

Illocutionary Forces of Interrogatives in Arabic and English: An Analytical Survey

Dr. Salah N. Al-Najjar

Assistant Professor of Linguistics
Al-Zaytoonah Private University of Jordan
Amman- Jordan

Abstract

This study aims at achieving a two- fold objective: firstly, it attempts to examine the syntactic sources of interrogatives in both Arabic and English which, in their different types are semantically specified: each of which is used for a major particular intention i.e. to seek information or to assert or negate it. Secondly, it surveys different other intentions which usually go beyond the seeking-information intention to become pertinent to the speakers' intentions. Such intentions are explicated and classified in accordance with the interpretations constituted in their different illocutionary forces brought about by the different illocutionary acts in both languages since these acts are viewed as an instance of culturally- defined speech acts types. Searle (1975) says that such types are used to communicate/ reciprocate the speech acts in different situations. The intended force of certain sentences or utterances is sometimes not obvious, but what is quite obvious to speakers of a language is that the interrogatives, for example, are supposed to indicate questions. In this regard, Searle and Vanderveken (1985) introduced what they term as 'illocutionary force indicating devices' (IFIDs) by means of which the utterance is made with a certain illocutionary force. Thus, interrogatives may go beyond the seeking- information intentions to become pertinent to the speakers' intentions. The IFIDs are elements of linguistic devices which include word order, stress, intonation, punctuation and performative verbs which are resorted to when interrogative sentences/ utterances are taken up.

1. Introduction

The issue of the speech acts within text structure or discourse has acquired great attention in the field of linguistics in the last few decades, especially by linguists, psychologists, and educationists who concern themselves with text and discourse analysis.

Searle (1970: 23) shows that the same reference and predication in one performance of a certain speech act may occur in the performance of different other complete speech acts with the name of 'illocutionary acts'. Thus, various speech acts in various illocutionary acts will differ in their illocutionary forces from other or similar structures. Sadock (1977: 9) takes up speech acts and refers to them as speech acts that we accomplish by communicating our intent to accomplish them. He further contends that there are numerous ways in which our intended illocution can be communicated. Coulthard (1977:44) says that all speech events and speech acts have a purpose, but sometimes several events sharing the same style are distinguished only by purpose and participants or setting. Lyons (1977:737) talks about the universality of some basic speech acts and that they are part of all human societies, while on the other hand, there are certain speech acts that are dependent upon some moral concepts codified or institutionalized in particular societies. Such a distinction between universal speech acts and culture-specific speech acts is essential in this study where differences may appear between Arabic and English interrogatives, as the major topic of this paper. Davies (1986:31-32) contends that traditional grammarians have tended to describe the meaning differences between sentences of different types of what they call 'mood' or 'attitude' of the speaker toward the event or state referred to. She gives examples of semantically specified nature for specific illocutionary forces as:

- (1) Is he here: (an information-seeking question)
- (2) I promise to be there. (stating a promise)

Throughout her discussion, Davies emphasizes the fact that relating meaning and the illocutionary forces of a sentence, whether in direct or indirect speech act, is only possible in a context, where it is the proper means of communicating both the performative form and its intentions.

Furthermore, Searle cited in Hatch (1992: 121) raises the issue of the sentence and the function/s that might be assigned to it, and that speaker's intent and sentence meaning are not always the same. She elaborates on this issue by saying that speaker's intent may be more or less, or actually the opposite of sentence meaning (as in sarcasm) where she comes to the conclusion that no utterance completely is context free in terms of meaning or function. Accordingly, Searle (ibid) proposes a small set of functions as to include directives, commissives, representatives, performatives and expressives. The directive speech act function is a kind of request made so that someone will do or stop doing something. The directive function is generally believed to have two forms- the blunt imperative and the polite imperative. Now, as regards English interrogatives, they are put under the category of directive function since a question, whether explicit or implicit, is a kind of an imperative, or to be more precise, is an imbedded imperative as in this example (cited in Hatch: 131).

