implied in a given text. In dealing with the oath, the scholars are primarily interested in establishing the glorification of the '*MB: object of the oath*'.

1.3. The Hypothesis and the Procedure

The study analyzes data from English and Arabic under the light of the theory of pragmatics. This theory has to do with the speech act. It is first developed by Austin (1962) and further by Searle (1975). The fundamental tenets of linguistic communication are that the speakers do action through using the language. That is, they perform actions. Subsequently, the aim of the speech act is to deliver meaning through communication. The paper also refers to the Classical Arabic Theory. It gives corroborative evidence that the speech act theory (SAT) is universal. It, also, includes Arabic and English texts to be analyzed; in addition, the researcher provides a translation for the Arabic texts to highlight the main assumption of this study: semantically, no difference between English and Arabic is deduced. However, the syntactic level is totally different in both languages.

1.4. The Value of the Study

The study sheds light on the performative act in both English and Arabic in terms of oath. The main aspects in both languages are similarly maintained. In terms of the Arabic language, Ibn ?al-Qayim ابن القيم (1429: 46) states that it is through communication the holy Qur'an gets down to the Holy Prophet. Therefore, the oath included in the Qur'an is worded by the Almighty God. Subsequently, when the speakers use oath in their speech, they emphasize their utterances and make the audience hearken to them. Thus, this view is elevated by the usage of '*?aymaan*'. The study proves that the performative act of oath is a commissive speech act by which the speaker is committed to a future promise or s/he just affirms her/his utterance.

2.   Literature Review
    This section presents the theoretical background of SAT in both English and Arabic. It also refers to the previous studies and the distinct value of the current paper.

2.1.   Theoretical Background with Reference to Previous Studies
  ?al- Raazi الرازي (1420: 84-86) defines the usage of swearing in terms of more than one thing. On one hand, Allah gives arguments and evidence to establish the notions of unicity of Himself, Afterlife, and the Retribution. On the other, Qur'an has been delivered to Arabs maintaining the convention of the Arabic society. For more exposition, through using oath, Allah gives evidence for His unicity by the arrangement of the heavens and the earth. Thus, the complement of oath/MA is mentioned in the Qur'an as 'indeed your Lord is one' (Quranic Verse 37:4). The opponents of ?al-Raazi consider that Allah doesn't give any argument through His statements. They support their view by their belief that the Prophet defeats the disbelievers through his polemics and not because of truthfulness of his case. In addition, Arabs always believe that false oaths result in a disaster striking them. They believe that their lands may be left barren. Therefore, if the Prophet took a false oath, he would not escape what follows.
    ?al-Faraahi states that it is not necessary to mention the object of oath (?al-Faraahi الفراهي , 1388: 6-8). Besides, Ibn ?al-Qayim (1429) fails to present a systematic approach of oath. Rather, he only explains the standard explanation. Nonetheless, ?al-Tabaari:الطبري (1374: 217) explains that when Allah swears by His objects, He only adds exalted attribution to these objects. The common method shared by all the classical writers expresses that the oath in the Arabic language is to add glorification to the complement of oath (MA). The goal of the oath in Qur'an, according to Ibn ?al-Qayim, is that Allah, who has the Almighty Power, would dispel any kind or darkness or arguments resulted from the interruption of revelation.

2.2. What Makes this Work Distinct
   The study analyzes English and Arabic texts to prove that the SAT is universal. It is believed that the essential method in oath is about rhetoric devices. It is used to express the commitment of the speaker as it is non-directive. It is only about having an impact on the audience that the speaker will keep the promise implied in the utterance. Besides, the speaker does a certain action through uttering an oath. Oath, either in English or Arabic, is expressed through having the object of the oath higher and nobler than the complement of it. This is to give either sacred glorification or honor to what the speaker says. In addition, the paper provides pieces of evidence that Arabic and English behave similarly in terms of oath pragmatically; however, they are distinctively different only syntactically.

3.   Swearing in English and Arabic
   Oath is divided in Arabic literature into two types: the poetic oath and the Qur'anic oath. The former is expressed by words like 'çumr-ika عَمرِك: your life', 'rabb-i-?al-kaçba الكعبةِ ربَّ : the lord of the Holly Mosque'…etc. The latter is expressed by, for example, 'the Last Day', 'separated letters at the verses of surahs'…etc.
    Linguistically, oath in Arabic is expressed by two ways: mentioning the particles of oath plus a performative verb of oath, mentioning particles of oath plus

a performative noun of oath. The particles of Arabic oath are '*baa?* الباء, *waaw* الواو and *taa?* التاء . The first two obviously denote accompaniment or joining one thing to another; the third is an allophone of '*waaw*'. It is believed that the interpretation of swearing is divided into four categories. The first is the phenomenal oath in which individual or multiple phenomena of nature are sworn by (i.e. the winds and rains have wiped out many a rebellious nation). The second is the historical oath by which one or more events from the past took place (i.e. the uses of the fig and the olive refer to the occasion when Noah's Ark stood atop Mount Judi). The third is the experiential oath in which a certain facet of human experience is presented as evidence (i.e. where Resurrection is sworn by). The fourth is the conjugate oath when the surah presents the argument from 'complementary opposites' (i.e. the examples of the sun and the moon and day and night) (?al-Faraahi translated by ?al-Islaħi, 2002,: 310-313).

Oath can take place by using morphological lexemes, either verbs or nouns, as '*?aqsama* أَقسَمَ: *swear*' and '*ħalifa* حَلِفَ: *swear*'. Having two different lexemes in Arabic referring to only one word in English explains that Arabic is a very rich language morphologically. However, there is a distinct difference in the connotation of these two verbs. That is, the former is used to express false oath while the latter is used to express a true oath (?al-ħarıθi, 1991: 3-6).

