



Illocutionary Act and Communication with Reference to Translation

Prof. Dr. Misbah Mahmood AL-Sulaimaan

Department of English, College of Education & Languages, Lebanese- French University, Erbil, Iraq
misbah_alsulaimaan@lfu.edu.krd

Lubna M. Khoshaba

English Department, College of Education & Languages, Lebanese- French University, Erbil, Iraq
lubna.markus@lfu.edu.krd

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 9/7/2020

Accepted: 15/9/2020

Published: Summer 2020

Keywords:

Illocutionary Act,
Locutionary Act,
Perlocutionary Act,
Communication,
Translation..

Doi:

10.25212/lfu.qzj.5.3.30

ABSTRACT

No doubt speech act theory received a lot of attention by philosophers, pragmatists and leading figures of speech act theory as well as theorists of translation. Among these theorists are Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). However, to the best of our knowledge no work concerning “understanding conversation through speech acts and translation was carried out. This paper is an attempt to abridge that gap. It is a well-known fact that languages which belong to different families are different syntactically, structurally, and stylistically. This means that the differences are due to language specific features. Hence comes the problem of translating communicative speech acts from English into Arabic. This variation between both languages and structures of speech acts in English and Arabic results in misunderstanding the communication between native speakers of English and Arabic. Consequently, it will have its own impact on the process of communication between two parties and thus on the process of translation. This paper aims at studying some conversations which were presented by British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC). The conversation

consists of 7 conversational exchanges with their renderings by BBC. These exchanges were studied and analyzed in terms of comprehensive tables, which involve Source Language (SL), Target language (TL) and different categories of speech acts such as assertives, directives, commissives, expressives as well as declarations. The main findings of this paper are: (1) the conversations in question contain different types of speech act categories, (2) these categories can be translated into Arabic despite cultural and structural divergences between English and Arabic.

1. Objectives of the Study:

This research paper is an investigation to fulfil the following objectives:

1. Rendering some communicative Illocutionary acts involving different categories of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) from English in Arabic.
2. Drawing some distinctions between the Source Language (English) Textual exchanges and their renderings in the Target Language (Arabic).
3. Specifying the categories of illocutionary acts in the SL exchanges and their realisations in the TL.

2. Hypotheses:

This study hypothesizes that:

1. Communicative Illocutionary acts categories in some conversational exchanges have a variety of different categories of Illocutionary acts.

2. There is no formal correspondence between Illocutionary acts in English and their realisations in Arabic.

3. Illocutionary acts exchanges in the SL English can be rendered into TL

Though there are some cultural differences between the languages in question.

I. INTRODUCTION

Austin (1962) originally used the term “speech act” to refer to an utterance and the “total situation in which the utterance is issued”. Today, the term “speech act” is used to mean the same as “illocutionary act”. In fact, we will find the terms “speech act”, “illocutionary act”, illocutionary force”, “pragmatic force”, all used to mean the same thing although the use of one rather than another imply different theoretical positions. In what follows, Searle’s categories of speech act are explained.

II. Searle's Categories of Speech Acts

Searle’s category (1979) is tied to a general theory of illocutionary acts. His category has been regarded as the most influential one and has been adopted as a basis for further investigation of particular areas. They are as follows:

- 1. Assertives:** The illocutionary point is to commit the speaker to something being the case. Examples: claim, emphasize, assert, etc...
- 2. Directives:** The illocutionary point of this category involves the fact that they are attempts by the speaker to let the hearer to do something and to prevent him from not doing something. Examples: demand, ask, direct, etc...
- 3. Commissives:** The illocutionary point of is to commit the speaker to some future course of action. Examples: vow, promise, commit, etc...

4. **Expressives:** The illocutionary point of this category is to express the psychological status of the speaker. Examples: condolence, wish, salute.
5. **Declaratives:** they mean to declare something or announce something. Examples: announce, name, declare, etc...

III. Politeness

In ordinary language use, politeness refers to proper social conduct and tactful consideration of others. Politeness as a pragmatic notion refers to ways in which the relational function in linguistic action is expressed (Leech:1983 and Levinson (1987). The politeness principle is a series of maxims, which Leech (1983) and Levinson have proposed as a way of explaining how politeness operates in conversational exchanges. Politeness can be defined as forms of behaviour that establish and maintain comity. That is the ability of participants in a social interaction to engage in interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony (Leech:1983 and Levinson (1987). Leech (1983) uses his own terms for two kinds of illocutionary acts. He calls representatives “assertives”, and calls directives “impositives”. (For further details, see Watts, 2003 and Holmes, 2006: 684).

