

A Linguistic Analysis of the Literary Translation of Address Forms from English into Turkish

Yazın Çevirisinde Hitap Biçimlerinin İngilizceden Türkçeye Çevirisinin Dilbilimsel Açından İncelenmesi

Research/Araştırma

Yeşim (SÖNMEZ) DİNÇKAN

Assist. Prof. Dr., Trakya Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Mütercim-Tercümanlık Bölümü,
yesimdinckan@trakya.edu.tr, ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0003-0335-4843

ABSTRACT

Address terms and address pronouns (T and V forms) play an important role in the organization of societies and social norms. While translating (the pronoun ‘you’) from English into Turkish the translator has to make a choice between the two alternatives (sen (T)-siz (V)) available in the target language. In this paper the choices of the translator as well as the possible sociolinguistic explanations are dealt with through examples taken from the novel *Little Women* by Louisa May Alcott and its translation into Turkish, *Küçük Kadınlar* by Müzehher VA-NU. A comparative and descriptive analysis is carried out taking into consideration how the characters address each other throughout the novel and in the translated work. The questions to be asked in terms of the corpus of data are as follows: a) How do family members address each other? b) How do general acquaintances address each other? c) How do strangers address each other? The first two categories are subdivided as i-close ii-distant. The study aims to provide a better understanding of the norms guiding the translator in the formulation of choices in the process of literary translation using linguistic descriptive and explanatory analysis methods. How the translator makes a choice between two alternatives each time “you” or one of the address terms occur in the source text and the factors affecting the choices are the questions to be answered. As a conclusion, it may be stated that the study served to shed light upon the following; effects of sociolinguistic categories in the choice of T/V forms; effect of relationships between the characters in the choice of T/V forms; the address terms used in English and their translations into Turkish and the effect of these in the choices of T/V forms.

Keywords: address Pronouns, address terms, power, solidarity, translator’s choices.

ÖZET

Hitap şekilleri ve hitap adıkları toplumlari ve toplumsal normlari düzenlemede önemli rol oynarlar. Çevirmen, İngilizceden Türkçeye ikinci tekil şahıs 'you' adını çevirirken erek dilde bulunan sen (T) ve siz (V) adılı arasında bir seçim yapmak zorundadır. Bu makalede çevirmenin seçimleri ve bunların olası toplumdilbilimsel açıklamaları, Louisa May Alcott'un *Little Women* adlı romanından ve Türkçeye Müzehher VA-NU tarafından *Küçük Kadınlar* adıyla çevirisinden örneklerle incelenmiştir. Romandaki ve çevirisindeki kişilerin birbirlerine hitap şekilleri karşılaştırmalı ve betimleyici bir yöntem aracılığıyla irdelenmiştir. Veri bütüncesi incelenirken sorulan sorular şu şekildedir: a) Aile bireyleri birbirlerine nasıl hitap etmektedir? b) Tanıdıklar birbirine nasıl hitap etmektedir? c) Yabancılar birbirine nasıl hitap etmektedir? İlk iki kategori i-yakın ii- uzak olarak da tekrar ikiye bölünmüştür. Çalışma, dilbilimin betimleyici ve açıklayıcı inceleme yöntemlerini kullanarak yazın çevirisi sırasında çevirmenin seçimlerine yol gösteren normları daha iyi anlamaya çalışmayı amaçlamaktadır. Kaynak metinde 'you' adının veya herhangi bir hitap şeklinin kullanıldığı durumlarda çevirmenin seçimlerini nasıl yaptığı ve bu seçimleri etkileyen unsurlar ortaya konmaya çalışılmaktadır. Sonuç olarak, çalışmanın şu konuları aydınlatığı söylenebilir; T/V (sen/siz) adlarının seçiminde toplumdilbilimsel kategorilerin etkileri; T/V (sen/siz) adlarının seçiminde kişilerin arasındaki ilişkilerin etkileri; İngilizcede kullanılan hitap şekilleri, bunların Türkçeye çevirileri ve T/V (sen/siz) adlarının seçiminde etkileridir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: hitap adıları, hitap biçimleri, güç, dayanışma, çevirmen seçimleri.

