



Linguistic Research in the Holy Quran.
Vol. 12, No. 2, 2023
pp. 89-102
Research Paper

The Speech Act Force in the First Encounter Between Satan and Humans in the Qur'an: A Cognitive Approach

Fathiyeh Fattahizadeh¹, Fatemeh Abadi*²

¹ Professor , Department of Quranic Studies and Hadith, Faculty of Theology, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran
f_fattahizadeh@alzahra.ac.ir

² Postdoctoral Researcher, Department of Quranic Studies and Hadith, Faculty of Theology, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran & member of the Quranic and hadith interdisciplinary studies research group
f.abadi@alzahra.ac.ir

Abstract

Based on the cognitive perspective of Johnson (1987) regarding Searle's speech act theory, each utterance carries different types of metaphorical forces. These forces are reflected in the container of the utterance, its impact on the listener, the intensity level, and the speech's external effects. Using this cognitive viewpoint to explain Searle's theory, the present study analyzes the report of the Holy Qur'an about the conversation between God and Satan and between Adam and Satan in the first encounter between Satan and Adam. Examining the corpus of 60 verses showed that three schemata of compulsion, removal of restraint, and blockage can be seen in the mentioned speech acts. God blocks Satan's compulsion force in arguing for his superiority over humans and his reasoning is refuted. God's declarative force, which is a compulsion force schema, can be observed in expelling Satan from the place of angels. On the other hand, Satan's speech acts are representative/assertive and commissive, without any real effect. The strong commissive force of Satan to mislead most humans is nullified for the audience of the Qur'an with God's force of removal of restraint. At the end of the battle and on the Day of Resurrection, contrary to all previous cases, Satan's words with humans lack force, which shows that he is in an inferior position.

Keywords: Holy Qur'an, Satan, Speech act theory, Searle, Force schema.



This is an open access article under the CC- BY 4.0 License ([Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)).

 <https://doi.org/10.22108/NRGS.2024.141670.1959>

1- Introduction

John L. Austin and, following him, John Searle, proposed a theory based on which, each utterance contains a linguistic force that goes beyond the level of conveying concepts and represents the content as an active action. Cognitive linguist Mark Johnson completed this theory from a cognitive viewpoint and explained Searle's speech act forces based on the gestalts of forces that are metaphorically expanded and elaborated based on force schema.

The Holy Qur'an as a holy text with great precision in its expressive structures, includes utterances that each contain different types of speech act forces. With this approach, the present paper examines the Divine scripture in terms of speech act forces in the conversation between Satan and God, and between Satan and human, during the first encounter between Satan and human in the context of Satan's refusal to prostrate to Adam.

Several studies have been conducted by interdisciplinary researchers on investigating speech act forces in analyzing religious texts. For instance, Hosseini Ma'soom and Radmard (2014) analyzed the effect of the temporal-spatial context on speech acts in Meccan and Medinan surahs. Talebi et al. (2017) examined Imam Ali's wartime speeches based on the speech act theory. Hasanvand (2019) analyzed the text of Surah Maryam based on Searle's speech act theory. Dastranj and Arab (2020) extracted and analyzed the speech act forces in the verses related to jihad. Daifallah Khazaleh et al. (2023) investigated the speech act of supplication in the Holy Quran. The current research is novel in terms of approach and subject. In terms of approach, none of the previous studies have focused on the speech act theory from a cognitive perspective. In terms of subject, the conversation between God and Satan and between humans and Satan has not been analyzed yet.

2- Theoretical foundations

Speech act theory was introduced by John Austin in a series of lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955 and published in 1962 as a book titled *How to do things with Words*. Against logical positivism, which considered truth and falsity to be the only criterion for meaningfulness, he proposed a viewpoint based on which the purpose of expressing many declarative sentences is not to express a thing; rather, the goal is the performance of an action. Therefore, they considered many declarative sentences to the inability to evaluate the truth or falsity. In this view, utterances are acts that are performed not only to convey concepts but also to produce some content (Austin, 1962, pp. 12-13; cf. Hosseini Ma'soom, & Radmard, 2015, p. 67; Dastranj & Arab, 2020, 25).

After Austin, much effort was made to complete his theory, among which Searle's view gained more acceptance. Based on Searle's view, the content of each proposition contains a linguistic act force that represents the content. For instance, the utterance "Did the cat run away?" can be analyzed as the propositional content of "the cat ran away," which is expressed with the force of a question word. Likewise, a single propositional content such as "The meeting is over" (examples 1 to 3) can be the function of several different forces to produce different types of speech acts (Johnson, 1987, p. 58; Searle, 1975, p. 344).

1- The meeting is over. (Force: making an assertion.)

2- Is the meeting over? (Force: asking a question.)

3- "The meeting is now over," said the chairperson (Force: causing it to be the case that the meeting is over)

Searle introduces five types of speech acts: representative/assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative (cf. Searle, 1975, pp. 344-369).

Representative/assertive acts are acts that the speaker claims to be true and

include statements, claims, and declarations. In the directive act, the speaker's goal is to encourage the audience to do something or not to do something, which can be manifested as imperative or prohibitive. In other words, in this type of action, the speaker seeks to make the outside world adapt to his/her desired situation through the audience. The expressive act belongs to the expression of the speaker's views or feelings, including interest, hatred, pleasure, etc. In the commissive act, the speaker commits to do something in the future, which can be expressed as threatening, swearing, promising, and the like. In the declarative act, as soon as the utterance is uttered, real changes are realized in the outside world (cf. Hosseini Ma'soom, & Radmard, 2015, pp. 70-71).

