

***IN FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
LINGUISTICS***

BY

***NAGLAA MUHAMMED EL SAYED KOTB
UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF***

***PROF. AHMED SALAH EL-DIN
PROFESSOR OF LIGUISTICS, FACULTY OF ARTS,
ZAGAZIG UNIVERSITY***

Advancing argumentation: The communicative force of assertive speech acts in Crest's translation of Remarque's *'Im Westen Nichts Neues'*

Abstract

Asserting a claim means advancing argumentation by backing up reasonable arguments. It is a distinctive activity that requires a certain amount of intelligence. According to Searle (1969: 66), the act of asserting a claim or giving reasons is called arguing. In spite of the research presented for understanding the argumentative function of the language, the factors affecting the composition of an argumentative text varies according to several linguistic features. Thus, this study deals with the act of arguing in a political narrative from a pragmatic perspective. Just so, this study attempts to answer two main questions that have the same scope: (1) What are the pragmatic realizations of the act of asserting in narratives? And (2) What is the significance of the illocutionary force of assertive speech acts in advancing argumentation in written texts? The corpus of the study consists of some selected dramatic passages of Remarque's political novel with common English publication by Fawcett Crest. In answering the study questions, it is hypothesized that (1) the act of arguing in written texts, more specifically in political narratives, usually takes the form of an assertive, (2) a great coherent communicative force is best viewed in the illocutionary force of this act that leads to effective perlocutionary effects. In order to reach convincing results proving the hypothesis, a qualitative descriptive approach is developed for the analysis of the data relying on observation and introspective reading.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Argumentation, Assertive speech acts, Communication.

1. The aim of the study

In this study, the researcher tries to highlight the significance of the descriptive role of assertive speech acts in advancing argumentation in a written literary text. In order to do this, we try to determine the communicative force embedded in the relationship between the illocutionary force of the most significant type used of speech acts, i.e. assertive speech acts, and the perlocutionary effects.

2. The significance of the study

We highlight assertive speech acts because of its significance to the observable world as well as to the mental states of mind. We will introduce this point through the following sequence. First and uppermost, we will show the significance of the descriptive role played by assertive speech acts as a member of a building of architecture in the process of argumentation. Second and consequently, since the descriptive role of assertive speech acts has a special nature because of the commitment of the speaker to the truth of the proposition, i.e. the representation of reality, then comes the second point in which we present the significance of the use of this kind of speech acts to the quality of being self-assured and confident without being aggressive and the impact of this learnable skill to the process of communication. Third, we will present the practical examples from all chapters. Fourth, after presenting the practical examples, we will conclude our analysis by illustrating the relationship between the illocutionary force of the speaker's assertive speech acts and the perlocutionary effects.

3. The hypothesis of the study

This study attempts to answer two main questions that have the same scope: (1) What are the pragmatic realizations of the act of asserting in narratives? And (2) What is the

significance of the illocutionary force of assertive speech acts in advancing argumentation in written texts? The corpus of the study consists of some selected dramatic passages of Remarque's political novel with common English publication by Fawcett Crest. In answering the study questions, it is hypothesized that (1) the act of arguing in written texts, more specifically in political narratives, usually takes the form of an assertive, (2) a great coherent communicative force is best viewed in the illocutionary force of this act that leads to effective perlocutionary effects. In order to reach convincing results proving the hypothesis, a qualitative descriptive approach is developed for the analysis of the data relying on observation and introspective reading.

4. Introduction

The author

In this novel, the arguer is the anti-war writer Erich Maria Remarque. Remarque is a brave German soldier and a skilled novelist. He participates in WW1; therefore, he tries to present the German military experience of this war. He enlists his main claim in the preface in which he says that the unjust war is nothing but a vicious activity and adventure for death. In this novel, he tries hard to refute the ideology of the war and its misleading propaganda, taking the Nazi propaganda his example because it was the best skillful propaganda at the time. In order to communicate his dangerous message, He practices a distinctive argumentative activity. In this activity, he performs a binary goal (double-targeted goal). The first target in this goal is to communicate his dangerous message which –in some ways– bear the burden of politically incorrect or offensive language. The second target is to preserve his position as a rational arguer or writer among the readers and the politicians of this critical

time. What is worth mentioning here is the writer's goal. We put a focused emphasis more on the writer's goal than on the characters or the elements of the novel as a pure literary genre; it is the writer's goal that makes this novel argumentative advocacy and nothing else.

The translator

Arthur When Fawcett Crest is the translator of this landmark political novel. He is a British anti-war soldier who participates in WW1. He shares with Remarque the same thought content against the ideology of the war and its misleading propaganda. As a translator, he is a communicated language expert. He translates Remarque's written political anti-war message from the German language to the English language. By his translation, he creates and updates a new literary genre that serves as a glossary that may be used when talking about the atrocities of the war.

The novel

Concerning the body of literature in this study, "All quiet on the western front" is a dramatic novel. The dramatic novels with the narrative dialectical plots of argumentative character of different types along with the multiplicity of its purposes and objectives are filled with several messages that can be perceived only by learning the techniques of language and the various linguistic laws of speech related to the overall knowledge and vision of the social community and the surrounding environment such as the theory of speech acts.

Students have bothered to look at the literary discourse -in the novel shape- as just a kind of intellectual and emotional enjoyment or entertainment manufactured by language. Most of the students of literature restrict the study of literature to the study of art related to the dimension of beauty. Particularly, they highlight and amplify the genius of creativity and beauty in

literary texts of all kinds and neglect many of the aspects related to the objectives of these texts especially the argumentative aspects or dimensions.

