

The Speech Act of Complaining In English-Arabic Translation

Dr. Misbah M.D. Al-sulaimaan (*)

Kawkab S. Muhammed (**)

ABSTRACT

Speech Act Theory was laid down by Austin (1962) and developed by Searle (1969). They provide us a new discipline for studying language by seeing it within a frame of social context rather than isolated sentences. Their belief is based on how meaning and action are related to language. The present paper aims at (1) formulating a set of felicity conditions for the performance of the speech act of complaining. (2) deriving some semantic rules for the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device, (3) showing how the speech act under discussion is realized in Arabic, (4) finding the strategies used by translators for rendering this speech act. and (5) proposing a new rendering in case of translators' failure.

1. THE SPEECH ACT OF COMPLAINING

The act of complaining is an utterance of pain, displeasure, disapproval, grievance, annoyance, unhappiness and dissatisfaction.

(*) Assistant Professor -Department of Translation - College of Arts / University of Mosul.

(**) Assistant Lecturer -Department of Translation - College of Arts / University of Mosul.

In the act of complaining, the speaker expresses his reaction to a past or ongoing action which has unfavourable consequences on him. This complaint is addressed to the hearer whom the speaker holds responsibility for the offensive act (cf. Olshtain & Weinbach, 1987:195). This speech act has been listed under different categories by many scholars from different perspectives. In what follows, we will shed some light on some of these views for a better understanding of this speech act.

1.1. Complaining as a Behabitive Act

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

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

Austin (1962) lists the speech act of complaining within Behabitives and says:

“Behabitives include the notion of reaction to other people’s behaviour and fortunes and of attitudes and expressions of attitudes to someone else’s past conduct or imminent conduct”.

(Austin, 1962:159)

Giving this definition complaining according to Austin’s classification is considered as a kind of performatives concerns behaviour towards others to exhibit attitudes and feelings. It is worthy to note that Austin’s Behabitives are included amongst Searle’s Expressives.

1.2. Complaining as an Expressive Act

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

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

The performance of an expressive act establishes an interpersonal relation between the speaker and the hearer because

the former expresses a psychological state brought about by a state of affairs that involves the latter. From this point Haverkate (1984:23) considers expressives to be “speaker and hearer centred acts”, in which the speaker is neither trying to get the world to match his words, nor the words to match the world. Expressives then have no direction of fit. The speaker simply expresses a mental state about a state of affairs represented in the propositional content (Vanderveken, 1994:106).

Trosborg (1995:236) relates this speech act to the category of expressives. This category includes moral judgements which express the speaker’s approval & disapproval of the behaviour mentioned in the speaker’s judgement. In a complaint, the speaker expresses a moral judgement on something that the complainee has already done, or failed to do or is in the process of doing:

“In a complaint, the speaker communicates his/her negative feelings towards the hearer, who is made responsible for a prior action which was against the speaker’s interests”.

(Trosborg, 1995:10)

1.3. Complaining as a Conflictive Act

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

(1) Competitions, (2) Convivials, (3) Collaboratives and (4) Conflictives.

In this paper, the final type will be of our concern. The illocutionary goal of this category conflicts with the social goal. In this class (which includes part of Searle's category) S expresses negative feelings & reactions towards H. Thus Leech (1983:104) demonstrates that "politeness is out of the question" because they cause offence. In the case of complaining, the relationship between S & H may be threatened. Taking into consideration what is polite or impolite, S may rely on using mitigating devices in performing this type of speech acts. Trosborg (1995:277) points out that such strategies are needed to lessen the impact of the complaint on the complainee to avoid conflicts in communication. Complaining then, to use Trosborg's terminology, is an "abusive act"

1.4. Complaining as a FTA

Language has numerous means by which people can express their feelings: one of the most effective ways to ensure and accomplish communication is the use of politeness strategies. Trosborg (1995:19) defines politeness as a "desire to protect self image and hearer's face". The notion of "face" is taken from Brown & Levinson's (1978, 1987) theory of linguistic behaviour in terms of two major categories: Positive & negative politeness. Face means the public self image of a person. It refers to that emotional

and social sense of oneself that every one has and expects everyone else to recognize (Brown & Levinson, 1978: 19, 1987:60; Liao, 1994: 12 and Yule, 1996:130).