Hi Larry, how are you?

Speech act equivalent: directive (in the meaning of tell me how you are).

Ervin-Tripp (1972) (cited in Hatch, PP. 122-3) classifies directives into five types that include the relationship between the speaker's and addressee's roles; they are: personal need / desire, statement, imperative, imbedded imperative and permissive directive and hint. They are all interrogatives but implicitly they are imperatives as shown from the examples below:

- (1) Imbedded imperative- speech act equivalent: directive
e.g. How was your trip?
(tell me how your trip was)
- (2) Permissive directive- speech act equivalent: directive
e.g. May I have your book?
(lend me your book)
- (3) Hint (sometimes with humour) speech act equivalent: directive.
e.g. This has to be done. What about the x?
(why don't you do the x? i.e. do it!)

To summarize this argumentation, interrogatives can be termed as 'indirect imperatives'. Sometimes interrogatives get into the domains of other functions as, for example, those of the expressive utterances which are mainly expressive of likes and dislikes, or happiness or despair. In such a function i.e. the expressive, the structure of the utterance may appear either in a form of interrogative or in a form of a statement with a rising intonation to function as an exclamatory utterance. All what is being discussed here is entirely dependent on the attitudes of both the speaker and the listener, where speech acts belong to the interactional aspect or nature of the two sides' communication.

II. The Corpus of the Study

Data of this study have been derived from two English novels: 'Emma' by Jane Austen and 'Tess of the D'urbervilles' by Thomas Hardy. The Arabic data have been taken from Tawfiq Al-Hakeem's paly 'Mohammad Rasul El-Bashar' and from Mohammad Abdul-Haleem Abdalla's novella 'Shajaratul Liblab'. Out of the English sources two hundred interrogative forms have been obtained, while hundred and ninety interrogative forms have been obtained from the Arabic sources.

III. Interrogative Speech Acts

Interrogation is a grammatical process that is employed by the speaker, asking a listener to supply him/ her with a specific type of information. The basic meaning of interrogation is universal amongst all languages, yet the grammatical processes that are adopted to convey this meaning are different. Quirk et. Al. (1972:386) consider questions as one of the major classes that are associated with the functions of discourse, where they are primarily used to express lack of information on a specific point, and (usually) to request the listener to supply this information verbally. Questions in English are put within three main categories: yes /no questions; wh-questions; and alternative questions, with expressions like: would you like tea or coffee? (ibid). In English, the yes/ no questions usually have rising intonation, while on the other hand wh- questions have falling intonation. Yes /no questions are those questions for which the speaker expects the answer by either 'yes' or 'no'.

Questions of this type are formed by the aid of an operator; tag questions and declarative; wh- questions are formed by using interrogative words, usually with different function types: they have either attributive, determiner function (which, what and whose) or nominal function (who, whom, whose, which, what). The remaining three relative pronouns are: who, whose and whom which have only personal reference (ibid, 216). Finally, alternative questions are classified into two types: the complete form and the elliptical alternative question. The complete form shows the alternatives in the question as in: Would you like tea or coffee?, while the elliptical does not show the alternatives as much as it implies them as in ; which ice-cream would you like? Alternatives include: chocolate, vanilla, etc..

As for interrogatives in Arabic, there are two major groups or categories of interrogative articles as they are called in Arabic: the first group is made up of two articles (the glottal stop (Hamza) and hal); the second group is made up of ten articles: min (from), man (who), maa (what / how), mata (when), ayyana (when), kayfa (how), ayna (where), anna (how), kam (how many; how much), ayyu (which), and matha (what). The two groups are given in detail as follows:

Group one (alhamza wa hal)

Questions of this type are those employed by the speaker when he expects the listener to reply with a negative or an affirmative answer, similar to English yes /no questions. This category includes two types in terms of form and structure:

A.1. question formed with (hal; Hamza)

Did Ali Come? Hal jaa'a Ali?