IV. Theory of Meaning vs. Theory of Translation

Translation has often been defined with reference to meaning; a translation is said to "have the same meaning" as the original text. Newmark (1988) defines translation as "that branch of the applied science of language which is specifically concerned with the problem-or the fact-of the transference of meaning from one set patterned symbols ... into another set of patterned symbols...".

It is clearly necessary for translation theory to draw upon a theory of meaning; without such a theory certain important aspects of the translation process cannot be discussed, nor can statements like that of Newmark be evaluated. In terms of the theory of meaning which we make use of here, a theory deriving largely from the view of Firth, the view that SL and TL texts "have the same meaning" or that "transference of meaning" occurs in translation is untenable.

Meaning, in our view, is a property of a language. An SL text has an SL meaning, and a TL text has a TL meaning (See also: Bruner, 1990). An Arabic text, for instance, has an Arabic meaning (as well as Arabic phonology / graphology, grammar and lexis), and an equivalent English text has an English meaning. This is necessarily the case, since, following Firth, we define meaning as the total network of relations entered into by any linguistic form text, item-in-text, structure, element of structure, class, term in system, or whatever it may be. The relations entered into by the formal linguistic units of grammar and lexis are of two kinds (1) formal relations, which mean relations between one formal item and others in the same language, and (2) contextual relations which mean the relationship of grammatical or lexical items to linguistically relevant elements in the situation in which the items operate as, or in texts.

V. Newmark's Theory of Translation

Newmark (1988) defined translation in terms of finding equivalence (across languages) and in terms of transference of meaning. He said that the translator should be after the spirit of text and not after the body of the text ,,after what is "meant" and not after what is "said." He must be after the intention of the writer and not after the literal meaning. A translator must seek the force of the message



and not after just the meaning of the text. Then, he used a flattened “V” diagram to prove that all types of translation can be either in terms of terms of literality ((literal translation and/ or semantic translation)) or in terms of transference of meaning ((free translation and/ or communicative translation”). Here is Newmark’s Types of Translation with Alsulaimaan’s modification.

Equivalence (literality).	Transference (Communication)
Word-to-Word Translation.	Adaptation (Completely Free)
Literal Translation.	Free Translation
Formal Translation	Dynamic Translation
Semantic Translation	Communicative Translation
Linguistic Translation	Pragmatic Translation
Textual Translation.	Speech Act Translation
Non- literary	Literary Translation

Newmark prefers the second column translations to the first column, simply because the second column can achieve an effective translation and communication. Then, he summarized all types of the first column and used “semantic translation”. He also suggested the term “communicative Translation” for the second column. Very briefly: 1. Semantic translation is writer oriented. 1. Communicative translation is reader oriented. 2. Semantic Translation is source language text oriented. 2. Communicative translation is target language oriented. 3. Semantic translation is after the meaning of the message. 3. Communicative translation is after the force of the message.

VI. Data Analysis

The analysis will cover the renderings of these utterances into Arabic to see how speech acts are realized in Arabic. Here are the exchanges:

SL Exchange (1):

Receptionist: I'll see what we have, madam. We are very full just at present. Now, let me see... ah, we have a room free on the first floor. Or I can offer you on the second floor with a private bathroom.

Teresa: I don't really need a private bathroom. All I want is a quiet room away from the noise of the traffic. I don't sleep very well.

TL Exchange:

موظف الاستقبال: سأرى ما لدينا يا سيدتي. الفندق ملآن في الوقت الحاضر – دعيني أرى... هناك غرفة شاغرة في الطابق الأول, أو إذا شئت أقدم لك غرفة في الطابق الثاني مع حمام خاص.
تريزا: أنا بالفعل لا أحتاج حماماً خاصاً. كل ما أطلبه هي غرفة هادئة بعيدة عن ضجة السير. أنا لا أنام جيداً.

Speech Act and Translation Discussion:

In this exchange, the first part of receptionist's utterance is considered as speech act of assertive and directive categories at the same time because he is stating something and indirectly asking Teresa to wait while he is checking if there is a free room or not. In other words, the receptionist expresses the proposition of his assertion and indirectly of requesting that he will see whether there is a free room or not and asking her to wait a moment. The receptionist believes that Teresa will wait and wants her to wait. As well as, the receptionist intends to make her know his intention that if she waits, it will be advantageous to her. The second part of his utterance can be identified as speech act of an assertive category, simply, because he is stating the situation at the hotel which is that the receptionist expresses the proposition of description in his utterance. The receptionist intends to make Teresa recognize that the hotel is full. As for the third part of his utterance, it is both directive and assertive categories because he is asking Teresa indirectly to wait and then he is informing her something. He expresses the proposition of his request which is asking her indirectly to wait. He believes that she will wait. However, he believes that waiting will be in her



interest. Moreover, it is regarded as the assertive category since the receptionist expresses the proposition of his statement in his utterance that there is a free room on the first floor. The final part of the utterance can be identified as commissive category since he is offering something. The receptionist expresses the proposition of offering in his utterance which is offering a room on the second floor with a private bathroom. The receptionist intends to make her believe that he intends to put himself under the obligation to perform the action which is offering a room.