2-1- Speech act force from a cognitive viewpoint

Cognitive linguist Mark Johnson investigates the concept of "force" in speech acts with a cognitive view of the theory of speech acts. He believes that this transition from pragmatics to semantics does not disrupt the unity of analysis, because if we aim to understand how meaning works, we cannot completely separate it from usage, and in many cases, the usage of the sentence is involved in determining its meaning. Johnson views speech acts and acts and holds that since social and physical acts are functions of force, one should expect speech acts to be functions of force, too. In his opinion, the forces related to this level are also based on force gestalts that are metaphorically expanded and elucidated based on the force schema (Johnson, 1987, pp. 57-58).

The term image schema was first used in Johnson's 1987 book *The Body in the Mind*. He explains that he coined this term to emphasize the corporeal and sensorimotor nature of various structures of conceptualization and reasoning. He believes that what we call "mind" and

"body" are not separate from each other; rather, we use these terms to capture various aspects of the stream of our experience (Johnson, 2005, p. 18).

Johnson defines the image schema as follows: a dynamic and iterative pattern of our perceptual and sensory-motor interaction in the environment that gives coherence and structure to the experience. He believes that schema is not an image, but a means of structuring certain experiences. He introduces schemata that are directly related to physical experiences as basic schemata, which include: part-whole, center-periphery, contact, adjacency, support, balance, and container (Johnson, 1987, p. 126).

Up-down, front-back, and center-periphery are directional schemata and the outcome of physical characteristics such as uprightness, forward/backwardness, and the function of our physical body in the environment, and deal with the main directions used by us (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 14; Taylor, 2003, p. 88).

The schema of power is one of the most important image schemata that Johnson introduced in his book *Body in the Mind*. He explained the pivotal role of force in human physical experiences by mentioning that the survival of a living being lies in its interaction with the environment and that all causal interactions require the application of force (cf. Johnson, 1987, p. 42). This physical experience of humans, which is derived from the interaction with the environment, is the foundation for the conceptualization of abstract domains; for example, interest is conceptualized as an attractive force and social rules and obligations are conceptualized as a compulsion force or an obstacle (cf. Johnson, 1987, p. 50; Kovecses, 2010, p. 37).

Image schemata can be clustered or networked. The force schema is of this type and comprises a set of interdependent schemata that share the following characteristics (cf. Johnson, 1987, pp. 43-

44; Evans & Green, 2006, p. 187): they are always experienced through interactions, they include force vectors (i.e., are directional), they often include a single movement path, they have an origin or source and a destination or goal, they have degrees of intensity, and they include a chain of causes.

Johnson introduces seven types of force schemata as follows (Johnson, 1987, pp. 47-45):

1- Compulsion, which is perceived as displacement due to external forces, such as wind, water, and foreign objects, in our physical experience.

2- Blockage, which is perceived as hitting obstacles in physical experience.

3- Counterforce, which is perceived, for instance, through experiencing the head-on collision of two vehicles.

4- Diversion, such that the resultant of the effect of two or more forces on an object is a force in another direction, and thus the object changes directions.

5-Removal of restraint, which means that nothing blocks the application of force, and in physical experience, it is perceived as an open door and the absence of physical barrier in the path of movement.

6- Enablement, which is perceived in the physical experience as a human sense of enablement or lack of enablement in moving light or heavy objects.

7- Attraction, which in physical experience is perceived as the feeling of the earth's gravity on the body and the attraction of iron chips toward the magnet.

Johnson believes that in most speech acts, there is content that is performed by a certain force, and therefore, each speech act carries one type of the compulsion force schemata, although different forces of blockage, removal of restraint, diversion, and counterforce may also exist. For example, in the content of the utterance itself, or through its context, it is possible to block some forces of speech acts. He introduces four types of

metaphorical forces that operate in the context of speech acts (cf. Johnson, 1987, p. 59):

1- The force that determines the form of the utterance, e.g., force in a declarative sentence is different from the force in an interrogative sentence.

2- The force that affects the listener to determine how he/she understands the utterance. This force is called the "force of the linguistic act" and determines what kind of linguistic act the listener considers the utterance to be (command, declaration, question, etc.)

3- The force by which the word or utterance is dispatched through the channel between the speaker and the listener and has a certain size; thus, in creating a speech act, there is a difference in the intensity or type of force. For example, examples (4) and (5) are both warnings, but example 5 is delivered more forcefully and sent to the listener with greater intensity. This is the same as emphasis.

4- You might want to be a little careful around the lions.

5- For God's sake, watch out for those lions!

4- Commonly, an effect is produced following the linguistic act of an utterance. For example, a command makes us do something. These behaviors are called perlocutionary effects of the speech act.

Paying attention to the different types of speech act forces (in their metaphorical sense) introduced by Johnson shows that the explanation of these forces requires attention to the linguistic and non-linguistic context of the speech. From a cognitive point of view, grammar cannot be separated from meaning, in the sense that, contrary to the traditional views on grammar, pairs similar to Saussure's signifier-signified can be formed between grammatical categories and meaning. Therefore, schemata can be represented in grammatical categories. For instance, an imperative as a grammatical category can contain the force schema as content.

