

Competitive Speech Acts in English and Arabic: A Contrastive Study

Muhammed Khadim Ali Nagham Kareem Jassim

Department of English/ College of Education for Humanities/ University of Thi-Qar
naghamkareem43@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Submission date: 6 / 8 / 2020

Acceptance date: 11 / 8 / 2020

Publication date: 21 / 10 / 2020

Abstract

Competitive speech acts are one of the language functions that have been classified by Jeffrey Leech in 1983 in the Theory of Speech Acts. The present study compares Competitive speech acts in two languages: English and Arabic. It investigates the points of similarity and differences of Competitive speech acts in the two languages. It aims at describing, analyzing and comparing Competitive speech acts in English and Arabic due to their importance in any conversational exchange between two or more people. It also aims at comparing Competitive speech acts between the two languages by defining them, showing their syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects. The study hypothesizes that Competitive speech acts are found in both languages. It explains Competitive speech acts of asking, begging and ordering through giving and explaining the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of each competitive act in the two languages. The major findings of the study are that Competitive speech acts are found in English and Arabic. In English, Competitive speech acts have been classified clearly by Leech as one of the language functions that are very important in understanding the speech act theory. In Arabic, Arab linguists take this classification of Competitive speech acts and apply and study it in their language where there is a great attention in the study of speech act theory by Arab linguists.

Keywords: Competitive speech acts, asking, begging, ordering, English and Arabic

أفعال التنافس الكلامية في اللغة الإنكليزية والعربية: دراسة مقارنة

محمد كاظم علي نغم كريم جاسم

قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/ كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية/ جامعة ذي قار

الخلاصة

أفعال التنافس الكلامية هي واحدة من وظائف اللغة التي صُنِّفت بواسطة جيفري ليج في عام 1983 ضمن نظرية الأفعال الكلامية. تتناول الدراسة الحالية مقارنة أفعال التنافس الكلامية في اللغتين الإنكليزية والعربية. وتقصي هذه الدراسة نقاط التشابه والاختلاف بين اللغتين.

تهدف الدراسة إلى وصف وتحليل ومقارنة أفعال التنافس الكلامية في اللغة الإنكليزية والعربية بسبب أهميتها في أي تبادل حوار بالمحادثة بين شخصين أو أكثر. تهدف الدراسة أيضاً إلى مقارنة أفعال التنافس الكلامية في اللغتين الإنكليزية والعربية وذلك بتعريفها وإظهار جوانبها النحوية والدلالية والتداولية.

تستند هذه الدراسة على افتراض أن أفعال التنافس الكلامية موجودة في كلتا اللغتين الإنكليزية والعربية. هذه الدراسة تشرح أفعال التنافس وهي أفعال (السؤال والتوسل والأمر) عبر تناول مستوياتها النحوية والدلالية والتداولية في كلتا اللغتين.

توصلت الدراسة بأن أفعال التنافس موجودة في اللغتين الإنكليزية والعربية. وقد وجد أن في اللغة الإنكليزية أفعال التنافس تم تصنيفها بوضوح بواسطة ليج كواحدة من وظائف اللغة التي تمتلك دوراً مهماً في فهم نظرية الأفعال الكلامية بينما أخذ اللغويون في اللغة العربية هذا التصنيف ودرسوه عندما كان هناك اهتمام كبير لدراسة نظرية الأفعال الكلامية في اللغة العربية من الكثير من اللغويين العرب.

الكلمات الدالة: أفعال التنافس الكلامية، السؤال، التوسل، الأمر، الإنكليزية والعربية

1. Introduction

Competitive speech acts are one of the language functions that can be used to fulfil some purposes. The functions of a language are called speech acts which begin with Austin's speech act theory in 1962[1]. Speech acts are "the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication" [2-4]. In English, speech acts have been classified by many linguists like Austin, Searle, Bach and Harnish and by Leech in (1983) when he states that speech acts are classified as language functions in which competitive speech acts are one of them. In Arabic, linguists were very interested in the study of speech act theory where they distinguished between the two concepts (alkhabar) (constatives) and (al? nshaa) (performatives) where competitive speech acts belong to performative acts. These two concepts match Austin's speech act theory [5, 6]. Competitive speech acts are considered one of the language functions according to Leech. Thus, they are usually used when the illocutionary goal competes with the social goal [7]. In this study the competitive speech acts of asking, begging and ordering are studied from the points of their syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects in English and Arabic. This study highlights the similarities and differences of Competitive speech acts in the two languages.

1.1 The Problem

There were a lot of studies which have been conducted in the study of speech act theory. Even its different classifications have been studied by many researchers. However, there was a little interest in the study of Leech's theory of speech act. Leech has classified speech acts from the social viewpoint and he points out that speech acts can be considered as language functions [8]. They are associated with indirectness and politeness principles in which an utterance is said in an indirect or polite way in order to be performed by the hearer. In English the term "Competitive speech acts" is not very much used because much of the studies have focused on the classification of speech acts which have been proposed by Austin and Searle. In Arabic, grammarians, rhetoricians and traditional thinkers have investigated the speech acts of Searle's and Austin's classifications.

There is no conducted study that tries to compare Competitive speech acts in English and Arabic. So, this study tries to answer the following questions:

1. What do Competitive speech acts mean?
2. What are the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of the competitive speech acts of asking, begging and ordering in both languages?
3. How can Competitive speech acts be associated with indirectness and politeness principles in both languages?
4. What are the similarities and differences between English and Arabic in terms of Competitive speech acts?

1.2 Aims

The study aims at:

1. Describing Competitive speech acts in English and Arabic.
2. Comparing and contrasting Competitive speech acts in English and Arabic, showing its classifications and indicating the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of each act in both languages.
3. Showing to what extent the two languages are similar or different from each other in terms of Competitive speech acts.