In Brown & Levinson's terminology a complaint is considered as a FTA (Face Threatening Act) since it costs H's face. Edmondson's (1981) conception of a complaint is that S assumes H responsible for committing a social offensive act which constitutes ground for the complaint. (Edmondson, 1981:496, and Edmondson & House, 1981:145).

Although complaining is a FTA and "politeness is out of the question" as Leech (1983:104)states, S may attempt to minimize the threatening or cost to H. S can choose an option of a severity scale ranging from the most severe case (which includes sanctions against H), to the least one, i.e. not carrying out the complaint (Olshtain & Wienbach, 1987:197, and Murphy & Neu, 1996:191).

From what have been said, we may conclude that the act of complaining is an utterance in which S expresses his feeling (annoyance, disapproval, etc.) because of a past or an ongoing act. It is not always that H is responsible for that past A. Sometimes H plays the role of the agent as in the following example:

1. Oh, you step on my foot. (H is responsible
for A).

In some other cases, one may complain to someone who is considered as a complaine, but not as an agent. When one suffers from certain pain, one would say:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>2. <i>That hurts.</i></p> <p>3. <i>It pains me.</i></p> <p>4. <i>Oh, my God!</i></p> | <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="border-left: 1px solid black; border-right: 1px solid black; height: 40px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-top: 1px solid black; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> </div> | <p><i>H is not responsible</i></p> <p><i>for the past A.</i></p> |
|---|---|--|

2. THE STRUCTURE OF THE SPEECH ACT OF COMPLAINING

Giving these defining properties of the speech act of complaining, we should know the conditions under which this speech act may be correctly performed. Searle (1969:54-71) proposes a set of felicity conditions for performing the act of promising and claims that one can formulate other conditions for other types of speech acts. If any of these conditions are not obtained, the speech act in question would be performed insincerely.

Norrick (1978) provides an analysis in which he attempts to differentiate the members of expressives and discuss their social function. Norrick (1978:277) points out that S presupposes a proposition to express a state of affairs and this proposition is to be of the “factive” kind. He also suggests three conditions that must be obtained for the successful performance of the expressive illocutionary act.

1. The Factive Condition

According to Norrick's view, the correct performance of any expressive act requires S's acceptance of a certain state of affairs. Also, S must presuppose the truth of the propositional content of that expressive act, Norrick's "factive presupposition" stands for Grice's (1975) conversational implicature (cf. Grice, 1975) in that S is expressing the emotion he expresses and involves many assumptions beyond the semantic level (Norrick, 1978:282).

2. The Value Judgement Condition

This, and the following condition, are Searle's (1969) preparatory condition. In this condition, S is required to make his value judgement with regard to the effect of the state of affairs (Norrick, 1978:283). If we try to apply this to the act of complaining, we may conclude that S feels that the state of affairs has affected him, and thus he makes his value judgement of that offensive act.

3. The Role Identification Condition

Another constraint that is necessary for performing an expressive act successfully is that S identifies the role of: "agent" (who is responsible for the state of affairs), "patient", and in some other cases an "observer" (a person cognizant of the state besides the patient). If S fails to identify who is the agent, he will be

ignorant to whom he is directing his complaint and there will be no complaining at all.

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

Schematically:

(Agent) / Value / (Patient) (Observer)

*C indicating optionality.

// offers the choice of positive or negative act.

In a complaint, Norrick's formula would be:

Agent = addressee, Value = negative, patient = speaker in which addressee is responsible for the state of affairs, but also:

Agent = O, value = negative, patient = speaker, Observer = hearer in which hearer is not the agent, he only fills the role of an observer.

Olshtain & Wienbach (1987) propose another set of precondition for the fulfilment of the speech act of complaining. They are as follows:

a.S expected a favourable event to occur (e.g. an appointment or an unfavourable event to be prevented from occurring) (e.g. damage).

The act results; therefore, not as **S** expected.

b. S views A to have unfavourable consequence for him.

c. **S** views **H** is responsible for **A**.

d. **S** chooses to express his frustration verbally.

Our next step is to set some felicity conditions for the successful performance of complaining taking into consideration Searle's (1969) general framework of Felicity Conditions, Norrick's (1978) proposal, and Olshtain & Wienbach (1987) set of felicity conditions:

1. ***The Propositional Content Condition***

S expresses the proposition of complaint in his utterance in the hope that **H** will alter this offensive state of affairs in future.

2. ***The Preparatory Conditions***

a. Past **A** done by **H**.

b. **A** has an unhappy consequences on **S**.

c. **S** views **H** as responsible for **A**.