1. Introduction

This paper is based on an unpublished PhD thesis on the linguistic analysis of T and V forms and describes the systematicity of the choices of the translators in translating address terms from English into Turkish (Dinçkan, 2004). How we say something is at least as important as what we say; in fact content and form are quite inseparable, being but two facets of the same object. One way of looking at this relationship is to examine a few specific aspects of communication: namely, pronominal choice between *tu* (T) and *vous* (V) forms in languages which require such a choice. In each case we may see that certain linguistic choices that a speaker makes indicate the social relationship that the speaker perceives to exist between him/her and the listener(s). Moreover, in many cases it is impossible to avoid making such choices in the actual 'packaging' of messages. Furthermore, languages may vary considerably in this respect (Wardhaugh, 1990, p. 251)

According to Fasold (1990, pp. 1-2), address forms are the words speakers use to designate the person they are talking to while they are talking to them. In most languages, there are two main kinds of address forms: names and second person pronouns. Address forms are part of complete semantic systems having to do with social relationships. Clichè and prominent examples are 'T' and 'V' forms.

In most modern European languages, though not in Standard English, there is a distinction between what are conventionally called the polite and the familiar pronouns of address: French 'vous': 'tu'; German 'Sie': 'du'; Italian 'lei': 'tu'; Russian 'vy': 'ty'; Spanish 'usted': 'tu' etc. (Lyons, 1981, p. 317). Following the French forms, the familiar pronouns collectively are referred to as T, the polite forms as V. It is worth to note that English had a T-V distinction in the past. As Upton and Widdowson (2006) state,

in very early English there was a simple distinction between THOU for the singular and YE for the plural subject pronouns, while THEE and YOU were respectively used for the singular and plural object pronouns. In the thirteenth century the French T-V system came to be copied in English, singular th-forms being applied to familiars, children and inferiors, while plural y-forms were used to show respect. By the sixteenth century the singular subject and object pronouns THOU and THEE had become interchangeable for many speakers. (p. 79)

Therefore, according to Upton and Widdowson, the T-V distinction came into use into Middle English by analogy with the French system and then disappeared. Warren (2006, pp. 16-14) carried out a recent study on address pronouns in French and finds out that among other factors the overriding factor in the choice of address pronoun is simply convergence to their interlocutor's choice of pronoun.

Second person pronouns have been analyzed by researchers from various points of view. Some of the most important initial research conducted in the field are; Roger Brown and Albert Gilman, 1960, "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity; Friederike Braun, 1988, *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures* and Paul Friedrich, 1972, *Social Context and Semantic Feature: The Russian Pronominal Usage*.

The subject still attracts attention from researchers and is still currently studied from various perspectives; Natalia Levshina, 2017, *A Multivariate Study of T/V Forms in European Language Based on a Parallel Corpus of film Subtitles*; Piera Molinelli, 2015, *Polite Forms and Sociolinguistic Dynamics in Contacts Between Varieties of Italian and Jane Warren, 2006, Address Pronoun in French: Variation Within and Outside the Workplace*.

The classic and most influential study on address forms and the social relationships they revealed was published by Brown and Gilman in 1960. Using a variety of methods, such as informal interviews, the analysis of works of literature, and the results of a survey questionnaire, they investigated second-person pronoun usage in French, German, Italian and Spanish (Fasold, 1900, p. 3). Brown and Gilman studied T and V forms in terms of power and solidarity terms of sociolinguistics. "Power" is a relationship between at least two persons, and is non-reciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior. There are many bases of power; physical strength, wealth, age, sex...". Solidarity has been defined as "the name given to relationship", and further as "the rules governing the differentiating address among equals" (Brown and Gilman, 1960, p. 255).

In Turkish, there is a two choice system for second person pronouns. Turkish speakers must choose between the familiar pronoun "sen" and the polite pronoun "siz" each time they address someone. König (1990) carried out a research on the use of second person pronoun. The observations and the surveys carried out provided the following conclusions: (1) The use of T/V forms require a multidimensional choice; (2) the choice between T/V forms is not context bound; (3) in informal settings, age is an

effective variable and in formal settings, social status becomes important; (4) if there is a gap between the participants in terms of social class, social status or age and if this is accepted by both parties, the second person pronoun usage is non-reciprocal; (5) sex is not an effective variable in the choice of a second person pronoun; (6) the effects of variables like familiarity, formality, distance and solidarity may become very complex. Distance, formality and respect can be considered as interwoven concepts. Generally, familiarity and solidarity lead to the use of reciprocal T form (sen) and formality leads to the use of V form (siz).