The syntactic structure in English is somehow different from its counterpart in English. English oath is illustrated by having the first pronoun 'I' in an active present simple structure and a performative verb. It allows Austin's 'hereby' test to examine whether the verb is performative (Sultan, 2007: 25). However, the Arabic oath is illustrated by having the same English components, in addition to two other components. They are the object of oath, named '*muqsam bıhi*' and the complement of oath, named '*muqsam çali:hi*'.

Pragmatics, in English, is known as the scientific study of the language signs within a certain context to give a means of communication and meaning (Potts, 2014: 3). With respect to a pragmatic-theoretical perspective, language is deemed as a system of symbols and referents in accordance with thing's theory (Frege, 1879 and 1892). It is also considered as a mental idea expressed through words in accordance with idea's theory. In accordance with use's theory, it is analyzed as a social means to communicate (Wittgenstein, 1953). Austin (1962: 115) declares that the most important component of the speech act theory is the illocutionary act "*Now, however, I must point out that the illocutionary act as distinct from the perlocutionary is connected with the production of effects in certain senses*".

4. Pragmatic Analysis of Swearing in Arabic

This study uses the illocutionary act to analyze the behavior of oath both in English and Arabic. Linguistically, the main focus of this study is the pragmatic behavior of swearing which studies the context where it occurs. However, the usage of the letters and predicates to give oath demands to consider syntax and morphology as well. For more exposition, at the morphemes level in Arabic, the particles, as aforementioned, are divided into three letters (*waaw, taa?* and *baa?*), nouns are (*?aymaan* إيمان, *yami:n* يمين and *qasam* قسم) and predicates are (*ħalafa* حَلَفَ and *qasama* قَسَمَ) (?al-?anbaari الأنباري , 1997: 248). According to the letters, '*baa?*' is the origin among others as it can be affixed to the nouns as represented in (1a) and to the pronouns as represented in (1b) below:

1. (a)   أُقسِمُ بِاللهِ

```
?uqsem-u          bel-allah
swear-INOM        by-GodOBL
```
                              "I swear by God"

بِكَ أُقسِمُ يا الله (b)

```
bɪ-ka         ?uqsem-u      ya allah
by-youOBL     swear-INOM    O-GodVOC
```
                     "By the name of God"

(library.islamweb.net)

It can be represented through the translated line that the behavior of swearing is closely similar in both English and Arabic. The English line uses the first person pronoun 'I' in the present tense and the active voice. Tested by 'Austin's hereby test', the outcome would be grammatical if 'hereby' is inserted resulting in 'I hereby swear by God'. Similarly, the Arabic line uses the present active verb, the implicit subject meaning 'I' and, additionally, the MB (the object of the oath). It also allows 'bɪ-haðaa بِهذا: hereby' resulting in 'bɪ-haðaa ?uqsem-u bel-allah'. Here, the only distinctive feature between both languages is that Arabic considers the MB as part of the oath.

While 'waaw', which occurs in a very limited environment, is only affixed to the nouns as illustrated in (2) below:

```
2.    واللهِ وربِّ الكعبةِ
      wa-allah-i    wa rabb-i    ?al-kaʕbah
      by allahOBL, by GodOBL  the kaʕbahGEN
      "To swear by God who is the Lord of the Holy Ka'ba."(Ibid)
```

As long as 'waaw' is considered to be limited, it has a rule-governed context, namely, the explicit nouns. Here, it is apparent that the English translation of all Arabic swearing particles is given only one version, namely, 'I swear'. Thus, Arabic works distinctively from English in that the latter must use an explicit first pronoun 'I'. Accordingly, this means that Arabic can give more than one version which has only one counterpart in English. However, both preserve the rules of SAT.

The last option among particles is 'taa?' which is also rule-governed in the sense that it only can be used in swearing if and only if it gets affixed to the names of God as illustrated in (3) below:

```
3.    (a)    تربِّ الكعبةِ
             ta-rabb-i      ?al-kaʕbah
             by-GodOBL   the-ka'bahGEN
                   "By the Lord of the Holy Ka'ba." ( Ibid)
```

تاللهِ لأكيدنَّ أصنامَكُم (b)

```
ta-allah-i    la-?akida-nna          asnaama-kum
by-GodOBL   no-plan-INOM-against   idolsGEN-your
      "And [I swear] by Allah, I will surely plan against your idols."
             (Verse 57, ?l-?anbia? الأنبياء)
```

In (3/b) above the 'taa?' is attached to 'Allah' satisfying its rule while the MA is what comes after. Attaching 'la' and 'nna' to the verb proves the usage of

affirmation of oath. The translation of (3/b) above illustrates the richness of the Arabic language. Although this Arabic structure is an explicit direct oath in Arabic, the performative verb in English is implied represented in two brackets, i.e. [I swear]. No attention is taken to the tense in Arabic. The particle '*taa?*' is affixed to the word '*Allah*' and the tense in the main verb is the future tense. On contrary, tense is taken into consideration by which the main verb of the sentence is in the present tense satisfying the condition of performative act in English. The difference exists because Arabic uses nominative phrases to perform an oath while English uses a present-simple performative verb. But the MA in both is represented in the future tense.

However, swearing can be conducted when the syntax and morphology interface as illustrated in (4) below:

4. (a) لعُمر أبيكَ تفعَل هذا

la-çumri   ?abi-ka   tafçal   haðaa
by-life^{OBL} father^{GEN}-your^{GEN} do-you^{NOM} this
                    'I beg you to do this'

(b)حَلِفتُ باللهِ أن تذهبَ إليهِ

ħaleft-u   bel-allah   ?an taðhab-a   ɪlai:h-i
swear-I^{NOM} by-God^{BOL} that go-you^{NOM} to-him^{OBL}
          "I swear by God that you will go to him."