Has Ali come? 'a jaa'a Ali?

2. Questions formed by using the elliptical form (a laysa kathaalik?

You finished your study, didn't you?

'Anta akmalta dirasataka, alaysa kathaalik?

B. alternative questions: these are questions the speaker uses when he expects the answer to be one of two or more alternatives mentioned in the question.

Examples:

Did you buy a book or a copybook?

'a kitaaban ishtarayta am daftaran?

C. information question: information question are those questions that are formed by the speaker when he lacks a specific piece of information which the listener is expected to supply. Examples:

Where did you buy this book from?

Min 'ayna ishtarayta haathaa l-kitaab?

Group Two

This group of interrogative articles is similar to question words or wh-questions in English. The article used in a question has a meaning, where the answer goes along with that meaning as long as it is used in terms of its typical illocutionary force i.e. asking a question. Meanings of the articles of this group are as follows:

1. Min ayna = where from
2. Man= who
3. Ma = what
4. Mata=when
5. Ayyana= when (for future time)
6. Kayfa = how
7. Ayna= where
8. Annaa= how, where from, when
9. Kam= how many, how much
10. Ayyu=which (of two or more)
11. Maathaa= what

III. A. English Interrogative Speech Acts

As it is the case with all other human languages, the direct acts of English interrogative are either information-seeking or asking for either an affirmative or a negative answer. This does not restrict interrogatives to such a limited role, but they may serve as indirect acts of different meanings or functions. Sometimes, in their indirect use, interrogatives are believed to be a polite softening of the imperatives, with a new category termed as 'wh-imperatives'¹.

'Wh-imperatives' are formed by using a wh-word as the softening tool, added before an imperative sentence as in the following example:

- _____ study your lesson!
- Why don't you study your lesson?

Wh-imperatives are believed to be more polite than imperatives but Sadock (1974:113) for example, does not accept this belief on the ground that it is a serious misapprehension of the situation, where, as he contends, there are certain requests that, by their nature are rude. He backs his argument by citing the following examples:

- Shut up, would you?
- Will you cut it out?
- Get off my back, won't you?

Speech acts in their interactional nature of communication are realization of different meanings and functions. Thus, a question which is basically formulated to obtain information about a certain thing, can be pragmatically used for achieving or attaining different meanings or functions.

In order to find out the illocutionary forces of the English interrogatives, reference has been made to different sources (Davies 1986), (Hatch 1992), (Leech and Svartvik 1975), (Lyons 1977, I and II), (Quirk et. Al. 1972), (Sadock 1974) and (Sa'eed 1997). Thirteen interrogative functions can be derived from different functions and subfunctions identified by van Ek (1976) (cited in Hatch, 1992: 131-132); they are: asking permission, surprising, disappointing, wanting / desiring, approving, disapproving, suggesting, inviting, advising, warning, offering and attracting attention. With the fact that different functions or meanings are termed differently in the literature, in addition to the overlap noticed between some of them, English interrogative functions, identified from different sources total twenty one functions; they appear as: requesting, suggesting, exclaiming, surprising (astonishing), surprising (disbelieving) denying/ refusing, permitting, commanding, warning, blaming, inviting, offering, negating, advising/ exhorting, calling attention, disappointing / annoying, confirming, intensifying, debasing/ demeaning, asserting and wishing/ desiring.

III. B. Arabic Interrogative Speech Acts

Arabic interrogatives go beyond their typical use of asking into other functions or meanings that are also understood out of the context and the situation. There are nineteen meanings which are recognized in Arabic as cited by Ateeq (1971: 104-121). They are as follows:

B.1. Negating : annafyu

You: you save those in hell?!
'a fa 'anta tunqithu man fin-nar?

B.2. Exclamating: 'at-ta'ajub

Maali haathaarrasulu yaakulu t-t'aama wa yamshi: fi laswaaq?
What is wrong with this prophet, he eats food and walks in the markets?