1.3 Hypotheses

To achieve the aims of the study, it is hypothesized that:

1. Competitive speech acts exist in English and Arabic.
2. Competitive acts are asking, begging and ordering in which these acts are associated with indirectness and politeness principles.
3. In both languages, Competitive speech acts are associated with directive acts of Searle's classification of speech acts.
4. Each act of asking, begging and ordering has its syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects. Similarly, as a direct speech act, each of them is associated with a certain sentence type for example asking is associated mostly with the interrogative sentence.
5. There are similarities and differences between Competitive speech acts in English and Arabic.

1.4 Procedures

The following procedures are adopted in carrying out the study:

1. investigating and describing Competitive speech acts in English by defining them, showing their classification into different types.
2. Giving a description and analysis of Competitive speech acts in Arabic.
3. Listing the similarities and differences between the two languages in terms of Competitive speech acts.
4. Arabic examples are translated into English and then transliterated by using Arabic phonetic symbols throughout the study.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Definitions of competitive speech acts in English and Arabic

Competitive speech acts can be defined as one of the illocutionary functions, "the actions and physical gestures of a person that help communicate the intended message of the speaker"[9]. They have been proposed by Leech and they indicate the degree of politeness that is used in different situations. In Competitive speech acts the illocutionary goal competes with the social goal. Within the competitive function of the illocutionary act, there are important acts to deal with in this study these are asking, begging and ordering [7].

Competitive speech acts belong to the category of the directive acts which have been proposed by Searle. Directives are the acts that embody an offer on the part of the addressee like requesting and questioning [10]. Directives attempt to produce obligation for the hearer to a certain course of action [11]. In 1975 Searle points that directives have the power of changing the world in a way that makes the propositional content true [12, 13].

Leech's competitive speech acts show how people use the indirect way in conveying what they mean [4]. Politeness and indirectness principles are the main aspects in competitive speech acts because in performing the speech acts there is an implied imposition on the hearer in which politeness and indirectness can reduce the force of imposition[4]. There are three basic rules for politeness, that are "don't impose", "give options", and "make the hearer feel good be-friendly". However, Competitive speech acts require indirect acts which aim to use the indirect strategies in order to fulfil the action by the hearer [8]. Competitive (directive) speech acts require negative politeness. In this sense Leech has used the term (appositives) to refer to the directive acts [14]. Therefore, Competitive speech acts mean using the indirect way when speaking instead of the direct way. One might prefer the indirect way in addressing the hearer by saying " it is cold in here" instead of " close the window" in order to reduce the degree of imposition [15].

The first one in the Arab heritage who tries to explain the use of polite utterances that are associated with competitive acts is Abu Al Hassan Al Mawardi[16]. The speaker can use polite words in his/her speech according to certain conditions [17]. Hence, a speaker should choose the right words and expressions in a given situation in order to achieve his social goal. Accordingly, Al-Mawardi shows that there are four conditions in speech in which they all should be fulfilled by the speaker: That the speaker should be called for either to make benefit or to pursue damage, to speak according to the given situation and to be limited as much as he can. In both languages competitive acts are said to belong to the directive act. Directive speech acts are used when words are said to perform an action that has a social form within particular context. For example, when a judge in the court says (futiHat al chalsah) (the session is opened), he does a social act by words [18]. Directives require the fulfillment of an action in which the speaker asks the hearer to perform an action for the benefit of the speaker [19, 20].

2.2 The Competitive act of Asking in English and Arabic

Asking questions is one of the competitive acts that belong to the directive acts. In English the syntactic representation of interrogatives has both semantic and pragmatic entities [7]. Within the semantic level, interrogatives can be represented by the term "question" while in the pragmatic level, it can be termed as "asking". In Arabic asking is expressed by linguists and grammarians as a comprehension demand [21], [6]. This means that a question is a real use of context which requires an action because a question has been distinguished from (al? istikhbaar) (inquiry) by Arab linguists and grammarians. Inquiry refers to the meaning of constative demand while a question refers to a comprehension demand.

2.2.1 The Syntactic, Semantic and Pragmatic Aspects of Asking in English and Arabic

Within the syntactic aspect of asking, questions are sentences that differ from statements in which the operator is placed immediately before the subject, the sentence begins with an interrogative word and the sentence has subject plus verb order with rising intonation in spoken English and ending with a question mark in written English[14]. Questions are of three main types these are: yes/no questions, wh-questions and alternative questions [22] as in the following examples:

1. Will Tom be here tomorrow?
2. -Who do you want to speak to? [8].
3. Would you like chocolate, vanilla, or strawberry ice cream? [22].

Arabic questions usually begin with question articles which is located at the beginning of the question followed by a question mark at the end of the question. Among these articles are (alhamzah) (Hamzah) and (hal) (do you).

4. (? afaza Khalid bi alcha? izah? am Ausamah?)
(Did Khalid win the reward or Ausamah?)

This question begins with Hamzah followed by an infinitive verb plus subject and at the end of the sentence a question mark. It is a question in which it requires an answer about a state of affairs about unknown things [23].

In respect to the semantic aspect of asking which is interested in the literal meaning of utterance Questions have the multiplicity of meanings in terms of the speaker's intentions according to the types of questions which have been asked. The literal meaning of an utterance means that it is either true or false and it is context independent, conventional and primary. So, the question in (3) when asserted either it is true or it is false [15]:

5. Is Peter here?

6. Peter is here.

7. Peter is not here.

On the other hand, the meaning of wh-questions is determined by the choice of a wh-word. Therefore, the following examples show the wh-words with their syntactic/semantic correspondences [15].

8. Subject NP [+human].....Who...Who did it?

9. Subject NP [-human].....What...What went wrong?

10. Object NP [+human].....Who (m)...Who (m) did you tell?

11. Object NP [-human]What...What did she say?

Semantically, question acts are related to the directive performative [24]. The meaning of the directive act requires the fulfillment of an action. According to [19], question is a subclass of directives in Arabic as in:

12. (hal qama Mohamed?) (Did Mohamed stand?)

Pragmatically speaking, "interrogatives are typically used to ask questions"[25]. The word "typically" here is used to indicate that there is no one to one correspondence between the syntactic form of a sentence and its use. Interrogatives have the illocutionary force of asking questions as in example (13). The sentence (14) is declarative with the force not of a statement but of a question. It is a yes/no question which requires a 'yes' or 'no' response [26]:

13-What'm I supposed to have done?