As represented in (4a) above, the oath structure is direct in Arabic as the form of the word '*çumri عُمر: life*' and its function are equivalent. While the relation between the form and the function represented in the English translation is indirect. This is illustrated by the translation line as the verb 'beg' has nothing to do with the oath. On a syntactic level, the predicate (beg) is a transitive verb which requires an object. This object pragmatically is the complement of the indirect oath/MA. Subsequently, the oath is explicit direct in Arabic and implicit and indirect in English. In contrary, the example in (4/b) above, the performative verb in the translation is represented in the present simple tense while the performative verb in the Arabic structure is in the past simple tense which refers to the distinctive rich Arabic morphology in dealing with any operation including swearing.

4.1 Procedure

Austin distinguishes between what are utterances and what are sentences. He suggests that the aim of utterances does not depend on truth-condition only; it also has to do with what is known as felicity condition. This condition demands that the content of the proposition be true and have the suitable circumstances for this utterance. Austin, in this area, tries to highlight the importance of dealing with utterances as performative ones. They intend to perform an act rather than just articulating words. Accordingly, any kind of utterance is controlled through the speech act theory. He also draws a distinction between locution, illocution and perlocution. Locution tends to mean what is articulated within a certain context. On the other hand, illocution is to perform an action and to 'alter the state of affairs'; while perlocution aims at having an impact on the addressee. This is illustrated by the data in (5) below:

5. I said I promised to go early to bed. (Ambroise, 2010: 2-3)

The locution in (5) above is about uttering the whole sentence giving a full-fledged proposition while the illocution is about doing or performing the promise. Thereby, the speaker performs this act of promising and s/he will go to bed early. The perlocution may be about having the impact of assuring the parents to sleep early (Ibid). According to Searle (1975), speech acts are divided into five categories: assertives which state the facts. Commissives are about having the situation in which the speaker is committed to do an action. Directives seem to highlight the attempts made by the speaker to do things. Expressives are what refer to a psychological state. Finally declaratives are those that affect immediate change. The speech act mainly focuses on the performative aspect of utterances. Therefore, the ways of communication are used to act and do things (Austin, 1962). The above example clarifies that proposition of an utterance is incomplete without considering the context and circumstances. Therefore, the theory of speech act explains the communication through its function rather than its forms. In this perspective, Levinson (1983:227) mentions:

> "…*Austin launched his theory of speech acts. There are strong parallels between the later Wittgenstein's emphasis on language usage and language games and Austin's insistence that "The total speech act in the total speech situation is the only actual phenomenon which in the last resort we are engaged in elucidating."*

Any utterance either English or Arabic is either constative or performative. The former, namely, constative, describes truth and falsehood. A constative utterance conveys a message which can be compared to the real world and declared to be true or false. A failed constative is false, unclear, or void of reference. On the other side, through a performative utterance an action is conveyed. It is not a matter of 'saying' rather, it is a matter of 'doing'. This is conditioned by having a typical kind of performative verb. It is not judged by truth or falsehood. Yet, it is affected by the felicity condition (i.e. who says what to whom in which context and under which circumstances). While a constative utterance describes a state of affairs independent of itself, a performative one describes the reality itself; that is why, it is called a self-reflexive utterance. Performative, which oath is mainly concerned with, comprises a first person indicative active sentence in the simple present tense. To test the performative utterance, Austin suggests a test by which 'hereby' is inserted without violation of the meaning. This adverb collocates only with all the performative verbs (Austin, 1962:10; Sultan, 2007:30).

Oath is a performative speech act which is concerned with being either happy performative or unhappy performative. If the utterance is delivered by the right speaker at the appropriate time and place and in an appropriate situation, this will be an instance of a 'happy performative' utterance. These performatives are subject to felicity condition. The five major types of felicity conditions are: general conditions by which all the participants have the same knowledge, content conditions, preparatory conditions by which the speaker has the right to utter such content, sincerity conditions by which a commitment is made and essential conditions. This performative act could also be either explicit which is introduced by the first pronoun 'I' preceding the illocutionary performative predicate as

'promise, swear...etc.', the tense is a simple present and the voice of the structure is active, or implicit otherwise (Austin, 1962:18-20).

Austin (1962) and Searle (1975) state that the speech act depends on the balance between the form and the function. It is considered to be straight and direct if and only if the relationship between the form and the function is direct; and indirect otherwise. For more exposition, English uses the declarative sentences to convey a message which is constative (i.e.it is exposed to be either true or false). While it uses interrogative type to form questions. However, (Leech, 1983: 127) believes that people tend to use indirect speech acts mainly in connection with politeness. For example, people may use an interrogative structure to request something very politely as illustrated in (6) below:

6. Can you pass the salt? (Yule, 1996: 134)

The speaker here does not ask for the ability of the hearer whether s/he can pass the salt. Rather, the speaker requests the salt but in a polite way. Therefore, it is believed that people use sounds, words and phrases combining speech event with certain components. Such components include: sender or the addresser, a receiver or addressee, a message, a channel, a code, a topic and a situation. These components must share common grounds to result in understanding and meaning. These are grounded by what Grice (1975) called 'Maxims of Cooperative Principles'. They are also known as Grecian Maxims which include the maxim of quality where the speaker must be truthful; the maxim of quantity as per the speaker must be as informative as s/he could; the maxim of relevance by which the speaker has to be very relevant to the context and the situation and the maxim of manner through which the speaker has to be brief and orderly.