In regard to Teresa's utterance, the first part is identified as assertive category because she is stating something. Teresa expresses the proposition of her assertion in her utterance that she does not want a private bathroom. Teresa intends to make the receptionist understand her proposition that she does not want a room with a private bathroom. The second part can be identified as speech act of directive category because she is requesting something. Teresa expresses the proposition of her request in her utterance that she wants a quiet room. Teresa wants the receptionist to give her a quiet room. She intends to make the receptionist recognize that the action is in her interest. Yet, the third part of Teresa's utterance is as speech act of assertive category because she is ,simply, describing her situation. Teresa expresses the proposition of her description in her utterance that she does not sleep well.

As for the TL exchange, the first part of receptionist's utterance can be identified as speech act of assertive and directive categories at the same time because he is stating something and indirectly asking Teresa to do something. In other words, the receptionist expresses the proposition of his assertion and request that he will see whether there is a free room or not and indirectly asking her to wait a moment. The receptionist intends to make her know his intention that if she waits, it will be advantageous to her. The second part of his utterance can be identified as speech act

of assertive category ,simply, because he is stating the situation at hotel. The receptionist expresses the proposition of description in his utterance that the hotel is full. As for the third part of his utterance, it is both directive and assertive categories because he is asking Teresa indirectly to wait and then he is informing her something. He expresses the proposition of his request, i.e. he is asking her indirectly to wait. The receptionist wants Teresa to wait. However, he believes that waiting will be in her interest. Moreover, it is regarded as an assertive category since the receptionist expresses the proposition of his statement in his utterance that there is a free room on the first floor. The final part of the utterance can be identified as commissive category since he is offering something which is a room on the second floor with a private bathroom. The receptionist intends to make her believe that he intends to put himself under the obligation to give her a room.

In regard to Teresa's utterance, the first part is identified as an assertive category because she is stating something. Teresa expresses the proposition of her assertion in her utterance that she does not want a private bathroom and she expects a future action to be done by the receptionist which is giving her another room. Teresa intends to make the receptionist understand her proposition that she does not want a private bathroom. The second part can be identified as speech act of directive category because she is requesting something. Teresa expresses the proposition of her request in her utterance that she wants a quiet room and she expects that the receptionist will give her a quiet room. She intends to make the receptionist recognize that giving her another room will be in her interest. The third part of Teresa's utterance is identified as speech act of assertive category because she is ,simply, describing her situation. Teresa expresses the proposition of her description in her utterance that she does not sleep well. However, she intends to make the receptionist recognize that she needs a quiet room.

The receptionist's utterance is polite since it contains explicit polite marker (madam). Also, Teresa's utterance, there is no polite marker; therefore politeness is also implicit. The receptionist's utterance has a performative verb (offer); therefore it is explicit. However, Teresa's utterance does not contain performative verb; so it is implicit. In regard to the social relationship, both of them have the same social status; therefore, it is a type of solidarity.

As for TL exchange, both the receptionist's contains polite markers (سيدتي); therefore their politeness is explicit. Teresa's utterance has no polite marker, so politeness is implicit. The receptionist's utterance has performative verb (أقدم). Yet, Teresa's utterance has no performative verb; so it is implicit.

In regard to translation, it is clear that the original writer has followed pragmatic translation in rendering this exchange. All what has been said can be summarized in the following table:

Exchange Analysis (1):

Title		Hotel Receptionist's Utterance		Teresa's Utterance	
		SL English	TL Arabic	SL English	TL Arabic
Speech Act Categories	Assertives	+	+	+	+
	Directives	+	+	+	+
	Commissives	+	+		
	Expressives				
	Declarations				
Social Relationship	Power				
	Solidarity	+	+	+	+
Explicitness	Explicit	+	+		
	Implicit			+	+
Directness	Direct	+	+	+	+
	Indirect				
Voice	Active	+	+	+	+
	Passive				
Politeness	Polite	+	+	+	+

	Impolite				
Type of Translation	Pragmatic		+		+
	Linguistic				
	Failure				

SL Exchange (2):

Receptionist: Then I'll give you the first floor room. That's at the back and it's very quiet.