3. ***The Sincerity Condition***

S feels unhappy for a past **A** done by **H**.

4. ***The Essential Condition***

S's utterance counts as an expression of annoyance (disapproval) to make **H** recognize that the past **A** does not satisfy **S**.

From the above mentioned set of felicity conditions, we will derive some semantic rules for the use of the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device:

1. *The Propositional Content Rule*

Complaining is to be uttered only in the context of a sentence, the utterance of which put responsibility.

2. *The Preparatory Rules*

a. The proposition of complaining is to be uttered only if there is a past A which has unhappy consequences on S.

b. Use the proposition of complaining only if S views H responsibility for A.

3. *The Sincerity Rule*

Complaining is to be uttered only if S feels unhappy for A.

4. *The Essential Rule*

The proposition of complaining is to be uttered only if S's utterance counts as an expression of annoyance to make H recognize that the past A does not satisfy S.

3. DATA ANALYSIS

The following procedure is an application of the suggested set of felicity conditions to the data collected from Hemingway's Novel. **A Farewell to Arms** (ten texts). The analysis includes also a comparison of the English text and the Arabic renderings. For economical reasons, alphabetic letters will be used instead of writing the full names of the Arab translators (Ba'labackey: A, Urabey: B, Nayef: C, Naseem: D, and Yousif: E).

Text No. 1 and its Renderings

<i>The English Text</i>	<i>The Arabic Renderings</i>	
You're dirty	A	انك وسخ
	B	يظهر ان جسديك قد اتسخ كثيرا
	C	انك وسخ
	D	يظهر ان جسديك قد اتسخ كثيرا
	E	يظهر ان جسديك قد اتسخ كثيرا

Interpretation

speaker (Rinaldi) expresses his annoyance to his friend Enrico, who comes back to battle field. Enrico's smell is very useful He wants to kiss Rinaldi, the latter becomes annoyed and accuses him of being dirty.

Speech Act Analysis

1. *The Proportional Content Condition*

Rinaldi expresses his annoyance by saying "you're dirty" in the hope that Enrico would have a shower.

2. *The Preparatory Conditions*

- a. Enrico was very dirty.
- a. Being so, Rinaldi became annoyed,
- b. Rinaldi views that Enrico is responsible for his annoyance.

3. *The Sincerity Condition*

Rinaldi is unsatisfied because of Enrico's bad smell.

4. *The Essential Condition*

Rinaldi's utterance counts as an expression of annoyance to Enrico who recognizes that his bad smell annoyed Rinaldi.

Text Analysis

<i>Subject</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Arabic</i>
Mood	Indicative	Indicative (A,B,C,D, & E)
Agent	First Person Singular	First Person Singular (A,B,C,D,& E)
Subject	Second Person Singular	Second Person Singular (A &C)
		Third Person Singular (B,D & E)
Tense	Present	Present (A,B,C,D, & E)
Voice	Active	Active (A,B,C,D, & E)
Type of SA	Direct	Direct (A &C) Indirect (B,D & E)

Discussion

It is clear that A, and C succeed to render this direct complaint in English into a direct complaint in Arabic if this strategy is used by the speaker to convey the severity of his complaint against the hearer who is responsible for this annoyance

Text No. 2 and its Rendering

<i>The English Text</i>	<i>The Arabic Renderings</i>	
I can't	A	لا أستطيع
	B	لا أستطيع
	C	لا أستطيع
	D	لا أستطيع
	E	لا أستطيع

Interpretation

Enrico is in the hospital. His knee is wounded. A doctor comes and as he tries to move Enrico's leg, the latter screams that he can't.

Speech Act Analysis

1. The Propositional Content Condition

Enrico expresses his pain by saying that he can't in the hope that the doctor will stop moving Enrico's leg.

2. The Preparatory Conditions

- a. Enrico's wounded leg was moved by the doctor
- b. Doing so, Enrico suffers pain.
- c. Enrico considers the doctor to be responsible for his pain.

3. The Sincerity Condition

Enrico feels of pain because the doctor moved his leg.

4. The Essential Condition

Enrico's utterance counts as a complaint to make the doctor stop touching & moving Enrico's leg.

