Speech Act as a Basis of Understanding Dialogue Coherence with Reference to English-Arabic Translation

Prof. Misbah M. D. Al-Sulaimaan
(Ph. D. in Linguistics)
Asst. Lecturer Lubna M. Khoshaba
Lebanese French University
Erbil/Kurdistan Region

_____

Abstract

The present study tackles speech act as a basis of understanding dialogue coherence in English and its translation into Arabic. Speech act theory deals with the functions and uses of language; so in the broadest sense, it might be said that speech acts are all the acts we perform through speaking, all the things we do when we speak. This study aims at (1) studying whether Speech Act Theory can be applied to English dialogues, (2) attempting to modify and reframe Searle's felicity conditions according to the categories of speech acts,(3) translating selected samples so as to show how they are realized in Arabic, (4) comparing source language texts with their renderings to show similarities and differences between them, and (5) showing the type of method that has been followed by BBC. committee for rendering the dialogues under investigation.

To achieve the above mentioned aims, the study hypothesizes that: (1) speech acts in English can be translated into Arabic despite the cultural and syntactic divergences between languages in question, (2) both English and Arabic dialogues use a variety of various patterns of speech acts, and (3) there is no one-to-one formal correspondence between speech acts in English and their realizations in Arabic.

The study is based on a corpus of (01) exchanges involving speech acts. These utterances are translated by (BBC). Each exchange analysis is in terms of speech act analysis and translation discussion.

The main findings the study arrived at are: (1) most of speech acts of the utterances belong to directive and assertive categories thus coherence has been achieved.

_____

1. Statement of the Problem

Speech act theory has received a great deal of attention by western linguists and philosophers. However, to the best of our knowledge, no work concerning the study of speech acts as a basis of "understanding dialogue coherence with reference to translation" has been previously appeared. The present study is an attempt to abridge that gap.

Philosophers believe that there is an overlap between different types of speech acts. So, the first problem in this study is how to set felicity conditions for specifying speech acts in dialogues.

The second problem is how to render speech acts from English into Arabic since there are cultural and structural divergences between the two languages.

2. Aims of the Study

This study is an attempt to achieve the following aims:

1. Studying whether Speech Act Theory can be applied to English dialogues.

2. Translating the selected samples so as to show how they are realized in Arabic.

3. Comparing source language exchanges with their renderings to show the similarities and differences between their structures.

4. Showing the type of translation used by BBC. Committee for rendering speech acts in English dialogues into Arabic.

3. Hypotheses

The current study hypothesizes that:

1. Speech acts in English dialogues can be translated into Arabic despite the cultural and structural divergences between the two languages.

2. Both English and Arabic dialogues use a variety of various patterns of speech acts.

4. Procedure and Data Collection

The procedure followed in this study is as follows:

1. Felicity conditions will be used as a model for specifying different types of speech acts.

2. The chosen samples are rendered into Arabic by (BBC).

5. Introduction

Speech act theory has played an important role in the philosophy of language in modern times and aroused an interest among philosophers like Austin (1962) Searle (1969), semanticists Palmer (1981) Lyons (1977) pragmatists Leech (1983) Levinson (1983) and anthropologists Malinowski (1922). As a result, a great amount of literature on speech act theory has been written and published.

Austin gave important lectures on the topics at Harvard in (1955), and was the first philosopher to launch 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 used.

Speech act theory (Austin, 1962 and Searle, 1969) deals with communication in a broader sense which includes the issuing of requesting, apologizing, congratulating, threatening, warning, advising, urging among many other speech acts. (For further details, see Barker: 2004 and Grewendorf and Meggle: 2002).

Searle (1979) classified speech acts into five categories. They are: (1) assertives, (2) directives, (3) commissives, (4) expressives, and (5) declaratives or representatives. In what follows, these characteristics will be explained in some details.

6. Characteristics of Assertives

Assertive speech acts are also known as representative speech acts because they reflect the speaker's as well as the narrative belief. According to Searle, the purpose of assertive class is to commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition. That is to say the speaker wants to make the listener believe the truth of what he or she said. Assertive speech acts are statements of fact, getting the viewer to form or attend a belief. Here, the speaker's words reveal his beliefs and he/she is uttering about external world. English verbs that function as explicit assertive include*: **report, predict, inform, accuse, testify, confess, state, swear, criticize, complain etc.**

Assertive speech acts have word-to-world direction of fit, for individual assertive speech acts achieve success of fit only, if their content is true – that is to say, corresponds to reality.

