

The Speech Act of Compliment:□ A Theoretical View

Dr.Maysa'a Kadhim Jibreen
College of Education / University of Al-Qadisiya

Abstract

The study of expressive speech acts has received a great deal of attention by linguists, philosophers, and researchers since they reflect psychological states of the speaker specified in the propositional contents. Each speaker may find himself /herself tending to express approbation many times daily about hearer's appearance, behaviour, skill...etc. ' Compliments ' are common features of everyday discourses due to their great number offered and received.

The present research aims at:

1. Examining the theoretical views adopted by linguists, philosophers, and researchers concerning:
 - a. Definitions, types, classifications and strategies of compliments speech acts.
 - b.The defining properties that distinguish compliments acts from other related acts.
 - c.The syntactic, semantic and pragmatic structures of compliments.
2. Arriving at different and to some extent new theoretical views from those presented in (1) especially those concerned with syntactic and pragmatic structures.

1. The Speech Act of Compliment

France (1992: 11-15) states that the word 'compliment' has its roots in the Italian *complimento*. *Complimento* refers to an action done on one hand by obligation and, on the other hand to "a sentiment of gratitude which comes from the heart and reflects the truth and sincerity of the soul". *Complimento*, in turn, is borrowed from the Spanish *complimiento* (which itself is derived from the Latin *Comolere*). Le Robert (1992), cited in France (1992: 44), sets the date at which 'compliment' was borrowed from the Italian as 1604.

From the seventeenth century on wards, the notion of 'compliment' represents a word or an action codified by politeness towards others. (Chick, 1996 cited in Yousif, 2003:4)

Different definitions on the speech act of 'compliment' have been provided according to different viewpoints. Manes (1983:97) for example, defines it with reference to culture. 'Compliment' acts are similar to a window through which a society as a whole or an individual in particular can view what is valued by a relevant culture.

Cohen (1991:25) and Holmes (1994), cited in Smadi (1999:15), use 'compliments' to function as socializing devices. "It is the most appropriate way of expressing solidarity".

Kasper and Schmidt (1996:446-448) provide, however, the following definition concerning the particular relation between the speaker(S) and the hearer (H):(Whether it explicitly or implicitly attributes credit to the person addressed for her / his good (characteristic, skill, possession, etc) is valued positively by the S and the H as a 'compliment' speech act).

The researcher is going to adopt the following definition stated by Searle and Vanderveken (1985:215) since she finds it the most appropriate one in her analysis of the pragmatic aspects of this speech act in general and her formulation of the felicity conditions in particular.' Compliments' are used to "express approval of the hearer for something ". Such

acts "presuppose that the thing the hearer is complimented for is good, though it need not necessarily be good for him". As an example of this is to compliment the H on his/her heroic and self-sacrificing behaviour.

From what has been stated before, two questions might be asked: First, why do people use 'compliments'? Second, what are their types?

The first question can be answered by Han (1992), cited in Yousif (2003:15), who states that 'compliments' are used for a variety of reasons, to:

- 1- Express admiration or approval of someone's work.
- 2- Confirm / maintain solidarity (Cohen (1991) and Holmes' (1994) definition).
- 3- Replace greeting / gratitude / apology / congratulation acts.

This function has further investigated in Manes and Wolfson's (1981), cited in Smadi (1999:16), analysis of complimenting behaviour in American English. Their analysis shows that in such society, 'compliments' serve other functions than those stated before, they are used in greeting, thanking and apologizing or even as substitutes for them. Therefore, they suggest that "any contrastive study accordingly, must include the levels of both form and function".

- 4- Soften face-threatening acts such as 'apologies', 'requests' and 'criticisms'.

This function is clearly pointed out by Kasper (1990:198). He states that the literature on 'compliments' (by Manes, 1983, Wolfson, 1983 and Holmes, 1986 & 1988) provides "evidence for systematic maximization of hearer benefits" unlike that on complaints (by House and Kasper, 1981 and Olshtain and Weinbach, 1987) provides mitigation of hearer's cost (since it is one of the face threatening acts).

- 5- Open and sustain conversation.
- 6- Reinforce desired behaviour.

Concerning the second question, major 'compliment' topics can be classified into three categories:-

- 1-Appearance / possessions.

It is one of the most common types of 'compliments' in English. e.g.

1. Your blouse looks beautiful.
2. I really love your car.

- 2-Performances/ skills/ abilities.

- 3-You did a good job.
- 4-You are such a wonderful writer.

Concise compliments are some of these types given by male speakers:

- 5-Nice Shot!
- 3- Personality traits:

This category of 'compliment' occurs less frequently than those on the first and the second categories.