Similarly, Bayyurt and Bayraktaroğlu (2001, pp. 226-227) studied the use of pronouns and terms of address in Turkish service encounters and they said that Turkish has a rich selection of deferential or solidarity consolidating address terms comprising of honorific titles: Hanım /Bey “Lady, Ms/Sir, Mr”- Hanımefendi/Beyefendi “Madam/Sir”- Bayan/Bay “Ms/Mr”; occupational titles such as Doktor hanım/bey “Lady/Gentleman Doctor”; humble occupations with no honorifics: “Postacı-Postman”, “Sütçü-Milkman”; kinship terms for nonrelatives: “Abla/Bigsister”, “Dede/Grandfather”; endearment terms: “Şekerim/My sweet”, “Birtanem/My one and only”, “Canımın içi/Inside of my soul.” They (2001, p. 235) also emphasized that power and solidarity are two universal concepts which are influential in the use of numerous speech elements, including second person pronouns and terms of address.

It is possible to say that the use of address terms in Turkish is similar to the address terms used in Western languages. However, in addition to this, as mentioned above, Turkish kinterms such as “ağabey, abla, teyze, amca, dayı, yenge,” are used not only in addressing relatives but they are also used when the name, age, occupation or social status of the addressee are not known. The factors effective in the choice of second person pronouns are also valid in the choice of address terms. (Eğit, 1992, pp. 34-35).

Özcan, (2016, pp. 983-1000) studied choice of address terms in conversational settings and in her study she says that speakers have to consider the nature of the speaking environment, the social status of the participants and the interpersonal relations between themselves and the other speakers in order to choose appropriate address terms. Speakers’ choice of address terms reveals information about the social background of the speaker as well as about the relationship between the speaker and the addressee.

2. Translation of Address Forms

Given the context provided above, the difficulty of translating second person pronouns from English into Turkish is apparent. Most Turkish speakers will not hesitate in their usage of the second person pronouns in most cases in the natural flow of conversation or writing in Turkish. It is true that there may be a few occurrences a speaker could hesitate in. However, the situation is more difficult when one has to make this choice in the name of others in a foreign setting and in a different culture, which is the task of the translator.

Translating second person pronoun 'you' and any other address term in the source text with T and V forms into target language is then a difficult decision making process in translation. The translator is not only translating an address form but also interpreting and shaping the social relationship between the characters in the novel. During the process of interpretation, the translator will have to take the social norms of both the source and target cultures into consideration. The translation needs to overcome the diversity between the social codes, the linguistic codes and the cultures concerned.

The literary translator considers the ways of reflecting social norms through language in literature and s/he is also well-aware of the existing ways of reflecting them in the target literary system. S/he will make use of the forms in target language to reflect the source text. Thus, in a way s/he develops a system within the translated text which makes use of the structures of the target system in such a way as to reflect the use of language and its significance (which may or may not exist in the target system) in the source text.

This interpretation process and the hybrid nature of the translated text needs to be analysed through the product, the translated texts. Paul Friedrich (1971, pp. 216-270) indicates that a full and balanced interpretation of the pronominal usage may be derived from the creative literature; the novels, in particular, adequately define most protagonists and the contexts of most speech events. He makes clear the value of the nineteenth century novels in particular. Not only are they rich in indications of common usage, but they also bear witness to dynamics of use and implicit meaning.

Bearing this in mind, the corpus analysed within the scope of the thesis includes four classical English novels and their contemporary translations into Turkish. As a genre, the novel is selected, since in a novel, due to its presentation of data in its length, the details of the relationship of the characters can generally be observed more easily than in a short story. Also, in a novel one can find both the dialogues (which is the main focus of attention of the study) and there is also contextual information needed to classify relations. For the limitations of this single paper only one of the novels studied in the thesis will be exemplified. The novel to be studied is *Little Women* by the American author Louisa May Alcott and its translation into Turkish by Müzehher VA-NU. It is one of the novels which is widely read and translated and retranslated in Turkey and currently still attracts attention. Some of the translations are; by Sami Belkis in 1931 by Selamet Publishing House; Türkan Çolak in 2006 by Artemis Publishing House, Derya Yıldırım in 2009 by Remzi Publishing House, Cevdet Serbest in 2015 by Türkiye İş Bankası. Many shortened versions are also available.

3. Method

Assis-Rosa (2000), who studied T and V forms in Robinson Crusoe and its translations into Portuguese states,

for a lack of a model especially designed for the study of translation of forms of address, I propose to analyse their translation as textual clues to

be the interactional component of the text, based on the well-known model by Brown and Gilman. The general framework of the model has proven to be particularly insightful when applied to cross-cultural analysis, including translation. (p. 37)

This is also the methodology embraced for the current study.