Teresa: How much is this room?

TL Exchange:

موظف الاستقبال: إذا سأعطيك الغرفة في الطابق الأول. هي في الجهة الخلفية وهادئة جدا.
 تريزا: كم إيجار هذه الغرفة؟

Speech Act and Translation Discussion:

In this exchange, both the first and the second parts of receptionist's utterance are considered as speech acts of the assertive and category because he is suggesting a room to Teresa and describing it. In the first part, the receptionist expresses the proposition of his suggestion in his utterance that he will give Teresa a room on the first floor and he expects that Teresa will accept and take it. The receptionist intends to make Teresa recognize his intention that his suggestion is in her interest.

Concerning the second part, the receptionist expresses the proposition of his description in his utterance that the room is at the back and very quiet. He intends to make Teresa recognize his proposition.

As for Teresa's utterance, it can be identified as speech act of the directive category since she is trying to get the receptionist to answer her question. Teresa expresses the proposition of her question in her utterance that she is asking the receptionist about the cost of the room. Teresa believes that the receptionist is able to answer her. However, she intends to make the receptionist recognize that answering her will be in her interest.

In regard to TL exchange, the first and second parts of the receptionist's utterance can be identified as illocutionary acts of assertives because he is first suggesting something and then describing it. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his suggestion in his utterance that he will give Teresa a room on the first floor and he predicates a future action, i.e. Teresa will accept and take this room. The receptionist intends to make Teresa recognize his intention that his suggestion is in her interest. Concerning the second part, the receptionist expresses the proposition of his description in his utterance that the room is at the back and very quiet and he expects that Teresa may accept his suggestion.

Teresa's utterance can be identified as speech act of directive category since she is asking a question. Teresa expresses the proposition of her question in her utterance that she is asking the receptionist about the cost of the room and she predicates that the receptionist will give her an answer and she intends to make the receptionist recognize that answering her will be in her interest.

Both the receptionist and Teresa's utterances have no polite marker; therefore the politeness is implicit. Both of them are implicit because they do not contain performative verbs. With regard to the social status, the receptionist and Teresa have the same social status; so it is a sort of solidarity.

In regard to TL exchange, both of the utterances are implicitly polite since there is no polite marker. However, they are implicit because they do not contain performative verb.

Concerning translation, it can be noticed that this exchange is translated by using the pragmatic method. All what has said can be illustrated in the following table:

Exchange Analysis (2):

Title		Hotel Receptionist's Utterance		Teresa's Utterance	
		SL English	TL Arabic	SL English	TL Arabic
Speech Act Categories	Assertives	+	+		
	Directives			+	+
	Commissives				
	Expressives				
	Declarations				
Social Relationship	Power				
	Solidarity	+	+	+	+
Explicitness	Explicit				
	Implicit	+	+	+	+
Directness	Direct	+	+	+	+
	Indirect				
Voice	Active	+	+	+	+
	Passive				
Politeness	Polite	+	+	+	+
	Impolite				
Type of Translation	Pragmatic		+		+
	Linguistic				
	Failure				

SL Exchange (3):

Receptionist: Three pounds, including breakfast.

Teresa: How about the other meals?

TL Exchange:

موظف الاستقبال: ثلاثة جنيهات مع الفطور.
تريزا: وكيف تحاسبون عن باقي الوجبات؟

Speech Act and Translation Discussion:

A close look at this exchange shows that the receptionist's utterance can be identified as a speech act of the assertive category, simply, because he is answering a question. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his assertion in his utterance that the cost of the room is three pounds, including breakfast and he intends to make Teresa recognize that his action is in her interest.

Teresa's utterance is identified as speech act of directive category since she is asking a question. Teresa expresses the proposition of her question in her utterance that she is asking about the cost of other meals and she expects that the receptionist will answer her question. Teresa intends to make the receptionist recognize that answering her will be good for her.

In regard to TL exchange, receptionist's utterance is identified as illocutionary act of assertives because he is trying to give an answer. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his assertion in his utterance that the cost of the room is three pounds, including breakfast and he predicates that Teresa may accept to take the room. And he intends to make Teresa recognize that his action is in her interest.

Yet, Teresa's utterance can be identified as speech act of directive category because she is attempting to get the receptionist to do something. Teresa expresses the proposition of her question in her utterance that she is asking about the cost of other meals and she predicates a future action, i.e. the receptionist will answer her question.