- 6- Good boy.
- 7-You're so sweet. (Gajaseni, 1994 cited in Yousif, 2003:16)

'Complimenting' speech act has been listed under different categories by many scholars from different perspectives. In what follows, it is going to shed some light on these views for a better understanding of this speech act.

1.1 Compliments as Behabitive Acts

Austin (1962) was the first to give the formulation of what is called speech act theory (henceforth SAT). He classifies illocutionary acts into five categories taking into consideration English verbs (cf. Austin, 1962: 150-162). These categories are as follows:

- 1- Verdictives: They are typified by giving a verdict by a jury.
- 2- Exercitives: They are typified by exercising powers, rights or influences.
- 3- Commissives: They are typified by assuming of an obligation or declaring of an intention.
- 4- Behabitives: They are typified by adopting of an attitude.
- 5- Expositives: They are typified by clarifying of reasons or arguments.

Austin (1962: 159) lists the speech act of 'compliment' within behabitives and states that "behabitives include the notion of reaction to other people's behaviour and fortunes and of attitudes and expression of attitudes to someone else's past conduct or imminent conduct". Examples of this category are: 'apologies', 'thanks', 'greetings', 'compliments', etc.

1.2 Compliments as Expressive Acts

Expressive acts are distinguished from other kinds of illocutionary acts by the types of psychological conditions they express. Norrick (1978: 279) points out that expressions do not express beliefs or intentions, but emotions these emotions arise in response to given states of affairs.

According to the Searlean approach, the illocutionary point of this class is to express "psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about the state of affairs specified in the propositional content (Searle, 1979:15).

Since the speaker expresses a psychological state brought about by a state of affairs that involves the H, the performance of an expressive act establishes an interpersonal relation between them. Therefore, Haverkate (1984:23) considers expressive acts to be "speaker and hearer centered". Expressive acts have no direction. The speaker simply expresses a mental state about a state of affairs represented in the propositional content. (Vanderveken, 1994: 106)

Searle and Vanderveken (1985:19) state that a 'compliment' is an expressive force of the form. Moreover, Searle (1979: 15) relates the convivial class to his class of expressive acts. Therefore, 'compliments', belong to the expressive category. 'Compliments' are also related to the expressive acts identified by T.Gorgis (1992). Hence, they are classified as polite formulaic speech acts. (Al-Rassam, 1999: 6).

2. Compliments and Politeness Strategies

In this section, two concepts are going to be discussed with reference to the notion of 'politeness': A convivial act and 'face'.

2.1 Compliments as Convivial Acts

Leech (1983: 104-105) proposes a classification of illocutionary function according to the notion of politeness. He attempts to show how illocutionary functions are related to the social goal of maintaing comity. He distinguishes four types:

- 1- Competitives.
- 2- Convivals.
- 3- Collaboratives.
- 4- Conflictives.

Only the first two types are the ones which chiefly involve 'politeness'. This is due to the fact that in 'competitives', politeness is of a negative character, and its purpose is to "reduce the discord implicit in the competition between what S wants to achieve, and what is

good manners ".Convivial', are on the contrary, intrinsically courteous. Politeness in this category takes a more positive form of seeking opportunities for comity. Since 'compliments' are one type of the second illocutionary functions, convivial functions will be the focus of the researcher's concern.

2.2 Compliments as a Positive Politeness Strategy

One of the most effective ways to ensure and accomplish communication is the use of politeness strategies. Trosborg (1995:19) defines 'politeness' as "a desire to protect self-image and hears face". The notion of 'face' is taken from Brown and Levinson's (1978:19) and (1987:103) theory of linguistic behaviour in terms of two major categories: Positive and negative politeness. 'Face' means the public self image of a person. It refers to that emotional and social sense oneself that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize.

First, 'positive politeness' orients the face of the addressee by indicating that in some respects (e.g. by treating him as a member of an in-group who wants and personality traits are known and liked). (Brown and Levinson, 1987:70).

Second, 'negative politeness' on the other hand, is oriented mainly towards partially satisfying its negative face, his/her basic want to maintain claims of territory and self-effacement, formality and constraints. (ibid)

Are 'compliments' face saving acts (henceforth FSAs) or face threatening acts (henceforth FTAs)? According to what has been previously mentioned (cf. 2.1), compliments, i.e.; convivals are FSAs in contrast to the fourth illocutionary function 'conflictive'.

In 'conflictives', politeness is out of question, since conflictive functions are designed to cause offence. To threaten or cause someone in a polite manner is a contradiction in terms. The only way to make sense of the idea is to suppose that the speaker does so ironically. In convivals, however, positive politeness means observing Politeness Principle (henceforth PP), if one has an opportunity to congratulate H on his/her 30th birthday, one should do so.