Text Analysis

<i>Subject</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Arabic</i>
Mood	Indicative	Indicative (A,B,C,D,&E)
Agent	First Person Singular	Implicit First Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Subject	First Person Singular	Implicit First Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
		Third Person Singular (B, D & E)
Tense	Present	Present (A,B,C,D, & E)
Voice	Active	Active (A,B,C,D, & E)
Type of SA	Direct	Direct (A,B,C,D, & E) Indirect (B,D & E)

Discussion

There is a unanimous agreement by the five translators to render the ST "I cannot" into "لا أستطيع" the TL which fits the situation in which it occurs. the speaker uses the direct strategy to express the degree of his pain aiming that the hearer would stop doing this offensive action towards the speaker. "لا أستطيع" then, is an appropriate rendering of the ST.

Text No. 3 and its Renderings

<i>The English Text</i>	<i>The Arabic Renderings</i>	
That hurts	A	ان هذا يوجعني
	B	انها تؤلمني كثيرا
	C	هذا يؤلمني
	D	انها تؤلمني كثيرا
	E	انها تؤلمني كثيرا

Interpretation

Once again the doctor tries to move Enrico’s wounded leg.

Speech Act Analysis

1. *The propositional content condition*

Enrico expresses his pain by saying “that’s hurt” in the hope that the doctor would leave him in peace.

2. *The Preparatory Conditions*

- a. Enrico’s wounded leg pains him very much.
- b. Enrico suffers because his wounded leg was moved by doctor.
- c. Enrico views that the doctor is responsible for his pain.

3. *The Sincerity Condition*

Enrico suffers from pain because the doctor moved his leg.

4. *The Essential Condition*

Enrico’s utterance counts as an expression of pain to make the doctor recognize that moving Enrico’s leg make Enrico suffer.

Text Analysis

<i>Subject</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Arabic</i>
Mood	Indicative	Indicative (A,B,C,D,&E)
Agent	Implicit 3 rd Person Singular	First Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Subject	Implicit 3 rd Person Singular	Third Person Singular (A,B,C,D,&E)
		Third Person Singular (A,B,C,D,&E)
Tense	Present	Present (A,B,C,D, & E)
Voice	Active	Active (A,B,C,D, & E)
Type of SA	Indirect	Direct (A,B,C,D, & E)

Discussion

In the ST, speaker expresses his pain but, avoids direct reference to H and S. Also reference to the offensive act is done in vague manner.

This strategy is used to avoid an open face threatening. In Arabic this SA is realized differently by the five translators. Thus we don't agree with their renderings. Our proposed rendering will be is: ان ذلك مؤلم .

Text No. 4 and its Renderings

The English Text	The Arabic Rnderungs	
I don't want to hear about it	A	لا أريد ان اسمع شيئاً عن ذلك
	B	لا أريد سماع شيء عنه
	C	لا أريد أن اسمع شيئاً عن ذلك
	D	لا أريد السماع عنها. يكفي
	E	لا أريد سماع شيء عنه

Interpretation

Enrico & Catherine are talking. Catherine told him that she is pregnant. He became angry. Catherine went on talking about this subject. He complained that he doesn't want to talk about it.

Speevh Act Analysis

1. The Propostional Content Condition

Enrico expresses the proposition of his annoyance in his

utterance in the hope that Catherine stop talking about it.

2. The Preparatory Condition

- a. A previous utterance by Catherine.
- b. Catherin’s utterance annoyed Enrico.
- c. Enrico views Catherine to be responsible for his annoyance.

3. The Sincerity Condition

Enrico feels unhappy and angry.

4. The Essential Condition

Enrico’s utterance counts as an expression of annoyance to make Catherine realize that she is the reason behind Enrico’s annoyance.

Text Analysis

<i>Subject</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Arabic</i>
Mood	Indicative	Indicative (A,B,C,D,&E)
Agent	First Person Singular	Implicit First Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Subject	First Person Singular	Implicit First Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Tense	Present	Present (A,B,C,D, & E)
Voice	Active	Active (A,B,C,D, & E)
Type of SA	Direct	Direct (A,B,C,D, & E)

Discussion

Enrico becomes angry when he knew that Catherine is pregnant. He expresses this directly to show the degree of his

annoyance. When this text is rendered into Arabic, we find a unanimous agreement by the five translators to use the same strategy which in our opinion is an appropriate one to render this speech act.