For example, the following sentence, *It is raining.* Achieves success of fit just in case it is raining. (For further details, see Gary, 2004:57-77).

7. Characteristics of Directives

Directive speech act occurs when the speaker expects the listener to do something as a response. For example, the speaker may ask a question, make a request, or issue an invitation. This class includes commands, suggestion and order etc.

Directive speech acts have world-to-word direction of fit, for individual directive speech acts achieve success of fit only if the addressee sees to it that reality is changed to correspond to their contents. For example, imperative, *Come!* Achieves success of fit just in case the ordered person comes.

8. Characteristics of Commissives

This kind of speech acts refers to "a type of utterance where the speaker makes a commitment to a future course of action" (Crystal: 1985). Commissive speech acts are performed through a relatively small class of verbs like „offer, promise, swear, volunteer, vow, etc.

This kind of speech act even called ***intended act***. In conversation, common commissive speech acts are ***promise*** and ***threats***. The class involves ***promising, vowing, refusing, threatening, pledging, guaranteeing etc***.

Commissive speech acts have world-to-word direction of fit, for individual commissive speech acts achieve success of fit only if the speaker sees to it that reality is changed to correspond to their content. For example, *I shall come.* Achieves success of fit just in case I come.

9. Characteristics of Expressives

Expressive speech act occurs in conversation when a speaker expresses his or her psychological state to the listener. Typical cases are when the speaker thanks, apologizes, or welcomes the listener.
As Searle says (1979):

"Wherever there is a psychological state specified in the sincerity condition, the performance of the act counts as an expression of that psychological state. This law holds whether the act is sincere or insincere, that is whether the speaker actually has the specified psychological state or not. (...) To thank, welcome or congratulate counts as an expression of gratitude, pleasure (at H"s arrival) or pleasure (at H"s good fortune)."

This is true for every class of illocutionary acts not only for expressives. The sincerity condition of expressives is that the speaker has the psychological states that he/she expresses when he/she performs an expressive act. Searle goes on to tell us that this is the case whether or not the speech act is sincere, so that even if I do not believe what I assert, that assertion is still an expression of belief.

Dore (1979: 30) seems to suggest that expressive verbs nonpropositionally convey attitudes or repeat others. He divides them into three types: (1) exclamation which express surprise, delight, or other attitudes, (2) accompaniments that maintain contact by supplying information redundant with respect to some contextual feature (e.g. here you are), and (3) repetitions which repeat prior utterance.

Expressive speech acts have a null or an empty direction of fit, for an individual expressive speech acts serve to express attitudes of the speakers. Although it is presupposed that the attitudes are about exists, the attitudes themselves are part of the speaker's mind and not of reality. For example, *Happy birthday.*
It is assumed that it is addressee's birthday. However, the conveying of the congratulations relates not to reality but to the psychological state of the speaker. (For further details, see Agha, 2005).

10. Characteristics of Declaratives

Searle (1979) defines declarative speech acts as statements that bring about a change in status or condition to an object by virtue of the statement itself. For example, a statement of declaring war or a statement that someone is fired. As soon as addresser utters the words, the very utterance brings about a change in the hearer's world. The prelocutionary effect is immediately felt on the hearer. The class includes ***betting, declaring, resigning, passing a sentence, answering, appointing, nominating, applying, etc***.

It is a kind of illocutionary speech acts. Searle (1979:16-17) states that "the successful performance of one of its members brings about the correspondence between the propositional contents and reality, successful performance guarantees that the propositional content corresponds to the world."

Declarative speech acts have double direction of fit, for individual speech acts change reality in conformity with their content by presenting reality as thus changed. For example, *I appoint you chairman*, achieves success of fit when the appointed person becomes chairman by virtue of declaration.

11. Dialogue Coherence

Dialogue coherence has been identified in various ways. In literature, there are many views of coherence in language and of dialogue coherence in particular. A distinction must be made between coherence and cohesion. Coherence is a kind of impression that arises (or not) in a person who attempts to understand particular language use. In general, it is not language dependent, in the sense that a translation of a coherent text is usually coherent, even the cohesive devices of the source text are absent in the target language. Some studies (Ellis, 1983 and Goldberg, 1983) assume that coherence is produced by design and by appropriate use of cohesive devices.

