

Speech Act Analysis in Conversation With Reference to English – Arabic Translation

** Muhammad Tahir Sattam & Osama Misbah Mahmood*

تاريخ القبول: 2012/1/2

تاريخ التقديم: 2011/11/20

The Concept of Conversation

Much ink has been spilt on the notion of conversation; yet, it has not been settled. This means that its definition is still controversial. Wittgenstein (1968: 30), for instance, points out that "to speak a language is to engage in a conversation and other activities interwoven with previous forms of life." This means that the speakers and hearers of a language would not understand each other in many cases if they were not sharing the same relevant forms of life and information about the background of their utterance. This is why many actual special modes of achievement and propositional content or preparatory conditions in English, French, and German, which serve important purposes in our modern societies, are not linguistically significant for closed linguistic societies living at an earlier historical state or advanced or under a totally different natural environment (Beun, 1989: 50, 2002: 140 and 2004: 93).

Sacks and Schegloff (1973: 312) point out that conversation is an occasion whereby different people take turns to speak. Likewise, Schegloff (1985: 80) defines

* Department of Translation/ College of Arts/ University of Mosul.

conversation as an "inclusive way in which he wants to include chats, service contacts, therapy sessions, asking for time, asking for showing the way to certain places, press conferences, physician and patient dialogues, etc".

Crystal and Davy (1975: 86) adopt a different view stating that conversation is any stretch of connected speech between two or more people within audible range of each other who have the mutual desire to communicate, and bounded by separation of all participants for an extended period of time. Abercrombie (1972: 64) believes that our linguistic actions are always accompanied by the movements of our entire bodies. This means that conversation involves much more than a simple interchange of spoken words. Similarly, Laver and Hutcheson (1972: 11) defines conversation as the "total system of communication undertaken by participants in face – to –face interaction". This means that they view conversation as a total process. Hussein (1995: 2) in his review of the notion of conversation, focuses on the structural aspect of conversation and views conversation as a formal product in which at least two people are involved.

From what have been said so far, it can be said that all the definitions reviewed focus on different aspects of conversation; yet, they all agree on its nature and its basic characteristics. We believe that conversation can be viewed as the total sum of verbal and non-verbal actions in which at least two people are involved in a certain context.

Conversation Analysis:

Conversation analysis is a notion used in linguistics, sociolinguistics and some other related disciplines. It refers to a method of studying the sequential structure and coherence of conversations in their everyday sense, usually, employing the techniques of ethnomethodology (Sacks, 1972: 82 and Robinson: 2003: 75). The approach studies recordings of real conversation to establish what properties are used in a systematic way when people linguistically interact. Conversation analysis is considered to be an empirical, inductive study, and a contrast is often drawn with the deductive approach characteristic of discourse analysis (see Ventola, 1979: 280, 1987: 38 and 1991: 85).

To sum up, we can say that conversation analysis is an analytical approach which examines carefully the different aspects of successive sentences of language in use. Among these different aspects are cohesion, coherence, speech acts, implicatures, inferences, phatic communions, etc.

Our study will focus on speech act categories as major aspects of connected speech so as to achieve a better understanding of the informal talk in face-to-face interaction and thus give effective translation similar in force to that of the source language text.

Speech Act Theory:

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 term "speech act", "illocutionary act", "illocutionary force",

"pragmatic force' or just 'force', all used to mean the same thing although to use one rather than another may imply different theoretical positions (cf. Al-Sulaimaan, 1997: 261 and 2011: 290, and Al-Sulaimaan and Al-Sanjary, 2007: 30).

Searle's, and Searle's and Vanderveken's Categories of Illocutionary Acts:

Searle's (1969), and Searle's and Vanderveken's (1985) categories are tied to a general theory of illocutionary acts. Their categories have been considered as the most influential and consistent, and have often been adopted as a basis for further investigation of particular area (Sbisá: 1994: 160, Verschueren, 1995: 130 and Al-Sulaimaan, 1997: 262). The five categories that Searle (1969), and Searle and Vanderveken (1985) end up establishing are:

(1) Assertives: The force of assertives has the assertive point. The illocutionary point is to commit the speaker to something being the case. The mode of achievement is neutral. The propositional content condition is neutral. The preparatory condition is that the speaker has reasons or pieces of evidence for the truth of the propositional content. The sincerity condition is that the speaker believes the propositional content. The degree of strength is neutral. This group contains most of Austin's (1962) expositives and many of his verdictives, e. g. suggest, put forward as a hypothesis, insist, swear, flatly state, advise, etc.

This primitive illocutionary force is named in English by the performative verb "assert" and is realized syntactically in the declarative sentential type.

(2) Directives: The force of directives has the directive point. The illocutionary point of this category consists in the fact that directives are attempts by the speaker to get the hearer to do something. The mode of achievement and degree of strength are neutral. The propositional content condition represents a future course of action of the hearer. The preparatory condition is that the hearer is able to carry out this action in his utterance, and the sincerity condition is that the speaker desires or wants the hearer to carry it out. This class contains some of Austin's

(1962) perlocutionaries and many of Austin's illocutionaries, e. g. order, command, request, invite, permit, advise, etc. This primitive directive force is realized syntactically in English in the imperative sentential type.