Hence, how the sentence is constructed and used is involved in determining its meaning (Langacker, 2008, pp. 56-57; Johnson, 1987, p. 57). In the non-linguistic context, it is also necessary to pay attention to the historical, social, literary, etc. contexts of the speech.

2-2- Speech act force in Qur'anic studies

Paying attention to speech acts is a new theory in linguistics; still, it has a long history in Qur'anic studies (albeit not from the perspective of force schema) (cf. Hosseini Ma'soom, & Radmard, 2015, p. 72). In the following, we discuss the attention of rhetoricians in the Arabic studies tradition to the forces of speech act with the approach of Austin and Searle.

In dividing word speech into declaration and creation, rhetoricians refer to a type of creation that is often expressed with the declarative structure, but it does not aim to convey the meaning. Rather, its expression makes something happen in the outside world. For example, the transfer of ownership of the house from one person to another in the outside world is realized by saying the sentence "I sold my house to you"¹, which is interpreted as a contract of sale; or by uttering the sentence "I have married you to her"², which is interpreted as a marriage contract. In the outside world, a man and a woman marry each other (cf. Maydānī, 1996, vol. 1, pp. 224-225). This type of creation, which has received attention in the rhetorical studies of Arabic, is similar to the declarative act in Searle's speech act theory.

In addition, rhetoricians' attention to the secondary purposes in declarative, interrogative, imperative, prohibitive, and other structures is the same as attention to the forces of speech act that exist beyond the representation of the main meaning in

these structures. For example, it has been mentioned that the main purpose of saying a declarative sentence is to inform the audience about the contents of the sentence, but sometimes such sentences contain another meaning; for example, the declarative sentence: "He said, My Lord, indeed my bones have weakened, and my head has filled with white" (Maryam: 4), does not aim to inform but to express weakness and humility, which is equivalent to the expressive force of speech acts in Searle's theory. Besides, regarding sentences with imperative or prohibitive structure, it has been noted that their main purpose is to request someone to do or not to do something with transcendence and obligation (directive action), but sometimes, these sentences contain other concepts. For instance, in "And if you are in doubt about what We have sent down upon Our Servant [Muhammad]), then produce a surah the like thereof and call upon your witnesses other than Allah, if you should be truthful" (Al-Baqarah: 23), God does not order the deniers of the Qur'an to bring a book similar to the Qur'an; rather, by uttering this sentence as an imperative, He notes their inability to bring a book like the Qur'an (cf. Skāky, 1987, p. 319; Hāshimī, 2010, pp. 40, 57). The latter case also corresponds to the representative/assertive act based on Searle's classification.

3- Methods

This study seeks to examine the force of speech act in the Holy Qur'an in the words attributed to Satan in the context of his first encounter with humans and not prostrating to Adam. This paper examines the force of speech act with a cognitive approach (a point of view that Johnson proposed to complete Searle's theory with a cognitive approach) and deals with the forces manifested in grammatical categories or expressive structure. According to the four forces in speech act, this study explains the type of force and analyzes its meaning

¹ بعُتِكَ دَارِي

² زَوْجَتِكَ إِبَاهَا

using Johnson's schema approach.

To this aim, a corpus of 60 verses from the Qur'an containing God-Satan and human-Satan conversations was extracted, which served as the basis of the analysis. With this aim, all the mentioned verses were divided into 6 categories according to the course of the story: 1- The command for prostration, 2- Satan's banishment, 3- Satan's reaction to banishment, 4- God's response, 5- Conversation between Satan and Adam, and 6- The final encounter. Finally, to achieve a complete analysis of speech act forces in the mentioned conversations, all the verses were examined from the point of view of speech act forces.

In explaining the type of speech act forces, force schemata, and grammatical categories carrying force, the original text of the Qur'an in Arabic (not its translations) was the basis of extraction.

Since God's answer to Satan's words and the conversation between Satan and his followers on the Day of Resurrection also help complete the process of analyzing the forces in the words attributed to Satan, the forces in God's words in response to Satan and the forces of speech acts in the last encounter between Satan and human are also implicitly investigated.

4- Speech act force in the first encounter between Satan and human

It is possible to examine the force in the Qur'anic utterances on two levels: morphology and syntax. At the level of morphology, force-carrying categories such as emphatic affixes and at the level of syntax, utterance containers, and the expressive structure of speech can carry force. Each will be examined in detail below. As mentioned in the method section, the extracted corpus was divided into 6 sections based on the main events, and the speech act forces were analyzed in each section.

The story of the first encounter between Satan and humans, which can be seen in

the context of Satan's refusal to prostrate to Adam and disobeying God's command, is mentioned in 7 surahs (cf. *Al-Baqarah*: 30-39; *An-Nisa*: 117-122; *Al-A'raf*: 11-27; *Al-Hijr*: 26-42; *Al-Isra'*: 61-65; *Ta Ha*: 116-122; *Sad* 71-85). In each case, some aspects of the story are mentioned according to the register of the verses and the purpose of telling the story. Still, the story mainly revolves around a conversation between God and Satan. In the following, we will examine the process of the story in different surahs, with an emphasis on speech act forces and their analysis.