From here, the researcher aims to rejoin with those who have gone a different route in looking at the literary text that it can accommodate more than just the function of enjoyment or entertainment. So we chose the communicative aspect of the language and the characteristics and the specifications of its use: the psychological motivations of speakers, the reactions or the perlocutionary effects of the readers or listeners, patterns of social adjustment of speech or dialogue, and above all the subject of the discourse.

The significance of the role of assertive speech acts and the descriptive mechanism in advancing written argumentation

In advancing his argumentation, the writer employs a distinctive group of speech acts, i.e. assertive speech acts. Assertive speech acts have a persuasive effect lead to a considerable argumentative purpose whether it is written in English format or in any other language format because of several argumentative characteristics.

In this paper, we aim to determine the argumentative feature or the communicative force embedded in the relationship between the illocutionary force of the most significant type used of speech acts, i.e. assertive speech acts, and the perlocutionary effects in an attempt to investigate the message embedded in Remarque's novel. These evidential confident ropes, i.e. assertive speech acts, spread all over the novel and constitutes a great coherent communicative force.

According to Searle (1969), the locution of these acts can be reflected in the descriptive declarative sentences in which the speaker acts as the person who has the full responsibility of the relationship of fit between the words and the world of belief. In

the description of this relationship, the writer commits himself to the truth of the propositions asserted by these declarative sentences without aggressive attitude. The illocutionary force of these confident ropes can be reflected in the quality of the writer's descriptive arguments. The argumentative power of this illocutionary force lies behind the writer's intention or desire to transfer the experience to those who didn't see it. The significance of the use of this illocutionary force is embedded in the following five points: (1) the logic of intention, (2) the confirmatory commitment, (3) the constructive role, (4) the narrative function, and (5) the self-respect attitude.

(a) The logic of intention

The significance of the use of the illocutionary force of assertive speech acts is embedded in the relationship between the words of the speaker and the world of belief and reality or the relationship between intention and belief in which assertive speech acts function as "communicative primitives" of the form "I have the intention to" (Herzing & Longin 2002). These communicative primitives with this form allow the reader to infer the hidden motives of the speaker's intention.

(b) The confirmatory commitment

The confirmatory commitment is the most significant characteristic that distinguishes this type of speech acts from other categories. With this kind of commitment, the speaker provides a principled way to connect the internal world of individual rationality with the external world of conversational protocols (Chung, 2010). Without this kind of commitment, the speaker serves as "a passive channel", experiencing "psychological distance", "weakened reliability", and "lack of responsibility" (Chung, 2010).

(c) The constructive role

The significance of the use of the illocutionary force of assertive speech acts is embedded in the constructive role it played in advancing argumentation.

(d) The narrative function

The significance of the use of the illocutionary force of assertive speech acts is embedded in the professional characteristics of its narrative function. This type enables the writer to put the reader to live in the same form of suffering presented by the story; the readers interact with stories more easily than statistics and figures. The description of the events, conditions, circumstances, qualities, and characters play a significant role in the process of argumentation within this novel. By describing, as an act of speech, the writer asserts explicitly what he can never say even implicitly. Our analysis, then, proves that the narrative description is a very skillful tool of argumentation.

(e) Self- respect attitude

The significance of the use of the illocutionary force of assertive speech acts is embedded in the quality of being self-assured and confident without being aggressive (Towned, 2007). Respect is a prestigious position can be acquired by words and sometimes actions. People respect arguers or writers who respect others' opinions even if they are against their views. This polite behavior raises the status of the arguer, the quality of his arguments, and the effectiveness of the subject under discussion: people respect polite arguers to the point of support.

(5) Theoretical Framework

In an argumentative analysis, "the question of interest for argumentation scholars is whether or not the framework provided by speech act theory can provide a useful basis for analyzing the concept of an argument." (Jacobs, 1983, P. 346-347). Traditionally, "argumentation scholars have treated

argument as a kind of proposition or as a set of propositions that support a conclusion " (ibid). Searle (1969) suggests "that 'argue' is a kind of assertive that is essentially tied to an attempt to convince the addressee" (P. 66). Above all, the most explicit treatment of argumentation with a focused concern on assertive speech acts is found in work by van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1982; 1984). According to them, "argumentation is an 'illocutionary act complex', by which they mean that it is a constellation of one or more component elementary assertives that together form the illocution of argumentation." (Jacobs, 1983, P. 348). So, speech act theory (Austin 1962; Searle 1965, 1969, 1975, 1979) plays a crucial role to the study of argumentation.

In illustrating the fundamentals of the theory, Austin (1962) and his follower Searle (1965) explain how the theory of speech acts describes the interaction between the speaker and the receiver in using language; how speakers and hearers use language. They "observe that there are many uses of language which have the linguistic appearance of fact-stating but are really quite different" (Bach, 2003, P. 147). They make that clear when they say that there are three components of the communication process: the speaker, the message and the hearer. Those linguists crystallize these components in the theory of speech acts, and these components become as follows: "the locution" (Austin, 1975); the propositions, the "illocutionary act" (Austin, 1975); "what it is we are doing with these propositions" (Sadock, 1974, P. 12), and "the perlocutionary effect" (Austin, 1975, P. 106); "a given utterance has infinitely many potential effects on the addressee" (Kissine, 2013, P. 13). According to them, this theory is considered 'a building of architecture'. This building consists of a number of members that are each responsible for various tasks and share the necessary sum of information required for the

overall effect, i.e. perlocutionary effect. And as the effects are usually clear, we are first in the process to clarify one of the system members and its function that contributes, in a state of harmony, with the other argumentative techniques and contact ladders to reach the goal or to assert the novel's general claim.