(3) Commissives: The primitive commissive illocutionary force has the commissive point. The illocutionary point is to commit the speaker to some future course of action. The mode of achievement and degree of strength are neutral. The propositional content condition represents a future course of action of the speaker. The preparatory condition is that the speaker is capable of carrying out that action. This sincerity condition is that the speaker intends to carry it out. The category contains Austin's (1962) commissives except "shall", "intend", "favour", etc. this primitive commissive force is not

realized syntactically in a sentential type in English, but is named by the performative verb "commit"

(4) Expressives: The primitive expressive illocutionary force has the expressive point. The illocutionary point of this class is to express the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about the state of affairs specified in the propositional content. This category is characterized by the neutral mode of achievement and degree of strength. It is realized syntactically in English in the type of exclamatory sentences. The following verbs are examples of English expressives: apologize, thank, greet, etc.

(5) Declaratives: The illocutionary force of declaratives has the declarative illocutionary point. The mode of achievement and degree of strength are neutral. It is a defining characteristic of this class that the successful performance of one of its members brings about correspondence between the propositional content and reality, i. e. successful performance ensures that the propositional content corresponds to the world. The preparatory condition is that the speaker is able to carry out this action in his utterance, and the sincerity condition is that the speaker believes, intends and desires to carry out this action. The following verbs are examples of English declaratives: declare, resign, approve, announce, etc. This illocutionary force of declaration is named by the performative verb "declare" and is expressed in utterances of performative sentences.

The Identification of Illocutionary Acts:

Turning now to the identification of illocutionary acts, certain conventions should be considered to express a certain act. The most overt linguistic indicator of the illocutionary force is the (sincere) use of an explicit performative, e. g.

- 1- I hereby ask you what time it is.
- 2- I hereby confirm my reservations.
- 3- I hereby check whether John has gone.

However, explicit performatives are seldom used in physician – patient dialogues (Beun, 1989: 18). Austin (1962: 50) discusses other features, apart from situational aspects, that may also indicate a particular illocutionary force:

(1) Mood: For Austin (1962: 82) mood refers to what we call sentence type, e. g. , “declarative”.

The main features that lead to identifying the illocutionary acts, are those aspects that are related to the written language in our data analysis. Some examples within table No. (1) are illustrative.

Table (1) Aspects Indicating a Particular Illocutionary Force

No.	Sentence Type	Example	Illocutionary Force
1-	Declarative	John drinks juice.	Statement (assertive)
2-	Interrogative	Does John drink juice?	Question (directive)
3-	Imperative	Drink juice, John.	Order (directive)

(2) *Connecting Particles:*

Austin (1962: 84) discusses some particles that may replace the use of an explicit performative. For instance, the particle “still” indicates “I will insist that”; “therefore” and “so” indicate “I conclude that”, etc.

(3) *Tone of Voice, Cadence and Emphasis:*

Tone of voice, cadence and emphasis are aspects of spoken language and they are called “prosodies”. In written language they may be replaced by punctuation, italics, etc. So, one has to be careful, though especially in transcriptions of spoken dialogues, where question – markers often indicate the utterance “function”, and not its prosodic characteristics. Table No (2) is illustrative.

Table (2) Prosodies Indicating a Particular Illocutionary Force

No.	Prosodies	Example	Illocutionary Force
1-	Final Fall	There is a dog in the house.	Statement
2-	Final Rise	There is a dog in the house?	Question
3-	Accentuation	There is a <u>DOG</u> in the house.	Warning

(4) *Accompaniments of the Utterance:*

Utterances may be accompanied by non – verbal phenomena, like gestures (winks, pointing, frowning, etc.) or

ceremonial non – verbal activities. In our data analysis, we will focus on those features that are related to the written form of the conversation under investigation.

Data Analysis and Translation:

Our data is based on a part of contextualized transcript of conversation between a physician and a patient namely, Charles Balis, M. D. and Mrs. Lenore Marconi taken place at the California Pacific Hospital's In-Patient Psychiatric Ward. This transcript, then, was given to six Assistant Professors in the Department of Translation, College of Arts, University of Mosul as professional translators to be translated into Arabic. Finally, in the light of the professional translators given renderings, we will suggest proposed renderings in cases of inappropriate and failure taking into consideration the pragmatic description of the speech act categories as criteria to judge the proposed renderings.

Speech Act Analysis and Discussion:

SL Text (1):

Dr. Balis: Hello, Lenore. How are you ?

Mrs. Marconi: Ugh, O. K. , I guess.

TL Texts:

- 1- دكتور بالي: هلو ! لينور، كيف حالك ؟
السيدة ماركوني: أنا بخير.
- 2- دكتور بالي: مرحبا لينور. كيف الحال؟
السيدة ماركوني: بخير.
- 3 - دكتور بالي: مرحبا لينور. كيف الحال؟
السيدة ماركوني: اظنني بخير.
- 4 - دكتور بالي: أهلاً، لينور. كيف حالك؟
السيدة ماركوني: آه ، بخير ، أظن.

5- دكتور بالي: أهلاً لينور، كيف حالك؟

السيدة ماركوني: أشعر أنني بخير.

6- دكتور بالي: أهلاً لينور، كيف حالك؟

السيدة ماركوني: على ما يرام إن شاء الله.