Text No. 5 and its Renderings

<i>The English Text</i>	<i>The Arabic Renderings</i>	
Don't you know That you can't touch An officer?	A	ألا تعلم انه ليس ميسورك أن تمس ضابطا
	B	ألا تعلم انك لا تستطيع لمس الضابط
	C	ألا تعلم انه ليس على ميسورك أن تمس ضابط
	D	ألا تعلم انك لا تستطيع لمس الضابط
	E	ألا تعلم انك لا تستطيع لمس الضابط

Interpretation

Enrico & his group run away from the battle. The military police catch him. One of the military police takes him by the collar. Enrico complains that he has no right to humiliate an officer.

Speech Act Analysis

1. The Propositional Content Condition

Enrico expresses the proposition of his annoyance in his utterance in the hope that the complainee would leave him.

2. The Preparatory Conditions

- a. Someone catches Enrico from his collar.
- b. Enrico becomes upset and angry.
- c. Enrico considers the complainee responsible for his anger

3. *The Sincerity Condition*

Enrico feels unhappy and angry because someone tries to humiliate him.

4. *The Essential Condition*

Enrico's utterance counts as an expression of complaining to make the complainee recognize that catching Enrico from his collar annoyed him.

Text Analysis

<i>Subject</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Arabic</i>
Mood	Indicative	Indicative (A,B,C,D,&E)
Agent	First Person Singular	First Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Subject	Second Person Singular	Implicit Second person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Tense	Present	Present (A,B,C,D, & E)
Voice	Active	Active (A,B,C,D, & E)
Type of SA	Indirect	Indirect (A,B,C,D, & E)

Discussion

The speaker chooses to use this indirect speech act to show the implied threatening in his complaint. If the hearer is not going to change the state of affairs which annoys the speaker, the latter would go on in the accomplishment of the implied threatening in his complaint. When this text is rendered into Arabic, there is a

tendency (in all renderings) to follow the English text word by word. As a result, we find that all renderings do not convey the degree of severity in the act of complaining as it is found in the ST. Our suggested translation could be

ألا تعلم بأنه ليس من حقه الاعتداء على أي ضابط؟

Text No. 6 and its Renderings

<i>The English Text</i>	<i>The Arabic Renderings</i>	
I can't wait six months to be operated	A	أنا لا أستطيع أن انتظر ستة اشهر لأجراء العملية الجراحية
	B	لا أستطيع الانتظار ستة اشهر
	C	أنا لا أستطيع الانتظار ستة اشهر لأجراء العملية
	D	لا أستطيع الانتظار ستة اشهر
	E	لا أستطيع الانتظار ستة اشهر

Interpretation

Enrico is in the hospital, because his leg is wounded. The doctor tells him that he will have an operation after six months. Enrico complains that he cannot wait for six months in order to have an operation.

Speech Act Analysis

1. The Propositional Content Condition

Enrico expresses the proposition of complaining in his utterance in the hope that the doctor would change the date of his operation.

2. The preparatory Conditions

- a. Enrico's operation is to be after six months.
- b. Waiting for six months to be operated upsets Enrico.
- c. Enrico views that the doctor is responsible for this delay.

3. The Sincerity Condition

Enrico is not satisfied about waiting for six months for the operation.

4. The Essential Condition

Enrico's utterance counts as an expression of disapproval to make the doctor recognise that making Enrico's operation after six months is unfavourable to Enrico.

Text Analysis

Subject	English	Arabic
Mood	Indicative	Indicative (A,B,C,D & E)
Agent	First Person Singular	First Person Singular (A,B,C,D & E)
Subject	First Person Singular	First Person Singular (A,B,C,D & E)
Tense	Present	Present (A,B,C,D & E)
Voice	Active	Active (A,B,C,D & E)
Type of SA	Direct	Direct (A,B,C,D & E)

A refusal is used here as a kind of strategy for expressing the act of complaining. The complainer uses this strategy to convey the degree of his complaint and that waiting for six months is unfavourable to him. The translators use this strategy successfully since it is found in Arabic.

Text No. 7 and its Renderings

<i>The English Text</i>	<i>The Arabic Renderings</i>	
What's the meaning of this?	A	7
	B	ما بك؟
	C	ما معنى هذا كله؟
	D	ما بك؟
	E	ما بك؟

Interpretation

One of the military police catches Enrico and pulls his arms up. Enrico tries to resist, but he could not.

*Speech Act Analysis***1. The Propositional Content Condition**

a. Enrico expresses the proposition of complaining in his utterance in the hope that the military policeman would treat him kindly.