Reciprocity and non-reciprocity (Brown and Gilman, 1960), in other words the reciprocal or non-reciprocal use of familiar and polite terms, is considered the key in understanding power and solidarity relationship. If two characters reciprocate T forms, for example, this may indicate that they are power equals or show solidarity etc. if the use of T and V forms are non-reciprocal, then one may start thinking about power relationship. Reciprocity is one of the important concepts that is taken into consideration during the study.

As well as Brown and Gilman's model some other linguists and researcher and their valuable contributions and the related concepts they brought to the field of sociolinguistics, anthropology and the ethnography of communication will be used during the analysis of address forms.

Friedrich (1972, p. 274) emphasized that the second person pronouns functioned, not only in isolation but, interrelated with other sets, notably kinship terms, proper names, official ranks, words reflecting occupation, relative age, and similar categories. Power and solidarity relations are thus represented through these address terms in English. The use of any of these address terms are thought to guide the translator during the analysis.

Ervin-Tripp in her study of sociolinguistic rules of address (1979) concluded that English people address each other by title+Last Name (LN), Mister +LN, Mrs+LN, Miss+LN, kin title+First Name (FN) and finally they use no address term at all. The findings of her study form the basis of the categories of the analysis of source texts.

The categories of address forms to be considered in the source text are mainly as follows: **1**-Second person pronoun and all its' inflected forms (you-your-yours-yourself) **2**-Proper names **a**) First name (John) **b**) Last name (Smith) **c**) Mr and Mrs or Miss or Madame or Mademoiselle+Last name (Mr. Smith) **3**-Titles (words reflecting occupation, official ranks etc.) (Doctor) **d**) Any combination of a, b and c. (Doctor John Smith) **4**-Nicknames **5**-Terms of endearment (dear).

4. Analysis

A comparative and descriptive analysis is carried out taking into consideration how the characters address each other throughout the novel and in the translated work. The questions to be asked in terms of the corpus of data are as follows: a) How do family members address each other? b) How do general acquaintances address each other? c) How do strangers address each other? The first two categories are subdivided as i-close ii-distant. At the end of the analysis, each category is classified in terms of 1-gender 2-age 3- social class 4- marital status. General norms are deduced and explained following

the descriptive analysis. The study aims to provide a better understanding of the norms guiding the translator in the formulation of choices in the process of literary translation. How the translator makes a choice between two alternatives each time “you” or one of the address terms occur in the source text and the factors affecting the choices are the questions to be answered.

The novel *Little Women* by Louisa May Alcott is the corpus to be studied. Louisa May Alcott was born in Germantown, Pennsylvania in 1832. *Little Women* the story of Meg, Jo, Beth and Amy March, has a place in American culture. Four girls grow up under their mother’s loving tutelage to become what their father wants them to be: ‘little women’. On their way to achieving complete diminution, they struggle with selfishness, greed, vanity and temper (Saxton, 1995, p. 4)

There have been plays, movies, condensations and countless translations. The popularity of the novel is an enduring phenomenon. The book had found its way into translations in almost every language, not just in Europe but throughout the world, so the Japanese children were as familiar with the March family as American ones (Alderson 1994, pp. xxii-xxv).

The list of the characters in the novel are:

Mrs March- a middle-class genteel housewife, mother.

Mr March- a soldier, husband and father

Margaret March (Meg)- the eldest daughter of Mr and Mrs March.

Josephine March (Jo)- daughter of Mr and Mrs March

Elizabeth March (Beth)- daughter of Mr and Mrs March

Amy March- the youngest daughter of Mr and Mrs March

Hannah Mullet- servant working in March’s house

Aunt March- an elderly spinster of considerable means, aunt of Margaret, Josephine, Amy and Elizabeth March.

James Laurence- a wealthy and benevolent elderly gentleman, one of the neighbours who was once a friend of Mrs March’s friend

Theodore Laurence (Laurie)- a wealthy young man of genteel society, Mr Laurence’s grandson and Josephine March’s close friend

John Brook- a young middle class, educated man, Theodore Laurence’s tutor

Mr Davis- Amy March’s teacher at school

Sallie Gardiner- Margaret March’s friend

Annie Moffat- a young girl of a wealthy family, Margaret March’s friend

Ned Moffat- Annie Moffat’s brother

Bell Moffat- an engaged young girl, Annie Moffat's elder sister

Clara Moffat- Annie Moffat's sister

Grace Vaughn- Theodore Laurence's friend

Fred Vaughn- Theodore Laurence's friend

Kate Vaughn- A young girl, one of Theodore Laurence's guest at the picnic

Estelle Valnor (Esther)- The maid in Aunt March's house

In the thesis all the dialogues in which a second person pronoun "you" or an address term is used are cited, studied and exemplified in detail and after the descriptive analysis the general norms are deduced and explained. In this article, however only one example from each category will be given as well as the findings about the related category.