Pragmatic and Translational Discussion:

Dr. Balis' utterance can be identified as the speech act of directive category since Dr. Balis is attempting to get Mrs. Marconi to give an answer to his question concerning her condition. However, Mrs. Marconi's utterance is identified as the illocutionary act of expressive category as Mrs. Marconi expresses her condition as an answer to Dr. Balis' question. Consequently, the sincerity condition of Dr. Balis' utterance is that wishing to know Mrs. Marconi's condition, i. e. something about her health, her circumstances, her mood, and so on. As for the sincerity condition of Mrs. Marconi's expressive act is that the way Marconi expressing her feelings and attitudes and how her utterance fits her world of reality, i. e. the reality of her way of living and the status of her mood.

In regard to translation and its types, it seems that Dr. Balis' utterance is a sort of phatic communion which consists of "Hello" as an English expression of greeting and an information question. Subject translators (1, 4, 5 and 6) translated the utterance in question semantically since they kept the English expression of greeting (أهلاً، هلو). However, subjects (2 and 3) used a communicative translation since both followed the Arabic culture and used the word (مرحباً) instead of "هلو".

Concerning Marconi's expressive speech act, it seems that all subject translators followed a communicative translation. It seems that subject (4) failed in his rendering because he translated the word (ugh) into "آه" which is incorrect, simply, because "ugh" means something unpleasant and expresses pessimism on the part of the speaker, whereas "آه" expresses surprise, pleasure, sympathy, optimism. Consequently, it should be translated into "أف" which expresses the pessimistic nature of the receiver. All what we have said can be illustrated by the following table.

Table (1) Speech Act and Translation Analysis

Title	Speech Act Categories					No.	Types of Translation.		
	Assert.	Direct.	Comiss.	Express.	Declar.		Sem.	Com.	Fail.
Dr.		+				1	+		
						2		+	
						3		+	
						4	+		
						5	+		
						6	+		
Mrs.				+		1		+	
						2		+	
						3		+	
						4			+
						5		+	
						6		+	

The Proposed Rendering:

دكتور بالي: مرحبا لينور. كيف حالك؟
السيدة ماركوني: أف! أظنني بخير.

SL Text (2):

Dr. Balis: How do you like it here ?

Mrs. Marconi: Well, it's different from what I expected.

TL Texts:

- 1- دكتور بالي: ما رأيك بالمكان هنا؟
السيدة ماركوني: حسنا، إنه غير ما توقعت.
- 2- دكتور بالي: كيف تجدين هذا المكان؟
السيدة ماركوني: حسنا، إنه على غير ما توقعت.
- 3- دكتور بالي: هل أعجبك المكان؟
السيدة ماركوني: إنه في حقيقة الأمر أسوأ مما توقعت.
- 4- دكتور بالي: هل تحبين هذا المكان؟
السيدة ماركوني: حقيقة، إنه يختلف عما كنت أتوقعه.
- 5- دكتور بالي: كيف وجدت المكان؟
السيدة ماركوني: مختلفة عما توقعت.
- 6- دكتور بالي: هل أعجبك المكان هنا؟
السيدة ماركوني: حسنا، يبدو أنه خلاف ما توقعت.

Pragmatic and Translational Discussion:

In this exchange, Dr. Balis' statement is identified as the illocutionary act of directives because he attempts to get Mrs. Marconi to give an answer to his question on her situation staying at the hospital. However, Mrs. Marconi's utterance is defined as the illocutionary act of expressive and assertive since her situation related to her feelings and attitudes and asserts her situation related to her staying at the hospital. As a

result, the sincerity condition of Dr. Balis' utterance is that he wants to know Mrs. Marconi's feelings and impressions about the In-Patient Psychiatric Ward. In regard to the sincerity condition of Mrs. Marconi expressive and assertive acts, it shows her disappointment and frustration about the In-Patient Psychiatric Ward.

With regard to translation, it is apparent that all renderings of Dr. Balis' utterance are semantic since subject translators could succeed in conveying the literal meaning of the utterance under investigation. Added to this, all renderings are realized by questions which are similar to that of the source text.

Regarding Marconi's answer, it seems that all subject translators (except subject 5) used semantic translation. This fact reveals from the transference of the contextual meaning of the source language text as well as keeping the same flavor and tone particularly, by using the Arabic gambit "حسناً" as a lexical equivalence for the English gambit "well". As for subject (5) it seems that his translation is communicative, simply because he did not translate the English gambit "well". He only transferred the propositional content as a force of the message. The following table is illustrative.

Table (2) Speech Act and Translation Analysis

Title	Speech Act Categories					No.	Types of Translation.		
	Assert.	Direct.	Comiss	Express	Declar.		Sem.	Com.	Fail.
Dr.			.	.					
		+				1	+		
						2	+		
						3	+		
						4	+		
						5	+		
Mrs.	+			+		1	+		
						2	+		
						3	+		
						4	+		
						5		+	
						6	+		

The Proposed Rendering:

دكتور بالي: كيف ترين هذا المكان؟
السيدة ماركوني: حسناً، على غير ما توقعت.

SL Text (3):

Dr. Balis: How so?

Mrs. Marconi: It's kind of like a college dorm, except some of the people walk around naked and talk to themselves. I'm sharing a room with an elderly Russian woman. I think she was put here against her will by her daughter. She cries all the time. It's really sad.