B.3. Whishing (desiring): at-tamanni

Hal bittuluuli lisaaelin raduu? Am hal lahaa bimumtakalimin 'ahdu?
Is there an answer to that who asks the ruins? Or is it used to having a speaker?

(¹) wh-imperatives are not taken up in this paper since they deserve to be discussed separately on their own.

B.4. Acknowledgement: átaqri:r

‘alam nashrah laka sadrak?

Have we not expanded for you your chest?

B.5. Debasing: át-tahqiir

ahaathaal- lathii ba‘aΘa llaahu rasuulan?

Is this the one God sent a prophet?

B.6. Slowness: álistibtaaá

That is the speaker is eager to see something happen, but he feels that it is very slow.

Mataa ya‘uudu áxii?

When does my brother come back?

7. Improbability: álistibáad

The speaker views something far from being fulfilled or is improbable to take place.

Áyna Ali min zayd

How very far is Ali from Zeid?

8. Greatening: át-ta'athiim

Ádhaa ‘uuni wa áyya fatan adhaa‘uu liyawmi kariihatn wa sadadi Θa arin?

They lost me! What a young man they lost! For a day of mishap and revenge ?!!.

9. Denial: ál- inkaar

Álaa taraa bi ánnaka tuz‘iju l-áaxariin?

Don't you see that you disturb others?

10. Sarcasm: áltahakum

A haathihi llatii tatahadaΘu ‘an jamaalihaa dawman?

Is this (she) about whose beauty you are always talking?

11. Equality: át-taswiya

Qul áfat-taxathum min duunihi awliyaá?

Say: did you take alliance with those below Him (Allah).

(Are you making those equal to Him?)

12. Threatening: álwa‘i:d

A lam tara kayfa fa‘alarabbuka bi‘aad?

Have you not considered how your Lord dealt with Ad?

13. Intimidating: át-tarhi:b/át-tahwi:l

Fakayfa ithaa jíánaa min kulli ummatin bishahi:d wa jíánaa bika ‘alaa haulaa‘eshahi:daa?

How will it be, then, when we bring from every people a witness and bring you a witness against these?

14. Admonishing / Awakening: át-tanbi:h ‘alaa áddalaal

Ilaa ayna satuádii bika haathihi s-suluuki yaat?

Where will such behaviors lead you?

15. Encouraging : (suspension) át-tashwiiq

(by making someone long for)

Qul yaa aadamu hal ádduluka ‘alaa shajarati lxuldi wa mulkin laa yablaa?

Say: Adam shall I show you to the immortality tree and immortal property?

16. Commanding: ál-ámr

Wamaa ‘inda llaahi xayrun wa ábqaa áfalaa ta‘qiluun?

...and whatever is with Allah is better and more lasting; do you not then understand?

(The meaning is you! Understand)

17. Prohibiting: (interdicting) ánnahyu

‘qaala átastabdiluuna l-lathi: huwa ádnaa bil-lathi: huwa xayr?

He said: will you exchange that which is better for that which is worse?

18. Offering: al^áardh

Álaa tuhbuuna án yaghfira llaahu lakum?

Do not you like God to forgive you?

19. Exhorting / Inciting: át-tahdi:d

Hallaa darasta lil- imatihaan?

Why don't you study for the exam?

IV. Analysis

1. The two sets of interrogatives in both English and Arabic have been thoroughly analysed and investigated as to their exact contextual meanings and acts in their original sources. As for English interrogatives speech acts arrived at in this paper, twenty eight meanings / acts have been identified: they include;

Surprising (disbelieving), surprising (astonishing), negating, requesting, seeking advice/ advising, insinuating, denying (refusing), suggesting, suspecting, objecting, blaming, debasing, reprimanding, permitting (asking or giving), disappointing, appealing, offering, inviting, confirming, asserting, intensifying, hesitating, inciting, expressing sarcasm, wishing (desiring), challenging, complaining and proposing.