4-1-The command for prostration and Satan's refusal

The story begins with God commanding angels to prostrate to Adam. Satan refuses to prostrate, and a conversation takes place between God and Satan, including God's questions about the reason for Satan's refusal and his response. This conversation is reported in several ways in the Qur'an (Examples 6-9):

6. قَالَ مَا مَنَعَكَ أَلَّا تَسْجُدَ إِذْ أَمَرْتُكَ قَالَ أَنَا خَيْرٌ مِّنْهُ .

[Allāh] said, "What prevented you from prostrating when I commanded you?" [Satan] said, "I am better than him. You created me from fire and created him from clay" [i.e., earth]. (*Al-A'raf*: 12)

7. وَإِذْ قُلْنَا لِلْمَلَائِكَةِ اسْجُدُوا لِآدَمَ فَسَجَدُوا إِلَّا إِبْلِيسَ قَالَ .

And [mention] when We said to the angels, "Prostrate to Adam," and they prostrated, except for Iblees. He said, "Should I prostrate to one You created from clay?" (*Al-Isra*: 61)

8. قَالَ يَا إِبْلِيسُ مَا لَكَ أَلَّا تَكُونَ مَعَ السَّاجِدِينَ * قَالَ .

لَمْ أَكُنْ لَأَسْجُدَ لِبَشَرٍ خَلَقْتَهُ مِنْ صَلْصَالٍ مِّنْ حَمَإٍ مَّسْنُونٍ [Allāh] said, "O Iblees, what is [the matter] with you that you are not with those who prostrate? He said, "Never would I prostrate to a human whom You created out of clay from an altered black mud."

(Al-Hijr: 32-33)

9. قَالَ يَا إِبْلِيسُ مَا مَنَعَكَ أَنْ تَسْجُدَ لِمَا خَلَقْتُ بِإِيْدِي ۗ أَسْتَكْبَرْتَ ۖ أَمْ كُنْتَ مِنَ الْعَالِينَ * قَالَ أَنَا خَيْرٌ مِمَّنْ خَلَقْتَنِي مِنْ نَارٍ وَخَلَقْتَهُ مِنْ طِينٍ [Allāh] said, "O Iblees, what prevented you from prostrating to that which I created with My hands? Were you arrogant [then], or were you [already] among the haughty?" He said, "I am better than him. You created me from fire and created him from clay." (Sad: 75-76)

In this conversation, in the speech attributed to God, the part of speech is in the interrogative structure, but the linguistic act that affects the listener is a rebuke. This rebuke is of great intensity, which is manifested in some grammatical categories and expressive structure. The لا is superfluous in the structure أَلَا تَسْجُدَ (What prevented you from prostrating?) in example 6, which is used to express emphasis, (cf. Tabataba'i, 2011, vol. 8, p. 24) is a grammatical category. Also, reference to the order being God's command (Example 6), the departure from the great multitude of angels who obeyed God's command (Example 8), and disobeying from prostration to what God has created with His own hands (Example 9) adds to the intensity of this rebuke. The force of this speech act is of the compulsion type, and in Searle's classification, it is a directive act that enters upon Satan through the channel of God's speech to encourage him to obey the command of prostration.

In response to God, Satan's speech is a representative/assertive act, which is expressed in Example 7 as an interrogative with a negative content. The sentence "Should I prostrate to someone who is created from dust?" means "I do not prostrate to someone who is created from dust". This answer is more intense in Example 8, which is expressed in the expression "Never would I prostrate", which is the denial structure and denotes

the intensity of negation (cf. Ibn `Ashūr, 1420 H., vol. 13, p. 37). The force in this speech act is of the compulsion type and used in reasoning, such that with this emphasis and argument about the creation of Adam from the inferior substance, Satan seeks to appear his disobeying God's command correct and reasonable.

4-2- Satan's banishment

Then, after disobeying God, Satan is banished. His banishment is represented in the concepts of "cursing," "descent," and "expulsion" (Examples 10-12).

10. لَعَنَهُ اللَّهُ: Allāh has cursed. (An-Nisa:

118)

11. قَالَ فَاهْبِطْ مِنْهَا فَمَا يَكُونُ لَكَ أَنْ تَتَّكِبَ فِيهَا فَارْجُ. [Allāh] said, "Descend from it [i.e., Paradise], for it is not for you to be arrogant therein. So, get out; indeed, you are of the debased." (Al-A'raf: 13)

12. قَالَ فَارْجُ مِنْهَا فَإِنَّكَ رَجِيمٌ * وَإِنَّ عَلَيْكَ اللَّعْنَةَ:

[Allāh] said, "Then depart from it, for indeed, you are expelled. And indeed, upon you is the curse until the Day of Recompense." (Al-Hijr: 34-35)

Although the container of the utterance in most mentioned cases is the imperative structure, the force affecting the audience (Satan) in all these cases is not of the directive type but of the declarative type. In other words, this speech act contains the compulsion force and the perlocutionary effects; that is, through these utterances, Satan was expelled, descended, and became one of the debased.

Besides the mentioned force, in the utterance "for it is not for you to be arrogant therein", as in Example 8, the denial structure carries force. This force is of the type of blockage force schema, which blocks the force in Satan's argument for refusing prostration by referring to his superiority over Adam, invalidating his argument, and regards the reason for his refusal to be his arrogance.