(6) Limitations of the study

The facts identified may result from a number of limitations found in the material translated and reviewed by A. W. Fawcett Crest (1991). The significance of each of these facts will be examined in further details below.

(7) analysis

In this paper, the researcher tries to prove that the writer advances his argumentation (his argumentative writing) by using assertive speech acts according to two stages.

In the first stage, the writer describes the distressing facts and sights that enable the reader to grasp the negative aspects of the war. The writer crystallizes each negative aspect by putting it within a specific frame or dimension. In the end, the reader finds that the writer depicts the negative aspects of the war from all dimensions.

In the second stage, the writer advances his argumentation that aims to deflate the value of the war by describing several characters. He employs three methods of description. In the first method, the writer describes the characters by mentioning their names, actions, and functions. He divides them into two groups: positively acting characters and negatively acting characters. Both groups contribute –in one way or another- to the process of revealing the audacity of the war. In the second method, the writer presents the character as being a part describing the whole. This method enables him to generalize his point of view. In the third method, the writer employs a descriptive

comparison. In this comparison, the writer depicts two types of characters (or combines two sets of contradictions) in order to show a specific reality.

(8) The practical analysis

The war can be a scientific subject for researchers whose aim is to make "strategic thinking", but Remarque does not intend to gather knowledge about the war in order to reach reasonableness or clarity of the phenomenon. In fact, Remarque's aim is to show the truth and he can do this only by a precise description. We find that his goal is clear and his tool is also clear and proper. The writer aims to portray the war and all its dimensions: the military dimension, the political dimension, the economic dimension, the moral, i.e. ethical, dimension, the social dimension, and the cultural dimension.

In chapter one, in the first point, the writer's assertive speech acts describe his hatred and hostility to "jingoism" or "enforced publicity" that means extreme patriotism, especially in the form of aggressive or warlike foreign policy. Remarque's way of argumentation, i.e. commitment based description, reveals his intention to change every human cognition about the armed conflict and all its levels from the disastrous to the disgusting. In this chapter, the key sentence that carries the burden of his description is the following sentence: *"enforced publicity has restored in our eyes the character of complete innocence to all these things"* (Crest, 1991) [chapter 1]. This sentence comes within a narrative description of a real experience. This experience stripped the soldiers of the human spirit and turned them into pseudo-objects in the form of humans. In the front, they are not fighting for the sake of the glory of the nation, but fighting to still alive. In the second point of this chapter, the writer introduces the character of "Kantorek" (the schoolmaster): *"Kantorek had been our schoolmaster, a stern little man in a*

grey tailcoat, with a face like a shrew mouse" (ibid). From his description, the writer wants the reader to detect the following fact: the leaders (the promoters) of the unjust war are immoral characters.

In chapter two, in the first point of this chapter, the writer introduces another face of the same image that shows and reveals the disadvantages of the war and its misleading propaganda. It is the "misty vision" imposed by the war and its propaganda to obscure and block any path to view the truth, reality, and the future. This is clearly evident in the following key sentence of this chapter: "*we were still crammed full of vague ideas which gave to life and to the war also an ideal and almost romantic character*" (ibid) [chapter 2]. From this key sentence and the surrounding declarative assertive arguments, the writer wants the reader to detect the following fact: the war and its propaganda have deprived the soldiers of the ability to deal with the challenges and the opportunities of the future and thus live in a miserable state of fog and lack of knowledge to their real requirements, which leads them finally to fall into the circle of mystery. In the second point of this chapter, the writer describes another bad, immoral character, i.e. Corporal Himmilestoss: "*He had the reputation of being the strictest disciplinarian in the camp, and was proud of it. He was a small undersized fellow with a foxy, waxed moustache...etc*" (ibid) By introducing the qualities of such characters, the writer wants the reader to detect the following fact: within the military perspective of the war, characters like "Kantorek" and "Corporal Himmilestoss" play important roles in hurting the young innocent soldiers. Each one of them plays the role in his own way. Kantorek plunges the soldiers into the throes of the war by means of dirty deceit, and systematic mischief or

deception. Corporal Himmilestoss hurts them by practicing cruelty and tyranny.

In chapter three, by the systematic description, Remarque defines war accurately as an organized and systematic form of violence that lengthens to affect all the fields of human action. Not all chapters of the novel are confrontations on the front lines. In the first point of this chapter, the writer shows that war is a form of human decline at the level of food collection.

In chapter three, by the systematic description, Remarque defines war accurately as an organized and systematic form of violence that lengthens to affect all the fields of human action. Not all chapters of the novel are confrontations on the front lines. In the first point of this chapter, the writer shows that war is a form of human decline at the level of food collection. The key sentence that carries the burden of this description is the following sentence: *"for breakfast, turnip-bread—lunch, turnip-stew—supper, turnip-cutlets, and turnip-salad"* (ibid) [chapter 3]. By this description, the writer wants the reader to detect the following fact: after the community enjoyed the cultivation and eating of all kinds of food, in the war both the citizens and the soldiers become beggars in the streets for a loaf of bread. In the second point of this chapter, the writer introduces "Kat", one of the soldiers who have several positive characteristics: *"we couldn't do without Kat; he has a sixth sense. Every company has one or two. Kat is the smartest I know."* (ibid). From the description of this good character and the description of the bad characters in the previous chapters, we find that the writer makes a comparison showing that the victims of the war are individuals with positive characteristics. These positive qualities enable them to work and produce several things. But unfortunately, the war ends their lives. On the other hand, bad people with bad qualities

live and control the world. Under their control, they drive good people to death and the world to destruction.