14- You haven't closed the door?

There is much attention which has been paid to the distinction between the direct and indirect speech acts in the studies on directive speech acts. Speech acts are said to be indirect because they seem to be intended to perform an action other than that which is suggested by their literal meaning [27]. Example (15) can be considered a direct interrogative while (16) is an indirect question [13].

15- Did you close the main door? He asked me.

16- He asked me if I had closed the door.

Indirectness is associated with politeness and this can be shown in the following interaction in which the employee uses the strategy of the negative politeness which was proposed by Leech(1985) to minimize imposition as in " I just wanted a few minutes of your time....."[28]:

17.- Steve (the employee): How are you, Bethany? How is the family?

- Bethany (the boss): Well, I am ok. Still fighting that cold from last week. What can I do for you, Steve?

- Steve: I just wanted a few minutes of your time to go over some work-related issues. Uh, you know, uh, that.....well. I have been doing the best I can to meet your deadlines at all....'

There are a number of strategies that can be used by the speaker in order to minimize the imposition of asking directly. These indirect strategies can be either hearer-based as in the first three strategies that are mentioned below or speaker-bases which are the last three strategies below [29].

1. Suggestory formula: the speaker may use suggestions as an indirect strategy to ask the hearer to do an intended action in mind.

18. How about lending me some of your books?

2. Asking about the hearer's ability or willingness: sometimes the speaker asks about the hearer's ability or willingness about doing an action as an indirect strategy to fulfill the speaker's intoned desire. This means that the speaker in fact does not asks about the hearer's ability or willingness because he knows that the hearer is able to do

the intended action for examples when the speaker asks the hearer "Can you reach this jar for me please?"

3. Permission: which is the last hearer-based strategy of asking about doing an action indirectly?

19. May I borrow your car?

4. Contextual clues (hints): it is a speaker-based strategy which means that the hearer is somehow obliged to do the intended act that is asked by the speaker indirectly. The speaker may use statements in his utterance instead of asking or requesting directly by using interrogatives.

20. You have left the kitchen in a right mess.

5. The speaker's wishes: in this strategy the speaker uses more polite ways to lessen the force of requesting by using some expressions as (I would like.

21. I would like to borrow your car.

6. The speaker's needs: it is an impolite strategy because when the speaker employs this strategy the hearer will be imposed to fulfill the required.

22. - I want the manuscript ready by noon, please.

In Arabic, Al-Sakaki was the first who shows that speech acts can be used not only for their original meaning but they also can express other meanings according to the given context. In other words, a question may go out of its original meaning to the contextual meaning when it refrains from the clues of the conditions of the original meaning. This meaning is called (alma9na alsyaqy) (contextual meaning) [30]. Moreover, language exhibits hidden meaning this meaning can be concluded by) al? Istlal) (inference) [5].

Arab grammarians and rhetoricians show that there are reasons for using question not only for getting information (its actual purpose) but about using them in other purposes beyond getting information. This means that questions may be used to express other illocutionary forces. A speaker for example may use a question not for getting information but about warning, threaten or prohibiting the addressee. One may address a child by [31]:

23. (? a fa9lt kaDa?) (Did you do this?)

In this case, the questioner knows that the child performs an action but he uses a question to give the meaning of warning.

2.3 The Competitive Act of Begging in English and Arabic

Begging is "a type of directive in which the speaker allows the hearer a freedom of action"[29]. Begging belongs to the speech act category of requesting to ask someone for something especially in an anxious way [32]. Begging is a synonymy of "plea" since the latter can be defined linguistically as "a requestive act in which the speaker asks the addressee to do something"[33]. In Arabic, altawasl (begging or plea) can be defined as a type of request for the sake of nearness from Allah the Almighty [34,35]. This type of request can be made by mentioning the name of a prophet, an Imam or righteous person [36, 37].

24. (Raf9a akufahtawasaila Allah) (He raised his hands pleading to Allah.)

In this sense, the pleader is asking Allah to help him/her. Plea is widely used in religious texts in which plea are an act of worship [38].

2.3.1 The Syntactic, Semantic and Pragmatic Aspects of Begging in English and Arabic.

The syntactic components of begging can be shown in vocatives and imperatives. Within vocatives it can be shown by adding optional forms usually noun phrases to denote the person to whom the sentence is addressed to pay his/her attention [22]:

25-John dinner is ready.

Plea is usually used in religion in which the use of the vocative form "O" is mostly used. Also, it is used to show total respect and praising to Allah in addressing His name in pleas, vocative forms like, O God, O Lord, and Almighty God [39]:

26. O God our help in ages past.

Imperatives are another syntactic component of plea. Imperative sentence has no overt subject, usually a main verb in its base form [22]:

27. Put the flowers on the table.

In Arabic, the basic syntactic structure that is used for plea is (alnida?) (Vocative). Vocative forms are the structures that are used to express plea. Arab grammarians state that vocative means calling the addressee by using one of (Hruuf al nida?) (the vocative particles). These vocative particles are (alhamzah) (Hamzah), (? ay) (oh), (hayaa) (come on), (? ayah) (whatever) and (yaa) (oh) [40]. Al hamzah and? ay are used to address someone who is close to the speaker while hayaa and yaa are used for addressing someone far away [41].

28. (hayaa Jamal? istayqDh) (Oh, Jamal wake up.)

In addition, imperative sentences are another syntactic structure that can be used for pleading. In other words, imperative is a request from superior to inferior to do something [26]. Imperative takes the form of an infinitive verb as in:

29. 12 (يَا يَحْيَى خُذِ الْكِتَابَ بِقُوَّةٍ) (yaa yaHyaa khuD a lkitaab bi quuha)

(O Yahya! Hold fast the Scripture (theTaurat))) [42]

Semantically speaking, the verb beg in English provides more than one meaning. According to the Oxford Learners Dictionaries, the lexical meaning of beg can be used to make a very strong and urgent" request".

30-He begged her to stay, but she simply laughed and put her bags in the car.