4-3- Satan's reaction to his banishment

Satan's reaction to being expelled appears in various forms in the Holy Qur'an and can be seen in Examples 13 to 17.

13. وَقَالَ لَاتَّخِذَنَّ مِنْ عِبَادِكَ نَصِيبًا مَفْرُوضًا *
وَلَا ضَلَّئَهُمْ وَلَا مَنِّينَهُمْ وَلَا مَرْنَهُمْ فَلَيُبْتِغْنَ آذَانَ الْأَنْعَامِ وَلَا مَرْنَهُمْ
وَلَا ضَلَّئَهُمْ: For he had said, "I will surely take from among Your servants a specific portion. And I will mislead them, and I will arouse in them [sinful] desires, and I will command them so they will slit the ears of cattle, and I will command them so they will change the creation of Allāh."
(An-Nisa: 118-119)

14. قَالَ فَبِمَا أَغْوَيْتَنِي لَأَقْعُدَنَّ لَهُمْ صِرَاطَكَ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ *
ثُمَّ لَأَتَّبِعُهُمْ مِنْ بَيْنِ أَيْدِيهِمْ وَمِنْ خَلْفِهِمْ وَعَنْ أَيْمَانِهِمْ وَعَنْ شَمَائِلِهِمْ وَلَا تَجِدُ أَكْثَرَهُمْ شَاكِرِينَ
[Satan] said, "Because You have put me in error, I will surely sit in wait for them [i.e., mankind] on Your straight path. Then I will come to them from before them and from behind them and on their right and on their left, and You will not find most of them grateful [to You]."
(Al-A'raf: 16-17)

15. قَالَ أَرَأَيْتَكَ هَذَا الَّذِي كَرَّمْتَ عَلَيَّ لَئِنِ أَخَّرْتَنِي إِلَىٰ
يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ لَأُحْتَنِكَنَّ ذُرِّيَّتَهُ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا
said, "Do You see this one whom You have honored above me? If You delay me [i.e., my death] until the Day of Resurrection, I will surely destroy his descendants, except for a few."
(Al-Isra: 62)

16. قَالَ رَبِّ بِمَا أَغْوَيْتَنِي لَأُزَيِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ
وَلَأُغْوِيَنَّهُمْ أَجْمَعِينَ
said, "My Lord, because You have put me in error, I will surely make [disobedience] attractive to them [i.e., mankind] on earth, and I will mislead them all."
(Al-Hijr: 39)

17. قَالَ فَبِعِزَّتِكَ لَأُغْوِيَنَّهُمْ أَجْمَعِينَ
said, "By Your might, I will surely mislead them all."
(Sad: 82)

What is noticeable in Satan's response to God after being expelled is not the force of the utterance nor the force affecting the

listener, but the intensity of the existing forces. In all the mentioned cases, the force of the speech act is very intense, manifested in grammatical categories of emphatic *laam*, and emphatic *nn* in (laattakhithanna)³, (laodillanna)⁴, (laomanniyanna)⁵, (laamuranna)⁶, (la'aq'udanna)⁷, (laatiyanna)⁸, (laahtanikanna)⁹, (laozayyinanna)¹⁰, (laoghwiyanna)¹¹, and in the oath structure.

Nun (ن) is an emphatic used to emphasize nouns and verbs, with the difference that it is used in the form of a prefix (أَنْ/أَنَّ) when emphasizing a noun, and as a suffix (emphatic n and nn) when emphasizing a verb. The emphatic *nn* expresses a stronger emphasis because the emphasis is repeated by repeating the *nun* (cf. *Sāmarrā'i*, 2000, vol. 4, pp. 155-156).

The oath structure, which is used for emphasis, can be seen in Examples 15 and 17. In Example 17, the oath is clearly stated, and Satan swears by God's might to mislead all humans. In Example 15, the demonstrative *Laam* of the oath in لَئِن shows that there is an oath structure in the speech in the implied form, and after that, the response to the oath is presented as لَأُحْتَنِكَنَّ ذُرِّيَّتَهُ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا (I will surely destroy his descendants, except for a few). The demonstrative *laam* of oath is added to "if" – here, *إن* - and shows that there is an implied oath in the speech (cf. *Emil Badi'*,

³ لَاتَّخِذَنَّ

⁴ لَا ضَلَّئَنَّ

⁵ لَا مَنِّينَنَّ

⁶ لَا مَرْنَنَّ

⁷ لَأَقْعُدَنَّ

⁸ لَأَتَّبِعَنَّ

⁹ لَأُحْتَنِكَنَّ

¹⁰ لَأُزَيِّنَنَّ

¹¹ لَأُغْوِيَنَّ

answer is expressed as an imperative with the following structures: "go", "incite", "assault", "become a partner", and "promise". This speech act does not fully correspond with any of the types of speech acts mentioned by Searle and is only slightly close to the expressive act.

In terms of form, this speech act contains the force of command, but the force affecting the listener is that of the removal of restraint with schema aiming to express contempt. This power is also intense, which is transferred through the repetition of imperative and persuading Satan to use all possible means. After Satan's threat, God does not forbid him from this act. Rather, with this expressive structure, He shows that even if he carries out his threats, it will be fruitless to him. The insignificance of Satan's power is further emphasized in the form of "Indeed, My servants - no authority will you have over them"¹⁴, which will be examined below.