There is no polite marker in both the receptionist and Teresa’s utterances; the politeness is implicit. As for explicitness, both of them lack performative verbs; so they are implicit.

Concerning the social relationship, both have the same status so it is a sort of solidarity.

Regarding TL exchange, the receptionist and Teresa’s utterances are implicitly polite, simply, because there is no explicit polite expression or marker. With regard to explicitness, they are implicit since there is no performative verb. As for translation, this exchange is pragmatically rendered. In sum, the following table is interesting:

Exchange Analysis (3):

Title		Hotel Receptionist’s Utterance		Teresa’s Utterance	
		SL English	TL Arabic	SL English	TL Arabic
Speech Act Categories	Assertives	+	+		
	Directives			+	+
	Commissives				
	Expressives				
	Declarations				
Social Relationship	Power				
	Solidarity	+	+	+	+
Explicitness	Explicit				
	Implicit	+	+	+	+
Directness	Direct	+	+	+	+
	Indirect				
Voice	Active		+	+	+
	Passive	+			
Politeness	Polite	+	+	+	+
	Impolite				
Type of Translation	Pragmatic		+		+
	Linguistic				
	Failure				

SL Exchange (4):

Receptionist: They are charged separately.

Teresa: I'll take that room, please.

TL Exchange:

موظف الاستقبال: الحساب يكون لكل وجبة على حدة.
تريزا: من فضلك سأخذ تلك الغرفة!

Speech Act and Translation Discussion:

The receptionist's utterance can be identified as a speech act of the assertive category because he is confirming something. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his answer in his proposition and he predicates a future action to be performed by Teresa. He tries to give Teresa an answer concerning her question.

Teresa's utterance is identified as speech act of the directive category since she is requesting. Teresa expresses the proposition of her request in her utterance that she is requesting the room and she predicates that the receptionist will give her the room. And she wishes that. Teresa intends to make the receptionist recognize that giving a room for her will be advantageous to her.

As for the TL exchange, the receptionist's utterance can be identified as a speech act of the assertive category because he is stating something. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his answer in his proposition and he predicates a future action performed by Teresa.

Teresa's utterance is considered as illocutionary act of directives because she is requesting something. Teresa expresses the proposition of her request in her utterance that she is requesting the room and she expects that the receptionist will give her the room and she wishes that. Teresa intends to make the receptionist recognize that the action will be advantageous to her.

The politeness in the receptionist’s utterance is implicit. Politeness in Teresa’s utterance is explicit which is expressed by using polite marker (please). In the receptionist’s utterance there is no performative verb; therefore it is implicit. Teresa’s utterance is also implicit because it lacks performative verb.

Since the social status of the receptionist and Teresa is the same so it is a type of solidarity.

As for TL exchange, the receptionist does not have a polite marker; so the politeness is implicit. Teresa’s utterance contains polite marker (من فضلك); therefore it explicit. Both of utterance have no performative verb; so they are implicit.

In regard to translation, it is clear that this exchange has been rendered pragmatically. All what has been said can be summarized in the following table:

Exchange Analysis (4):

Title		Hotel Receptionist’s Utterance		Teresa’s Utterance	
		SL English	TL Arabic	SL English	TL Arabic
Speech Act Categories	Assertives	+	+		
	Directives			+	+
	Commissives				
	Expressives				
	Declarations				
Social Relationship	Power				
	Solidarity	+	+	+	+
Explicitness	Explicit				
	Implicit	+	+	+	+
Directness	Direct	+	+	+	+
	Indirect				
Voice	Active	+	+	+	+
	Passive				
Politeness	Polite	+	+	+	+
	Impolite				
	Pragmatic		+		+

Type of Translation	Linguistic				
	Failure				

SL Exchange (5):

Receptionist: Certainly, madam. Would you please fill in this registration form, giving your name and address, nationality and passport number?

Teresa: Thank you. Oh, I should like to be called in the morning at eight o'clock.

TL Exchange:

موظف الاستقبال: حسناً يا سيدتي. وهل تتكرمين بإملاء ورقة التسجيل هذه، فتعطينا اسمك، وعنوانك، وجنسيته، ورقم جواز سفرك؟
تريزا: شكراً. أريد أن توقظني في الساعة الثامنة صباحاً.