Hornby points out that plea is an act which means asking for something that you need very much in an emotional way [43]. Beg can be also used to "ask" for food or money because of poorness. Besides, the phrasal verb "beg off" means to ask to be executed from something that you are expected to do:

31. She had to beg for money and food for her children.

32. I had to beg off from the meeting because I had too much work to do.

The act of plea in Arabic can be dealt with semantically. The conceptual meaning of plea means proximity or to be nearer to what one desires [44]. For example, when one plead to Allah means he/she seeks or requests humbly for Allah's mercy and forgiveness.

Plea in Arabic has synonyms to express the same meaning in similar texts. Among these concepts are (altashf9) (intercession), (al? istiGhathah) (asking for help) and (altawachah) (addressing Allah) [38], [45]. This means for example seeking nearness to Allah through an intercession as in:

33.28 (وَلَا يَشْفَعُونَ إِلَّا لِمَنْ أَرَادَتْهُ) (wa la yashfa9uun? ila limn? irtDha)

(and they cannot intercede except for him whom He is pleased) [42]

Within the pragmatic aspects of begging, it belongs to the speech act category of requesting when the cost benefit is for the hearer [32]. In Searle's classification of speech acts, begging acts belong to the directive acts that attempt to get the hearer perform a future action [46]. In the light of its synonym "plea", begging can be defined as a speech act in which the speaker is requesting the hearer when the later has the power and the former is powerless [47]. From the in/directness viewpoint of speech acts, begging can be both direct when the form of the sentence matches its function and indirect when the form of the sentence and its function do not match.

Therefore if the act realized by imperative sentence, it a direct act but if it is realized by other type sentence which is not imperative, it is indirect speech act [48]:

34- O my Merciful Lord, have mercy on me for the sake of Your son Jesus Christ.

35-What then will you do for Your own Great Name?

In Arabic, plea can be defined pragmatically as a requestive performative speech act. It is issued from an inferior (human being) to superior Allah and it is realized by rhetorical or unreal imperatives [49]. In Arabic, plea can take different forms. In this sense, the pleader may directly ask Allah to respond to his supplications for the sake of the Prophets or Imams [50]. Also, the pleader may ask the Prophets or Imams to supplicate Allah for him/her [51] as in:

36. (يَا مُوسَى ادْعْ لَنَا رَبَّكَ بِمَا عَهِدَ عِنْدَكَ لِئِنْ كَشَفْتَ عَنَّا الرِّجْزَ لَنُؤْمِنَنَّ لَكَ وَ لَتَرْسِلَنَّ مَعَكَ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ) (الأعراف: 134)

(yaa Musa? id9u lanarabkbima 9ahid 9indak li? ankashfta 9ana alrichzlinu? minnalakwalinursilan ma9k bany? israa? y1)

(O Musa! Invoke your Lord for us because of His Promise to you. If you remove the punishment from us, and we indeed shall believe in you, and we shall let the Children of Israel go with you.) [42]

2.3 The Competitive Act of Ordering in English and Arabic

Ordering is one of the competitive functions of speech acts which have been classified by Leech (1983). Orders are the strongest type of directive acts [52]. Orders are compelling instructions to people that are intended to make them act in the way other people want them to act [53]. It is the addressee who is expected to perform a future action because the speaker has ordered him/her when the speaker has authority over the addressee [39].

In Arabic, Ordering or commanding is a type of performative directive. Command can be defined as (Talab alfi9l 9ala wachihal? isj9la?) (the requirement of the action to be done by the addressee due to superiority of the first party). Command is one of the types of performatives which can take the forms (? if9l) (do) and (litaf9l) (should do) [26], [54,55], [23].

2.3.1 The Syntactic, Semantic and Pragmatic Aspects of Ordering in English and Arabic

Imperative sentences are the prototypical sentence type for ordering which have a communicative function to get the hearer do a future action. Imperatives are introduced by the infinitive form of the verb usually with no overt subject [15]. There are many forms for imperatives to be used as [56]:

(a) Affirmative form that is the base form of the verb:

37- Sit down, please.

(b)Emphatic form that is do + imperative verb:

38-Do forgive me. I did not mean to interrupt.

(c) Imperative + tag question:

39-Wait here, will you?

(d) Imperative joined by coordinator:

40- Go and play outside [22].

Besides the imperative realizations of ordering in English there are other syntactic ones. These constructions are:

1. Declarative Order Constructions: The directive act of ordering can be formed by declarative sentence type in the performance of ordering [14].

41. Get out of my room, I order you to go away.

2. Interrogative Order Constructions: The sentence type of interrogative is not much used in presenting the act of ordering which is" due to the fact that the open

nature of the interrogative sentence type clashes with the imposition that is characteristic of orders"[57].

42. Can you stop following me, please!

Arabic syntactic realizations of order can be shown by certain linguistic forms [55]:

1. The form of command (do and should do) when it is used by the high status speaker to address a low status addressee. The forms of command (do) like:

43. 78 (أقم الصلاة لِدُلُوكِ الشَّمْسِ إِلَى غَسَقِ اللَّيْلِ) الإسراء: 78 (aqimalSalahlidluukalshamsi? ilaGhasaqallayl)

(Perform As-Salat from mid-day till the darkness of the night,) [42]

2. The imperfect form beginning with (laamal? amr) (Lam of order). This is when the verb in the present tense and the particle (l) of order is prefixed to it to give an imperative sense [36]:

44. (لِيُطِبْ قَلْبَكَ) (liutibqalbak) (let your heart be at ease)

3. The form of a verbal noun of an imperative verb. There are forms which are rarely used nowadays like (Sah) (hush) which has the meanings of (? iskt) and (? akff) that mean (stop and give up) [58]. Verbal nouns work instead of verbs in their meanings [59, 60].