4.2 Data Analysis

This section includes English and Arabic texts which are analyzed under the light of Austin's and Searle's speech act theory. Pragmatically, the researcher tries to prove that oath is a principle among languages. However, the parameter occurs only when it comes to the syntactic structure of both English and Arabic. Chomsky states that principles are the rules that exist in all languages, while parameters are the variations among languages (Chomsky, 1995: 213). Throughout the examples below, oath is performed to be a performative illocutionary act. This assumption is corroborated by the data of 'the Hippocratic Oath' in (7) below:

7. I SWEAR by Apollo the physician and Aesculapius, and Health, and All-heal, and all the gods and goddesses, that, according to my ability and judgment, I will keep this Oath and this stipulation -- to reckon him who taught me this Art equally dear to me as my parents, to share my substance with him, and relieve his necessities if required.(*Edelste*, 1946: 56)

In the example above, swearing in English is expressed directly satisfying the direct speech act. This utterance may be apparently judged as a constative as it may be judged as true or false. However, in fact, this is a performative utterance including one of the performative verbs 'swear'. A performative verb like 'swear' here requires a subject, namely, the first person pronoun 'I', and an object which is considered as the complement of the object, in accordance with the Arabic

approach. The structure is indicative active in the simple present tense. Following Austin 'hereby' test, the structure 'I hereby swear that' is a well-structured proposition. Therefore, this structure is pragmatically an illocutionary explicit and direct speech act. According to the Arabic theory, there is the performer of the oath who is 'I', the speaker, while having 'by Apollo the physician and Aesculapius, and Health, and All-heal, and all the gods and goddesses' as *Muqsam Bıhi* 'MB' and 'keep this Oath' , 'reckon him', 'pass my like'…etc as *Muqsam çali:hi* 'MA'. It is illustrated in above that the speaker has a holy thing, from the speaker's view, to perform the oath. This is used to prove the commitment of the speaker just as the sacred item sworn by (i.e. the object of the oath). Regarding the felicity condition, this structure is felicitous as the speaker has the authority to use this kind of oath, utter this structure to the appropriate addressee and under the appropriate circumstances.

Another data that illustrates the approach of oath in English is represented in the Poem by 'Rosemary Tonks' in (8) below:

8. a. I swear that I would not go back
        To pole the glass fishpools where the rough breath lies

    b. I would not for a youth
        Return to ignorance, and be the wildfowl
                    (poemhunter.com)

In the above examples, the speaker wants to prove that she is truthful when she says that she will not surrender or make a mistake. She uses a direct speech act where the meaning is delivered simply by the meaning of the literal meaning of the words. The form and the function are equally structured. Here, it might seem that the structure has been violated as the speaker does not mention anything about the MB. However, this is how English differs from Arabic. It has been proven that oath as a principle exists in all languages. However, each language behaves differently in terms of performing this kind of oath. The illocutionary act here is transferred by using the word 'swear' and by allowing the insertion of 'hereby' without any violation of the proposition itself. The speaker through this speech act does not state the truth or the falsehood of the structure. Rather, she tries to perform an action which is 'promising' that she will not return back to ignorance. Besides, it is a kind of commissive act by which the speaker is personally committed to her utterance. The felicity of this utterance can be proven simply by checking the authority of the speaker-hearer relationship, the circumstances and the context under which this utterance takes place. The above examples are explicit where there is a thematic subject occurs at the surface structure preceding the performative verb (swear).

However, the data in (9) below represents the implicit speech act:

9. a. A promise made,
        of sincerity and truth,
        to honor you with loyalty,
        to wait for you.

    b. Temptation's irrelevant,
        I'm a woman of my word,

31

my creed is pure declaration,
to wait for you.

   c. Day by day,
       I recite my vow,
       my own pledge of allegiance,
       to wait for you.
                    (scrapbook.com)

   The structures in the above examples are felicitous. This is tested by that the speaker is a women who waits for her lover. The speaker-hearer relationship is satisfied. Then, regarding the circumstances and the context in which this takes place, she honors him that he has gone to save the country and she will wait for his return. Subsequently, the felicity condition is satisfied. However, this is a passive voice structure which expresses the implicit speech act. Although it is an implicit speech act, it is a direct one where the form and the function are similarly structured. They go for the same action, namely, promise. The performative act in (9/a) is declared through a passive structure where the object gets passivized to serve as the syntactic subject of the whole structure. While in (9/b), it is an active; yet, the subject is not a first person pronoun. Rather, it is a nominative phrase having the synonym of the word 'desire'. Here, it is strongly apparent that the promise act is implicit thorough the presupposition notion in pragmatics. The author presupposes that the promise she made is like a creed she declares. On the other hand, the data in (9/c) is a commissive performative act where she uses the morpheme 'vow' to intensify her message and her action of waiting. In accordance with the Grice's maxims, the examples in (9) above satisfy all the maxims. She preserves the maxim of quality by being truthful in her utterance, the maxim of quantity by being very informative using her words to attribute greatness and commitment to her vow, the maxim of relation by being very relevant to the message that she delivers and the maxim of manner by being very orderly and brief.
   The examples in (10) by 'Maria Konopnicka' below illustrate that oath is used to describe the loyalty of Polish nation where the MB is very honorific in Polish nation's view:

   10. a. We won't forsake the land we came from,
            We won't let our speech be buried.
            We are the Polish nation, the Polish people,
            From the royal line of Piast,
            We won't let the enemy oppress us.

        b. To the last blood drop in our veins,
           We will defend our Spirit.

       c. We won't have Poland's name defamed,
          We won't step alive into a grave.
          In Poland's name, in its honor
          We lift our foreheads proudly.
                        (en.wikipedia.org)
          (infopoland.icm.edu.pl/web/arts_culture/music/hymns/rota/Oath.html)