Speech Act and Translation Discussion:

The first part of the receptionist's utterance can be identified as speech act of an assertive category because he is affirming something. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his affirmation in his utterance by saying 'certainly'. He intends to make Teresa know that it is in her interest. But, the second part is identified as a speech act of the directive category, simply, because he is indirectly asking Teresa to do something which is asking her to fill in the form. The receptionist intends to make Teresa recognize that filling the form is in her interest. As for Teresa's utterance, the first part can be identified as speech act of an expressive category because she is trying to express her psychological state and attitude by thanking the receptionist. However, the second part is identified as a speech act of expressive and directive categories because she is first expressing her psychological state and attitude then she is asking the receptionist to do something. Teresa expresses the proposition of her request in her utterance that she is asking the receptionist to be called in the

morning and she predicates future action to be done by the receptionist, i.e. she will be called tomorrow morning. She also believes that the receptionist will call her. Teresa intends to make the receptionist recognize that doing what she has asked him will be advantageous for her. Concerning the TL exchange, the first part of receptionist's utterance is considered as speech act of an expressive category because he is expressing her psychological state and attitude. But, the second part is identified as the directive category since he is trying to get Teresa to do something. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his request in his utterance that he is asking Teresa to fill in the form. The receptionist intends to make Teresa recognize that filling in the form is in her interest. With regard to Teresa's utterance, its first part can be identified as speech act of an expressive category since she is expressing his psychological state and attitude because she is thanking the receptionist. The second part is considered as a speech act of the directive category since she is trying to get the receptionist to do something which is asking the receptionist that she must be called in the morning.

Politeness in the receptionist's utterance is expressed by using polite marker (please and madam), modal verb (would); therefore it is explicit. Nonetheless, Teresa's utterance is implicitly polite since there is explicit polite marker. Both utterances have no performative verb; so they are implicit. Concerning the social relationship between Teresa and the receptionist, both have the same social status; therefore it is a sort of solidarity.

Concerning TL exchange, politeness, in the receptionist utterance, is expressed by using the particle (هل); therefore it is explicit. Yet, the politeness ,in Teresa's utterance, is implicit since there is no polite marker. Both utterances are implicit since

they have no performative verb. With regard to translation, it is apparent that pragmatic method has been followed in translating this exchange. The following table illustrates all what has been said:

Exchange Analysis (5):

Title		Hotel Receptionist's Utterance		Teresa's Utterance	
		SL English	TL Arabic	SL English	TL Arabic
Speech Act Categories	Assertives	+			
	Directives			+	+
	Commissives				
	Expressives		+	+	+
	Declarations				
Social Relationship	Power				
	Solidarity	+	+	+	+
Explicitness	Explicit				
	Implicit	+	+	+	+
Directness	Direct				
	Indirect	+	+	+	+
Voice	Active	+	+	+	+
	Passive				
Politeness	Polite	+	+	+	+
	Impolite				
Type of Translation	Pragmatic		+		+
	Linguistic				
	Failure				

SL Exchange (6):

Receptionist: Would you like early morning tea?

Teresa: Yes, please.

TL Exchange:

موظف الاستقبال: هل ترغبين شاي الصباح الباكر؟

تريزا: نعم من فضلك.

Speech Act and Translation Discussion:

Receptionist's utterance can be identified as directive and commissive categories at the same time because he is asking Teresa a question and indirectly offering something. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his question in his utterance that he is asking Teresa whether she likes tea or not and he predicates that Teresa will answer him. The receptionist intends to make Teresa recognize that answering him will be in her interest.

Teresa's utterance is identified as a speech act of commissive and directive categories since she is trying to show her acceptance and indirectly asking him to do something. Teresa expresses the proposition of her acceptance in her utterance and she predicates a future action which is having a cup of tea in the morning. She is indirectly asking the receptionist to bring her tea tomorrow morning. Teresa intends to make the receptionist recognize that if he will do that, it will be in her interest.

In regard to TL exchange, receptionist's utterance is identified as speech act of directive and commissive categories since he is asking and offering something indirectly. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his question in his utterance that he is asking Teresa whether she likes tea or not and he expects a future action that Teresa will answer him. He believes that Teresa will answer him. The receptionist intends to make Teresa recognize that answering him will be in her interest.

As for Teresa's utterance, it is identified as speech act of commissive and directive categories since she is trying to show her acceptance and indirectly asking him to do something. Teresa expresses the proposition of her acceptance in her utterance. She is indirectly asking the receptionist to bring her tea tomorrow morning. Teresa intends to make the receptionist recognize that if he does what she asked him, it will be in her interest.

In the receptionist’s utterance, there is a polite marker which is the modal verb (would); so it explicit. In Teresa’s utterance, politeness is also explicit expressed by using the polite marker (please). Both utterances have no a performative verbs; therefore they are implicit. In regard to the social relationship, both of them have the same social status; therefore it is a type of solidarity.