The interpreters of the Holy Qur'an have also pointed out the falsity of this matter and believe that it is meant to allow Satan to do so, and God's answer to Satan is accompanied by his contempt (for example, cf. *Zamakhsharī*, 1407 H, c. 2, p. 677; *Ṭabarsī*, 1992 H, vol. 6, p. 657; *Fakhr Rāzī*, 1420 H, vol. 21, p. 367; *Ālūsī*, 1415 H, vol. 8, p. 105)

The removal of restraint in this expressive structure neutralizes the strong force of the speech act in the commissive act of Satan for the third party of this conversation, who is the addressee of the Holy Qur'an. The utterance "Indeed, My servants - no authority will you have over them", contains the strong forces of the speech act derived from the emphases in it, manifested in the categories of *إِنَّ*, the structure of the nominal sentence, and using *سلطان* in the indefinite and negative form, which expresses generality, showing

that Satan has no authority over God's servant.

Also, in the utterance "I will surely fill Hell with you and those of them that follow you all together"¹⁵ in Example 22, the content of which is repeated in Examples 18, 19, and, 20, the force is a commissive act. This utterance carries the schema of compulsion force, which has a high intensity. The intensity of the force is conveyed through the emphatic *laam*, the emphatic *nn*, the emphatic phrase *اجمعين*, and the emphatic phrase "The truth [is My oath], and the truth I say"¹⁶ that precedes it and acts like an oath (cf. *Zamakhshari*, 1407 H, vol. 4, p. 108).

In general, it can be said that God's answer to the many threats of Satan, which came in his speech in the form of strong commitment forces, is to remove the restraint from his way to mislead humankind. In this way, the power of Satan's speech act will not affect the audience of the Qur'an. This form of using speech act forces, which can be explained through the force schema, expresses the point that Satan will not harm the servants of God and, undoubtedly, the only ones who are harmed in this process is Satan himself and those who have chosen to follow him based on their own free will, and not under the domination of Satan.

4-5- Conversation between Satan and Adam

After what passed between God Almighty and Satan, Adam settled in paradise with his wife (cf. *Al-A'raf*: 19). God warned Adam about Satan's enmity (Example 23). This warning is of directive act and carries the schema of compulsion force. This power is also quite intense and is manifested in many emphases, such as *إِنَّ*, the preposition *ل* (*laam*) and its repetition

¹⁵ لَأَمْلَأَنَّ جَهَنَّمَ مِنْكَ وَمِمَّن تَبِعَكَ مِنْهُمْ أَجْمَعِينَ

¹⁶ فَالْحَقُّ وَالْحَقُّ أَقُولُ

¹⁴ إِنَّ عِبَادِي لَيْسَ لَكَ عَلَيْهِمْ سُلْطَانٌ

in the utterance *عَدُوُّكَ وَلِزَوْجِكَ*, which could have been expressed as *عدوكم*, and the emphatic nn in *يُخْرِجَنَّ*.

23. *فَقُلْنَا يَا آدَمُ إِنَّ هَذَا عَدُوُّكَ وَلِزَوْجِكَ فَلَا*: We said, "O Adam, indeed this is an enemy to you and to your wife. Then let him not remove you from Paradise so you would suffer. (Ta Ha: 117)

This Divine warning and the many emphatics in it show that God did not leave human beings alone against the enemy, and God's support for humans exists even after the descent (cf. Al-Baqarah: 37-38). Examining this issue is beyond the scope of this article. Finally, Satan comes to Adam and his wife and starts a conversation with them. This conversation is also expressed in two ways in the Holy Qur'an (Examples 24 and 25).

24. *فَوَسْوَسَ لَهُمَا الشَّيْطَانُ لِيُبْدِيَ لَهُمَا مَا وُورِيَ عَنْهُمَا* من سَوَاتِيهِمَا وَقَالَ مَا نَهَاكُمَا رَبُّكُمَا عَنْ هَذِهِ الشَّجَرَةِ إِلَّا أَنْ تَكُونَا مَلَكَتَيْنِ أَوْ تَكُونَا مِنَ الْخَالِدِينَ * وَقَاسَمَهُمَا إِنِّي لَكُمَا لَمِنَ النَّاصِحِينَ: But Satan whispered to them to make apparent to them that which was concealed from them of their private parts. He said, "Your Lord did not forbid you this tree except that you become angels or become of the immortal." And he swore [by Allāh] to them, "Indeed, I am to you from among the sincere advisors." (Al-A'raf: 20-21)

25. *فَوَسْوَسَ إِلَيْهِ الشَّيْطَانُ قَالَ يَا آدَمُ هَلْ أَدُلُّكَ عَلَى* شَجَرَةِ الْخُلْدِ وَمُلْكٍ لَّا يَبْلَى: Satan whispered to him; he said, "O Adam, shall I direct you to the tree of eternity and possession that will not deteriorate?" (Ta Ha: 120)

Satan's speech act in the mentioned cases is directive, which is placed in the container of declaration and in example 24, in the container of interrogative. In example 25, the force affecting the listener - Adam - which is conveyed in the form of a question, also aims to persuade and

encourage him. The nature of this persuasion, especially since it is false, requires strong speech forces. These forces are manifested in example 24 in the restriction structure of *إِلَّا... ما*, Satan's swearing which is reported by God in *إِنِّي لَكُمَا*, and the emphatic *laam* in *لَمِنَ النَّاصِحِينَ*.