Moreover, in Brown and Levinson's theory (1987), 'compliments' are largely positive politeness strategy, since it signals the complimenter's noticing of and attending to the complimentee's interest and needs. (Brown and Levinson, 1987:78-80).

Brown and Levinson's theory (1987) is useful for the analysis of 'compliments' as politeness strategies because the theory's interest in 'compliments' lies primarily in their use in re-addressing FTAs. In their terms, "paying a compliment is a positive strategy that addresses the hearer's positive face" (Yousif, 2003, 20).

Similarly, the literature in different varieties of English (e.g. Manes (1983); Wolfson (1983), American English; Holmes (1986, 1988), New Zealand English; Herbert (1989), South African English and American English, predominantly documents maximizing strategies, increasing the force of 'compliments' and thereby hearing the receiver's positive face wants such as

8- I love your shirt.

9- Your presentation was really great. (Kasper, 1990: 199)

3. Compliments and Praising

There are some terms in language, which may share compliments', certain features, i.e. expressing approval or admiration, yet there are differences between them. One of these is 'praising'.

Lewandowska- Tomaszczyk (1989), cited in Al-Rassam (1999:8), states that to 'compliment' somebody means that you are giving, him, her personal positive evaluation either about his, her appearance, attire, physical shape or any thing related to that person (this is a

general definition since the researcher adopts Searle and Vanderveken's (1985: 215)). Praising, on the other hand, may not be directed to others. Thus, one praises his, her own home (country, army, ancestors, etc.).

This idea has been clearly established by Searle and Vanderveken (1985: 215). They state that there are number of expressive acts which express approbation such as 'compliments', 'praising', 'lauding' and 'extolling'. However, 'compliments' express approval of the hearer, unlike 'praising', 'lauding' and 'extolling' which don't carry such suggestion, i.e., that the hearer is necessarily related to the thing being praised, lauded or extolled(1).

In addition to what Searle and Vanderveken (1985: 215) state concerning the differences between 'compliments' on one hand and 'praising', 'lauding' and 'extolling' on the other, the researcher adds another term which is similar to all of them since it expresses approbation. It is 'commendation' speech act or 'commend' verb. However, it differs from 'complimenting' in the same way 'praising', 'lauding' and 'extolling' are different(2).

Furthermore, 'praising' is understood most frequently as a wider term than compliment. Tannen (1993), cited in Al-Abodi (2005:21), strengthens this idea by considering 'compliment' as an interactive speech act whereas praising is a statement with or without this interactive function.

Moreover, Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (1989), cited in Al-Rassam (1999:8), suggests that 'compliments' appear only in face to face Interaction: "complimenting always involves a human addressee". Therefore, when one says for example:

10- "We have a good teacher",

In his/ her absence, in this case one is not 'complimenting' the teacher; rather 'praising' him/her.

However, another possibility exists when 'praising' implies a 'compliment', e.g.:

11- You have a handsome son,

In this example, one is 'praising' the son and at the same time 'complimenting' the parents for their contribution or their personal involvement in the object complimented (ibid). But if one says:

12- That girl is attractive,

this has nothing to do with 'complimenting'; rather it is 'praising'. Praising here, is not only used in describing achievement but also appearances of others. (ibid).

It has been mentioned above (cf. 2.2) that compliments are FSAs; however, it can be considered as FTAs in relation to face to face interaction (especially in Arabic culture) for example,

13- I like your pen.

It implies a FTA since the comment would threaten the addressee's face. The latter may understand the complimenter wants his/ her pen; thus he/she is likely to feel embarrassed, so the addressee's response might be: Please take it! While

1. *These verbs are different from each other in their uses. 'Extolling' and 'lauding' are highly religious. The researcher is not going to talk in detail about the different uses of 'praising', 'lauding' and 'extolling' since they are outside the scope of her study. (But she finds it is useful to show the similar points which 'praising', 'lauding' and 'extolling' on one hand, and 'compliments' on the other hand, share).*
2. *The researcher does not want to go in to detail concerning 'commendation' speech act since it is outside her study. Yet, she tries to gather these acts which may have 'compliment' and 'praising' common features, i.e.; since they implicate positive evaluation.*

14- X has a nice pen

does not imply a FTA since X is passive, i.e.; on the scene. Thus, 'praising' can not be considered as FTAs. (AL-Rassam, 1999:9)

Praising is also distinguished from 'complimenting' as for as function is concerned, 'compliments' are used to establish solidarity despite the fact that this is different as for as sex is concerned (See Fraser, 1990: 201).

Praising, on the other hand, can only do that indirectly.