In contrast, cohesion represents connectedness of text that arises from the use of particular linguistic devices such as pronoun, anaphoric references and repetition etc.

In sum, Coherence refers to the way in which things flow, function together, how they are connected and whether they are consistent. In a conversation, coherence refers to the way the participants cooperate to maintain a reasonably focused thread of conversation.

12. Felicity Conditions

Before starting to analyze the collected data, it is important to propose a model; so the following felicity conditions will be used as models for analyzing the data:

12.1 Felicity Conditions for Specifying Assertives:

Felicity conditions for specifying assertives can be summarized as follows:

1. The Propositional Content Conditions:
a. Speaker expresses the proposition of assertives in his utterance, and
b. predicates a future action.
2. The Preparatory Condition:
Speaker knows the truth of the proposition.
3. The Sincerity Condition:
Speaker believes in the proposition expressed.
4. The Essential Condition:
a. Speaker intends to recognize that the action is in hearer"s interest.
b. Speaker intends to make hearer believe in the actual state of affairs.

12.2 Felicity Conditions for Specifying Directives:

Felicity conditions for specifying directives are as follows:

1. The Propositional Content Conditions:

a. Speaker expresses the proposition of directives in his utterance, and

b. predicates a future action.

2. The Preparatory Conditions:

a. Speaker believes that the hearer will be able to do the action.

b. Speaker believes that it is not obvious to hearer that action will occur.

3. The Sincerity Condition:

a. Speaker wishes the hearer to do the action.

4. The Essential Conditions:

a. Speaker believes that the effect of action is in hearer's interest.

b. Speaker intends to make the hearer recognize the speaker's intention that the action will be advantageous to hearer.

12.3 Felicity Conditions for Specifying Commissives:

Felicity conditions for specifying commissives can be illustrated as follows:

1. The Propositional Content Conditions:

a. Speaker expresses the proposition of commissives in his utterance, and

b. predicates a future action.

2. The Preparatory Conditions:

a. Hearer prefers the act to be done. And speaker knows this.

b. The act does not happen, unless it is brought by speaker.

3. The Sincerity Condition:

Speaker may be sincere or insincere in doing the action.

4. The Essential Condition:

Speaker intends to make hearer believe that speaker intends to put himself under the obligation to do the action.

12.4 Felicity Conditions for Specifying Expressives

Felicity conditions for specifying expressive speech acts are summarized as follows:

1. The Propositional Content Condition:

Speaker expresses the proposition of expressives in his utterance as a reaction to past action.

2. The Preparatory Condition:

Speaker believes that the action is in hearer's interest.

3. The Sincerity Condition:

Speaker wants hearer to be happy.

4. The Essential Condition:

Speaker wants hearer to know that the action is in hearer's interest.

12.5 Felicity Conditions for Specifying Declarations:

Felicity conditions used for specifying declarations are illustrated in the following points:

1. The Propositional Content Condition:

Speaker expresses the proposition of declaration in his utterance which can be implemented by a present course of action

2. The Preparatory Condition:

Speaker is able to carry out the action in his utterance and the hearer knows that the speaker can carry out the action.

3. The Sincerity Condition:

Speaker believes, intends and desires to carry out the action in question.

4. The Essential Condition:

Speaker intends to make the hearer believe that the speaker intends to put himself under an obligation to do the action.

The ground has now been prepared for a full-dress analysis of speech acts. The data to be presented in the following chapter will be analyzed by using FCs as a model for establishing different types of speech acts in BBC dialogues and their realizations in Arabic.

12.6 Pragmatic Translation

Pragmatic translation is a term used to refer to translation which pays attention not only to denotative meaning, but also to the way utterances are used in communicative situations and the way, we interpret them in context. As stated by Baker (1992) pragmatics is a branch of linguistics devoted to "the study of meaning, not as generated by the linguistic system but as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation". This means that a pragmatic translation will, for example, attempt to convey connotative meaning, allusion and interpersonal aspects of communication such as implicature, tone, register and so on. Many insights of pragmatics have been incorporated into various translation theories, including relevance theory.