The analysis of the English interrogative speech acts in terms of their frequency of occurrence shows that they appear in the following order (from higher to lower); the highest frequency is shared by three categories: surprising (astonishing), denying (refusing) and disappointing with 15 occurrences for each category, then comes the category of negating with 14 occurrences. Following are the entire acts with percentages of occurrence and examples on each of them:

1. **Surprising** (astonishing): (7.5%, 15 occurrences)

This category is not put under the meaning exclaiming since exclaiming is not enough as to the meaning of the sentence or utterance itself.

- a. (Harriet to Emma) "What can it be, Miss Woodhouse?" (1.24:57)
- b. (Tess to Abraham) "What has put that into your head?" (2.10:28)

2. **Denying (refusing):** (7.5%, 15 occurrences)

- a. 1. (Emma to Harriet) "Are you in any doubt as to that?" (1.17:40)
- b. 2. (Fred to Jack Durbyfield) "Who be you, then, John Durbeyfield, to order me about and call me "boy"?" (2.7:4).

3. **Disappointing:** (7.5%, 15 occurrences)

- a. (Frank to Emma) "How often is happiness destroyed by preparation, foolish preparation?" (1.62:196)
- b. (Jack to the Person) "Oh? No lands neither?" (2.4:3)

4. **Negating:** (7%, 14 occurrences)

- a. (Mr. Woodhouse to Emma) "A house of her own! But where is the advantage of a house of her own?" (1.2:7)
- b. John (Tesses' mother) to Tess "Who said I had such a thought?" (2.14:35)

5. **Confirming:** (6%, 12 occurrences)

- a. Mrs. Weston to Mr. Knightly) "She is loveliness itself, isn't she?" (1.11:31)
- b. (Tests to her mother) "Will it do us any good mother?" (2.9:18)

6. **Insinuating:** (6%, 12 occurrences)

- a. (Emma to Harriet) "My dear Harriet, what are you thinking of?" (1.26:57)
- b. (The maids discussing Angel's marriage to Tess) "What would his mother and his brothers say?" (2.54:184)

7. **Objecting:** (5.5%, 11 occurrences)

- a. (Mr. Elton to Emma) "I know what your drawings are. How could you suppose me ignorant?" (1.12:34)
- b. (Tess to her mother) "Mother, how could you ever put such stuff into their heads?" (2.23:51)