TL Texts:

1- دكتور بالي: وكيف؟
السيدة ماركوني: انه أشبه ما يكون بقاعة نوم طلبة الأقسام الداخلية، فيما عدا أن بعض الأشخاص يتجولون عراة هنا وهناك ويتحدثون مع أنفسهم. أنا وامرأة روسية مسنة نشترك في غرفة واحدة، وأظن أن ابنتها أجبرتها على المجيء إلى هنا وهي تبكي طوال الوقت. إنه لأمر محزن حقاً.

2- دكتور بالي: كيف ذلك؟
السيدة ماركوني: انه أشبه بقسم داخلي، سوى أن البعض يسIRON عراة ويتحدثون إلى أنفسهم. إنني أشاطر امرأة روسية عجوز إحدى الغرف. اعتقد أن ابنتها أنزلتها هنا رغماً عنها. إنها تبكي طوال الوقت. أمر محزن حقاً.

3 - دكتور بالي: هلا شرحت لي كيف؟
السيدة ماركوني: يبدو لي. . كأنها قسم داخلي في كلية، عدا أن بعض النزلاء يتمشون عراة ويتحدثون لأنفسهم. تشاركني غرفتي امرأة روسية كبيرة السن، واعتقد انه جيء بها إلى هنا دون إرادة منها. إنني حقاً حزينة لأجلها فهي دائمة البكاء.

4 - دكتور بالي: كيف ذلك؟
السيدة ماركوني: انه شبيه بمهجع الطلبة، سوى أن بعض الأشخاص يجوبون المكان عراة ويحدثون أنفسهم. وإني في غرفة حيث أشارك امرأة روسية عجوزاً، وأظن أن ابنتها وضعتها هنا كرها؛ فهي لا تكف عن البكاء في كل حين. إنه لأمر مؤسف حقاً.

5- دكتور بالي: إلى أي حد؟
السيدة ماركوني: إنها شبيهة إلى حد ما بالأقسام الداخلية، سوى أن بعض الناس يسIRON عراة ويتحدثون مع أنفسهم، أنا اشترك في الغرفة مع امرأة مسنة من روسيا. اعتقد أن ابنتها رمتها هنا رغماً عن أنفها، فهي تبكي طوال الوقت.

6- دكتور بالي: وكيف ذلك؟
السيدة ماركوني: انه أشبه بالأقسام الداخلية للطلبة غير أن البعض يتجولون عراة في المكان ويتحدثون مع أنفسهم. إنني أقيم في الغرفة مع عجوز روسية. الوقت. الأمر محزن حقاً

Pragmatic and Translational Discussion:

A close look at this exchange, reveals that Dr. Balis' utterance can be identified as the illocutionary act of directives as response to Mrs. Marconi's answer in the previous exchange. Dr. Balis wants Mrs. Marconi to explain why she is unhappy in her staying at the hospital. Nevertheless, Mrs. Marconi's response consists of a series of simple utterances and the whole situation can be identified as the illocutionary act of expressives and assertives since Mrs. Marconi expresses herself concerning her description of the Psychiatric Ward and at the same time she asserts her situation there by describing and reporting. This means that she is expressing her psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about the world of reality that she is living in.

In regard to translation it seems that Dr. Balis' information question was translated semantically by all subjects except subject (5) who translated the question under discussion communicatively. Those who translated Dr. Balis' question semantically succeeded in conveying the contextual meaning which is a feature of the semantic translation. In addition, they used the same syntactic structure for expressing the request.

As for subject (5), he asks about the degree of her unhappiness in the hospital rather than the description of place. Concerning the translation of Mrs. Marconi's expressive and assertive speech acts, it is apparent that all

subjects used a semantic translation except subject (5) used a communicative translation. The semantic translation is revealed clearly because subjects could convey the contextual meaning of the source language text through a descriptive style which is the same as the source language text. However, subject (5) used a communicative translation because he focussed on the force of the message rather than the meaning of the message. His translation is reader biased. The following table is interesting.

Table (3) Speech Act and Translation Analysis

The Proposed Rendering:

دكتور بالي: وكيف؟

Title	Speech Act Categories					No.	Types of Translation.		
	Assert.	Direct.	Comiss.	Express.	Declar.		Sem.	Com.	Fail.
Dr.		+				1	+		
						2	+		
						3	+		
						4	+		
						5		+	
						6	+		
Mrs.	+			+		1	+		
						2	+		
						3	+		
						4	+		
						5		+	
						6	+		

Speech Act Analysis in Conversation With Reference to English – Arabic Translation

Muhammad Tahir Sattam & Osama Misbah Mahmood

السيدة ماركوني: انه اشبه بقسم داخلي لطلبة الكليات. سوى ان بعض الاشخاص يجوبون المكان عراة. ويحدثون أنفسهم. إنني أشارك امرأة روسية مسنة إحدى الغرف. وأظن أن ابنتها وضعتها هنا كرها. فهي لا تكف عن البكاء. أمر محزن حقاً.

SL Text (4):

Dr. Balis: I see.

Mrs. Marconi: The nurses are nice... well, most of them. There's cable TV in the main room.