4. The Preparatory Conditions

- a. Someone treats Enrico unkindly.
- b. Enrico becomes angry and upset for being humiliated.
- c. Enrico views the policeman responsible for the offensive action.

5. The Sincerity Condition

Enrico feels unhappy because someone humiliates him.

6. The Essential Condition

The Speech Act of Complaining Dr. Misbah M.D. Al-Sulaimaan & Kawkab Salim

Enrico's utterance counts as an expression of annoyance to make the military policeman recognize that treating Enrico unkindly makes Enrico unhappy and this severe treatment is a sort of humiliation for him.

Text Analysis

<i>Subject</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Arabic</i>
Mood	Indicative	Indicative (A,B,C,D, & E)
Agent	First Person Singular	Implicit Second Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Subject	First Person Singular	Implicit Second Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Tense	Present	Verbless (A,B,C,D, & E)
Voice	Active	-----
Type of SA	Indirect	Indirect (A,B,C,D, & E)

Discussion

Enrico (the complainer) chooses to express annoyance of the offensive state, but avoids direct reference to complaine. Also, the reference to the offensive act is done indirectly using Interrogative strategy in a very obvious hint that the state of affairs is considered offensive by the complainer. In all renderings this speech act is realized by the use of interrogative strategy. Since Arabic uses this strategy and it conveys the indirect complaint, one can say that it is appropriate.

Text No. 8 and its Renderings

<i>The English Text</i>	<i>The Arabic Renderings</i>	
Oh, It doesn't work	A	اوه انه لم يعد يعمل

any more	B	انه لا يصلني
	C	انه لم يعد يعمل
	D	انه لا يصلني
	E	لا يصلنيأه

Interpretation

Catherine is going to give birth. She suffers from dreadful pains. From time to time, Enrico has to place the rubber mask over her face to give her gas for minimizing pains.

Speech Act Analysis

1. The propositional Content Condition

Catherine expresses the proposition of her complaint in her utterance in the hope that Enrico would give her some more gas.

1. The Preparatory Conditions

- a.* It seems that the gas cylinder does not work any more.
- b.* As a result, Catherine's pains increase.
- c.* Catherine views that Enrico is responsible for turning the dial of the gas cylinder.

2. Sincerity Condition

Catherine feels pains because the gas cylinder doesn't work any more.

3. The Essential Condition

Catherine's utterance counts as an expression of complaining to make Enrico recognize that he is responsible for her pains.

Text Analysis

<i>Subject</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Arabic</i>
Mood	Indicative	Indicative (A,B,C,D, & E)
Agent	First Person Singular	First Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Subject	Third Person Singular	Third Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Tense	Present	Present (A,B,C,D, & E)
Voice	Active	Active (A,B,C,D, & E)
Type of SA	Indirect	Indirect (A,B,C,D, & E)

Discussion

In performing this speech act, the complainer avoids reference to himself or to the complaine. This strategy is used when S wants to avoid an open face threatening. In Arabic the translators rendered it successfully since Arabic uses this strategy.

Text No. 9 and its Renderings

<i>The English Text</i>	<i>The Arabic Renderings</i>	
Good Christ	A	يا الهي
	B	يا الهي
	C	يا الهي
	D	يا الهي
	E	يا الهي

Interpretation

Enrico is the military hospital because his leg is wounded and there are some fractures in his head. When the doctor presses his head, Enrico complains “Good Christ!”.

Speech act Analysis

1. *The Propositional Content Condition*

Enrico expresses the proposition of complaining in his utterance in the hope that the doctor wouldn't press on Enrico's wounded head.

2. *The Preparatory Conditions*

- a.** Enrico got some fractures in his head and the doctor pressed on that wounded head.
- b.** Pressing the wound makes Enrico suffer some pains.
- c.** Enrico considers the doctor responsible for his pains.

3. *The Sincerity Condition*

Enrico feels great pain in his head.

4. *The Essential Condition*

Enrico's utterance counts as an expression of complaining to make the doctor recognize that pressing on Enrico's head increases his pains.

Text Analysis

<i>Subject</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Arabic</i>
Mood	Indicative	Indicative (A,B,C,D, & E)
Agent	First Person Singular	First Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)

The Speech Act of Complaining Dr. Misbah M.D. Al-Sulaimaan & Kawkab Salim

Subject	Third Person Singular	-----
Tense	Verbless	Verbless (A,B,C,D, & E)
Voice	-----	-----
Type of SA	Indirect	Indirect (A,B,C,D, & E)

Discussion

It is worthy to note that avoidance of explicit mention of the offensive event leads to minimization of face threatening act of the complaine. In Arabic this strategy is available, and thus the translators succeeded to render “Good Christ” into " يا الهي " .