In some contexts, Herbert (1990), cited in AL-Rassam (1999:9), in an analysis of over a thousand American compliments suggests that 'compliments' may function as 'praising' and 'encouragement'. 'Praising' is often directed downwards from super-ordinates to subordinates. So the teacher's compliment about student's work in:

15- This is a very good painting Ali,

would generally be regarded as 'praising'.

From the above distinction, it is concluded that it is difficult to draw a sharp line between 'complimenting' and 'praising' {since they overlap}.

However, one can not claim that 'complimenting' is subordinate to 'praising' since the former provides conditions missing in the latter. (For further information concerning 'praising' only, see Al-Abodi, 2005).

Finally, there is another term which is in one way or another related to 'compliments', it is 'flattery'. While 'compliments' are tend to "sincere, objective and given without thought of gain", 'flattery' is "often mere lip service and lacking sincerity". A 'flattery' may be used as an introduction to another act. Therefore, they are called 'pre-acts' for questions and requests for example. (Lewandowska -Tomaszczyk, 1989), cited in Al-Rassam (1990:10).

In this case, the addressee is aware that the flatterer has something to have or gain. This pre-act does not take much time of the researcher's time and effort because it lacks the sincerity of the S (sincerity condition is one of the FCs that the researcher suggests for a successful performance of the speech acts of 'compliments') (For further information concerning 'flattery' pre-act, see Manes (1983), Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (1989) and Rubin et al (1994)).

4. Structures of Compliments

In this section, three types of structures are going to be discussed: syntactic, semantic and pragmatic.

4.1 The Syntactic Structures of Compliments

The first and most important study of 'compliments' is that made by Manes and Wolfson (1981). They provide a detailed description of 'compliments' in American English. Their model has been the basis of most of the subsequent studies.

Manes and Wolfson (1981), in their analysis of the corpus of (686), found that the structure of 'compliments' is even more highly patterned than that of the semantic one. Moreover, their (686) naturally occurring compliments are extremely formulaic. The data are gathered from middle-class Americans, males and females of varying ages and occupational, educational back-grounds.

These compliments (formulas) are categorized into three major classes and other six minor ones. These three major categories are:

- 1- NP [is] (really) ADJ e.g.
[looks]

16- You look good.

2- I (really) [like] NP e.g.:
[Love]

17-I really like your bag.

3- PRO is (really) (a) ADJ NP, e.g.:

18-That's a good system. (Al-Rassam, 1999:14-15)

Therefore, according to Manes and Wolfson (1981), only these three patterns are required to describe (85%) of the compliments found, while the six secondary patterns account for (97.2.) of all the data in their corpus. (ibid: 15)

The six secondary patterns are as follows:

1-You V (a) (really) ADJ NP e.g.:

19. You did a good job.

-2-You V (NP) (really) ADV.

20-You really handled that situation well.

3-You have (a) ADJ NP!

21. You have such a beautiful hair!

4-What (a) ADJ NP!

22-What a lovely baby you have!

5-ADJ NP!

23-Nice game!

6-Isnt NP ADJ!

24-Isnt your ring beautiful! (Yousif, 2003:25)

Parallel to these findings for American English, are these of Holmes' (1988).The syntactic formulas that both men and women in New Zealand used are consistent with those found in Manes and Wolfson's (1980).Women, however, relied more heavily than men on the 'I like NP' pattern (especially the verb 'love') Indicating a personal focus. Women also made more use of a formula 'what (a) (ADJ) NP!' while men made use of a minimal formula 'ADJ NP!' (Al-Rassam, 1999:18)

The reason behind the women's choice is that they use strategic devices to strengthen the illocutionary force and expressive function of a 'compliment', while men use them to "hedge on a compliment's force and expressive function". (ibid)

Finally, Herbert (1990:226) arrived at similar conclusions to Holmes' (1988). Herbert found that women's use of 'I like NP' pattern is much more personal in focus. Specifically, he searched whether the grammatical subject of a 'compliment' was personal (1st and 2nd person) or impersonal (3rd person). He found that women used first and 2nd person pronouns as subjects of sentences much more than men did (particularly when women address other women). Men's compliments, however, were more impersonal with special reference to other men. Herbert suggested that 'subjective 'compliment in which speakers use 1st subject (such as I) have less force than a 'comparable objective' form (such as 'you' and 'that' as in 'that's a nice shirt')

From what has been presented, it might be noted that 'compliments' are implicitly indicated by adjectives or verbs within different patterns. Out of the researcher's searching and reading books, she can not find any single sentence including the explicit per formative verb' compliment'. The researcher thinks that the reasons behind this are due to :(1) its

formality and restriction. (2) People try to use the swiftest and easiest term that has such frequency among them.