Regarding TL exchange, both the receptionist and Teresa’s utterances are polite since there is polite markers expressed by using the particle(هل) in the receptionist’s utterance and (من فضلك) in Teresa’s utterance. Both utterances are implicit because there is no prtformative verb.

In regard to translation, it seems that this exchange is translated pragmatically.

The following table shows all what has been said:

Exchange Analysis (6):

Title		Hotel Receptionist’s Utterance		Teresa’s Utterance	
		SL English	TL Arabic	SL English	TL Arabic
Speech Act Categories	Assertives				
	Directives	+	+	+	+
	Commissives	+	+	+	+
	Expressives				
	Declarations				
Social Relationship	Power				
	Solidarity	+	+	+	+
Explicitness	Explicit				
	Implicit	+	+	+	+
Directness	Direct	+	+	+	+
	Indirect				
Voice	Active	+	+	+	+
	Passive				
Politeness	Polite	+	+	+	+
	Impolite				
	Pragmatic		+		+



Type of Translation	Linguistic				
	Failure				

SL Exchange (7):

Receptionist: Here is your key, madam. The porter will show you to your room.

TL Exchange:

موظف الاستقبال: تفضلي هذا مفتاح غرفتك يا سيدتي! وسيدلك الحمال عليها.

Speech Act and Translation Discussion:

The first part of the receptionist’s utterance can be identified as speech act of directive category since he is trying to get Teresa to do something. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his request in his utterance that he is requesting Teresa to take the key. He intends to make Teresa recognize that if she will take the key, it will in her interest. However, the second part is identified as speech act of assertive category because he is stating something. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his statement in his utterance and he expects that Teresa will follow the porter. The receptionist intends to make Teresa recognize that it will be advantageous to her. As for TL exchange, the first part of the utterance is considered as a speech act of the directive category because he is attempting to get Teresa to do something. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his request in his utterance that he is requesting Teresa to take the key and he predicates a future action, i.e. Teresa will take the key. Yet, the second part can be identified as speech act of assertive category because he is ,simply, asserting something. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his statement in his utterance and he predicates a future action that

Teresa will follow the porter. Politeness in the receptionist’s utterance is explicit since there is polite marker (madam). It also lacks a performative verb; therefore it is implicit.

As for TL exchange, politeness is explicit since is expressed by the imperative verb (سيديتي and تفضلي). With regard to translation, it is clear that this exchange is rendered pragmatically. All what has been said can be illustrated in the following table:

Exchange Analysis (7):

Title		Hotel Receptionist’s Utterance		Teresa’s Utterance	
		SL English	TL Arabic	SL English	TL Arabic
Speech Act Categories	Assertives	+	+		
	Directives	+	+		
	Commissives				
	Expressives				
	Declarations				
Social Relationship	Power				
	Solidarity	+	+		
Explicitness	Explicit				
	Implicit	+	+		
Directness	Direct				
	Indirect	+			
Voice	Active	+	+		
	Passive				
Politeness	Polite	+	+		
	Impolite				
Type of Translation	Pragmatic		+		
	Linguistic				
	Failure				

Conclusions

The data analysis of this study reveals the following conclusions :



1. The conversations in question contain different types of speech act categories.
2. These categories can be translated into Arabic despite cultural and structural divergences between English and Arabic.
3. The conversational exchanges under investigation contain different types of speech act categories such as directives and assertives.
4. Concerning speech act categories, most of the utterances are identified as speech acts of assertive and directive speech acts. Others are commissive and expressive speech act categories. There is no declarative speech acts.
5. Regarding the voice, all the analysed utterances are active.
6. Explicit politeness in English is expressed by using modal verbs “can, could and would”.
7. With regard to translation, all utterances have been rendered pragmatically.

REFERENCES:

- Al-Sulaimaan, M. M. D. (2016 a): **Semantics & Pragmatics**, Erbil: Haval Printing Press.
- Al-Sulaimaan, M. M. D. (2016 b): **Translation Theory & Practice**, Erbil: Haval Printing Press.
- Austin, J. L. (1962): **How to Do Things with Words**, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987): **Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R. and Ford, M. (1961): “Address in American English”. *Journal Abnormal and Social Psychology*, No. 62, pp. 375-385.
- Bruner, J. (1990): **Acts of Meaning**, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Grice, H. P. (1957): "Meaning". **The Philosophical Review**, Vol.66, pp.377-388.
- Holmes, J (2006): "Politeness Strategies as Linguistic Variables". **Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics**, pp.684.
- Leech, G. (1983): **Principles of Pragmatics**, London: Longman Group Ltd, pp.101-106.
- Newmark, P. (1988): **A Textbook of Translation**, London: Prentice Hall.
- Searle, J. R. (1969): **Speech Act Theory: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strawson, P. F. (1964): "Identifying Reference and Truth-Values". **Theoria**, Vol. 30, pp.96-118.
- Watts, R. (2003): **Politeness**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