In chapter four, in the first point of this chapter, the writer's communicative ropes, i.e. assertive speech acts, communicate and convey another face of the same message that aims to deflate the war and its value. The writer goes on to describe the devastating effects of the war. More specifically, he describes the most important aspect of the war, i.e. the military dimension. The key sentence that carries the burden of this description is the following sentence: " *There'll be a bombardment, I tell you. I can feel it in my bones*" (ibid) [chapter 4]. By description, the writer states that the military dimension is very complex and dangerous and it is the most terrible action because it is the actual confrontation with death. The writer brilliantly describes this dimension and all its stages. In the first stage, the writer accurately describes in details the first moments of the bombardment. In the second stage, the writer describes an important and exciting part of the bombardment, i.e. the deadly gas attack. In the third stage, the writer describes the way back or the return route after the bombardment. All these stages direct the reader to the general claim of the novel. Furthermore, the sequence of these stages and their logical order constitute the novel's recitative style. In the second point of this chapter, the writer introduces Detering, i.e. another positive character and another victim of the unjust war. Detering is a farmer. When Detering entered the course of the war, he found himself in a completely barbaric environment. Therefore, he chose to escape from the hell of the war, which is totally opposite to all his positive principles. What the writer seeks from his description of this character is to clarify that the unjust war is nothing but a vicious activity of destruction.

In chapter five, in the first point, the writer explains the idea of "lost generation". More specifically, he explains the destructive effects of the war at the future level dimension. The key sentence that carries the burden of this description is the following sentence: "*the war has ruined us for everything*" (ibid) [chapter 5]. From his description, the writer wants the reader to detect the following fact: the outbreak of the war and its continuation affect the resources of the state badly. In turn, this affects the structures and the functions of the families. Therefore, the individuals of this society (either the soldiers or the members of the civilian community) have a constant sense of loss along with the permanent psychological suffering. In the second point of this chapter, the writer introduces Tjaden, a rebellious character: "*Tjaden replies, without knowing it, in the well known classical phrase*" (ibid) From his description of this character, he wants the reader to detect the following fact: within the war, the language of reason and wise behavior cannot be perceived as a personality trait by uneducated characters such as Tjaden.

In chapter six, in the first point of this chapter, we find that assertive speech acts used are very impressive and expressive. The negative aspect of the war that the writer seeks to communicate through this chapter is "the state of uncertainty" imposed by the war. The key sentence that carries the burden of this description is the following sentence: "*that is all, we neither know nor determine*" (ibid) [chapter 6]. His assertive speech acts entail that the soldiers are forced to live in a hangover of misery and killing because of the inevitable state of uncertainty imposed by the war. In the second point of this chapter, the writer shows a new way of describing characters. He describes the character as being a part that expresses the whole. This method of description is important because it enables the writer to generalize his point of view. In this chapter, the writer describes the following

characters: 1- the character of the new recruit, 2- the character of the French soldier. Both are victims of the war.

In chapter seven, in the first point of this chapter, the writer advances his argumentation about the negative aspects of the war by describing two further dimensions: the moral dimension, and the social dimension. The key sentence that carries the burden of this description, concerning the moral dimension, is the following sentence: *"just as we turn into animals when we go up to the line, we want to live at any price"* (ibid) [chapter 7]. The writer wants the reader to detect the fact that "war is a system of depreciation and the machine of death. This system does not support any positive possibility for continuity or production. Therefore, there is no consensus or compatibility between the individuals' minds, intellects, and instincts and this system. Hence, it is immoral or unethical". On the social dimension, the key sentence that carries the burden of this description is the following sentence: *"a terrible feeling of foreignness suddenly rise up in me, there is a distance a veil between us"* (ibid). The writer wants the reader to detect the fact that "war is a system of solitude and isolation. This system does not support any positive possibility for cooperation or participation. Hence, it is the unsocial system in which one does not seek the company of others". The immoral behavior and the unsocial attitude are two negative aspects of the war by which the writer supports his general claim. We find that the writer advances his argumentation about these two aspects by using assertive speech acts that constitute the communicative force of the argumentative language of this novel. In the second point of this chapter, the characters are the members of the social community (Paul's mother, his sister, his father, the people in the streets, his friend, and his German school teacher). Assertive speech acts enable the writer to advance his argumentation by

holding a comparison between the members of the social community and the members of the front line confrontations: *"the war may be rather different from what people think. I feel no contact here. They are different men here, men I cannot properly understand"* (ibid). It is obvious from the writer's description of these characters that the members of the social community are completely different in their way of thinking and living from the members of the front line confrontations. The contradictions between the ways of thinking of the civilized community members and the front line confrontation members enable the reader to detect the following fact: the reality of the war can never be achieved nor touched by those who act as outsider observers (the civilized community members). In fact, the reality of the war can be achieved and touched by those who act as actual (real) practitioners (the front line confrontation members).