The date in (10) above represents the performative illocutionary act by which the poet lives proudly for Poland's name and to save its land. She tries to expound the notion of loyalty and the spirit of freedom by holding an oath indirectly and implicitly. The indirectness is expressed through using a declarative sentence which is void of any performative verbs. Therefore, there is no direct relationship between the form and the function of this structure. Besides, the notion of oath is implied in the structure. However, through the implicature theory, the reader is able to deduce what the speaker means. The examples in (10) above express the commissive speech act as the speaker expresses her commitment of not allowing enemies to force the nation forsake their land as appears in (10/a), of defending the spirit of Poland as in (10/b) and of living in honor as in (10/c). Using a future simple tense deviates the structure from the normal explicit composition. Yet, it behaves similarly to Arabic as represented in (3/b) above. It can be argued for by the application of Austin 'hereby' test which is very applicable here which proves that the data in (10) above is a performative act. It is illustrated by restructuring (10/b) in (11) below:

    11. To the last blood drop in our veins

                          We hereby will defend our Spirit

As aforementioned, the speech act theory is to have the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. The poet uttered these words to mean that the nation will defend bravely their land, to do the action of dependence of honor by fighting and to assure the entire nation that they will stand together in front of the enemies, respectively. The felicity, thereof, of such structure is satisfied as long as the speaker is Polish speaking to her nation and under the circumstances that they will defend their spirit if they may get into a war with their enemies. Accordingly, it is a happy structure. Not only is the poet commissive in her utterance, but she is also directive as she attempts to encourage the speaker to defend- to do an action. It is a clear-cut evidence for the five major types of felicity conditions. The general condition is satisfied by which all the participants have the same knowledge. Besides, the content condition has to do with the relevance of what has been said. The preparatory condition is met by which the speaker has the right to utter such content. Finally, the sincerity and the essential conditions are made when a commitment is made.

Regarding more corroborating evidence of a direct speech act, consider the data in (12) below:

    12. I swear by the moon and the stars in the sky I'll be there

             And I swear like the shadow that is by your side I'll be there

                  For better or worse till death do us part

               I'll love you with every beat of my heart

                    And I swear.

                (azlyrics.com/all4one)

The directness of (12) above is illustrated by the usage of the performative verb 'swear'. The locutionary act through this structure is done by illustrating the literal meaning of the words themselves, while the illocutionary act is performed through

performing the act of love and the perlocutionary act is met when the addressee gets assured that speaker's love lasts forever. Besides, the Gricean maxims of cooperative principle are satisfied. It is exemplified above in (12) that the speaker is truthful and brief satisfying the maxims of quality and manner, respectively. The speaker also is relevant to the message and so informative satisfying the maxims of relevance and quantity, respectively.

   Another evidence of the felicity condition is represented in (13) below by which the president of the United States must take as an Oath of Office:

13. I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

(americanhistory.si.edu/presidency)

Just as what has been illustrated through the power of promises and swearing, articulating "I swear," "I promise," or "I vow" are all speech acts. The felicity condition is to be satisfied if the speaker is the president of the US, the addressees are the nation and the circumstance is about the elections, for example. As a result, the utterance is a happy cooperative one as it satisfies delivering the message, the code, and the speaker-hearer relationship. The structure of the active sentence in (13) above is constructed through using a simple present predicate 'swear' with the first person pronoun 'I' giving an explicit act. In accordance with Austin's 'hereby' test, the structure is going to be fulfilled by saying 'I hereby swear that'. The illocutionary act said by the US president is about taking the action of being committed to his utterance, defending the country and being aligned with the constitution. It also has a perlocution act by which the speaker wants to affect the audience and to assure them that he will exert his effort not to let their voices down. Therefore, the speech act here can also be described as commissive and directive, respectively. The explicit directness of the example in (13) above copes with fulfilling the conditions of felicity and the maxims of cooperative principles. This results in a happy performative utterance.

      In parallel, the same constraints of performative act are applicable in Classical Arabic. In the same way that English behaves, Classical Arabic behaves in terms of swearing and performing an oath. However, Arabic is a very rich language morphologically. Thereby, oath is performed through more than one level. The morphological level of oath is to use one of the swearing particles (i.e. *baa?, waaw* and *taa?*) preceding a glorious lexeme as '*Allah: God'*, '*ςumr-ika: your life'…*etc, or an oath predicate meaning 'promise' or 'swear'. The syntactic level of Arabic oath exists by the occurrence of the performative commissive verb in accordance with the speech act theory. However, in Arabic, oath comprises two objects: '*Muqsam Bıhi*: a thing sworn by (i.e. the object of oath) and '*Muqsam ςali:hi* : a thing sworn for' (the complement of oath). Similarly to English, MB is optional which may be, implicitly, uttered or null at all. The interface between both levels is interrelated with the pragmatic level which illustrates that the performative speech acts are universal. However, Arabic behaves differently with respect to tense as it allows a past performative act as represented in (4/a).