Therefore, they tend to use adjectives or any other forms referring to the speech act of 'compliment'. In addition to that, if one asks any of them: 'What a speech act you are using in: 'your blouse is beautiful?', they answer: 'It is 'praising' and not 'complimenting' since 'praising' is wider and more comprehensive than 'praising'.

The only place that the researcher finds this is in dictionaries, i.e., lexical definitions of this speech act. One of these dictionaries is Webster's (1999): Revised Unabridged Dictionary which includes the sayings of poets such as

25. Tedious waste of time, to sit and hear so many hollow compliments and lies (Milton)

26. Many a compliment politely penned. (Cowper)

27. I make the interlocutors, upon occasion, compliment with another. (Boyle)

28. Monarchs should their inward soul disguise...should compliment their foes and shun their friends. (Prior)

Since the per formative verb 'compliment' is used in such contexts, one should also explain the syntactic structure of it.

Generally speaking, expressive acts will not take 'that clause' and 'infinitives'. They rather tend to accept the obligatory gerund (one type of nominalization) and other types of 'nominalizations'. This is due to the fact that there is no direction of fit, i.e. "the speaker is neither to get the world to match the words nor the words to match the world". e.g. one can not say:

29.*I apologize that I stepped on your toe or

30.* I apologize to behave badly but rather

31. I apologize for behaving badly or

32. I apologize for my bad behavior (Searle, 1975:357,364)

Applying these rules to the speech act of compliment (particularly the explicit use of the per formative verb 'compliment'), the researcher finds that these rules are applicable through the examples mentioned above (examples (25) and (26) followed by noun, example (27) a verb followed by PP and example (28) a verb followed by NP)

4.2 The Semantic Structures of Compliments

Regardless of the use of the explicit lexical verb 'compliment' discussed above, there are various semantic structures maintaining the speech act of 'compliment'.

On the semantic level, Manes and Wolfson (1981), cited in Al-Rassam (1999:13), stated that each compliment must include at least one term which carries positive semantic load. They have found the majority of compliments fall within a highly restricted set of adjectives and verbs.

They have also found that (80%) of their data are adjectival, in the sense that they depend on an adjective for positive semantic value. Of these are five ones which are used with any frequency (nice, good, beautiful, pretty, and great), while most adjectives occur only once or twice in the data. The two commonly occurring adjectives are 'nice' and 'good' (22.9% and 19.6%) of the data respectively. The results of this analysis show that "these adjectives are semantically vague which makes it possible for speakers to use them in connection with an almost unlimited variety of nouns" e.g.

33. Your home is nice.

34. You are such a good cook.

Other adjectives are 'beautiful, pretty, and great' appear in (9.7%), (9.2%) and (6.2%) of all adjectival compliments in the data, 'pretty' on the other hand, is more specific than the others. All of these adjectives occur with different topics.

35. You did a beautiful job of explaining that.

36. That was a really great job.

37. That shirt is very pretty. (Ibid: 13-14)

Manes and Wolfson (1981), cited in Yousif (2003:26), illustrate the usefulness of this extremely high frequency of these five adjectives in American English to language teachers and learners. The reason behind this is that learners may, "with perfect appropriateness, make use of the members of this set to speakers of any topic in a complimentary statement".

Other compliments in the corpus are of the verbal having the positive semantic evaluation e.g.

38. I like / love your dress

These two verbs (like and love) constitute (86%) of all compliments which contain a semantically positive verb. Other verbs (as in patterns 1, 2 and 3 of the six secondary patterns discussed above) occur only once or twice in the data. Therefore, Manes and Wolfson (1981) conclude that speakers of American English make use of the following semantic formula:

[Like] NP (that is the second major syntactic pattern)

[Love]

Moreover, they found that women use 'love' than 'like'(as mentioned and discussed before). (Manes and Wolfson, 1981 cited in Al-Rassam, 1999:14)

The results of Holmes' (1988) study in New Zealand were compared with the American data investigated by Manes and Wolfson's (1980). The study showed that two-thirds of the compliments used are of the following five adjectives which are the same most common adjectives marked in the American data: 'Nice, good, beautiful, lovely and wonderful'. In addition to these adjectives, the same verbs are used: 'love' for women and 'like' for men. (Smadi, 1999:17)

Finally, for Herbert (1990:227), he comes up with similar conclusions to those of Manes and Wolfson's (1980) and Holmes' (1988). Examining gender differences in lexical choice, Herbert (ibid) found that women intensified compliments by using 'love' more than men, who tended to select 'like' (that's why the use of 'I like (love)' pattern is more used than others as it is discussed previously), but he reported no salient differences in the use of intensifiers. This result intensified his conclusion that compliments from females will most likely not be accepted whereas compliments from males will, especially by female recipients.