In chapter eight, in the first point of this chapter, the writer advances his argumentation by using assertive speech acts that show another negative aspect of the war: "the license granted by uttering and assigning the decision of the war, namely death". We find that this chapter has an important implicit question. This question implies the following: "how can one take the decision of the war with ease and naiveté without considering clearly the respectful rights of the victims from all nations and at all levels?" The key sentence that carries the burden of the description in this chapter is the following sentence: *"A word of command has made these silent figures our enemies; a word of command might transform them into our friends"* (ibid) [chapter 8]. From his description, the writer wants the reader to detect the following fact: resorting to the decisions of the wars under any circumstances is really resorting not to hear the voice of the members of the community world because the only victims of these decisions are these members from all factions and sides.

This is what the writer explains in this chapter: "the decision of the war is the license that leads to the deaths of many individuals". The soldier dies in the bombardment, the prisoner dies in the prison, and the mother dies at the home because of a fatal disease accompanied by poverty. Really, it is nothing but an adventure for death. In the second point of this chapter, the writer describes the character of the "Russian prisoner". From his description, the writer wants the reader to read the violence of the war through the structure of the social and the psychological relations: "*it is distressing to watch their movements, to see them begging for something to eat*" (ibid)

In chapter nine, in the first point of this chapter, the writer explains how the sense of fear that reaches the level of terror affects the behavior of the soldier badly especially in frontal confrontations, i.e. face-to-face confrontations. The key sentence that carries the burden of the description in this chapter is the following sentence: "*the terrible loneliness and fear of death by which I had been almost destroyed; we all share the same fear*" (ibid) [chapter 9]. The writer shows how this continuous and troubled feeling (extreme sense of fear) affects the behavior of the soldier and increases his severity to the point of delinquency and committing the crime such as murder. This is another negative aspect of the war: "the war is the biggest field to commit the most heinous crime, i.e. murder". In brief, more particularly in this chapter, the writer considers the act of killing, i.e. murder, to be a crime even within the context of the war. In the second point of this chapter, the writer describes three characters. By his description, the writer tries to tie the reader's thoughts to an important and significant fact. The first character described in this chapter is the character of the Kaiser, the German leader. By describing this character, the writer tries to direct the reader's attention to the characteristics and the desires of those leaders.

The writer indicates that those leaders seek fame and power. They try hard to be famous so they proclaim wars. The second character described in this chapter is the character of the French soldier Gerard Duval. By describing this character, the writer tries to direct the reader's attention and thoughts to the sense of guilt and the feeling of sympathy that Paul experienced after killing the man. The third character described in this chapter is the character of the sniper, Sergeant Oellrich. By describing this character, the writer tries to hold a comparison between the human considerations that affect Paul's feelings about his act of killing and the inconsiderate repercussions that affect the other (the sniper) about his several acts of killing. In fact, by describing all three characters, the writer invites readers to "think humanly"

In chapter ten, in the first point of this chapter, the writer wants to say the following fact: "the unqualified medical staff, the unsatisfactory medical care, the poor and unsatisfactory means of transportation, the lack of conscience and compassion among the members of the medical staff towards the patients, the discomfort and deliberate indifference and disturbance practiced daily in hospitals, the ugliness of the wounds and the depth of their impact, increase death numbers. The number of deaths in hospitals becomes much higher than the number of deaths on the battlefields. The writer does not assert this miserable reality or this negative aspect in relation to Germany's hospitals only, but – as he says- "*there are hundreds of thousands in Germany, hundreds of thousands in France, hundreds of thousands in Russia*" (ibid) [chapter 10]. This means that the anti-war idea spread throughout the novel is universal, i.e. has a general trend. In fact, this generalized way of criticizing proves what the writer says in the preface: "*it is neither an accusation nor a confession*" (ibid). It is obvious from his assertive speech acts, more particularly in this chapter, that he does not accuse Germany, but

he accuses the war and its people whosoever. In the second point of this chapter, the characters that the writer describes in this chapter are divided into two groups. The first group is the members of the medical staff. Because the writer describes them as unqualified, he does not mention their names. By the description of the actions of these characters, he aims only to convey the picture of the medical treatment or the medical care within the realm of the war. The second group is the wounded soldiers. They are the victims of the war and its medical field. Because they are victims, the writer mentions their names and describes the kinds of their wounds and the cases of their operations. By describing the physical and the psychological suffering of the tormented soldiers, the writer tries to gain the reader's sympathy. On the other hand, by describing the inconsiderate and unqualified staff and the abuses of the medical field, he tries to gain the reader's support to his side, i.e. anti-war side.

In chapter eleven, in the first point of this chapter, the writer sums up his thoughts by indicating the following fact: the idea of comradeship continues in spite of the end of all things in this life. The writer explains that the value of comradeship is the most heroic and beautiful thing in the existence of the man on this earth. The key sentence that carries the burden of the description of this idea is the following sentence: *"it is a great brotherhood, which adds something of the good-fellowship"* [chapter 11] (ibid). In the second point of this chapter, the writer introduces the character of the American soldiers. His description of the character of the American soldiers is competent with the end of the novel that marks the collapse of the German troops. The American soldiers recently introduced into the war were superior in their numbers than the German troops who faced all the calamities of the bombardments. In addition to this, the

American soldiers recently and freshly introduced into the war were healthy compared to the tortured, exhausted German soldiers.