Text No. 10 and its Renderings

<i>The English Text</i>	<i>The Arabic Renderings</i>	
Oughf	A	أف
	B	No translation
	C	أف
	D	No translation
	E	No translation

Interpretation

Enrico comes back to the battle field. He is very dirty. He is leaning to Rinaldi to kiss him. Rinald become upset because of Enrico’s bad smell.

Speech Act Analysis

1. The Propositional Content Condition

Rinaldi expresses the proposition of complaining in his utterance in the hope that Enrico would take a shower.

2. *The Preparatory conditions*

- a. Enrico is very dirty and smells bad.
- b. Being so, Rinaldi becomes annoyed.
- c. Rinaldi views Enrico responsible for this annoyance.

4. *The Sincerity Condition*

Rinaldi feels annoyed because Enrico smells bad.

5. *The Essential Condition*

Rinaldi's utterance counts as an expression of annoyance to make Enrico recognize that being dirty is the reason of this annoyance.

Text Analysis

<i>Subject</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Arabic</i>
Mood	Indicative	Indicative (A,B,C,D,& E)
Agent	First Person Singular	First Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Subject	Third Person Singular	Third Person Singular (A,B,C,D, & E)
Tense	Verbless	Verbless (A,B,C,D, & E)
Voice	-----	-----
Type of SA	Indirect	Indirect (A,B,C,D, & E)

Discussion

In this speech act, no reference is made to the speaker, hearer, or even to the offensive act to avoid the face threatening. To compare this formula with the Arabic renderings we find that the translators succeeded to convey the exact degree of complaining.

3.2. Findings, Discussion and Conclusions

The Preceding analysis has a twofold focus. First it is an application of the suggested model to the data to provide a pragmatic analysis of complaining. Second it attempts to show how this speech act is realized in Arabic. The findings show that the performance of this speech act differs with regard to the directness level. A speaker sometimes expresses his annoyance, anger, disapproval, etc., by using direct complaint. Other times, he avoids embarrassing the complainees and leans on using indirect strategies to soften his complaint.

In some cases, we find that the complainer is not directing his complaint to the hearer, but to a third party:

Good Christ! يا الهي

We also come across some other cases in which the hearer has nothing to do with the offensive event, and he is unable to change the state of affairs that the complainer suffers from:

I hurt like a hell ان الآلام تمزقتني

We may conclude the following categories concerning the referential structure of the speech act of complaining:

A. Reference to Speaker Hearer, and the Offensive

Act:

Examples:

I have been having some pains, darling.

أي أفاسي من بعض الألام أيها الحبيب.

Oh! darling, I hurt dreadfully

اوه أيها الحبيب واني أتوجع توجعا رهيبا.

B. Reference to Hearer & the Offensive Act:

Examples:

You're dirty.

انك وسخ

Don't you know that you cannot touch an officer?

ألا تعلم انه ليس في ميسورك ان تمس ضابطا؟

You ask a great many questions

ان كم أنت كثير الأسئلة؟

C. Reference to Speaker & the Offensive Event

Examples

I cannot wait six months to be operated.

أنا لا أستطيع الانتظار ستة اشهر لإجراء العملية.

I am awfully tired.

اني متعبة إلى مخيف

I don't want my leg to be fooled with by a first captain

لا أريد يعبت برجلي الكابتن الأول.

D. No Reference to Speaker & Hearer

Examples

Oughf

أف

That hurts.

هذا يؤلمني

It does not work.

انه لم يعد يعمل

Having discussed the referential structure of the speech act of complaining, we shall present the strategies that are used to perform this speech act ranging in a scale of directness:

1. ***Explicit Complaint***

I am having some pains.

اني أقاسي بعض الآلام

2. ***Asserting***

So do I!

وأنا أيضا أريده!

I am awfully tired.

إني متعب إلى حد مخيف

3. ***Refusals***

I don't want to hear about it.

لا أريد سماع شيء عنه

I can't wait for six months.

لا أستطيع الانتظار ستة أشهر

4. ***Expressions of Annoyance or Disapproval***

Dughf!

أف

Good Christ!