- 1- دكتور بالي: فهمت
السيدة ماركوني: الممرضات هنا لطيفات أو لنقل معظمهن. ثمة جهاز تلفاز في الغرفة.
- 2- دكتور بالي: آه
السيدة ماركوني: الممرضات لطيفات. . . حسناً أغلبهن. يوجد تلفاز قنوات
سلكية في صالة الجلوس.
- 3 – دكتور بالي: فهمت، ثم ماذا؟
السيدة ماركوني: والممرضات جيدات. . . أعني أغلبهن كذلك.
- 4- دكتور بالي: هكذا إذن!
السيدة ماركوني: أكثر الممرضات لطيفات هنا. . . ويوجد بث تلفزيوني مشترك في الغرفة الرئيسية.
- 5- دكتور بالي: أقدر ذلك.
السيدة ماركوني: الممرضات لطيفات، معظمهن. . . كما أن هناك تلفاز في
الصالة الرئيسية .
- 6- دكتور بالي: حسناً
السيدة ماركوني: الممرضات لطيفات حقاً. . . في الواقع، غالبيةهن.
وهناك تلفاز في الصالة الرئيسية

Pragmatic and Translational Discussion:

A close inspection of this exchange reveals that Dr. Balis' utterance can be identified as the illocutionary act of expressive category as the sign of acknowledging her situation. As for Mrs. Marconi's utterance, it is identified as the illocutionary act of expressive and assertive categories on the situation of the people and facility at the hospital. So the sincerity condition of Dr. Balis' utterance in his wide range of feelings and attitudes represented by his acknowledgement of Mrs. Marconi's response, it seems that the sincerity condition of her utterance is expressing and asserting the situation of the people and facility at the hospital, i. e. describing the world of reality that she is living.

With regard to translation, it is apparent that all subject translators rendered Dr. Balis' utterance communicatively. They conveyed the force of the message and contextual meaning rather than the literal meaning. As for Mrs. Marconi's utterance, it seems that all subject translators used the semantic translation, simply, because they conveyed the literal meaning rather than the contextual meaning. We believe that communicative translation is much better in order to convey the contextual meaning and force of the message. The following table is illustrative.

Table (4) Speech Act and Translation Analysis

Title	Speech Act Categories					No.	Types of Translation.		
	Assert.	Direct.	Comiss.	Express.	Declar.		Sem.	Com.	Fail.
Dr.				+		1		+	
						2		+	
						3		+	
						4		+	
						5		+	
						6		+	
Mrs.	+			+		1	+		
						2	+		
						3	+		
						4	+		
						5	+		
						6	+		

The Proposed Rendering:

دكتور بالي: لقد فهمت.

السيدة ماركوني: حسناً. أستطيع القول أن معظم الممرضات لطيفات في تعاملهن

مع المرضى. كما أود القول بأن هناك تلفاز في الصالة الرئيسية.

SL Text (5):

Dr. Balis: Is there anything you need?

Mrs. Marconi: Hmm, No, thank you.

TL Texts:

1- دكتور بالي: هل أنت بحاجة إلى أي شيء؟

السيدة ماركوني: كلا. أشكرك.

2- دكتور بالي: هل ثمة ما تحتاجين إليه؟

السيدة ماركوني: هممم، كلا، شكراً

3 - دكتور بالي: وهل ينقصك شيء ما؟

السيدة ماركوني: لا لا اعتقد ذلك. شكراً لك.

4 - دكتور بالي: هل تحتاجين شيئاً؟

السيدة ماركوني: هممم، لا، أشكرك.

5- دكتور بالي: أهنأك ما تحتاجينه؟

السيدة ماركوني: أعتقد لا، شكراً.

6- دكتور بالي: هل تحتاجون لأي شيء آخر؟

السيدة ماركوني: كلا، شكراً

Pragmatic and Translational Discussion:

In this exchange, Dr. Balis' utterance is considered as the illocutionary act of directive category since he wonders of the things Mrs. Marconi might need other than what she has got from the hospital. This directive illocutionary act is realized syntactically by polarity question. However, pragmatically, it is considered as the speech act of asking which is in the underlying structure "I ask you to tell me whatever you need".

As for Mrs. Marconi's utterance in this exchange, it can be said that it is identified as the illocutionary act of expressive category as she responds to Dr. Balis' question despite the fact that "hmm" is an indication of hesitation whether or not she needs anything else other than what she has got. Then she replied by saying "No, thank you" that she does not need anything more.

Considering translation, it seems that only subject translator (3) translated Dr. Balis' utterance communicatively. He

Speech Act Analysis in Conversation With Reference to English – Arabic Translation

Muhammad Tahir Sattam & Osama Misbah Mahmood

conveyed the force of the message rather than the literal meaning. This means that his translation is reader biased. Nevertheless, others' translations are semantic. With regard to Mrs. Marconi's utterance which is a polite refusal to Dr. Balis' offer, it seems that all subjects' translations are semantic since they conveyed the literal meaning of the source language text though subjects (1, 3, 5 and 6) deleted the expression "H'm". all what have been said can be summarized by the following table.