8. **Appealing:** (4.5%, 9 occurrences)
 - a. (Mrs. Elton to Frank) “How do you like my gown?” (1.73:244)
 - b. (Angel to Tess) “I wonder if you will forgive me.” (2.83:265)
9. **Seeking advice/ advising:** (4%, 8 occurrences)
 - a. (Harriet to Emma) “What do you think of him?”
 - b. (Jack to the Parson) “And what had I better do about it, sir?”
10. **Debasing:** (4%, 8 occurrences)
 - a. (Emma to Harriet) “What has he to do with books?” (1.9:27)
 - b. (Alec to Tess) “Ho! Poor relations?” (2.17:40)
11. **Wishing (desiring):** (4%, 8 occurrences)
 - a. (Emma to herself) “How was it to be endured?” (1.87:319)
 - b. (Jack to the Parson) “And where be our family mansions and estates?” (2.3:3)
12. **Requesting:** (3.5%, 7 occurrences)
 - a. (Harriet to Emma) “Will you read the letter?” (1.14:39)
 - b. (Tess to her mother) “Will you let me look at it?” (2.22:45)
13. **Suspecting:** (3.5%, 7 occurrences)
 - a. (Emma to herself- about Mr. Elton) “Can it be possible for this man to be beginning to transfer his affections from Harriet to me?”
 - b. (The dairyman (Mr. Crick) to Tess) “Quite sure you can stand it?” (2.31:126)
14. **Asserting:** (3.5%, 7 occurrences)
 - a. (Frank to Emma) “Miss Woodhouse, why are you always right?” (1.63:196)
 - b. (Alec to Tess) “Didn’t you make that hat blow off on purpose? I’ll swear you did” (2.2:59)
15. **Suggesting:** (3%, 6 occurrences)
 - a. (Mr. Elton to Emma) “Why does not Perry see her?” (1.32:85)
 - b. (Angel to Tess) “Don’t you think we had better endure the ills we have than fly to others?” (2.94:287)
16. **Reprimanding:** (3%, 6 occurrences)
 - a. (Mr. Knightly to Emma) “Have you never at anytime had reason to think that he admire her, or that she admired him?” (1.80:134)
 - b. (James Clare (Angel’s father) to Angel – about the book) “What do you know about it?” (2.33:134)
17. **Inciting:** (3%, 6 occurrences)
 - a. (Mrs. Weston to Mr. Elton) “Do not you dance, Mr. Elton?” (1.77:246)
 - b. (Angel to Tess) “The milk turning sour? No she said: Life in general? Yes, sir” (2.40:143)
18. **Surprising (disbelieving):** (2.5%, 5 occurrences)
 - a. (Harriet to Emma) “Will he, indeed?” (1.8:26)
 - b. (Angel to himself) “Whose was this mighty personality? A milkmaid’s?” (2.50:182)
19. **Expressing sarcasm:** (2.5%, 5 occurrences)
 - a. (Mr. Knightly to Emma) “How did you all behave? Who cried most?” (1.5:9)
 - b. (Alec to Tess) “And so, pretty girl, you’ve come on a friendly visit to us as relations?” (2.18:40)
20. **Blaming:** (2%, 4 occurrences)
 - a. (Tess to her mother) “Why didn’t you tell me there was danger in men-folk?” (2.28:95)
 - b. (Angel to Tess) “What makes you draw off in that way, Tess? Are you afraid?” (2.38:143)
21. **Hesitating:** (2%, 4 occurrences)
 - a. (Mr. Woodhouse to Emma) “And where are the poor horses to be while we are paying our visit?” (1.4:8)
 - b. (Frank Churchil to himself- on going to the Bateses with Mrs. Elton or staying home) “What am I to do?” (1.52:177)
22. **Challenging:** (2%, 4 occurrences)
 - a. (Emma to Mr. Elton) “Why will not you write one yourself for us, Mr. Elton?” (1.23:55)
 - b. (Angel to his father) “How can I? Why?” (2.36:134)

23. **Complaining:** (2%, 4 occurrences)
 a. (Emma to her father, Mr. Knightley, Mrs. Elton and others) “Is it necessary for me to use any roundabout phrase?” (1.72:224)
 b. (Angel to his father) “But what shall I tell the dairyman’s wife?” (2.58:190)
24. **Intensifying:** (1.5%, 3 occurrences)
 a. (Emma to Mrs. Weston) “Jane Fairfax!- Good God! You are not serious” (1.85:299)
 b. (Tess to Angel) “Angel, Angel what do you mean by that laugh?” (2.87:270)
25. **Offering:** (1%, 2 occurrences)
 a. (Mr. Knightley to Miss Bates) “I am going to Kingston. Can I do anything for you?” (1.53:485)
 b. (Alec to Tess) “Well, my Beauty, what can I do for you?” (2.15:39)
26. **Permitting:**(0.5%, 1 occurrence)
 (Alec to Tess) “Do you mind my smoking?” (2.21:42)
27. **Inviting:**(0.5%, 1 occurrence)
 (Mr. Weston to Emma) “Can you come to Rndalls at any time this morning?” (1.83: 296)
28. **Proposing:** (0.5%, 1 occurrence)
 (Angel to Tess) “Will you be that woman, Tessy?” (2.62:200)

Conclusion

English and Arabic have shown a great deal of common features in their interrogative structures at both structural and functional levels. As for the structural dimension, both languages show that interrogatives can be made so by their structures and by rising intonation. As for the functional dimension, they both show that interrogative acts/functions are various and many where the two languages reflect a very wide area of overlap in different acts/functions. This fact is helpful in getting the reader/ learner to better understand English and Arabic in a more examining attitude which, in turn gives him/ her more insights as to enjoy and make use of such wide variety of acts and functions.