4. Infinitive which substitutes command. It is an utterance which indicates the action as in the following verse when the saying (? iHsanah) (best) substitutes the command verb (? aHsin) (to make the best) [19]:

45. 23 (وَبِالْوَالِدَيْنِ إِحْسَانًا) الإسراء: 23 (wabialwalidayn?iHsana)

(And that you be dutiful to your parents.) [42]

In respect to the semantic aspects of ordering, the semantic representation of ordering is called "mand". Mand is expressed by the base form of the base underlying imperatives in which the utterance is said when the speaker wants the hearer to perform an action as in [43]:

46. Eat your lunch.

Thus, giving orders simply mean that the speaker has intentions of getting the hearer to do something [59]. In Arabic, ordering semantically is the opposite of prohibition because with command the speaker demands an action to be performed by the addressee whereas prohibition the speaker asks the addressee to leave the action [61]. Command requires an action or the saying predicated by the requirement of an action by the one who has the authority over the other. The speaker sometimes does not say (do and should do) to include the meaning of command. In other words, command includes all utterances that represent a command meaning and refer to the requirement of an action as in [6]:

47. (Sah) (hush)

Pragmatically, giving orders can be realized by using the sentence type of imperatives. Imperatives can be interpreted pragmatically as directives [7]. The pragmatic aspects of indirectness and politeness are associated with performing the directive acts of orders. Indirect acts are realized when the form of the sentence does not match with the function of the speech act. Sentence (48) shows an indirect act of ordering which is by form an interrogative functioning as an order and (49) is by form a declarative functioning as an order [62,63].

48- Can you give me a hand?

49- I can't do this on my own.

There is an important issue concerning the pragmatic meaning when ordering that is the authority constituent of the speaker over the addressee. This can be exemplified by the power relationship between the speakers. The power of the speaker is important in understanding orders in the sense that " the lower the speaker's

power, the weaker the force of the order and vice versa"[57]. The speaker with an authority has a powerful position which makes the hearer comply the speaker's order [64]. The type of power the speaker holds over the addressee has the communicative impact of increasing the force of the order.

50- You must not smoke nor drink nor chew.

51-As the commanding officer, I order you to step off this balcony and close the door behind you [57].

In the Arabic pragmatics of ordering, Arab linguists discuss the indirect phenomenon in which the meaning can be guessed from the complex structure of a sentence and not from its simple structure. They called this phenomenon (mukhalafat Dhahirallaf Dh ma9nah) (violation of the apparent meaning of the word) [65]. Accordingly, Sibawaih deals with command in real context when it does not occur without performing an action [66]. Command is usually realized by imperative sentences. In Arabic imperative sentence may have other meanings besides its basic meaning of command [57]. These meanings can be concluded from the context. In this sense, command goes out of its real meaning of ordering to express other metaphorical purposes or meanings. These meanings can be inferred from the context and its implications [16]. Among these metaphorical meanings of command are the following speech acts:

1.) alwachuub) (Obligation)

Imperative sentences are usually occurring in a context to imply an obligation. So, the addressee should fulfil the action which has been addressed by the high-status addresser [62]. This speech act of obligation can be shown in the following verse:

52. 43 (وَأَقِيمُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتُوا الزَّكَاةَ وَارْكَعُوا مَعَ الرَّاكِعِينَ) البقرة: 43

(WA? aqymualSalahwaaatuualzakahwa?irka9uu ma9a alraki9yn)

(And perform As-Salat and give Zakat and bow down (or submit yourselves with obedience to Allah) along with Ar-Raki-un.) [42]

2. (alnuSiHwaal? irshad) (Advising and Guiding)

In Arabic, giving advice means not obligating the addressee to do something or he is not obligated to take it [54]. Command is widely used in the Holy Quran to express the purpose of advising like:

53. (وَإِذْ صَرَفْنَا إِلَيْكَ نَفَرًا مِنَ الْجِنِّ يَسْتَمِعُونَ الْقُرْآنَ فَلَمَّا حَضَرُوهُ قَالُوا أَنْصِتُوا فَلَمَّا قُضِيَ وَلَوْا إِلَىٰ قَوْمِهِمْ مُنْذِرِينَ) الأحقاف: 29

(wa? iDaSarafna? ilayknafra min alchin yastami9uun alqur? anfalma Ha Dharuuhqaluan Situufalmaqu Dhywaluu ?ilaqaumihimmun Diryn)

(And when We sent towards you (Muhammad) a group of the jinn, listening to the Qur'an. When they stood in the presence thereof, they said: "Listen in silence" And when it was finished, they return to their people, as warners. [42]

3. (aldu9a? aw altaDhar9) (Supplication)

This purpose of command must be made by a low status person to a high status. This can be usually seen in the relationship between a worshiper and Allah the Almighty [20]:

54. 25 (قَالَ رَبِّ اشْرَحْ لِي صَدْرِي) (qalrabi? Ishra Hly Sadry)

(said:"O my Lord! Open for my chest) [42]

4. (al? ibaHah) (Approval)

Approval means giving permission. It means that when a person with an authority permits another person to do something [55]. Permission is usually given when the addressee thinks that something is forbidden as in the following verse [65], [54]:

55. 2 (wa?iDaHaliltumfaSTaduu) (وَ إِذَا حَلَلْتُمْ فَاصْطَادُوا) المائدة: 2

(But when you finish the Ihram, you may hunt,) [42]

5. (alta?dyb) (Educating by Instruction)

Command by imperative sentences can be used to express the purpose of educating by giving instruction. Thus, when a person who has been educated to be polite so he is a polite person [65]. In this sense, the addresser instructs the addressee to perform something in order to improve his manners of behavior. This can be shown in the following example [67]:

56. 104 (yaa ?ayuhaalDynamanu la taquluuanDhirnawa ?isma9uu walilkafiryn 9aDab ?lym)

(O you who believe! Say not (to the Messenger) Ra'ina but say Unzurna (make us understand) and hear. And for the disbelievers there is a painful torment.)[42]

6. (altakhyir) (Alternative choices)

Imperatives can be used to give the addressee a freedom to choose between two or more choices as in [68]:

57. (tazawach Hind auu ?ukhtaha) (Marry Hind or her sister.)