Table (5) Speech Act and Translation Analysis

Title	Speech Act Categories					No.	Types of Translation.		
	Assert.	Direct.	Comiss.	Express.	Declar.		Sem.	Com.	Fail.
Dr.		+				1	+		
						2	+		
						3		+	
						4	+		
						5	+		
						6	+		
Mrs.				+		1	+		
						2	+		
						3	+		
						4	+		
						5	+		
						6	+		

The Proposed Rendering:

دكتور بالي: هل أنت بحاجة إلى أي شيء؟
السيدة ماركوني: هممم... كلا. اشكرك.

SL Text (6):

Dr. Balis: Are you sure?

Mrs. Marconi: Yes, I'm O. K.

TL Texts:

- 1- دكتور بالي: هل أنت متأكدة؟
السيدة ماركوني: نعم، أنا بخير.
- 2- دكتور بالي: أنت أكيدة؟
السيدة ماركوني: أجل أنا بخير.
- 3 - دكتور بالي: أأنت متأكدة؟
السيدة ماركوني: نعم إنني على ما يرام.
- 4 - دكتور بالي: أمتأكدة أنت؟
السيدة ماركوني: نعم أنا بخير.
- 5- دكتور بالي: أمتأكدة؟
السيدة ماركوني: نعم
- 6- دكتور بالي: هل أنت متأكدة؟
السيدة ماركوني: نعم أنا على خير ما يرام.

Pragmatic and Translational Discussion:

In this exchange of conversation, it is apparent that Dr. Balis' utterance is identified as the illocutionary act of directive category making sure whether Mrs. Marconi really does not need anything else. Dr. Balis' in his conversation, uses a polarity question which is in the underlying structure a speech act of asking "I ask you if you are sure". As for Mrs. Marconi's utterance, it can be identified as the illocutionary act of both expressive and assertive categories. She expresses her feelings and attitudes and asserts that she does not need anything else and that she is fine and all-right.

Speech Act Analysis in Conversation With Reference to English – Arabic Translation

Muhammad Tahir Sattam & Osama Misbah Mahmood

In regard to translation, it seems that all subject translators used a semantic translation except subject translator (2) who failed in conveying the contextual meaning or even literal meaning because "أنت أكيدة" does not mean "are you sure". It means "are you Mrs. Marconi?". Considering the translation of Mrs. Marconi, it can be said that all subject translators used a semantic translation since they conveyed the literal meaning except subject translator (5) who translated only the word "yes" into "نعم" and neglected the expression "I'm o. k. ". Consequently his translation is a communicative one. What we have said can be illustrated by the following table.

Table (6) Speech Act and Translation Analysis

Title	Speech Act Categories					No.	Types of Translation.		
	Assert.	Direct.	Comiss.	Express.	Declar.		Sem.	Com.	Fail.
Dr.		+				1	+		
						2			+
						3	+		
						4	+		
						5	+		
						6	+		
Mrs.	+			+		1	+		
						2	+		
						3	+		
						4	+		
						5		+	
						6	+		

The Proposed Rendering:

دكتور بالي: هل أنت متأكدة؟

SL Text (7):

Dr. Balis: Good. Well, I really need to be going now. I'll contact you when you're out. Take care of yourself and your baby, Lenore. You'll be okay.

Ms. Marconi: O. K. Thanks for coming, doctor.

TL Texts:

- 1- **دكتور بالي:** طيب، حسناً، أريد الذهاب الآن. سأتصل بك عند خروجك. عليك أن تعتني بنفسك وبطفلك لينور. ستكونين بخير.
السيدة ماركوني: حسناً، شكراً على مجيئك يا دكتور!
- 2- **دكتور بالي:** جيد، حسناً. ينبغي أن اذهب الآن. سأتصل بك بعد مغادرتك المستشفى.
- 3- **دكتور بالي:** حسناً، إذن عليّ الذهاب الآن وسوف اتصل بك عندما تغادرين المكان.
اعتني بنفسك وبالطفل، لينور، ستكونين بخير.
السيدة ماركوني: طيب، شكراً لقدومك يا دكتور.
- 4- **دكتور بالي:** حسناً، عليّ أن اذهب الآن حقاً. وسأتصل بك عند خروجك.
اعتني بنفسك وبطفلك، لينور. لا بأس عليك.
السيدة ماركوني: حسناً، شكراً على مجيئك، (يا) طبيب.
- 5- **دكتور بالي:** هذا جيد، حسناً، عليّ الذهاب الآن، وسأتصل بك عند خروجك، اعتنِ بنفسك وبطفلك، لينور، ستكونين بخير.
- 6- **دكتور بالي:** حسناً، عليّ أن أغانر الآن سأتصل بك عندما تخرجين. اهتمي بنفسك
وطفلك سيدة لينور. ستكونين على ما يرام.
السيدة ماركوني: حسناً. شكراً على زيارتك أيها الطبيب.

Pragmatic and Translational Discussion:

An inspection of this exchange reveals that Dr. Balis' first and second utterances should be identified as the illocutionary act of expressive as he must go. His second utterance is identified as a commissive since he will contact Mrs. Marconi once she is out. The third utterance is to be identified as directive speech act as he asks Mrs. Marconi to take care of herself and her baby.

As for Mrs. Marconi's utterance, it is to be identified as the illocutionary act of expressive category as she expresses her appreciation of Dr. Balis' coming and visiting her.