One of the questions to be answered is: How do family members address each other?

1-Family Members

a-Close

i-Close Female Family Members: Josephine March (Jo)-Amy March (sister)

Josephine March→ Amy March

Josephine March addresses her sister using her first name (Amy) and a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

Josephine March addresses her sister using her first name (Amy), when her first name is used, and when a second person pronoun is used in the source text, T form is used in the target text.

*-“Come here, **Amy**, and do the fainting scene, for **you** are as stiff as a poker in that.”* (p. 7, parag.6)

*-“Gel buraya, **Amy!** Bayılma sahnesini oyna bakalım. **Sen** bu sahnede şu kırk kadar katı görünüyorsun.”* (p. 11, parag.9)

Amy March→Josephine March

Amy March addresses Josephine March using the shortened form of her first name (Jo), by a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

Amy March addresses her sister using the shortened form of her first name (Jo), when the shortened form of her first name is used in the source text, her first name+last name when her first name+last name is used in English as an address term and when a second person pronoun (you) is used in the source text, T form (sen) is used in the target text. Josephine March and Amy March reciprocate T form in the novel.

-“Don’t, **Jo**, it’s so boyish!” (p. 4, parag.11)

-“İslık çalma **Jo**, oğlan çocuğu gibi...” (p. 7, parag.12)

-“You’ll be sorry for this, **Jo March**, see if you ain’t.” (p. 70, parag.3)

-“**Sen** bunu pahalıya ödeyeceksin, **Jo March**, sonra görürsün!” (p. 98, parag.1)

ii-Close Male Family Members Theodore Laurence (Laurie)- James Laurence (Grandfather)

Theodore Laurence→ James Laurence

Theodore Laurence addresses his grandfather using the address term ‘efendim’ when the address term “sir” is used in the source text and V form (siz) in the target text when a second person pronoun (you) is used in the source text.

-“I didn’t know **you’d** come **sir**,” he began, as Jo gave him a triumphant little glance.” (p. 51, parag.4)

-“**Sizin** geldiğinizi bilmiyordum, **efendim**,” diye söze başladı.” (p. 72, parag.1)

James Laurence→ Theodore Laurence

James Laurence addresses his grandson using the address term “sir” and a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

James Laurence addresses his grandson using the address term “oğlum” when the address term “sir” is used in the source text and T form (sen) is used in the target text when a second person pronoun (you) is used in the source text. There is non-reciprocal pronoun usage between Theodore Laurence and James Laurence. Theodore Laurence addresses James Laurence using V form and receives T form.

-“That’s evident, by the way **you** racket downstairs. Come to your tea, **sir**, and behave like a gentleman.” (p. 51, parag.9)

-“Patırtıyla inmeden belli... Hele çaya gel **oğlum**. Bir beyefendi gibi hareket et!” (p. 72, parag.6)

b-Distant

i- Female Family Members: Josephine March-Aunt March

Josephine March→ Aunt March

Josephine March addresses her aunt using the address term “madam and a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

Josephine March addresses her aunt using a kinship term (yenge) when the address term “madam” is used in the source text and when a second person pronoun (you) is used V form (siz) is used in the target text.

-“I’m afraid it tires **you**, **ma’am**; shan’t I stop now?” (p. 40, parag.2)

-“Korkarım **sizi** yordu **yenge**,” dedim. Bırakayım mı artık?” (p. 56, parag.1)

Aunt March→ Josephine March

Aunt March addresses Josephine March using the shortened form of her first name (Jo), the address term “miss” and a term of endearment (child) and a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

Aunt March addresses Josephine March using the shortened form of her first name (Jo) when the shortened form of her first name is used in the source text and with the address terms “kızım” and “miss” when the address term “child” and “miss” are used in the source text and when a second person pronoun (you) is used T form (sen) is used in the target text. There is non-reciprocal pronoun usage between Josephine March and Aunt March. Josephine March addresses Aunt March using V form and receives T form.

ii- Distant Male Family Members: There are no instances of dialogues where the characters address a distant male family member.

Another question to be answered in the study is: How do general acquaintances address each other?

2-General Acquaintances

a-Close

i-Female General Acquaintances: Margaret March-Sallie Gardiner –Friends

Sallie Gardiner→ Margaret March

Sallie Gardiner addresses Margaret March using a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

Sallie Gardiner addresses Margaret March using T form (sen) in the target text when a second person pronoun (you) is used in the source text.