In chapter twelve, in the first point of this chapter, the writer sums up the claim of his novel. The key sentence that carries the burden of the description in this chapter is the following sentence: *"he fell in October 1918, on a day that was so quiet and still all quiet on the western front"* (ibid) [chapter 12]. The claim of the novel entails that the death of a single individual (like Paul Boomer, i.e. the hero and the narrator) does not evoke feelings and emotions, does not constitute a fatal crime, does not make sense to the wise men, does not awake the world conscience, does not blame the universal culture and philosophy, does not satisfactorily enable the people to take revenge on each other, does not put the war to its end, does not settle the debate over the *"no man's land"*, does not give the right to its people even if it is a matter of confusion –particularly in this unjust war- to declare what is the right and who owns it, and finally it does not prevent the devil from taking place. In other words, the death of a single individual in the war is invaluable. The writer ironically wants to say that the war degrades the value of the human being. The war is only a vicious institution for committing crimes because it does not consider the death of the human being to be the worst crime forever. In brief, *"all quiet on the western front"* implies an ironic criticism of the war; it is only an adventure for death. In the second point of this chapter, the writer does not introduce a new character. He ends his novel with assertive speech acts that describe the death of the protagonist 'Paul', the narrator. Since the narrator himself is the person who dies in the end, the writer uses the third person to describe his death.

"*All quiet on the western front*" denotes two meanings. First, it denotes the silence that comes before the hurricane, i.e. the bombardment. The writer makes this sentence the title of his novel to criticize the folly (stupidity and imbecility) of those who say it. This sentence was often repeated in the novel before and after the bombing of the bombardments without giving any considerations to those who died as flocks in large numbers. And after presenting the details which support and prove his general claim to the reader, the writer scoffs as if to say "how can everything be quiet on the altar". Second, it denotes an ironic touch intended deliberately by the writer to communicate the following fact: "no one wise man can imagine that in spite of all the mentioned miserable and devastating details and actions that take place in this war, there remains all quiet on the western front! (Which means nothing happens at all!!).

The idea of comradeship

The idea of comradeship continues in spite of the end of all things in this life. The writer explains that the value of comradeship is the most heroic and beautiful thing in the existence of the man on this earth. In other words, the writer's assertive speech acts explain how the value of comradeship expresses the essence of the man and his credibility. In several chapters, the writer mentions the idea of comradeship and explains that it carries within it several impressive meanings: love, trust, and loyalty. The idea of comradeship appears for the first time in chapter two where the writer explains Paul's comradeship with his fellow soldier Kemmerich who suffers from the pain of dying: "*Kemmerich's face changes color. My thoughts become confused. I draw near to him to console him*" (ibid) [chapter 2]. Then the idea appears again in chapter five when the writer explains the spirit of cooperation and communion that was between Paul and Kat (two soldiers): "*we*

are brothers and press on one another the choicest pieces" (ibid) [chapter 5]. In chapter eleven, the writer sums up or concludes his speech about the idea of comradeship, indicating that it is one of the most important human values that remains and makes life valuable.

It is worth mentioning here that the purpose or the intention of the writer from keeping this value to the end of the novel despite the end of everything even the life itself is to prove the following truth or fact: although the man faces difficulties and hardships, psychological troubles, physical pains, shocks and obstacles, wounds and calamities, and ultimately dies, nothing remains but the perfumed wonderful value of comradeship. The writer skillful argumentation about the notion or the idea of comradeship acts as an invitation from him (an implicit invitation) to replace the spirit of violence and hostility that ignite the fires and the flames of wars between people, groups, and societies with the spirit of comradeship, i.e. love and brotherhood, that remains despite all the odds and pains.

After showing the significance of the descriptive role played by assertive speech acts as a member of a system of architecture in the process of argumentation, and after presenting the significance of the use of assertive speech acts to the quality of being self-assured and confident without being aggressive and the impact of this learnable skill to the process of communication, and after providing the key sentences that can tie the reader with the descriptive dramatic passages of the text of the novel, now it is the time to present the goal of this novel or "what did this novel do with words, i.e. assertive speech acts". In the following section, we will illustrate the relationship between the illocutionary force of the speaker's assertive speech acts and the perlocutionary effects.

(9) The relationship between the illocutionary force of the speaker's assertive speech acts and the perlocutionary effects:

Concerning readers' reactions or the perlocutionary effects, readership, i.e. readers, never agree. There must be the pros and cons, i.e. proponents and opponents. Similarly, in this novel, we find that there are two fronts: pros and cons. What confirms the superiority of Remarque over his peers about the delivery of the message through argumentative writing is that all of the pros and cons gave clear responses, i.e. perlocutionary effects, at a high political level. First, when talking about the front of opponents, these are the general perlocutionary effects:

- (1) Remarque was forced to leave Germany, and his novel was banned and burned in Nazi Germany. Kam (1984) states this fact, he says:

When the American film version of *All Quiet* was screened in Berlin, his bands of Hitler youth had rampaged through the theater hurling stink bombs, scattering white mice, and shouting, "Germany awake!" The film was banned, and in 1931 Remarque was forced to leave Germany, were both his novels were thrown into the fire during the famous book burning of 1933. (P. 5)

- (2) Nazi Germany or Nazi troops stripped Remarque of his citizenship, i.e. identity, and considered him a traitor to Germany included under the group named "stab in the back" (Sauer, 2015, P.22), a group famous for treason at the time. In this respect, Sauer (2015) indicates that "to stab someone in the back is to harm someone by treachery or betrayal of trust. The 'stab in the back'

legend asserted that Germany's fate was caused, not by an overwhelming military defeat, but by treacherous internal forces...Just as Siegfried fell to the treacherous spear of terrible Hagen, so did our exhausted front line collapse" (ibid)