7. (alta9achb) (Astonishment)

Imperatives can be used to express the hearers' astonishment about something said by the speaker [69] like:

58. 48 (anظر كيف ضربوا لك الأمثالَ فضلوا فلا يستطيعون سبيلا) الإسراء: 48

(an Darkayf Darabuulakal? amthalta Daluufala yastaTy9uun sabyla)

(See what examples they have put forward for you. So they have gone astray, and never can they find a way) [42]

3. Method

There are some procedures that are adopted in the investigation of this study: Firstly, there is a full description and analysis of Competitive speech acts in English and Arabic through showing their definitions, types, and presenting in detail every type of Competitive speech acts by giving their syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of each type. Secondly, there is an illustrated presentation by showing the most important similarities and differences of Competitive speech acts in English and Arabic. Finally, there is a translation of every Arabic word in the Arabic sections into English and also all the examples are transliterated by using the Arabic phonemic symbols.

4. Results

This study shows that Competitive speech acts exist in English and Arabic in which both languages have dealt with the types of competitive that are asking, begging and ordering in terms of their syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of each type. Thus, the first and second hypotheses are accepted. However, in both languages Competitive speech acts are associated with the directive acts of speech acts which support the third hypotheses. Dealing with Competitive speech acts in details shows that every type of Competitive speech act has its syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects which support the last hypotheses.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Similarities

The similarities of Competitive speech acts between English and Arabic are as follows:

1. Competitive speech acts are existed in English and Arabic which are asking, begging and ordering. These competitive acts are associated with indirectness and politeness as this is verified in the first and second hypotheses.
2. Competitive speech acts belong to the directive acts of Searle's classification of speech acts. This agrees with the third hypothesis of the presented study.
3. Every competitive act of asking, begging and ordering has syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects. Each act is associated with a certain sentence type. This supports the fourth hypothesis.
4. Competitive speech acts are defined as one of the language functions.
5. Competitive speech acts are communicative speech acts.
6. Competitive speech acts are used directly and indirectly.
7. Competitive speech acts may be used explicitly or implicitly. Explicit competitive acts are used with a per formative verb of (ask, beg or order). Implicit competitive acts do not contain a per formative verb.
8. Syntactically, interrogative sentences are the major constructions of asking.
9. Semantically, asking is a directive act that has the literal meaning of seeking about unknown information. The meaning of a given question is determined by the question article that is used in the question.
10. Pragmatically, asking may be used to express hidden meanings. These meanings are concluded from the context.
11. Contextual meanings are gained by inference.
12. In order to understand the contextual meaning of a given question one should take all the sides of the context that are the questioner, the addressee and the question.
13. Begging is a requestive act in the sense of asking someone for something in an anxious way.
14. Begging is widely used in religious texts.
15. Syntactically, vocative and imperative sentences are the main syntactic constructions of begging.
16. Semantically, the lexical meaning of "beg" can be used to make a very strong and urgent request.
17. The act of begging can be expressed by using synonymous verbs. In English it can be realized by using verbs like ask, pray, plead, supplicate. In Arabic begging can be expressed by using verbs like (? istashf9) (seeks sympathy), (tashaf9) (intercede), (tawachh) (go to in addressing Allah).
18. Pragmatically, begging is a requestive act. It has the characteristic that the speaker is requesting from a position of powerlessness while the addressee is the one who has the power.
19. Using begging in English and Arabic in the sense of plea in religious texts shows no clear differences and shares a lot of similarities on the three levels of syntax, semantics and pragmatics.
20. Ordering is a strongest competitive speech act that involves doing a direct future action.
21. Syntactically, imperative sentences are the major syntactic constructions which are used to realize ordering.
22. Semantically, ordering requires the fulfillment of an action.
23. Ordering includes all utterances that represent a command meaning to refer to the requirement of an action. This can be shown by the speaker's authority over the hearer.
24. In both languages the semantic characterization of imperatives has an imposition on the addressee by the addresser to perform a future action.

25. Pragmatically, ordering can be dealt with in real context when. It involves performing a future action.

26. In both languages imperatives may have different functions to express depending on the context and the relationship between the addresser and the addressee.

27. Ordering may be directly realized by imperatives or indirectly by using sentence types other than imperatives.

5.2 Differences

There are a number of differences that have been derived from the contrastive analysis of Competitive speech acts in English and Arabic. These differences are as follows:

1. Competitive speech acts were first found in English in the theory of Leech in (1983) and then it has been mentioned and studied by Arab linguists.

2. The term "Competitive speech acts " is defined in English successfully as one of the illocutionary functions of a language as it has been proposed by Leech in (1983) while Arab linguists have taken this term and studied it from English.

3. In respect to the taxonomy of speech acts, the division of Arabic speech acts is very simple. Most Arab linguists have just divided speech acts into only (alkhabar) (constatives) and (al?nshaa?) (Performatives). Competitive speech acts belong to performatives. On the other hand, English linguists have divided speech acts into more than one type. Austin for example classifies speech acts into: veridicatives, exercitives..... and Searle also classifies them into representatives, directives.... And so on where Competitive speech acts belong to directive acts of Searle's classification of speech acts.

4. Performative in Arabic can be either directive or non-directive whereas in English there is no such division.

5. Concerning asking, Arab linguists differentiate between a question and an inquiry. Inquiry refers to the meaning of constatives demand while a question refers to a comprehension demand.

6. Syntactically speaking, English has three main types of questions like yes/no questions, wh-questions and alternative questions. Moreover, there are minor question types as exclamatory questions and rhetorical questions. In Arabic there is no such division.

7. Pragmatically, English questions may be understood indirectly. This means that when the form of a sentence (a declarative for example) does not match with its function like "You have not closed the door?" which is a declarative by form but an indirect question by function. Arabic on the other hand, questions are usually realized by interrogative forms to express warning, threaten, prohibition according to contexts.

8. In E English there are idioms with "beg" that give different meanings like "I beg to differ" which is used to say politely that you do not agree with something that has just been said.

9. Syntactically Arabic ordering is realized by specific linguistic forms like the form of verbal noun of imperative verbs, infinitive which substitutes command and the imperfect form beginning with the particle (ل). In respect to English, there are many forms for imperatives as imperative plus tag question and imperative joined by coordinator.