Three tables are used to summarize the study in terms of types of acts brought about by different interrogative illocutionary forces. Table ‘A’ summarizes the types of acts distinguished by different interrogative structures in Arabic and their meanings and functions arrived at by this study, while table ‘B’ summarizes the same out of the English corpus. Table ‘C’ is a summary of the finding where the two languages are contrasted.

A. Based on The Arabic Interrogative meanings arrived at in this study:

	Meanings/ Acts	Arabic	Percentage	English	Percentage
1.	Confirming	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6
2.	Denying	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7.5
3.	Surprising (astonishing)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7.5
4.	Asserting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8.7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.5
5.	Suggesting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
6.	Surprising (disbelieving)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.5
7.	Blaming	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2
8.	Reprimanding	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
9.	Suspecting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.5
10.	Commanding	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.1	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
11.	Requesting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.5
12.	Questioning-confirming	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.6	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
13.	Negating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7
14.	Inciting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3
15.	Expressing sarcasm	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.5
16.	Disappointing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7.5
17.	Wishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4
18.	Debasing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4
19.	Hesitating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2
20.	Advising/seeking Advice	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4
21.	Specifying	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.1	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
22.	Expressing slowness	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.6	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
23.	Threatening	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.6	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
24.	Contemplating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.6	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
25.	Expressing Farness	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
26.	Expressing Quickness	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
27.	Expressing care and love	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
28.	Appealing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.5
29.	Causing to long for	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0.5	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
30.	Reminding	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0.5	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
31.	Challenging	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0.5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2
Total			100%		82.5%
			Shared with Arabic		

B. Based on The English Interrogative meanings arrived at in this study:

	Meanings/ Acts	Arabic	Percentage	English	Percentage
1.	Surprising (astonishing)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9.4%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7.5%
2.	Denying (refusing)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10.2%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7.5%
3.	Disappointing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.6%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7.5%
4.	Negating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.6%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7%
5.	Confirming	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14.6%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6%
6.	Insinuating	<input type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6%
7.	Objecting	<input type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.5%
8.	Appealing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0.5%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.5%
9.	Seeking advice or advising	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.1%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4%
10.	Debasing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.1%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4%
11.	Wishing (desiring)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.1%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4%
12.	Requesting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.1%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.5%
13.	Suspecting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.1%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.5%
14.	Asserting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8.7%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.5%
15.	Suggesting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.2%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3%
16.	Reprimanding	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.1%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3%
17.	Inciting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.6%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3%
18.	Surprising (disbelieving)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.6%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.5%
19.	Expressing sarcasm	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.6%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.5%
20.	Balming	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.1%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2%
21.	Hesitating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.1%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2%
22.	Challenging	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0.5%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2%
23.	Complaining	<input type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2%
24.	Intensifying	<input type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.5%
25.	Offering	(it goes with suggesting)	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1%
26.	Permitting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0.5%
27.	Inviting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0.5%
28.	Proposing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0.5%
Total			82.9%		100%
Shared with English					

Table (C) –A Summary of Findings

	Interrogative functions/acts	Highest Frequency with Percentages	Number of Additional Functions/ acts arrived at by this study	Yes/ No questions	Wh-questions	Interrogatives made by intonation	Highest Functions/ acts made by intonation
English	In this study 28	Surprising (Astonishing) 7.5%	7	43%	57%	24 occurrences 12%	Expressing Sarcasm
	In books of Grammar 21						
Arabic	In this study 31	Confirming 14.6%	12	52.6	47.4%	13 occurrences 6.8%	Confirming
	In books of Grammar 19						

As seen from the tables, the two languages show that intonation play an important part in making use of declarative forms or statements in turning them into question; 24 English sentences/ utterances are made interrogatives by intonation which forms 12% of the entire English data. On the other hand, Arabic data show that 13 sentences/ utterances are made interrogative by intonation; they form 6.8% of the entire Arabic data. The highest frequented act distinguished by interrogative illocutionary force of the interrogatives made by intonation in English is that of 'expressing sarcasm', while the highest in the Arabic interrogatives made by intonation is that of 'confirming'.