Second, when talking about the front of proponents, these are the general perlocutionary effects:

- (1) In compensation for the act of burning his novel, the novel has been translated into English by Arthur Wheen Fawcett Crest and has been converted into a movie taking international award; furthermore, the Americans called him, i.e. Remarque, "king of Hollywood" (Kam, 1984, P.6)
- (2) In compensation for the deprivation of nationality, America opened the doors to him and allowed him to enter and exit by facilities from the US government. In this respect, Kam (1984) states:

When he first came to America in 1939, Remarque had none of the passport difficulties experienced by most German political exiles at that time...He applied for American citizenship in 1941, becoming a citizen after the time required by law. He loved America—especially the easygoing friendliness of the people—but never felt fully accepted by the Germans and always resented the loss of his German citizenship... And *All Quiet on the Western Front*, accounting for 8 million in sales, is still one of the greatest European bestsellers of the 20th century. (P. 6, 7)

The general perlocutionary effects show us several things. This work is one of the wonderful literary works in the whole world, and it ranks in the list of literature the most easily recognizable and communicatively approachable because of its simple sentences and because it is written in the form of a diary

with the pronoun 'I'. In this novel, the writer informs the reader with the true picture of the war and he achieves this through the descriptive or assertive speech acts that make the reader get excited by strong emotion. This strong emotion brings about a sense of dissatisfaction in the reader, and this feeling motivates the reader to take or adopt a point of view or reaction, i.e. either to be a proponent or to be an opponent.

(10) Conclusion

Concerning the argumentative power or the communicative force of assertive speech acts in the process of writing, at the beginning of the novel (in the preface), the writer presents the main general claim of the novel which illustrates the ugliness and the brutality of the war. In the folds of the novel, the writer presents many aspects that illustrate that this war is unjust or unfair. In order for the writer to argue and support his claim, within the novel, he uses fluent and confident ropes (arguments). These confident ropes give the novel a great communicative force. These ropes spread throughout the novel. In every chapter, the writer attempts to portray a bad aspect of the war's miseries alongside the work of refuting the misleading propaganda.

From the observation as a tool, when reading this novel, we find that these ropes are the use of assertive speech acts. From a theoretical perspective, there is a great deal of harmony between the theoretical framework of the theory of speech acts and the communicative force resulting from the use of this type of speech acts, i.e. assertive speech acts, in this novel. In other words, the theory of speech acts means 'how to do things with words', and the novel's goal also is 'how to do things with words'.

Concerning the novel's goal, there are certain perlocutionary effects that the writer seeks to achieve through his constant and accurate description of facts. In fact, the writer's messages are dangerous because they touch the ruling regime at the time and

because they occur during the hot preparation of Nazi propaganda. So he chooses words that have certain characteristics that fit his dangerous acts, i.e. messages. 1- The writer has an intention supported by his commitment to the described facts so he uses a method that expresses 100 % credibility. 2- The writer tries to refute a politically supported ideology so he uses the style and the words that do not address the culture of attack or hostility. Simply, we find that the descriptive style that employs assertive speech acts expresses 100 % credibility and 100 % flexibility.

In addition to the degree of credibility and acceptability, in this novel, the writer is very careful to direct the reader's behavior while protecting himself from any charge or aggression; therefore, he resorts to the use of this descriptive method. This technique is the fruit produced due to the attention (the care) of the writer for his approach.

The study of the dialectical structure and the communicative power of the style of this novel relates to the narration of the events that influenced the narrator's life. The writer narrates the story and the events by using a certain type of speech acts, i.e. assertive speech acts. This type plays a functional role in the achievement of a technical act on the one hand and a practical act on the other hand. The technical, i.e. artistic, act concerns the strict application or interpretation of the rules, and the practical, i.e. effective, act concerns the case that becomes so nearly that it can be regarded as evidence-based act. We can seek the features of the technical act in the light of the reciprocal relationship (arrangement) that occurs between what the writer tells or narrates (the situations) with the real events he has experienced. We can seek the features of the practical act in the light of the careful monitoring of the writer through the description and the corresponding relationship associated with

the behavioral and emotional feelings of the reader. In other words, the writer keeps the reader under a systematic review of the events of the war by his careful observation of the progress of the events of the war over a particular period of time. The technical act is the illocutionary force and the practical act is the perlocutionary effect. Hence, assertive speech acts used in this particular novel have a dialectical (argumentative) function because they are not merely transient tools to the narration of the details of the events, but they reflect (show) technical and practical parts of a structural entity that has special elements and characteristics such as credibility and responsibility and the ability to have a full commitment to the truth of the propositions. It is these elements that make this verbal (textual and literal) narrative entity a dialectical (argumentative) entity and nothing else.

Concerning the dialectical (argumentative) entity, in every chapter of the novel, the writer tries to convey a new face of the negative aspects of the war that supports the general claim of the novel that entails that the war is nothing but an adventure for death. Analytically, we find that this novel falls under the stage of argumentation and the writer of this novel uses assertive or descriptive speech acts to advance his argumentation. This descriptive stage, in turn, is divided into two points: the first point is the narrative description of the circumstances and the events that aim to transfer the experience, and the second point is the narrative description of the characters that aim to transfer the interactions. Both points support the general claim of the novel and contribute to the process of revealing the audacity of the war that in turn enables the reader to derive the argumentative irony embedded in "all quiet on the western front".