4.2 The Pragmatic Structures of Compliments

Compliments are believed to contain a combination of "semantic –pragmatic components which are assertions of positive valuation by the speaker and verbal gifts". (Herbert, 1990:208)

The researcher does not agree with what Herbert (1990) states above or any other linguist following him. This is due to the absence of syntactic structure. The researcher (out of her humble reading in books of linguistics and pragmatics) arrives at the following viewpoint: Any speech act should be presented on two levels: Linguistic level and extra-linguistic one. The former includes phonetics, syntax, and semantics. It is true that each of these levels has its own features and systems, however, it cannot work alone or to be more accurate, it cannot function appropriately regardless of others. This view is built upon the facts that:

First, language is not a heap of accidental matters but it is a network of interrelated systems.

Second, one of the characteristics of language is its systematicity, i.e., it is a system of systems. Therefore; semantics cannot work alone regardless of syntax.

Applying this view to the speech act of 'compliment' on the linguistic level, the researcher excludes phonetics and limits herself with answering the following question: How is the semantic structure of this act manipulated through syntax?

This is on the linguistic level; the extra-linguistic level cannot also work regardless of the linguistic one. The extra-linguistic level in this research is maintained through pragmatics which is embedded in the researcher's: First, discussion of the concept of 'compliment', its types and classifications. Second, differentiating between 'compliments' and other speech acts and finally, proving that it is a positive politeness strategy.

However, pragmatics in this section is mainly concerned with the illocutionary and perlocutionary focus of 'compliments' since the illocutionary act works through syntax and semantics, i.e., the linguistic forms of 'compliments'. Therefore, the researcher presents syntactic, semantic and pragmatic structures of 'compliments' respectively.

Given these defining properties of the speech act of 'compliment' (including its definitions, distinctions, strategies and linguistic structures), it is the turn to shed light on the pragmatic structure focusing on the FCs (these conditions clearly explain the illocutionary and perlocutionary forces of any speech act established through the relation between S and H) under which this speech act may be correctly performed and never to be overlapped with any other expressive ones.

Before dealing with these FCs, the researcher wishes to draw the reader's attention that she will not confine herself with whether the complimentee accepts or rejects the complimenter's 'compliment' or the detailed description of gender differences in giving and responding to different cultures (for more classification concerning these details, see Wierzbica, 1999:136-147). She will not tackle these since they are outside her main aims tackled throughout the research and clearly stated in the abstract.

Searle (1969:54-71) proposes a set of FCs for performing the act of 'promising' and claims that one can formulate their conditions for other types of speech acts. If any of these conditions are not obtained, the speech act in question would be performed insincerely. In other words, Searle puts the basis on which other researchers can build their conditions for other speech acts. They are briefly as follows:

1. Propositional Content Conditions: "What can be expressed in the proposition of a sentence".
2. Preparatory Conditions: "They specify contextual requirements"
3. Sincerity Conditions: "They specify the required beliefs, intentions...etc".
4. Essential Conditions: These are the constitutive rules that determine the type of the illocutionary force indicating device (henceforth IFID).

Norrick (1978:279) provides an analysis in which he attempts to differentiate the members of expressing and discusses their social function. He (ibid) points out that S presupposes a proposition to express a state of affairs and this proposition is to be of the 'factive' kind. He also suggests three conditions that must be obtained for the successful performance of the expressive illocutionary act:

1. The Factive Condition: According to Norrick's (1978:282) view, the correct performance of any expressive act requires S's acceptance of a certain state of affairs. Also, S must presuppose the truth of the propositional content of that expressive act, Norrick's 'factive presupposition' stands for Grice's (1975) conversational implicature (cf. Grice, 1975) in that S

is expressing the emotion he/she feels or possesses and involves many assumptions beyond the semantic level.

2. The Value Judgment Condition: This, and the following condition, is Searle's (1969) preparatory condition. In this condition, S is required to make his/her value judgment with regard to the effect of the state of affairs (ibid: 283). If one tries to apply this to the act of 'compliment', one may conclude that S feels that the state of affairs has affected him/ her, and thus he makes his/ her value judgment of that act.

3. The Role Identification Condition: Another constraint that is necessary for performing an expressive act successfully is that S identified the role of agent "who is responsible for the state of affairs", patient "a person cognizant of the state beside the patient". (ibid)

Given these three conditions, Norrick (1978:284) concludes his analysis with a generalized formulation of the kind of the expressive illocutionary act:

Schematically:(Agent)/ Value/ × (Patient) (Observer).() indicates optionally, // offers the choice of positive or negative act.