Of note, there is no answer from Adam to the devil recorded in the Qur'an, and the only sentence attributed to Adam and his wife in this story is addressed to God; after realizing their mistake, they said, "Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves, and if You do not forgive us and have mercy upon us, we will surely be among the losers." (Al-A'raf: 23)

4-6- The final encounter between Satan and human

The last confrontation between humans and Satan, which takes place in the Resurrection, is narrated in the form of two conversations in the Qur'an (Examples 26 and 27).

26. *وَقَالَ الشَّيْطَانُ لَمَّا قُضِيَ الْأَمْرُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَعَدَكُمْ وَعَدَ الْحَقُّ وَوَعَدْتُكُمْ فَأَخْلَفْتُكُمْ وَمَا كَانَ لِي عَلَيْكُمْ مِنْ سُلْطَانٍ إِلَّا أَنْ دَعَوْتُكُمْ فَاسْتَجَبْتُمْ لِي فَلَا تَلُمُونِي وَلُومُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ مَا أَنَا بِمُصْرِخِكُمْ وَمَا أَنْتُمْ بِمُصْرِخِيَّ إِنِّي كَفَرْتُ بِمَا أَشْرَكْتُمُونِ مِنْ قَبْلُ*: And Satan will say when the matter has been concluded, "Indeed, Allāh had promised you the promise of truth. And I promised you, but I betrayed you. But I had no authority over you except that I invited you, and you responded to me. So do not blame me; but blame yourselves. I cannot be called to your aid, nor can you be called to my aid. Indeed, I deny your association of me [with Allāh] before. Indeed, for the wrongdoers is a painful punishment." (Ibrahim: 22)

27. *كَمَثَلِ الشَّيْطَانِ إِذْ قَالَ لِلنَّاسِ اكْفُرْ فَلَمَّا كَفَرَ قَالَ إِنِّي* بَرِيءٌ مِّنْكُمْ إِنِّي أَخَافُ اللَّهَ رَبَّ الْعَالَمِينَ: like the

example of Satan when he says to man, "Disbelieve." But when he disbelieves, he says, "Indeed, I am disassociated from you. Indeed, I fear Allāh, Lord of the worlds." (Al-Hashr: 16)

It is necessary to divide Satan's speech in this space (which is stated in more detail in example 26) into several parts:

1) the part that deals with God in the utterance: "Indeed, Allāh had promised you the promise of truth"¹⁷, 2) the part dealing with his relationship with his followers: "I promised you, but I betrayed you"¹⁸, 3) the part dealing with his place in the system of creation: "But I had no authority over you"¹⁹, 4) the part dealing with the relationship between his followers and Satan: "I invited you, and you responded to me"²⁰, and 5) the part dealing with his current status in Resurrection: "So do not blame me, but blame yourselves"²¹.

In the first part, Satan testifies to the verity of God's promise with a strong force derived from the emphatic *إِنَّ* and the absolute object of the promise. In the third part, with the superfluous *nun* and the indefinite "sultan" in the negative form, the absence of an independent force is mentioned. Finally, he emphasizes that this conversation will not benefit his followers. But what is noteworthy is the second part of this speech.

As mentioned in the previous sections, Satan, whose threats and promises in the world and even his claim that his efforts are fruitful, were accompanied by the strongest forces, in the simplest possible way in a representative/assertive action, without any kind of emphasis force, says "I promised you, but I betrayed you". This change of situation, as mentioned in the

beginning of the verse, is because the battle is over, Satan is in an inferior position, and there is no need to use force anymore.

5- Conclusion

The story of Satan's first encounter with humans can be divided into six main parts: 1) The command to prostrate to Adam and Satan's defiance, 2) Satan's expulsion, 3) Satan's reaction to this expulsion, 4) God's response to Satan's claim, 5) the conversation between Satan and Adam, and 6) the final encounter between Satan and humans. Explaining each part based on the speech act theory with a cognitive approach leads to a better understanding of Satan's influence on human destiny.

In the first part, which includes Satan's reprimand by God and his answer, God's speech is of a directive act, which is expressed in the container of interrogative. In response, Satan tries to prove his superiority over humans by using the strong force of speech act of the compulsion schema in reasoning and presents this argument as a logical reason to refuse prostration.

In the second part, on the one hand, we witness the perlocutionary compulsion forces from God, where something is realized as soon as God announces it, i.e., the expulsion of Satan; on the other hand, the argumentative force of Satan in noting his superiority over humans is blocked by God and his argument is invalidated.

In the third part, strong commissive forces from Satan are observed in the context of misleading most human beings. Even in expressing the result of his efforts to mislead humans, Satan uses strong representative/assertive forces based on the schema of compulsion force and, in this way, implies that there is a great force behind these threats that will make them come true.

In the fourth part, the speech act forces God's response to neutralize Satan's claims. On the one hand, the removal of the

¹⁷ إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَعَدَكُمْ وَعَدَ الْحَقُّ

¹⁸ وَعَدْتُمْ فَأَخْلَفْتُمْ

¹⁹ وَمَا كَانَ لِي عَلَيْكُمْ مِنْ سُلْطَانٍ

²⁰ دَعَوْتُمْ فَاسْتَجَبْتُمْ لِي

²¹ فَلَا تَلُمُونِي وَلُومُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ

restraint force schema neutralizes the power of the devil and humiliates him, and on the other hand, the strong commissive forces in God's speech about the perpetuity of the devil and his followers in Hellfire return the effect of all the effort of Satan to him.