پوخته:

بېگو مان تیؤرا "کرده یا ئاخفتنی" گه له ک فه یله سوّف و زانایین پراگماتیکی گرنگی پیدایه. وه کو (ئوستن-1962)، (سیریل-1969). به لی ل گه ل ئه قی چه ندی چ فه کۆلین ل سه ر بابه تی تیگه هشتنا دیالوگی ب ریکا کرده یین گوتن و وه رگیپانی نه هاتینه نه جامدان.

یا ناسراوه کو ئه و زمانین سه ر ب خیزانین زمانی یین جودا فه، کو ژ لای پیکهات و شیوازیفه ژیکجودانه و ئه ف جودا هییه ژی بو سیما و تایبه تمه ندییین زمانی دزقرنه فه و ژ نه جامی ئه قی چه ندی ژی ئاریشه د وه رگیپانی د ژ زمانی ئینگیزی بو زمانی عه ره بی په یداد بیت. ژ ئه وئ جودا هییا د نا هبه را دوو زماناندا و جودا بوونا پیکهاتان د کرده یین گوتنی د سهرنه که قتن د دانوستاندن و په یوه ندیکرنا زمانیدا د نا هبه را ئاخفتنکه ریپ ره سه نین هه ر دوو زمانین ئینگیزی و عه ره پیدا په یداد بیت. ئه ف فه کۆلینه هه ولده ت ب فه کۆلینا هنده ک دانوستاندان ژ BBC 7 رادبیت ئه وین تورا پۆلین ئاخفتنی پیشکیشکرین ل گه ل وه رگیپانا ئه وان، کو فه کۆلین و شروقه کرنا ئه وان د خشته یاندا هاتییه دیار کرن، کو زمانی ره سه ن و زمانی مه به ستی ب خو فه دگریت. زیده باری پیقه ر و پۆلینکرین جودا بو کرده یین ئاخفتنی. وه کو کرده یین دووپاتکرنی و ئاراسته کرنی و ده ربپینی و پیگیربوونی ل گه ل کرده یین

بريارداني. ژ گرنگترین نهجامين فهكولين گههشتيبي بريتينه ژ: 1-دانوستاندن جورين جياواز د پولينكرين كردهيپن ناخفتنيډا ب خوڤه دگريت. 2-دشياندايه نهف پولينكرنه بو زمانى عه ره بى بهينه وهرگيپان، هه ر چهنده جوداهيپين كه لچهرى و پيكهاته يى د ناڤه را زمانى ئينگليزى و عه ره بيده هه نه.

المخلص:

مما لاريب فيه ان نظرية "فعل القول" قد حصت اهتمام العديد من الفلاسفة وعلماء التداولية ومنظرين مثل اوستن (1962) وسيرل (1969). الا انه لم يتم القيام باي دراسة تتعلق ب (بفهم الحوار من خلال افعال القول والترجمة). وعليه فان هذا البحث محاولة في هذا الخصوص. من المتعارف عليه ان اللغات التي تعود لعائلات لغوية مختلفة تختلف بنيويا واسلوبيا وبالتالي يعني بان هذه الاختلافات عائدة لمزايا خصوصية اللغة والتي يترتب عليها مشكلات في الترجمة من الانكليزية الى العربية. اذ ان هذا الاختلاف بين اللغتين واختلاف التراكيب في افعال القول يتمخض عنه اخفاقا في التخاطب والتواصل اللغوي بين متحدثي الاصل للفتين العربية والانكليزية. يهدف هذا البحث الى دراسة بعض الحوارات التي قدمتها شبكة BBC حيث يتكون الحوار من 7 ادوار كلامية مع ترجماتها تمت دراستها وتحليلها في جداول تتضمن لغة الاصل ولغة الهدف فضلا عن معايير وتصانيف مختلفة لافعال القول كافعال التاكيد والتوجيه والتعبير والالتزام بالاضافة الى افعال التصاريح. واهم النتائج التي توصلت اليها هذه الدراسة هي كالتالي: (1) تضم الحوارات انواعا مختلفة من تصنيفات افعال القول (2) يمكن ترجمة هذه التصنيفات الى العربية رغم الاختلافات الثقافية والتركيبية ما بين الانكليزية والعربية.