Applying this formula to the speech act of 'compliment', the researcher produces the following new formula:

Agent or Addresser /Positive Value /Patient or Addressee.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (1989) ,cited in Al-Rassam (1999:21-22), presented a more elaborate account; she suggested that giving 'a compliment' proposes a certain familiarity with the addressee which if not shared with him/ her results in ' misfire ' and a feeling of embarrassment. She also examined the illocutionary structure of 'praising' and 'compliment' in terms of a set of FCs (she calls FCs as illocutionary components) underlying both these acts

- a. There is a property 'a' related to A (A here presents H)
- b. S acts as if s/he evaluates 'a' positively.
- c. S expresses his/ her appreciation verbally directed to A in speech using formulaic semantico-structural patterns.
- d. Teleologically-to make A feel good in order to establish or maintain solidarity with A, optionally to ensure profit from A.

The researcher will not depend on any of the suggested conditions since: First, Searle (1969) presents a general framework for all acts expressives or none that any researcher can use it to build his/her own conditions .He (Searle) does not use specific FCs for specific acts. The researcher of this research will adopt the main proposition and classification of these FCs but will modify them and suggest her own FCs appropriate to 'compliments' in particular and not to any other speech act whether it is expressive or not.

Second, Norrick (1978) suggests these conditions but to be followed in formulating expressive acts in general with no clear description of the detailed relations maintained between S and H. The researcher evaluates these together with Norrick's formulation but she again modifies them and suggests her own for particular expressive act, i.e., 'compliment'.

Finally, Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (1989) suggests particular illocutionary components (she does not use the term FCs) to be followed in 'praising' and 'complimenting'. The researcher takes these components into her consideration but she specifies her own FCs to be used for 'compliments' in particular and not 'praising' (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk never distinguishes between ' complimenting' and 'praising', consequently she suggests her FCs to be applied on both).

Moreover, Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk is away from the detailed description of Searle's four FCs, therefore her conditions are superficial and never to be used or adopted by the researcher.

The researcher tries to be authentic in presenting these three models, i.e., Searle (1969), Norrick (1978) and Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (1989) and tries to take them into her consideration. However, she thinks that the following FCs are appropriate to be applied to the successful performance of 'compliments' acts:

1. The Propositional Content Conditions: S expresses his/her 'compliment' in his /her utterance for the property 'a' related to H. This is done to establish familiarity with H.

2. The Preparatory Conditions:

a. There is a property 'a' related to H.

b. S feels that this property 'a' has positively affected him/her. Hence,

c. S expresses his/her appreciation or value judgment of 'a' in his/her utterance using the formulaic structure of the speech act of 'compliment'.

d. Case (c) leads to (d) that S wishes H to believe that 'a' is in the interest of S. The H knows that but might accept or reject S's compliment.

3.3. The Sincerity Conditions: These conditions require that S must feel with sincere evaluation for 'a' related to H.

4.4. The Essential Conditions: The S reflexively wants the H, by counting S's utterance as an expression of evaluation to recognize S is complimenting. The violation of one or more of the above conditions will make the per formative utterance (in one way or another) unhappy or infelicitous.

Searle (1969:62-63) derives from his four suggested FCs, a set of semantic rules for determining IFID.

1. The Propositional Rules: They focus upon "the textual circumstance".

2. The Preparatory Rules: They focus upon "background circumstance".

3. The Sincerity Rules: They focus upon "speaker's psychological state".

4. The Essential Rules: They focus upon "the illocutionary point of what is said".

Similar to Searle's (1969) general framework of his four FCs, these are his general semantic rules (henceforth SRs) derived from FCs (This means that they are semantic but not in the literary meaning of the term 'semantics' discussed on 4.2 above, they are related to pragmatics since they are derived from FCs). The researcher's own SRs to the successful performance of the speech acts of 'compliments' are:

1. The Propositional Content Rules: 'a' is a positive property related to H which makes S expresses 'compliment' in his/her utterance.

2. The Preparatory Rules:

a. The property 'a' related to H. It is specific in the propositional content of the utterance which positively affects S. Hence,

b. S expresses his/her evaluation of 'a' in his/her utterance using the formulaic structure of 'compliments'.

c. Case (b) leads to (c) that S wishes H to believe that 'a' is in the interest of S and the H is aware of this.

3. The Sincerity Rules: 'Compliment' is uttered only if S feels with sincere or real appreciation or evaluation for 'a'.

4. The Essential Rules: The proposition of 'compliment' is uttered only if S's utterance is counted as an expression of evaluation to make H recognize that S is complimenting.