Through the example in (14) below by the poet 'Saçid Ben Aħmad سعيد بن أحمد', it is represented that the English pragmatic level is preserved similarly in Arabic:

14. لأقعُدنَّ على الطريقِ وأشتكي

$$\text{La-?qçuda-nna} \quad \text{çala} \quad \text{?l-tariqi} \quad \text{wa} \quad \text{?aʃtaki}$$
No-sit-I^NOM   on   the -road-^OBL   and   complain-I^NOM

"I swear I'll sit through the road and complain about your injustice"
(dhifaaf.com)

The poet formulates his structure on more than one level. On the morphological-syntactic interface level, he uses the particle 'la' not to negate, rather, to affirm and focus the idea of swearing. The performative act in Arabic is direct as the poet expresses his illocutionary act through an agentive verb '?qçud أقعُد: sit'. The form of affirmative verb having 'la' and 'nna' is to present focus and the function is also the same; subsequently, the relationship is direct. Structurally, he formulates the sentence in the active mood using the future simple tense and the first subject pronoun 'I'. Just like 'hereby' test in English, Arabic preserves the same test by inserting the word 'bɪ-haðaa بهَذا: hereby'. Comparing to the translated version, it is represented in the present-simple performative verb having the MA in the future tense. But in Arabic, the performative act is delivered by one of the oath particles plus an affirmative verb affixed to 'nna نون التوكيد'. In Arabic, the performative verb 'swear' is implied and interpreted through the implicature theory in pragmatics.

Morphologically, the Arabic language has the power to express the oath with one of the particles as 'baa?' and a honorific noun as '?ab أب: father' as a phrase as illustrated in (15) below:

15. بأبي و أُمي من شهدتُ وفَاتَهُ في يومِ الأثنينِ النبي المهتدي

Bɪ-?ab-i   wa ?umm-i   man ʃahed-tu   wafata-hu
     fi   youm-i ?al-?eθnain-i ?al-nabi   ?al-muhtadi

By-father^GEN-my and mother^GEN-my who see-I^NOM death^GEN-his
     on day^OBL the-Monday the-prophet^NOM the-delivered

'I swear by my parents that they are not avail against the prophet whose death was on Monday' *(aldiwan.net)*

Hassaan Ben θabet حسّان بن ثابت uses a direct performative act without mentioning any verb. This is the genuity of the Arabic language. The speaker here uses the MB: his emotions of his parent, to prove his feeling towards the MA: the Prophet Muħammad. It is absolutely believed that the Prophet is the best among all the creatures. Yet, in Arabic, people used to utter such structures to express that they love him more than their love to their parents. Morphologically, he uses the 'baa?' particle to perform the Oath attached to an explicit noun satisfying the properties of 'baa?'. Syntactically, the sentence is structured in an active voice and in the present simple tense. The morphological richness of the Arabic language allows the predicate, meaning 'I swear', to be implied within the structure and uttered indirectly. Subsequently, no verb of performative act is mentioned; however, it is a

direct speech act by which the form and function of the sentence parallel in a straight, direct track. The illocutionary act is maintained through the commissive speech act said by the speaker himself. In Arabic, the oath structure is characterized by being non-directive speech which requires no fulfillment of an action. Considering the above example, it is illustrated that the only difference between the English and the Arabic performatives lies in the syntactic form of each, but semantically speaking no difference at all is deduced.

It is a property of Arabic not to use predicates at all and the oath is performed. The example in (16) below represents that although no predicates are there, the oath is direct through the usage of a glorified noun as *'çumr: life'*:

16. لعُمركَ إنهم لفي سَكراتهم يعمهون

La-çumru-ka   ?enna-hum   la-fi sakaraat-ıhım   yaçmahuun
By-life^OBL-your indeed-they^NOM in   intoxication^GEN-their wander-they^NOM

"Verily, by thy life (O Prophet), in their wild intoxication, they wander in distraction, to and fro" *Verse 72, ?al-Hıjr* الحجر
(Translated by Yusuf Ali, [islamawakened.com)](islamawakened.com)

The Qur'anic verse in (16) above demonstrates the performative speech act by a noun like 'çumr'. God structures this performative act by the aspect of having a glorious entity to be MB '*La-çumru-ka: thy life*". Its glorification is attributable to the glorification of the person himself, namely, the Prophet. The illocutionary act is delivered through the usage of the word '*çumr: life'* morphologically and giving the active present simple voice syntactically. However, the meaning is direct- since the relation between the form and the function is straightforward, and it is also commissive- since Allah utters this. Performing an oath by a glorified thing as represented in (16) above explains the inevitable truthfulness of the MA, namely, the intoxication of the disbelievers. In accordance with the perlocutionary act expressed throughout, Allah directs the nation not to follow the same track by the disbelievers; otherwise, the entire nation will wander in distraction without vain. The non-directive utterance in (16) is illustrated as no action needs to be fulfilled. Allah has no need to prove what he says so this kind of oath is called an honorific oath by which the MB is glorified. It can be seen in Arabic through the usage of words with glorious connotation such as '*çumr: life'*.

A direct explicit oath occurs in (17) below where *Imaam Abu ħani:fa* الإمام أبو حنيفه says:

17. a. واللهِ يا خير الخلائقِ إنّ لي قلْبًا مشوّقًا لا يرومُ سواكَ

Wa-Allahi   ya-5yr ?al-5ala?eqi ınna li   qalb-an
mushaweq- an la   yaroum-u   swaka

By-God^OBL O-best the-people^VOC that for-me heart-^ACC
emotional   no   wish-it^NOM   but-you^ACC

"I swear by God that my emotional heart wishes nobody but you"

b. و بحقِّ جاهِكَ إنني بِكَ مُغرَمٌّ و اللهُ يعلمُ أنّني أهواكَ

Wa   bɪ-ħaqqi   jahɪka   ?enn-i   bɪka
mo3'ram-un wa ?allahu   yaçlam-u   ?ana-nni   ?ahwa-ka

And   by-glorification^{OBL} status^{GEN}-your   that-I^{NOM}   by-you^{OBL}
    enamored   and   God^{NOM}   know-he^{NOM}   that-I^{NOM}
love-you^{ACC}

"By your glorious status, I swear that I am enamored of you and God knows that I truly love you" *(adabislami.org/magazine)*.