13. Data Analysis

In this section, the modified model of the FCs for the speech act categories will be applied to different examples derived from BBC dialogues. 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: Good evening, madam. Can I help you?

Teresa: Good evening. I want a single room, please.

TL Exchange:

أساعدك؟ أن اق در د ل . سـ يدت ي ي ا الخ ير مساء :الا سـ ت ق بال موظف
.فـ ضمك من واحد ب سريـ ر غرفة أريـ د .الخ ير مساء :ز ا ت ري

Speech Act and Translation Discussion

The first part of the receptionist's utterance can be identified as speech act of the expressive category since he is attempting to express his psychological state and attitude. However, the second part of his utterance can be considered as directive category, simply, because he is requesting. In other words, the receptionist expresses the proposition of his request in his utterance that he is asking her if she needs any help. The receptionist believes that Teresa will answer him since it is in her interest.

The first part of Teresa's utterance is identified as speech act of the expressive category because it is a type of greeting and she is expressing her psychological state and attitude. Nonetheless, the second part of her utterance is both assertive and directive categories since she is stating and requesting something. i.e. Teresa wants the receptionist to book a room for her at the hotel. However, Teresa believes that the receptionist will book a room and she wants the receptionist to do that.

In regard to TL exchange, the first part of receptionist's utterance is identified as an expressive category because he is expressing his psychological state and attitude since it is a type of greeting. But, the second part of his utterance is considered as directive because he is requesting. i.e. he wants to get Teresa to answer his question regarding if he can help her and he expects her answer. He believes that answering his question will be in her interest.

The first part of Teresa's utterance is identified as expressive category because it is a sort of greeting and she is expressing her psychological state and attitude. Yet, the second part of the utterance can be identified as assertive and directive categories because she is stating and requesting. i.e. she wants a single room at the hotel and she predicates a future action to be done by the receptionist which is booking a room. She also believes that doing what she wants, it will be in her interest and she intends to make the receptionist recognize that booking a room will be good for her.

In the receptionist's utterance, politeness is explicit which is expressed by using the modal verb "can". While in Teresa's utterance, it is expressed by the polite marker "please" and "madam". The receptionist's utterance has no performative verb; therefore it is implicit. However, in Teresa's utterance, there is a performative verb "want" so it is explicit. As for the social relationship between Teresa and the receptionist, both have the same social status; therefore it is a sort of solidarity.

In regard to TL, politeness, in the receptionist's utterance, is expressed by using the particle (هل). Yet, in Teresa's utterance, politeness is expressed by using (فمن فضلك). The receptionist's utterance has no performative verb; therefore it is implicit. Nonetheless, in Teresa's utterance, there is a performative verb (أريـد); so it is explicit.

As for translation, it is clear that the original writer has rendered this exchange pragmatically. 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: Have you booked a room?
Teresa: No I'm afraid not. I didn't know I should be coming until today.
TL Exchange:

موظف بال‌ق‌د‌س الا: دل‌ت‌زجح ؟ة‌فرغ

.يرت‌ا‌ز: لا. م‌ل زجحا ي‌ذأل م‌ل فرعأ ي‌ن‌ذأ ة‌ي‌آ‌ت الإ موي لا‌.

Speech Act and Translation Discussion

A close look at this exchange reveals that receptionist's utterance can be identified as the illocutionary act of directives since he is attempting to get Teresa to give an answer to his question. In other words, he expresses the proposition of his question in his utterance that Teresa has booked a room or not. The receptionist believes that Teresa will answer his question. Moreover, the receptionist believes that answering his question will be good for her and he intends to make her recognize his intention that he will help her.

In regard to Teresa's utterance, both the first and the second parts of her utterance are identified as assertive speech acts because she is confirming the situation. Teresa expresses the proposition of her confirmation in her utterance that she has not booked a room. She also intends to make the receptionist recognize that if he books a room for her, it will be in her interest.

As for TL exchange, receptionist's utterance is identified as speech act of directive category because he is trying to get Teresa to give an answer. In other words, the receptionist expresses the proposition of his question in his utterance that Teresa has booked a room or not and he wants Teresa to answer him. Finally, he believes that answering his question will be in Teresa's interest.

Concerning Teresa's utterance, the first and the second parts of it are identified as speech acts of assertive category because she is asserting something. Teresa expresses the proposition of assertion in her utterance and she predicates a future action that the receptionist will book a room for her.