Regarding translation, it seems that all subject translators translated Dr. Balis' utterances semantically since they conveyed the literal meaning as well as grammatical meaning rather than the contextual meaning and the force of the message.

In our proposed rendering, we will add the expression "إن شاء الله" to the renderings of Dr. Balis' last utterance "you will be okay" since Arab people use "إن شاء الله" "God willing" in such contexts.

The whole discussion can be summarized by using table No (7).

Table (7) Speech Act and Translation Analysis

Title	Speech Act Categories					No.	Types of Translation.		
	Assert.	Direct.	Comiss.	Express.	Declar.		Sem.	Com.	Fail.
Dr.			+	+		1	+		
						2	+		
						3	+		
						4	+		
						5	+		
						6	+		
Mrs.				+		1	+		
						2	+		
						3	+		
						4	+		
						5	+		
						6	+		

The Proposed Rendering:

دكتور بالي: طيب. حسنا. عليّ الذهاب الآن. سأتصل بك بعد مغادرة المستشفى.
اعتن بنفسك لينور وبطفلك. ستكونين إن شاء الله بخير.
السيدة ماركوني: أشكر حضورك دكتور.

SL Text (8):

.Dr. Balis: You're welcome. Goodbye, Lenore

.Ms. Marconi: Bye bye

TL Texts:

- 1- دكتور بالي: عفواً! مع السلامة يا لينور.
السيدة ماركوني: مع السلامة.
- 2- دكتور بالي: اهلا وسهلا، وداعاً لينور!
السيدة ماركوني: مع السلامة!
- 3 - دكتور بالي: عفواً، إلى اللقاء لينور.
السيدة ماركوني: إلى اللقاء
- 4 - دكتور بالي: على الرحب والسعة، إلى اللقاء، لينور.

السيدة ماركوني: مع السلامة.

5- دكتور بالي: على الرحب والسعة، مع السلامة لينور.

السيدة ماركوني: وداعاً، وداعاً

6- دكتور بالي: على الرحب والسعة. وداعاً سيدة لينور.

السيدة ماركوني: وداعاً

Pragmatic and Translational Discussion:

A close examination of this exchange reveals that Dr. Balis' utterance is to be identified as the illocutionary act of expressive category. He expresses his appreciation and his state of departing by using leave-taking expression "Goodbye". Concerning Mrs. Marconi's utterance, it is to be considered as the illocutionary act of expressive category. In fact, Mrs. Marconi appreciates Dr. Balis' departure. She expresses her warm feelings and attitudes by using the informal expression of leave-taking "Bye Bye".

As for translation, it seems that subject translators (1, 3, and 4) rendered Dr. Balis' expressions (leave-taking) communicatively since they conveyed the contextual meaning rather than literal meaning, while subjects (2, 5, and 6) used a semantic translation.

In regard to Mrs. Marconi's utterance, it seems that all subjects translated her utterance of leave-taking semantically except subject (3) who translated it communicatively. As he was after the contextual meaning as well as the force of the message. The above mentioned discussion can be illustrated by table No. (8).

Table (8) Speech Act and Translation Analysis

Title	Speech Act Categories					No.	Types of Translation.		
	Assert.	Direct.	Comiss.	Express.	Declar.		Sem.	Com.	Fail.
Dr.				+		1		+	
						2	+		
						3		+	
						4		+	
						5	+		
						6	+		
Mrs.				+		1	+		
						2	+		
						3		+	
						4	+		
						5	+		
						6	+		

The Proposed Rendering:

دكتور بالي: على الرحب والسعة. مع السلامة لينور.
السيدة ماركوني: مع السلامة.

Conclusions and Suggestions:

The main conclusions that the study arrived at are the following.

(1) Physician – patient conversation involves different categories of speech acts, namely directives (55%), expressives (33%), and commissives (12%) (on the part of the physician), and assertives (33.4%) and expressives (66.6%) (on the part of the patient). This confirms the validity of our main hypothesis.

- (2) Our proposed renderings are based on the principle of the compatibility between the literal meaning, contextual meaning on one hand and the intentional meaning or the force of the message on the other.
- (3) In case of the existence of compatibility between the literal meaning and intentional meaning, a semantic translation was used only (76. 47%). However, in case of the lack of coincidence between the forms of the speech acts and their functions, a communicative translation only (21. 17%).
- (4) The percentages of the types of translation used by subject translators are (76. 47%) semantic, (21. 17%), communicative and (2. 35%) failure. Concerning failure, it can be attributed to the translators ignorance of the basic features of the illocutionary acts as well as the main features of semantic and communicative translations.
- (5) In conversation, it is the intention of the speaker that should be taken into consideration rather than the literal meaning in order to achieve a better communication. This means that translators should be familiarized with the aspects of conversation such as speech acts, inferences and implicatures in order to get the intention of the addresser and thus, give an effective rendering.
- (6) Translators of conversation in general and physician – patient conversation should be well familiarized with the basic features of the language of situational dialogues and conversation as well as the categories of the illocutionary acts.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962): **How to Do Things with Words**, Oxford: Oxford clarendon Press.
- Abercrombie, D. (1972): "Paralanguage". In Laver, J. and Hutcheson, S. (eds.) **Communication in Face-to-Face Interaction**, pp. 64-70.
- Al-Sulaimaan, M. M. D. (1997): **A Study of Three Speech Acts: Promise, Threat, and Warning in Three Shakespearean Tragedies with Reference to their Realization in Arabic**, (Unpublished PhD thesis), University of Mosul.
- Al-Sulaimaan, M. M. D. and Al-Sanjary, L. A. N. (2007): "Intentionality and the Translation of English Legal Verbs in the UNSC Resolutions into Arabic" **J. for Humanities: Tikrit University**, Vol. 14, pp. 25–90.
- Al-Sulaimaan, M. M. D. (2011): **Semantics and Pragmatics**, Mosul: Daar Ibn AL – Atheer Li AL – Tibaa'ti Wa Al – Nashr.
- Beun, R. J. (1989): **The Recognition of Declarative Questions in Information Dialogues** (Unpublished Ph. D Thesis) University of Vrijdag.
- Beun, R. J. (2002): "Context and Form: Declarative or Interrogative, That is the Question". **Manuscript**, No. 654, pp. 106 – 156.