    Imaam Abu ħanifa in (17a) and (17b) above explains his love for the Prophet. He performs an oath to prove the truthfulness of his utterances. In (17a), he uses the '*waaw*' particle to express oath. In accordance with the aspects of the '*waaw*', it gets attached only to the word '*God/Allah*'. Therefore, the directness of the speech is illustrated through the usage of '*wa-allahi: by God*' where the relationship between the form and the function is direct. Therefore, the performative speech act is expressive and direct. The MB in (17a) above is 'God'; subsequently, it inherits the glorious features to what the speaker intends to say later. The syntactic-semantic interface level deals, thereby, with the active voice of the structure which is represented through having the simple present tense giving the meaning of a direct explicit oath. The meaning of such structure, the locution, is just delivering a message that the speaker falls in love with the Prophet, yet the illocutionary act is expressed through the notion of the action of looking forward to seeing the Prophet in the Hereafter life. No action needs to be fulfilled; therefore, the structure is non-directive. In accordance with the Grecian Maxims, this structure fully meets all the maxims as it is very informative, brief, truth and relevant. Besides, the code, the context and the speaker-addressee relationship are perfectly drawn. Subsequently the utterance is happy satisfying the felicity condition. The example in (17b) by the same speaker, *Imaam Abu ħanifa*, expresses the same notions in (17a). However, the oath in (17b) is expressed by using the particle '*baa?*' attaching to a glorious nominative phrase '*bɪ-ħaqqi*'. No verb in Arabic is mentioned; yet, it is translated into English as it is implied in the original structure. Otherwise, it has the same analytical illustration.

    The data in (18) below represents the idea of implicit indirect oath by which the speaker is committed to what he intends under a certain condition:

18. أنتِ طالق إن خرجتِ
  ?anti   taalɪq   ɪn   5arag-ti
  you^{NOM} free   if   out-you^{NOM}
"I swear that you will be divorced under the condition of going out."
(?al-Shahari, 1422, Pg. 168)

    The data in (18) proves the fact that there is a relation between the form and the function. The conditional structure in Arabic is not attributed to oath. In the previous examples above, when the form and the function of the examples are direct, the relations are directly straightforward. However, the structure in (18) is a condition but the function is preforming an oath. The performative act is indirect where the speaker satisfies the felicity condition if and only if the components of the speech are met. These components include the relation between the speaker and the hearer. If the speaker is the husband of the addressee, he has the authority to articulate such an utterance. Besides if the situation is that the wife goes out, the

situational-context is satisfied. Then the oath occurs, namely, that she is divorced. Following the same approach of SAT, the speaker expresses the locutionary act through the conditional meaning. Yet, the illocutionary act is done through the action of oath. Besides, perlocutionary act is delivered through warning and directing the addressee not to go out. Through such a speech act, the speaker delivers a commissive act by which he is committed to his intention under this condition, namely, going out. However, it is a direct explicit oath in the English-translated version having the condition under the scope of the MA.

4.3 General Discussion

The definition of oath in Arabic is about a promise through which the speaker is committed to a certain thing. The oath taker uses a holy, honorific thing to attribute these features to what s/he says. In English, oath is delivered in the same way. It is about a commitment in the future. The Speech Act Theory by Austin deals with two acts mainly called constative and performative. The former is about having true or false statements while the latter is about having the illocutionary act by which the speaker does an action. It has been common that performative act either is a primary (i.e. implicit) or an explicit one. Oath in English is expressed explicitly by which the speaker uses the first person pronoun 'I', the simple present active voice of the statement and his/her structure can be tested by 'hereby' test. However, it has been proven that Arabic behaves differently. It allows both explicit and implicit oath by which the implicit oath is interpreted through the notion of implicature in pragmatics. Performing an oath can either be a direct or indirect depending on the relation between the form and the function of a certain structure. Throughout the current study, it can be safely generalized that oath is a universal speech act pragmatically. Yet, Arabic behaves differently in terms of the syntactic structure. This has been illustrated through the Arabic data with the English translated versions. This data proves that one swearing version in English 'I swear' can be expressed through more than one version in Arabic. This returns back to the Arabic morphological level at which oath is performed by one of the oath particle co-occurring with either nominative phrases or predicates.

Through the translation lines, it can be deduced that English uses the first person pronoun 'I' in the present tense and the active voice (or sometimes the passive voice giving an implicit oath); while Arabic uses either the present or the past active verb and an implicit subject means 'I'. In addition, Arabic adds one more component which is the object of oath. Thus one English utterance can be expressed by more than one way in Arabic as represented throughout the data included. The data in (3/b) above adds a distinctive feature for the Arabic language. No swearing verbs exist in this structure and the verb is implied. It is represented by the translated line where an implied verb is represented as '[I swear]'. Regarding tense, English requires that performative act occurs through a present simple structure. On contrary, Arabic allows past simple performative verbs as represented in (4/b) above. As long as Arabic allows nominative phrases to perform an oath, tense sometimes does not match its English counterpart criterion.