At the locutionary level, the interrogative speech acts in both English and Arabic are syntactically and semantically used to communicate questions, whether resorting to their syntactic structures or by using rising intonation; at the perlocutionary level, interrogatives in both languages show that a questions may be intentionally formed to make a certain effect on the addressee, or to avoid making any effect on him or her, but in either of the two cases, questions are associated with certain effects on the addressee. Here, the illocutionary forces of interrogatives, forming the main concern of this study, turned out to be more than what books of linguistics recognize in the two languages as it appears in table 'c'.

Both English and Arabic data show that the conversational nature of questions and responses imposes certain effects or perlocutions that reappear in responses which, in turn, may trigger a new force that can be termed as "reflexive illocutionary force". This is the case where the interlocutors are fully aware of what is being forced into their interrogatives and thus, their responses get far away from the literal meaning of the question of concern. Such kind of the reflexive illocutionary force clearly appears in 'Emma' where Emma herself goes beyond the conventions and has full control of the illocutionary acts she uses.

Out of the various acts reflected by interrogatives in both languages, it is seen that the illocutionary forces of such interrogatives are put within questions as indirect acts to reflect the forces aimed at by the speaker, they go straight forward to the listener and understood by him as they are meant if he / she is of the same level of education, but they go unquestioned by the listener if he/ she is not of the same level of education or social status. Interrogatives are sometimes considered indirect declaratives or imperatives for the sake of politeness, but it is true that viewing them as such is a strategy which is deliberately used by the speaker to deprive the listener of a quick access to the meaning aimed at by him/ her. A good example from the data on this strategy is Emma who manipulates her questions this way and keeps looking at Harriet Smith as a simple, naïve and uneducated person. Finally, it is noticed that an interrogative sentence in Arabic may belong to one act out of thirty-one acts that are distinguished by different illocutionary forces arrived at by this study, while an English interrogative sentence may belong to one out of twenty-eight acts arrived at by this study as appears in the three tables 'A' 'B' and 'C' previously displayed.

References

English

- Austin, J.L. (1962). How to Do Things With Words. Oxford: clarendon press
- Coulthard, Malcolm. (1977). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Davies, Eirlys. (1986). The English Imperative. Kent: Groom Helm Ltd., BEckenham.
- Hatch, Evlyn. (1992). Discourse and Language Deucation. Cambridge: Cmbridge University Press.
- Sadock, Jerrold M.. (1974). Toward a Linguistic Theory of Speech Acts. New York: Academic press.
- Sa'edd, John I. (1997). Semantics. Makdem: Blackwell.
- Searle, John R. (1970). Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leech G., and Svartivik J. (1975). A communicative Grammar of English. Harlow: Longman Group Ltd.
- Lyons, John. (1977). Semantics. Volumes I and II. Cambidge. Cambridge University Press.
- Quick et. Al. (1972). A Grammar of Contemporary English. Harlow: Longman Group Ltd.

II. Arabic

- Al-Rajihi. Abdu (1971) Al-Tatbeeq Al-Nahwi. Dar Al- Nahdah Al-Arabiyah, Beirut.
- Ateeq, AbdulRahman (1971) Al-Balagha. Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiyah, Beirut.

III. Data Sources

English

- Austen, Jane. (1994). Emma. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Hardy. Thomas. (1993). Tess of The D'urbervilles. Harlow. Longman Group Ltd.

Arabic

- Al-Hakeem, Tawfiq (1963) Mohammad Rasul El-Bashar Cairo.
- Abdullah, M.A. (1962) ShajartuLiblab. Dar Misr, Cairo.