- Beun, R. J. (2004): "Declarative Question Acts: Two Experiments on Identification." **IPO Annual Progress Report**, No. 20, pp. 91 – 98.
- Cartson, R. (2002): **Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication**, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crystal, D. and Davy, D. (1975): **Advanced Conversational English**, London: Longman.
- Hussein, K. H. (1995): **The Structure of Conversation in Arabic with Reference to English**, (Unpublished M. A. Thesis) University of Mosul.
- Laver, J. and Hutcheson, S. (eds.) (1972): **Communication in Face – to - Face Interaction**, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Peccei, J. S. (2010) **Pragmatics**, London: Routledge.
- Robinson, D. (2003) **Performative Linguistics: Speaking and Translating as Doing Things with Words**, London: Routledge.
- Sacks, H. (1972): "On the Analyzability of Stories by Children". In Gumperz, J. and Hymes, D. (eds.): **Sociolinguistics and Anthropology**, pp. 70-92.
- Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E. (1973): "Opening and Closing". **Semiotics**, Vol. 8, pp. 289-327
- Sbisà, M. (1994): "Language and Dialogue in the Framework of the Analytic Philosophy of Ordinary Language. In Weigand, E (ed.), **Concepts of Dialogue**, pp. 159-169.

- Searle, J. R. (1969): **Speech Act Theory**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. and Vanderveken, D. (1985): **Foundations of the Illocutionary Logic**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ventola, E. (1979): "The Structure of Conversation in English". **Journal of Pragmatics**, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 267-298.
- Ventola, E. (1987): **"The Structure of Social Interaction: A Systematic Approach to the Semiotics of Service Encounters**, London: Frances Printer.
- Ventola, E. (1991): **Approaches to the Analysis of Literary Discourse**, Åbo: Åbo Academy University Press.
- Verschueren, J. (1995): "The Pragmatic Return to Meaning". In: **Journal of Linguistic Anthropology**. Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 127-156.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1968): **Philosophical Investigations**, Oxford: Blackwell.

تحليل فعل القول في لغة المحادثة مع الإشارة إلى ترجمته من

الانكليزية إلى العربية

م. محمد طاهر سظام و م. م اسامة مصباح داؤد الحمداني

الملخص

يعد هذا البحث محاولة لتحليل فعل القول في الحوار الذي جرى بين الطبيب النفساني الدكتور "بالي" ومريضته السيدة "ماركوني" في إحدى ردهات مستشفى الأمراض النفسية في ولاية كاليفورنيا الأمريكية بتاريخ الخامس عشر من شباط عام 2010 في الساعة العاشرة صباحا. ويتضمن التحليل تحديد تصانيف أنواع أفعال القول مثل أفعال التأكيد والتوجيه والالتزام والتعبير والتصريح كما صنفها كل من "سيرل" Searle عام (1969) و "سيرل" و "فاندرفيكن" Searle & Vanderveken عام (1985).

ويعد البحث أيضا محاولة لمعرفة كيفية تحقيق الحوار الأنكليزي بين الدكتور بالي والسيدة ماركوني في العربية فضلا عن معرفة أية طريقة ينبغي استخدامها لنقل المقاصد أو القوى التعبيرية لأفعال القول من الأنكليزية إلى العربية. وعلى هذا للأساس تفترض الدراسة (1) بأن الحوار بين الطبيب النفساني والمريضة يتضمن فقط أفعال الإلتزام والتوجيه والتعبير في لغة الطبيب بينما لغة المريضة تتضمن أفعال التأكيد والتعبير ، (2) في حالة وجود التساوق بين المقاصد والنصوص تحقق الترجمة الدلالية نصوصا فاعلة للغة الهدف (3) أما في حالة غياب التطابق بين المقاصد والنصوص فيجب اتباع الترجمة التواصلية.

وأهم نتيجة توصل اليها البحث (من بين نتائج أخرى) هي أن لغة الحوار التي استخدمها الطبيب النفساني تتضمن (55%) افعال التوجيه و (2%) افعال الالتزام و (33%) افعال التعبير بينما تتضمن لغة المريضة (33.4%) افعال التأكيد و (66.6%) افعال التعبير. وهذه النسب تثبت صحة اختبار الفرضية الرئيسة في البحث.