5. Conclusion

This paper is concerned with the performative act of swearing in Arabic with reference to the speech act theory by Austin (1962) in English. It has been proven throughout this study that there are similarities between English and Arabic in what is called the pragmatic interface level. However, they both differ in terms of the syntactic level. Firstly, both languages agree that oath is included under the performative commissive act by which the speaker does an action (i.e. illocutionary act). Nonetheless, s/he is not away from the locutionary and perlocutionary acts as represented above. However, the discrepancies emerge in the structure of oath in both languages. Arabic uses oath either by particles plus nominative phrases or plus performative predicates allowing *'bi-haðaa: hereby'* test while English uses an indicative active voice structure with the first person pronoun preceding a performative verb. In terms of tense, English only uses the present simple performative verb with having the complement of oath in the present or in the future tenses; while Arabic uses both present and past performative verbs. In addition, English allows Austin's 'hereby' test to test the validity of the structure and Arabic allows 'bɪ-haðaa' test. According to Leech (1983), pragmatics is concerned with the function of the language (i.e. what the speaker means, does, and affects the addressee). Austin develops the speech act theory to mean 'how to do things with words'. Searle (1979) focuses on the significance of the speech act by performing a certain act through promising, swearing…etc. Austin distinguishes between performatives and constatives. This study was mainly concerned with the performative act which has two grammatical forms. These forms are the usage of the first singular pronoun in addition to a simple present active verb. As a result, it can be safely generalized that the SAT is universal which can be applied universally. The only difference between English and Arabic in swearing is the syntactic structure of the Arabic languages and this is resulted from the richness of the Classical Arabic morphology.

References

?al-?anbaari, çbderraħman Ben Muħammad Ben çubayd Allah. (1997). *?asraar ?al-çarabayah*, Beirut: Dar ?al-Kutub ?al-çılmyah.

?al-Faraahi, çbd El-ħamid. (1388). *?eçjaz ?al-Qur'an*, Cairo: ?al Matbaçah ?al-ħamidayah.

----------------------------. (2002). *Mufradaat ?al-Qur'an, Naðaraat Jadidah Fi Tafsir ?al-Faað Qur'aniah*, Translated by ?al-Islaħi, Muħammad ?ajmal ?ayoub. Beirut: Dar ?al-Gharb ?al-Islami.

?al-ħarıθi, çali Ben Muħamman Ben çab-?al-Muħsın. (1991). *?isloub ?al-Qasam Fi ?al-Qur'an ?al-Karim, Dırasah Balaghayah*, MA thesis. KSA: Um ?al-Qurah University.

?al-JurJani, çbdelqaaher. (1977). *?asraar ?al-Bala3'a*. Cairo: Muhammad Ali Subiħ Press.

?al-Raazi, Abu çabduallah Muħammad. (1420). *Mafaatiħ ?al-ghayb*, Beirut: Dar Iħya? ?al-Turaθ ?al-çarabi.

?al-Shahari, çawad Ben ħussien. (1422). *?eçtbaar ?al-Qasd fi ?al-talaaq,* MA. KSA: Um ?al-Qura University, Islamic Studies Faculty.

?al-Suyu:ti:, çbderraħman Ben Abi Bakr. (1974). *?al-?etqaan fi çulu:m ?al-Qur'an*, Cairo: ?al-Hay?ah ?al-Masrayah lel-Kitaab.

?al-Tabari, Abi Jaçfar Muħammad. (1374). *Tafsir ?al-Tabari*, Cairo: Dar ?al-?al-Maçaarıf.

?al-Zarkaʃi, Abu çabduallah Badr ?al-Din. (1957). *?al-Burhaan f çulu:m ?al-Qur'an*, Lebanon: Dar Iħyaa? ?al-kutub ?al-çarabayah.

Al-Hindawe, Fareed; Al-Masu'di, Hameed; Mizara, Ramia. (2014). *The Speech Act Theory in English and Arabic*, Open Journal of Modern Linguistics.

Ambroise, B. (2010). *From Speech Act Theory to Pragmatics: The Loss of Illocutionary Point*, Archives-ouverts.fr <halshs-00514810>

Austin J.L. (1962). *How to do things with Words*, Oxford: University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*, MA. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Datondji, A. (2017). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Newly Elected Heads of States' Inaugural Oaths: a Case Study*, International Journal of English research. The Republic of Benin.

Edelste, L. (1943). *In the Hippocratic Oath: text, translation and interpretation*, Page 56 ISBN 978-0-8018-0184-6.

Frege, G. (1879-1931). *Begriffsschrift, eine der arithmetischen nachgebildete Formelsprache des reinen Denkens*, Translated as Concept Script, a formal language of pure thought modelled upon that of arithmetic, by S. Bauer-Mengelberg, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation, Pragmatics*: A Reader, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ibn ?al-Qayim, Abi çbduallah Muħammad. (1429). *?al-Tibyan fi ?aymaan ?al-Qur'an*. Jaddah: Magmaç ?al-Fıqh ?al-Islami.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*, London: Longman Group Limited.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Potts, C. (2014). *Pragmatics*, Department of Linguistics Stanford University.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

--------. (1975). *A taxonomy of illocutionary Acts. Language, Mind, and Knowledge*, Minneapolis Studies in the Philosophy of Science.

--------. (1975). *Indirect Speech Acts, Syntax and Semantics: Speech Act*, New York: Academic Press.

Sultan, M. K. (2007). *The Semantics, Pragmatics and Translation of Speech Acts*, Al-Mustansiriya University: College of Basic Education.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations*, translated by G.E.M Anscombe, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Yule, G. (2006). *The Study of Language*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

The websites that some data are retrived from:
http://americanhistory.si.edu/presidency/1b2.html
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rota_(poem)

http://fatwa.islamweb.net/fatwa/index.php?page=showfatwa&Option=FatwaId&Id=79332

https://www.adabislami.org/magazine/print_article/347

https://www.aldiwan.net/poem21397.html

https://www.azlyrics.com/lyrics/all4one/iswear.html

http://www.dhifaaf.com/vb/showthread.php?t=12462

https://www.poemhunter.com/poem/oath-9/

https://www.scrapbook.com/poems/doc/35963.html

info-poland.icm.edu.pl/web/arts_culture/music/hymns/rota/Oath.html

http://islamawakened.com/quran/15/72/