10. English has syntactic realizations for ordering other than imperatives like declarative order constructions as "I want you, I order you, and you must" and interrogative order constructions like "can you? why do not you?".

11. Semantically English has idioms with the word "order" to give several meanings as "in order" which means right for the occasions, "out of order" means when someone does something which upsets people.
12. Pragmatically Arabic imperatives may express the functions of (al? ibaHa) (approval), (alta9achb) (astonishment), (alwuchub) (obligation) and) altaKhyir) (alternative choices).
13. English imperatives can be used to express different meanings according to situations like: permission, requests, offer, prohibition, threat, warning and so on.

6. Recommendations for Further Work

According to the presented contrastive analysis of Competitive speech acts in English and Arabic. This study pedagogically recommended that:

1. Leech's theory of the functions of speech acts should be introduced more thoroughly to undergraduate students in order to make them aware of these functions, enrich their pragmatic competence of the different types of speech acts functions and enable them to be aware that each competitive act may have more than one function according to contexts.
2. Instructors should draw the students' attention to the types of competitive acts of asking, begging and ordering because much attention has been made on the speech act types of Austin and Searle but not of Leech's classification.
3. Students should know that every competitive act is realized by a specific sentence type. In addition, they should be aware of that each competitive act may be realized directly or indirectly to express different meanings according to situations.
4. Students should know that competitive acts are classified under the directive category of context Searle's classification of speech acts. This enables them to be more professional in understanding and using them successfully.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

There are no conflicts of interest

References

1. Saeed, *Semantics*, Cambridge: CUP, 1997.
2. E. Flores, *The Pragmatics of Requests and Apologies*, **Amsterdam**/Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company, 2011.
3. A. Al-Sakaki, *MiftaH Al-9lum*, Beirut/Lebanon: Dar Al-Kitub Al-9ilmya, 2000.
4. J. Verschueren, *Understanding Pragmatics*, London: Arnold, 1999.
5. A. Al-Sakaki, *MiftaHAL-9lum*, (1st ed.). Beirut: Dar Al-Kitub Al-9ilmyah, 1980.
6. Q. Al-A'awsi, *Asalyb Al-Talab 9ind Al-NaHaweenwa Al-BalaGeen*, Baghdad: Al-Hikmah House, 1982.
7. G. Leech, *Principles of Pragmatics*, NY: Longman, 1983.
8. M. Laster, *English Grammar Drills*, New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, 2009.
9. A. Ismail, *Hermeneantics and the Problem of Translating Traditional Arabic Texts*, Cambridge: Scholars Publishing, 2007.
10. N.T. Al-Mansoob, and Y. Alrefae, "Pragmatic Transfer of Yemeni EFL Learners: An Interlanguage Pragmatic Study of Yemenis and Americans," M.S. thesis, Univ. of Alandalus, Beau Bassin, LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, 2018.

11. W.P. Alston, *Illocutionary Acts and Sentence Meaning*, New York: Cornell University Press, 2000.
12. J. Culpeper, and M. Haug, *Pragmatics and English Language*, Palgrave: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.
13. M. Holtgraves, *Language as Social Action: Social Psychology and Language Use*, Mahwah/ Erlbaum, 2002.
14. G. Leech and J. Svartvik, *A Communicative Grammar of English*, London: Longman, 1994.
15. M. Celece-Murcia and E. Olshtain, *Discourse and Context in English Language Teaching: A Guide for Language Teachers*, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 2000.
16. A. Al-Shihri, *Discourse Strategies*, Beirut: Dar Al-Ktub Al-MutaHida, 2004.
17. A.A. Al-Mawardi, *Adab Al-Dunyawa Al-Dyn*, Algeria: Algerian Company, 2006.
18. A.Bilkhair, *TaHlil Al-KhiTab Al-MasraHy fi Dhau? Al-NaDharyah Al-Tawlidiah: Manshorat Al-? ikhtilaf*, Cairo: The Story Magazine, 2003.
19. H. Jumah, *Chamalit Al-Khaba rwa Al-?insha'*, Damascus: Publications of the Writers Union, 2005.
20. A. A. Al-Hashimi, *Chawahir Al-BalaGhah fi Al-Ma9ani wa Al-Bayan wa Al-Baty9*, Cairo: Al-Sa9adah Library, 1960.
21. A. Al-Saraf, *Speech Acts in Arabic Rhetoric*, Cairo: Al-Adab Library, 2010.
22. R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J.Svartvic, *A Comprehensive Grammar of The English Language*, London: Longman, 1985.
23. J. Al-Syuti, *Al-?itiqan fi 9ulum Al-Quran*, Cairo: Dar Al-NahDhah, 1951.
24. A. Matlub, *A Dictionary of Rhetorical Terms and their Development*, Baghdad: Iraqi Scientific Publication, 1986.
25. B. Aarts, *English Syntax and Argumentation*, New York: Palgrave, 2001.
26. M Al-Jazim, *Al-Balaghah Al-SiHaH*, Beirut: Lebanon Library, 2010.
27. M. L-Geis, *Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
28. N. Ishihara, and A. D. Cohen, *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics Where Language and Culture Meet*, New York: Longman, 2010.
29. M. I. Monyna, and S. River-Mills, (2016). *Forms of Address in the Spanish of the Americans*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publish Company, 2016.
30. A. Cruse, *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*, Edinburgh: Edinburg U.P, 2006.
31. M. Abu Aubaida, *Majaaz Al-Quraan*, Bierut: Dar Al-Hadhara Al-Arabia, 1981.
32. A. De Mendoza. and A. Baicchi, *Illocutionary constructions: cognitive motivation and linguistic realization*, Berlin: Mouton de Grunter, 2007.
33. W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, Lebanon: A.J, 1974.
34. M. Mamduh, *Raf9 Al-ManarahlitakhrychAhadith Al-Tawasulwa Al-Zyarah*, Cairo: Al-Azhar Library, 2006.
35. A. Ibn Mandhur, *Lisaan Al-9arb*, Beirut: Dar Sadir, 1986.
36. Y. Al-AnSari, "Asalyb Al-Amur wa Al-Nahy fi Al-Quran waAsraruha Al-BalaGhyah," M.S.thesis, Univ. of Aum Al-Qura, Mecca, Saudi, 1990.
37. H. Amine, *A Shi'it Encyclopedia*, Qum: Al-Sitara Publication, 2001.
38. S. Abul Hamid, *Al-Zyarahwa Al-Tawasul*, Qum: Satarah, 2000.
39. J. Perez, *Illocutionary and Cognition: A Constructional Approach*, Longrono: Universidad de LaRi, 2001.
40. M. Haroon, *The Performative Methods in the Arabic Grammar*, (2nd ed.). Egypt: Al-Khafqy Library, 1979.