These four suggested FCs with their four suggested SRs, enable the speakers of English and learners of English language to perform successfully the speech acts of 'compliments' in their natural conversational usages .Can any of these conditions and rules be applied to literary discourses? This will be one of the researcher's future studies.

Conclusions

The present research has arrived at the following main concluding remarks:

- 1-Explicitly or implicitly, 'compliments' are expressive speech acts used to express approval of the hearer for something good.
2. 'Compliments' and other related speech acts which belong to convivial class take the form of positive positions .Hence, they are FSAs.
3. Since 'compliments' are illustrative examples of approbation, they are not 'praising', 'commending' or 'flattery'. These acts have their distinctive structures, uses and functions which make one draw a line between them.
- 4.' Compliments' have a set of syntactic and semantic formulas that distinguish their usage.
5. A set of FCs with their SRs is put for successful performance of 'compliments' and determining their IFID.

Bibliography

- Al-Abodi, Iman (2005)" Praise in English and Arabic: A Contrastive Study", (Unpublished M.A. Thesis) University of Al-Qadisiya.
- Al-Rassam, Eba (1999)" A Study of Compliments in Mousuli Arabic With Reference to English", (Unpublished M.A.Thesis) University of Mosul.
- Austin, J. (1962) How to Do Things with Words. Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1978)" Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomenon". In: Goody, E. (ed.), Questions and Politeness Strategies in Social Interaction.
 _____ (1987) Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage .Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, R. (1991)" Problems of Intercultural Communication in Egyptian – American Diplomatic Relations" .International Journal of Intercultural Relations,Vol. 11.
- France, P. (1992) Politeness and Its Discontents: Problems in French Classical Culture. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herbert, R. (1990)" Sex –Based Differences in Compliment Behavior ". Language in Society, Vol. 19.
- Kasper, G. (1990)" Linguistic Politeness: Current Research Issues". Journal of Pragmatics, Vol. 14.
- Kasper, G. and Schmidt, R. (1996)" Developmental Issues in International Pragmatics". Studies in Second Language Acquisition, Vol.18.
- Leech, G. (1983) Principles of Pragmatics .Longman: Longman Group Limited
- Manes, J (1983)" Compliments: A Mirror of Cultural Values" .In: N .Wolfson and E. Judd (eds.).Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition .Rowley: MA Newbury House.
- Norrick, N (1978)" Expressive Illocutionary Acts" .In: Journal of Pragmatics, Vol.2.
- Searle, J (1969) Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- _____ (1975) " A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts". In: Gunderson, K (ed.), Language, Mind and Knowledge, Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Vol.Vii.
- _____ (ed.) (1979) Expression and Meaning .Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J and Vanderveken, D. (1985) Foundations of Illocutionary Logic .Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smadi, O. (1999) " Politeness Strategies Employed by Graduate and Undergraduate Native Speakers of Jordanian at Yurmouk University". In: Zarka Journal for Research and Studies, Vol.1, No.1.
- Trosborg, A. (1995) Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yousif, Nadia (2003) " A Discoursal Analysis of Compliments and Compliment Responding in Iraqi Conversation". (Unpublished M.A. Thesis) University of Baghdad.

الخلاصة

نالت دراسة افعال الكلام التعبيرية اهتماما كبيرا من لدن اللغويين والفلاسفة و الباحثين ، لأنها تعكس أهمية الناحية السايكولوجية للمتكلم التي تتعلق بالمضامين ومقاصد الفعل الكلامي ، فكل متكلم يجد نفسه ميالا إلى التعبير عن استجابته مرات عدة يوميا في ما يخص ذاته و متلقيه في سلوكه ومهاراته وملبسه ومزاجه... الخ.

يمثل فعل الكلام : الإطراء ، صفة ، أو خاصة ، تكاد تكون يومية في الخطاب التداولي ، من خلال أنماط الإطراءات المختلفة المعطاة و المستلمة يوميا في الكلام .

لقد سعى البحث إلى أهداف بعينها لدراسة فعل الكلام : الإطراء ، منها :

١- رصد التصورات النظرية التي تبناها اللغويون و الفلاسفة و الباحثون في تفسير فعل الكلام الإطراء ، من حيث:

أ- التعاريف و الانواع و التصنيفات واستراتيجيات فعل الكلام : الإطراء.

ب- خصائص هذا الفعل الكلامي التي تفرقه عن غيره من أفعال الكلام المقاربة له .

ج - تراكيبه البنيوية و الدلالية و التداولية .

٢-٢- السعي إلى إيجاد تصورات نظرية مختلفة وجديدة إلى حد ما ، بناءً على مقولاتهم التي عرضناها في الفقرة أ ، لاسيما الجانبان البنيوي و التداولي .