To the current date, no researcher or writer has risked a study of war as a central theme of human societies. However, by

the systematic description, Remarque could define war accurately as an organized and systematic form of violence that lengthens to affect all the fields of human action. Remarque proves that the war is not just a mere military phenomenon. Not all chapters of the novel are confrontations on the front lines. But he shows that the war destroys the humanitarian organization as a whole and it is a form of human decline at all levels, as well as a theatre of the worst and most dangerous crime, i.e. the crime of murder.

Finally, we can summarize the communicative force of the mechanism of description or the argumentative approach using assertive speech acts as a persuasive act-stating group of the big classification of "how to do things with words" in the following points:

The general claim of the novel: "the war is nothing but an adventure of death". The writer proves his claim through assertive speech acts, the confident ropes spread all over the novel, according to the following tier:

- 1- From a materialistic perspective, the war is nothing but an adventure for death.
- 2- From a philosophical perspective, the war is nothing but an adventure for death.
- 3- From a social perspective, the war is nothing but an adventure for death.
- 4- From a cultural perspective, the war is nothing but an adventure for death.
- 5- From educational perspective, the war is nothing but an adventure for death.
- 6- From a psychological perspective, the war is nothing but an adventure for death.
- 7- From a rational perspective, the war is nothing but an adventure for death.

- 8- From a literary perspective, the war is nothing but an adventure for death.
- 9- From a military perspective, the war is nothing but an adventure for death.
- 10- From a moral perspective, the war is nothing but an adventure for death.

Tracing the argumentative tier of the writing of this novel enables the researcher to achieve the academic goal of the research. The academic goal of this paper is to assist in the development of the argumentative scope of writing by describing how it is employed and defined through the use of assertive speech acts and the mechanism of description in Remarque's "all quiet on the western front"

References

- Austin, H. J. (2003). *Chase, Chance and Creativity: the lucky art of novelty*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bach, K. (2003). Speech acts and pragmatics. *Blackwell. Guide to the philosophy of language*, 147-167.
- Chung, S. (2010). Korean evidentials and assertion. *Lingua*. volum 120, issue 4, april, pages 932-952
- Crest, F. (1991). *All quiet on the western front*. (Remarque, M). Retrieved from Amazon.com
- Jacobs, S. (1989). Speech acts and arguments. *Argumentation*, 3(4), 345-365.
- Kam, R. (1984). *Erich Maria Remarque's: All Quiet on the Western Front*. New York and London: Barron's educational series, Inc.
- Kissine, M. (2013). *From utterances to speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sadock, J. M. (1974). *Toward a linguistic theory of speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626). Cambridge university press.

Searle, R. J. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1985). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.

Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2010). *Speech acts in argumentative discussions: A theoretical model for the analysis of discussions directed towards solving conflicts of opinion* (Vol. 1). Walter de Gruyter.

Herzig, A., & Longin, D. (2002, July). A logic of intention with cooperation principles and with assertive speech acts as communication primitives. In *Proceedings of the first international joint conference on Autonomous agents and multiagent systems: part 2* (pp. 920-927).

نبذة عن البحث

تبحث هذه الرسالة في ممارسة ريمارك الكتابية التي تم عرضها من خلال تركيب كرسن المترجم فيما يتعلق بأبعاد جدلية وإقناعية محددة تحت نطاق الحجاج السياسي لرواية "كل شيء هادىء على الجبهة الغربية". تتألف هذه الدراسة من مجموعة من الفقرات الدرامية المختارة مشهورة النشر بالانجليزية. الدراسة لها هدفان: هدف أكاديمي ادراكي (معرفي). أولاً، الهدف الأكاديمي لهذه الدراسة يتمثل في المساعدة في تطوير النطاق الجدلي للكتابة من خلال وصف كيف وظف ريمارك هذا النطاق في كتابته الجدلية والإقناعية. ثانياً: تصبح هذه الدراسة باستخدام نظرية افعال الكلام ذات قيمة إدراكية لأنها تساهم في تقديم إضافة جديدة للمعرفة تساهم في حل مشاكل المجتمعات. إن رفض أيديولوجية الحرب الظالمة والقتل هو أحد أهم أركان هذه الرواية وكذلك مشروع البحث. كما أنها دعوة رائعة للجوء إلى التفكير النقدي في حل المشاكل مع التركيز المقصود على الايديولوجية البديلة (الإخاء). وفي هذا البحث اعتمد الباحث على تحليل أفعال الكلام التي تم استخدامها بشكل حجاجي في هذه الرواية. وعلى اعتبار ان الرواية هي النص الحجاجي، نجد ان افعال الكلام التي استخدمت للأداء الحجاجي هي (assertive speech acts) هذا النوع من افعال الكلام له خاصية وصفية لا يستخدم الكاتب هذه الخاصية الوصفية لمجرد السرد او الحكى ولكنه يستخدمها لتحقيق "صيد ما" (يعني هدف ما). وكما تقول الامثال العربية "الوصف صيد والكتابة قيده" "قيد صيودك بالحبال الوثيقة فمن حماقة ان تصيد غزاة وتعيرها بين الخلائق طالقة". باختصار، في هذا البحث وباستخدام نظرية افعال الكلام يتمكن الباحث من تتبع افعال الكلام ذات الوظيفة الحجاجية (الاستخدام الحجاجي للوصف) فالوصف في هذه الرواية هو صيد الكاتب الذي جعل الكتابة قيده.