5. ***Warning***

Don't you know that you cannot touch an officer?!

الا تعلم انه ليس في ميسورك ان تمس ضابطاً؟!!

6. ***Requesting***

Go easy.

Take it softly.

7. *Questioning*

What's the meaning of this?

What's the matter with you?

With reference to translation, this study provides some insights into how to be aware of the misunderstanding that may occur in the process of translation. In the case of speech act the process is much more complex because speech acts are context dependent tokens. Thus a translation has to take context into consideration in addition to the sentential level in decoding the message. This implies wide knowledge of SL & TL formulations of speech acts at the grammatical, lexical and pragmatic levels.

References

- Austin (1962): **How to Do Things With Words**, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Boxer, D. (1996): "Ethnographic Interviewing as a Research Tool in Speech Act Analysis: The Case of Complaint". In: Gass, S. M. & Neu, J. (eds.). **Speech Acts Across Cultures: Challenges to Communication in a Second Language**. pp. 217-239.

- Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. (1978). "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena". In: Doody, E. (ed.) **Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction**, pp. 96-156.
- (1987): **Some Universals in Language Usage**, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Edmondson, W. (1981): "Illocutionary Verbs and Conversational Behaviour". In: Eikmeyer, H.J., & Riesser, H. (eds.), **Approaches in World Semantics**. pp. 486-499.
- Edmondson, W., & House, j. (1981): **Let's Talk and Talk about it**, Munchen: Durban & Schwarzenberg.
- Grice, H.P. (1975): "Logic and Conversation". In: Cole, P. & Morgan, J.L. (eds.). **Syntax & Semantics: Speech Acts, Vol.3**, pp. 22-40.
- Haverkate, W.H. (1984): **Speech Acts, Speakers and Hearers**, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Leech, G.N. (1983): **Principles of Pragmatics**, London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Liao, G.C. (1994): **A study of the Strategies, Maxims and Development of Refusal in Mandarin Chinese**, Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Murphy, B. & Neu, J. (1996): "My Grade Is Too Low: The Speech Act Set of Complaining". In: Gass, S.M. & Neu, J. (eds.),

**Speech Acts Across Cultures” Challenges to
Communication in a Second Language**, pp. 191-216.

Norrick, N.R., (1978). “Expressive Illocutionary Acts”. In: **Journal of Pragmatics**, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 277-281.

Olshtain, E., & Wienbach, L., (1987). “Complaining: A Study of Speech Act Behaviour among Native and Non Native Speakers of Hebrew”. In: Verschueren, J., & Bertucelli-Papi, M. (eds.). **The Pragmatic Perspective**, pp. 195-208.

Searle, J. (1969): **Speech Acts: Essay in The Philosophy of Language**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1979): **Expression & Meaning**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trosborg A. (1995) **Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests Complaints, and Apologies**, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vanderveken, D. (1994): “A Complete Formulation of Simple Logic of Elementary Illocutionary Acts”. In: **Act Theory: Philosophical & Linguistic Perspective**, pp. 99-131.

Yule, G. (1996): **Pragmatics**, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ملخص

ترجمة فعل القول "التشكي" من الإنكليزية إلى العربية

د. د. مصباح م. د. د. السليمان (*)

كوكب س. محمد (**)

لقد أرسى الفيلسوف الإنكليزي "أوستن" Austin في عام 1962 قواعد نظرية "فعل القول" في اللغة وطورها من بعده الفيلسوف الأمريكي "سيرل" Searle في عام 1969 وبموجب هذه النظرية ينظر العالمان الى اللغة من حيث الجانب الوظيفي وذلك من خلال السياق الاجتماعي للغة. ونظريتهما تستند إلى كيفية ارتباط المعنى والحدث الكلامي باللغة. ويهدف البحث إلى (1) وضع مجموعة من شروط تحقيق فعل الكلام (التشكي) (2) استنتاج بعض القواعد الدلالية لتحديد أداة القوة التعبيرية لفعل الكلام (3) كيفية إظهار فعل القول في

(*) أستاذ مساعد - قسم الترجمة - كلية الآداب / جامعة الموصل.

(**) مدرس مساعد - قسم الترجمة - كلية الآداب / جامعة الموصل.

العربية (4) معرفة الوسائل المتبعة في ترجمة فعل القول (التشكي) (5) اقتراح
ترجمة بديلة في حالة إخفاق المترجم.