In the fifth part, by using the strong directive forces against Adam and his wife, Satan leads them to disobey God's command, and in the last conversation that takes place after the end of the battle between Satan and humans on the Day of Resurrection, Satan's speech is devoid of any kind of emphatic force.

Overall, there are three schemata of compulsion, removal of restraint, and blockage in the space of God-Satan and Satan-human conversations. In the first, third, and fifth sections, Satan exerts a strong compulsion force to prove his superiority over man, to show himself capable of misleading man, and to lead man to disobey God. With this statement, Satan tries to present himself as a powerful element. On the other hand, God blocks Satan's power in reasoning and thus, explains the insignificance of his reasons. Also, by removing the obstacle against the apparently very strong power of Satan to mislead man, it shows him as inferior and ineffective in front of himself, so that the third party of this conversation, who is the audience of the Qur'an and in other words human beings, will achieve a deep understanding of the weakness and inferiority of Satan in front of God's power.

Note that applying the theory of speech act force, especially from a cognitive perspective, in the analysis of Qur'anic concepts is a new approach with little background. Given the precision of the expressive structures of the Qur'an as a holy text, the development of this type of research to examine other fields of the Holy Qur'an can better explain Qur'anic concepts and helps researchers achieve a proper model in the use of this approach

for Qur'anic studies in this interdisciplinary field.

References

- The Holy Qur'an.
- Ālūsī, M. (1415 H). *Rūḥ al-ma'ānī fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'Azīm* Bayrūt: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmīyah. [In Arabaic]
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Daifallah Khazaleh, H., Sapar, A., & Mohd Jan, J. (2023). A Pragmatic Analysis of the Speech Act of Supplication in the Holy Quran. *Al-Dād Journal*, 7(1), 40-53.
- Dastranj, F., & Arab, M. (2020). Application of the speech act theory in reading jihad surahs. *The Historical Study of War*, 4(2), 23-52. [In Persian]
- Emil Badi', Y. (1988). *Mawsū'at al-naḥw wa-al-ṣarf wa-al-i'rāb*. Bayrūt: dārāl'lm lil-Malāyīn. [In Arabaic]
- Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fakhr Rāzī, M. (1420 H). *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*. Bayrūt: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī. [In Arabic]
- Hasanvand, S. (2019). Analyzing Surah Maryam Based on Speech Act Theory Emphasizing John Searle's Model. *Literary – Quranic Researches*, 7(2), 45-65. [In Persian]
- Hāshimī, A. (2010). *Jawāhir al-balāghah fī al-ma'ānī wa-al-bayān wa-al-badī'* (M. S. 'Aṭṭār, Corrector). Bayrūt: Dārālfkr. [In Arabic]
- Hosseini Ma'soom, S. M., & Radmard, A. (2015). The effect of temporal-spatial context on the analysis of speech act: A comparison of the frequency of speech act types in Meccan and Medinan surahs of the Holy Qur'an. *Language Related Research*, 6(3), 65-92. [In Persian]
- Ibn 'Ashūr, M. (1420 H). *Al-Taḥrīr wa-al-tanwīr*. Bayrūt: Mu'assasat al-tārikh al-'Arabī. [In Arabaic]
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind:*

- The bodily basis of the meaning, imagination, and reason.* Chicago: The university of Chicago press.
- Johnson, M. (2005). The philosophical significance of image schemata. In B. Hampe (Ed.), *From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Kovecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The university of Chicago press.
- Langacker, R. W. (2008) *Cognitive grammar: A basic Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Maydānī, A. (1996). *Al-lughah al-'Arabīyah usususuhā wa-'ulūmihā wa funūnuhā*. Bayrūt: Dār alshāmyh. [In Arabic]
- Sāmarrā'ī, F. Ş. (2000). *Ma'ānī al-naḥw*. Urdun: dārālfkr lil-Ṭibā'ah wa-al-Nashr wa-al-Tawzī' [In Arabic]
- Searle, J. R. (1975). *A taxonomy of illocutionary acts*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press. pp. 344-369.
- Skāky, Y. (1987). *Miftāḥ al-'Ulūm: taḥqīq Na'im Zarzūr*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmīyah. [In Arabic]
- Ṭabarsī, F. (1993). *Majma' al-Bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān*. (M. J. Balaqi, Researcher). Tehran: Nasser Khosrow. [In Arabic]
- Tabataba'i, M. H. (2011). *Al-Mīzān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān*. Bayrūt: Mu'assasat al-A'lamī lil-Maṭbū'āt. [In Arabic]
- Talebi, E. & Shoshtari, A. & Heydarian, A. (2017). Investigating Imam Ali's War Sermons Based on the Speech Act Theory. *Journal of Arabic Language & Literature*, 16, 161-202. [In Persian]
- Taylor, J. (2003). *Linguistic Categorization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zamakhsharī, M. (1407 H.). *Alkshāf 'an ḥaqā'iq ghawāmiḍ al-tanzīl* (M. H. Aḥmad, Crrctor). Lubnān: Dār al-
- Kutub al-'Arabī. [In Arabic]