-“Why don’t **you** send home for another?” said Sallie, who was not an observing young lady.” (p. 85, parag.2)

-“Pek anlayışlı bir genç kız olmayan Sallie sordu: “Başka bir elbise göndermeleri için neden başvurmuyorsun?” (p. 118, parag.2)

There is no instance in the book where Margaret March addresses Sallie Gardiner with an address term.

ii-Close Male General Acquaintance: Theodore Laurence- Josephine March-
Neighbours and Friends

Theodore Laurence→ Josephine March

Theodore Laurence addresses Josephine March using a title+last name (Miss March), title+last name (Miss March), a title+shortened form of the first name (Miss Jo), by the shortened form of her first name (Jo), the shortened form of her first name+term of endearment (Jo dear), the address term “madam” and a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

Theodore Laurence addresses Josephine March using a title+last name (Miss March) when a title+last name is used, the shortened form of her first name (Jo) when the shortened form of her first name is used, a term of endearment (canım) when a term of endearment+the shortened form of her first name is used, address term “hanımefendi” when address term “madam” is used in the source text and when a second person pronoun (you) is used in the source text, V form (siz) is used in the novel when they first meet in the novel and when they become friends T form (sen) is used in the target text. Josephine March and Theodore Laurence reciprocate V form in the beginning of the novel and later they start to reciprocate T form.

-“Don’t mind me, stay if **you** like.” (p. 26, parag.6)

-“Aldırmayın bana... İsterseniz kalabilirsiniz burada.” (p. 37, parag.2.)

-“How is your cat, **Miss March**?’ asked the boy, trying to look sober while his black eyes shone with fun.” (p. 27, parag.6)

-“Kediniz nasıl, **bayan March**?’ diye delikanlı ciddileşmeye niyetlenerek konuştu. Bu arada kara gözleri muzipçe gülümsüyordu.” (p. 38, parag.6)

-“Good night, **Jo**, good night!” (p. 52, parag.17)

-“İyi geceler, **Jo**, iyi geceler.” (p. 74, parag.9)

-“Begging your pardon, **ma’am**, it wasn’t a billiard saloon, but a gymnasium, and I was taking a lesson in fencing.” (p. 138, parag.13)

-“Bağışlayınız **hanımefendi**, orası bilyardo salonu değil, spor salonu. Eskrim dersi alıyordum.” (p. 193, parag.11)

-“I’m here. Hold on to me, **Jo, dear!**” (p. 171, parag.6)

-“Ben buradayım işte, **Jo**. Bana tutun, **canım**.” (p. 235, parag.6)

b) Distant

i-Distant Female Acquaintances: Margaret March-Belle Moffat-Distant friends

Margaret March→ Belle Moffat

Margaret March addresses Belle Moffat using a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

Margaret March addresses Belle Moffat using V form (siz) in the target text when a second person pronoun (you) is used in the source text.

-***You** are very kind, but I'm afraid he won't come.*" (p. 84, parag.2)

-*"Büyük bir nezaket gösteriyorsunuz ama korkarım gelmez," dedi.*" (p. 116, parag.3)

Belle Moffat→ Margaret March

Belle Moffat addresses Margaret March using a nickname+term of endearment (daisy dear), a term of endearment (chérie) and a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

Belle Moffat addresses Margaret March using the shortened form of her first name+term of endearment (Meg canım) in the target text when a nickname+term of endearment (daisy dear) is used in the source text, a term of endearment (canım) when a term of endearment in French (chérie) is used and by T form (sen) when a second person pronoun (you) is used in the source text. There is non-reciprocal pronoun (you) is used in the source text. Margaret March addresses Belle Moffat using V form and receives T form.

-***Daisy, dear**, I've sent an invitation to **your** friend, Mr Laurence, for Thursday.*" (p. 84, parag.1)

-***Meg, canım**, arkadaşın Bay Laurence'e Perşembe günü için bir davetiye gönderiyorum.*" (p. 116, parag.1)

-*Why not, **chérie**?"* (p. 84, parag.3)

-*Neden gelmezmiş **canım**?"* (p. 116, parag.5)

ii-Distant Male Acquaintance: Josephine March – John Brooke (Theodore Laurence's tutor)

Josephine March→ John Brooke

Josephine March addresses John Brooke using a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

Josephine March addresses John Brooke using V form (siz) in the target text when a second person pronoun (you) is used in the source text.