The receptionist and Teresa's utterances are polite implicitly, simply, because there is explicit no polite marker. In the receptionist and Teresa's utterances, there is no performative verb; so they are implicit. As for the social relationship between Teresa and the receptionist, both have the same social status; therefore it is a type of solidarity.

Regarding TL exchange, both utterances have no explicit polite markers; so they are implicit. In both, there is no performative verb; therefore they are implicit.

Concerning translation, it is obvious that the exchange is pragmatically translated since the meaning is conveyed. All what has been 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: How long did you want to stay?
Teresa: At least a week – possibly longer.

TL Exchange:

موظف بال ة ق د س الا: ما د ي المدة ال تي ك نت د ري د أن يا ض ي ة ت ي ف ؟فندق ال

ت ري ز ا: عمى الأق ل أس بوعا ما و ري ب ث أك.

Speech Act and Translation Discussion

The receptionist's utterance can be identified as speech act of the directive category since he is attempting to get Teresa to give an answer concerning her staying at the hotel. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his question in his utterance that how long Teresa will stay at the hotel. He believes that Teresa will answer him. He also believes that answering him is in her best interest.

As for Teresa's utterance, it is identified as illocutionary act of assertives because she asserts her situation. Teresa expresses the proposition of her assertion in her utterance that she will stay at least a week at the hotel and intends to make the receptionist recognize that she will stay at least a week.

Concerning TL exchange, receptionist's utterance is identified as a speech act of the directive category, simply, because he is attempting to get Teresa to give an answer. The receptionist expresses the proposition of his question in his utterance that how long Teresa will stay at the hotel. He believes that Teresa will answer him. Yet, the receptionist wishes Teresa to give him an answer. He intends to make her recognize his intention that answering him is advantageous to her.

Teresa's utterance can be identified as the assertive category since she is stating how long she will stay at the hotel. Teresa expresses the proposition of her statement in her utterance that she will stay at least a week at the hotel. Teresa intends to make the receptionist recognize that she will stay a week.

The receptionist's utterance has no polite marker; therefore politeness is explicit. As for Teresa's utterance, it does not contain any polite marker; so the politeness is also implicit. Both utterances have no performative verbs; therefore they are implicit. Concerning the social relationship between Teresa and the receptionist, both have the same social status; therefore it a sort of is solidarity.

In TL exchange, since the receptionist's utterance has no explicit polite marker; therefore its politeness is implicit. As for Teresa's utterance, its politeness is implicit because it does not contain explicit polite marker. Both utterances have no performative verb; so they are implicit.

In regard to translation, it is apparent that the original writer has translated this exchange pragmatically. In sum, the following table is shows all what has been said:

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: 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:

...أرى دع يني – ال حاضر ال وق ت ف ي ملآن ال ف ندق . س يدت ي ي ا ل دي نا ما سأرى :الا س ت ق بال موظف

حمام مع ال ثان ي ال ط اب ق ف ي غرف ة ل ك أق دم ش ئت إذا أو ,الأول ال ط اب ق ف ي شاغرة غرف ة د ناك

خاص.

ال س ير ض جة عن ب ع يدة د ادئة عرف ة د ي أط م بو ما ك ل .خاصاً حماماً أح تاج لا ب ال ف عل أذا :ز ا ت ري

.جيداً أذام لا أذا

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 دت ي سي; 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 (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				
Type of Translation	Pragmatic		+		+
	Linguistic				
	Failure				

SL Exchange (5):
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:

الأول الطابق في الغرفة سأعطيك إذًا :الاستقبال بال موظف. جدا ودادةالخمفيةالجيةفيدي.

الغرفة؟ هذه إيجار كم :زائري

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 (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: Three pounds, including breakfast.

Teresa: How about the other meals?

TL Exchange:

موظف بال ست ق دال: ثلاث ة جذ ي ات مع فطور ال.

ري ا ت ز: ف يك ون بوس حا ت عن ي اق ب ؟تاب جو ال

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 (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				
Type of Translation	Pragmatic		+		+
	Linguistic				
	Failure				

SL Exchange (7):
Receptionist: They are charged separately.
Teresa: I"ll take that room, please.