41. R. Lakoff, *Language and Women's Place*, NY: Hamper and Row, 1973.
42. M. Al-Hilali, and M. Khan, *Transilationof the Meaning of the Noble Quran in the English Language*, Madina: King Fahad Glorious Quran Printing Complex, 1984.
43. A. S. Hornby, *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary of Current English*, Oxford: OUP, 2010.
44. M. Al-Razi, *MukhtarAl-SiHaH*, Beirut: Lebanon Library, 1986.
45. H. Tahiri, *Al-Du9a wa Al-Tawasul bi Al-A?wlya*, Tahrn: Nagar, 2008.
46. J. Searle, *Indirect Speech Act*, New York: Academic Press Inc, 1975.
47. B. Fraser, *Hedge Performatives*, Orlando: Academic Press, 1975.
48. M. Haung, *Anaphora, cataphora, exophora, logophoricity*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2009.
49. H. Abdul Raof, *Arabic Rhetoric: A Pragmatic Analysis*. London: Rutledge, 2006.
50. M. Al-Sanad, *Al-Tawasul: Rukn Al-?imanwa Al-9ibadah*, Fakhry Library, 2006.
51. A. Al-Hamiri, *Al-Ta?mul fi Haqiqat Al-Tawasul*, Riyadh: Dar Qurtuba, 2001.
52. J. Holmes, *Politeness Strategies as Linguistic Variables*, Willington/New Zealand: Elsevier Ltd, 2006.
53. J. Holmes, *Politeness Strategies as Linguistic Variables*, Willington/New Zealand: Elsevier Ltd, 2006.
54. A. Ateeq, *In the Arabic Rhetoric: Semantic*, Lebanon: Dar Al-NahDhah Al-9arabiah, 2009.
55. A. Al-Gazali, *Al-Mustasfa min Al-Melusul*, Beirut: Dar Al-Turath Al-Arabi, 1993.
56. M. Swan, *Practical English Usage*, Oxford: Oxford English Press, 2003.
57. N. Martinez, *Illocutionary Constructions in English: Cognitive Motivation and Linguistic Realization*, Switzerland: Peter Lang International Academic Publications, 2013.
58. A. Matlub and H. Al-Basir, *Rhetoric and Application*, Baghdad: Ministry of Higher Education, 1980.
59. A.Tungi, *A Dictionary of Arabic Sciences*, Beirut: Dar Al-Chyl, 2003.
60. B. IbnAqeel, *SariH Ibn Aqeel 9ala ?ilfyat Ibn Malik*, Cairo: Dar?iHia? Al-Turath, 1980.
61. M. A. Al-Khashab, *Al-Murtachal. TaHqiq: Ali Haider*, Damascus: Dar Al-FaiHa, 1972.
62. M. Ariel, *Defining Pragmatics*, UK: CUP, 2010.
63. M. Haung, *Pragmatics*, Oxford: OUP, 2007.
64. Kh. Al-Aumani, *About Pleading*, Al-Sanabus: Dar Al-9iSmah, 2007.
65. L. Ma9luf, *Al-Machad fi Al-LuGahwa Al-?i9lam*, Beirut: Dar Al-Mashriq, 1997.
66. A. Sibawaih, *The Book. Tahqwq: Abd Al-Salam Mohammed Haroon.*, Cairo: Dar Al-NahDha, 1966.
67. A. Batahir, *Arabic Rhetoric*, Beirut: Dar Al-Kitub Al-9ilmyah, 2008.
68. E. Ibn Wahab, *Al-Burhan fi Wiguh Al- Bayan*, Baghdad: Al-9aani Library, 1467.
69. S. Abu Taki, *Suar Al-Amur fi Al-9arabia bayn Al-TanDhyrwa Al-?ist9mal*, Beirut: Dar Gharyb for Priting and Publication, 2005.
70. M. J. Betti, "Jokes in Iraq: A Study of Coherence and Cohesion", *Journal of the College of Education-University of Wasit*, vo. 1, no.1, pp. 399-411. Nov. 2007.

Appendix A.**A List of the Symbols of Arabic Phonemes**

/f/	/fiil/	an elephant
/th/	/tha9lab/	fox
/D/	/Dabha/	he threw it
/Dh/	/Dhabut/	an officer
/s/	/suug/	market
/S/	/Sabur/	patience
/z/	/zraar/	button
/sh/	/shmaalak/	What is wrong with you?
/kh/	/khubuz/	bread
/Gh/	/Ghraab/	crow
/h/	/hnaa/	here
/H/	/Hariim/	women
/b/	/baab/	door
/t/	/timman/	rice
/T/	/TamaTa/tomatoe	
/d/	/tdanna/	be nearby
/Dh/	/Dhaal/	staying
/k/	/ka9ak/	cake
/q/	/qadiim/	old
/ʔ/	/ʔams/	yesterday
/j/	/Jamaal/	beauty
/g/	/ga9ad/	he set down
/m/	/minhu/	who is it?
/n/	/nibaH/	barked
/l/	/limna/	gather us
/w/	/wayyana/	with us
/y/	/yamta/	when
/9/	/9aali/	high
/r/	/ramul/	sand
/p/	/parda/	curtain
/i/	/mi9da/	stomach
/a/	/saliim/	healthy
/aa/	/saalim/	safe
/u/	/ummii/	my mother
/uu/	/9uud/	stick

The Arabic symbols are taken from Betti(2007, pp. 409-410) with modifications