The last question to be answered in the study is: How do strangers address each other?

3- Strangers- Mrs March-An old man

Mrs March→ An Old Man

Mrs March addresses the old man using the address term “sir” and a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

Mrs March uses no address term in the target text when she addresses the old man using the address term “sir” in the source text and V form (siz) when a second person pronoun (you) is used in the source text.

-“**You** have done a great deal for our country, **sir,**’ I said feeling respect now, instead of pity.” (p. 41, parag.5)

-“Ülkeniz için çok büyük fedakarlık yapmış**sınız,**’ dedim. Acımanın ötesinde ona saygı duyuyordum.” (p. 58, parag.5)

An Old Man→ Mrs March

An old man addresses Mrs March using the address term “madame” and a second person pronoun (you) in the source text.

An old man addresses Mrs March using the address term “madam in the target text when the address term “madame” is used in the source text.

-“Yes, **ma’am.** I had four, but two were killed, one is prisoner, and I’m going to the other, who is very sick in a Washington hospital’ he answered quietly.” (p. 41, parag.4)

-“Evet, **madam.** Dört oğlum vardı, ikisi öldü, biri tutsak edildi. Ötekisi Washington’da hastahanedede yatıyor. Ben de ona gidiyorum. Çok hastaymış,’ diye durgunca yanıt verdi.” (p. 58, parag.4)

5. Results

The analysis entails the dialogues of the five prominent characters (Amy March, Josephine March, Margaret March, Theodore Laurence and Mrs March). How these characters address each other and how the other characters address them are the questions which are considered. These are analysed in both the source text and the target text. Only an example from each category is cited in this article in order to guide us through the results. The comparative analysis of the novel *Little Women* yields several results and they may be summarized as follows:

In *Little Women*, close family members (sisters) address each other using a second person pronoun “you”, first name, (Josephine), the shortened form of their first

names (Jo, Meg), a suffix of endearment+shortened form of first name (Meggy, Betty) or using terms of endearment (dear, my precious) or using the shortened form of first name+last name (Jo March) or do not use any address term in the source text.

The address terms used by sisters do not vary in terms of age of the sister. The eldest sister and the youngest sister receive similar address terms in the source text. They do not use kinship terms like 'sister' in addressing each other. The contextual effects in the use of address terms can be observed especially in two dialogues. The first dialogue is between Josephine March and her elder sister Margaret March. In this dialogue, Margaret March scolds Josephine March for being a tomboy and using slang. When Margaret March is telling Josephine March that she is not a child anymore, she addresses her with her first name (Josephine) rather than the shortened form of her first name (Jo). The second dialogue is between Amy March and Josephine March. In this dialogue Amy is giving an ultimatum to her sister and telling her that she will pay for what she has done. In this context Amy March addresses, her sister with the shortened form of her first name+last name (Jo March) to create distance. The switch between the use of first name (Josephine), the shortened form of her first name (Jo), first name+last name (Josephine March) and the shortened first name+last name (Jo March), seem to create the familiarity and distance the sisters want to express in their speeches.

In the target text, the sisters address each other using T forms in every context. The shortened form of first names, terms of endearment are translated, and these address terms accompany the reciprocal T forms in the target text. There are some dialogues in which terms of endearment (e.g. Meg dear) are translated by using the suffix of endearment in Turkish (Meg'ciğim).

Close family members, (mother-daughter-Mrs March-Amy March-Elizabeth March-Josephine March-Margaret March) address each other using non-reciprocal address terms. Mrs March addresses her daughters using a second person pronoun (you) or first name (Margaret) or of the shortened form of their first name and using terms of endearment (dear, my dear, little daughter, deary, baby, my child, my dear girl). The girls address their mother using a second person pronoun (you) as well as a kinship term (mother), a term of endearment + kinship term (mother dear) and the shortened form of kinship term (Marmee) or they do not use any address term in the source text. The address terms used by the girls do not vary according to their age.

The address terms used by mother and the daughters in the target text are non-reciprocal. Mrs March addresses her daughters using T form and in general she receives V form. The girls address their mother using T form in certain contexts, especially when they are discussing their personal problems with her and generally when there are no other participants.

Distant family members, (Aunt March-Amy March-Elizabeth March-Josephine March-Margaret March) address each other using non-reciprocal address terms in the source text. Aunt March addresses the girls using a second person pronoun "you" or the address term "miss", "child" or using a term of endearment (my dear). The girls address

their aunt using a second person pronoun “you” and the address term “madam” or the kinship term+last name (Aunt March).