TL Exchange: موظف: الا سـ تـ قـ بال الـ حـ ساب يـ كون لـ كل يـ وجـ بة عمى حدة.

تـ ريـ زا: زـ ضمك مـ نـ ضخ آسـ مك تـ ةـ غرفـ الا!

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 utterances have no perfomative 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 (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				

SL Exchange (8):

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 بال سـ تـ قـ بالاً: حسناً يا سـ يدتي . ولـ كن مـ تكرمـ تـ إملاء بـ ورقة الـ تسجيل ذه دـ نا تعطـ فـ ،اسمك

س فرك؟ جواز ورقم وجـ نسـ يتك، وعـ نواذك،

.يري زا تـ: شك ا رَ. بـ أرغـ أن نـ ظـ وقـ تـ ي فـ ساعة الـ ثامنة الـ صباح أ.

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 (ﻂﻟ); 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 (8):

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 (9):

Receptionist: Would you like early morning tea?

Teresa: Yes, please.

TL Exchange:

موظف بال قـ تـ سـ الا: لـ د بـ يـن تـ رغـ شاي صـ باح الـ باكر؟الـ

ريـ تـ ا زا: مـ عـن مـ ضمك من.

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 (9):

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 (10):
Receptionist: Here is your key, madam. The porter will show you to your room.
TL Exchange:
موظف بال سـ تـ قـ بال الا: يمضـ فـ تـ ذا ر فـ تاح م فـ تك غرفـ ا ي ر ي دتـ سـ ! كـ دلـ يـ سـ و الحمال يا ي عم.

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 (تفضلي and سيدتي).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 (10):

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				

14. Conclusions

The present study has come up with the following conclusions:

1. The findings confirm that the dialogues under investigation contain different types of speech act categories such as directives and assertives.

2. Most utterances of the dialogues consist of assertive and directive speech acts and others like commissive and expressive speech acts. This repetition of these categories means that speech acts can be considered as a basis of understanding dialogue coherence.

3. Speech acts can be translated into Arabic despite any cultural and structural differences between English and Arabic.

4. There is one-to-many formal correspondence between speech acts in English and their Arabic realizations. For example, the English polite marker "please" has more than three realizations in Arabic أرجوك, رجاءاً, فا ط ل خ لا....

5. Different types of speech acts have been found in the utterances in question. Most of them are implicit without performative verbs. This means that they are indirect speech acts. This indirectness reveals the politeness nature of touristic language.

6. With reference to the syntactic structures of the utterances in question, it has been found that all of them are of active structures.

7. With reference to politeness theory, it has been found that there is one type of relationship which is solidarity. This kind of relationship can be attributed to the politeness features of touristic language.

References

1. Agha, R. (2005): Expressive Speech Acts in English News Reports with Reference to their Realizations in Arabic. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis), University of Mosul.
2. Austin, J. L. (1962): How to Do Things with Words, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Baker, M. (1992): In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation, London and New York: Routledge. Barker, S. (2004): Renewing Meaning: A Speech-Act Theoretic Approach. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Crystal, D. (1985): A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
5. Dore, J. (1979): "Children"s Illocutionary Acts". In: Freedle, R. (ed.), Discourse Comprehension and Production, pp.20-60.
6. Ellis, D. G. (1983): "Language, Coherence and Textuality. In: Craig, R. T. and Tracy, K. (eds). Conversational Coherence: Form Structure and Strategy Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, pp.222-240. Gary, W. (2004): "Asserting and promising". Philosophical Studies, 117:pp.57–77.
7. Goldberg, J. A. (1983): "A Move Toward Describing Conversational Coherence". In: Craig, R. T. and Tracy, K. (eds). Conversational Coherence: Form Structure and

Strategy Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, pp.25-45. Grewendorf, G. and Meggle, G. (2002): Speech Acts, Mind and Social Reality, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

8. Leech, G. (1983): Principles of Pragmatics, London: Longman Group Ltd, pp.101-106.

9. Levinson, S. C. (1983): Pragmatics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

10. Lyons, J. (1977): Semantics: Vol.1 and 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Malinowski, B. (1922): Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

11. Palmer, F. R. (1981): Semantics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

12. Searle, J. R. (1969): Speech Act Theory: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

13. _____ (1979): (ed.): Expression and Meaning, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Text Analyzed

BBC English Course: *What to Say and Its Rendering.*