The address terms used by the distant family members (Aunt March+Amy March-Elizabeth March-Josephine March-Margaret March)) in the target text are non-reciprocal. Aunt March addresses the girls using T form and receives V form.

Close female acquaintances (friends-Margaret March-Sallie Gardiner), address each other using a second person pronoun “you” in the source text, when they are both young, single and from the same neighborhood. They address each other using T form in the target text.

Close male acquaintances (friends) (Theodore Laurence-Fred Vaughn), address each other using a second person pronoun “you” in the source text when they are at the same age. In the target text, they reciprocate T forms.

Close acquaintances of different genders (neighbors), (Mrs March-James Laurence) address each other using a second person pronoun “you”. When they are middle-aged and old and the male is older than the female, he addresses the female with the address term “madame” and a second person pronoun “you”. In the target text, V form is used.

Distant female acquaintances, (Margaret March-Clara Moffat, Annie Moffat), (Josephine March-Sallie Gardiner) when they are at the same age, they address each other using a second person pronoun “you” or a term of endearment (dear), in the source text. However in *Little Women*, Clara Moffat and Annie Moffat speak to Margaret March once when they are all getting prepared for the ball and Josephine March addresses Sallie Gardiner when they are one a picnic in the novel and there is no dialogue in the book where Margaret March addresses them or Sallie Gardiner addresses Josephine March. This makes it difficult to make a generalization in terms of reciprocity and the use of the address terms. In the target text, Clara Moffat and Annie Moffat address Margaret March using T form.

Distant female acquaintances when one of them is older (Margaret March and Belle Moffat) they address each other using non-reciprocal terms. Belle Moffat addresses Margaret March using a nickname+a term of endearment (Daisy dear), a term of endearment (chérie) and a second person pronoun “you” in the source text. Margaret March addresses her using a second person pronoun “you”. In the target text, Belle Moffat addresses using T form and receives V form.

Distant female acquaintances, when one of them is older and from working class (Amy March and Estelle Valnor) they address each other using reciprocal terms. Amy March and Estelle Valnor use only a second person pronoun “you” in the source text. In the target text they reciprocate V form. Distant female acquaintances when they the same age but one is from working class (Mrs March-Hannah Mullet), the one from the working-class addresses the other using the address term “madam” in the source text. In the target text, she addresses using V form. But there isn’t any dialogue in the novel

where Mrs March addresses Hannah Mullet, so we do not know whether the use of V form is reciprocated.

Distant acquaintances of different gender, (Josephine March-Fred Vaughn) (Josephine March-John Brooke) when they are about the same age, they address each other using a second person pronoun "you". In the target text, Josephine March addresses Fred Vaughn using T form, Fred addresses her using V form. Later Fred Vaughn also switches to T form. Josephine March addresses John Brooke using V form, John Brooke addresses Josephine March using T form after he confesses his love to her sister Margaret March.

Strangers of different gender, (An old man-Mrs March) when they are about the same age, they address each other using the address terms "madame" and "sir" in the source text. In the target text, Mrs March addresses the old man using V form, and the old man addresses her using the address term "madam".

6. Conclusion

There are various factors governing the choice of second person pronouns (polite form or familiar form) by the translators and the use of various address terms (first name, last name, a nickname, kinterm, some combination of these, or nothing at all) during translation. Sociolinguistic categories, the relationship between the characters, the address terms used in English are some of the factors that affect the choices of the translators. The conclusions concerning the address terms used in the source text and their translation into Turkish can be given as follows:

1-The use of first name as an address terms indicates a kin relationship or familiarity.

2-The use of Mr/Mrs/Miss indicates politeness and distance.

3-Terms of endearment may be attached to any kind of address term (first name, last name, kinship term, Mr/Mrs/Miss+last name etc.).

4-In English siblings address each other by their first names without consideration to differences in age. In Turkish, one may generally address an elder sister/brother by using a kinship term (abla/ağabey) and address young sisters/brothers by using a kinship term (abla/ağabey) and address younger sisters/brothers by their first names. In the source text siblings address both their younger and elder sisters by their first names. The usage is transferred into Turkish in the translations.

5-The use of first name as an address term generally leads to the use of T form in the translation.

6-The use of Mr/Mrs/Miss+last name as an address term generally leads to the use of V form in the translation.

7-The use of shortened form of first name as an address term is very frequent in English and it generally leads to the use of T form in the translation.

Since the use of second person pronouns (T/V forms) is a reflection of social norms in society, sociolinguistic variables like age, sex, social class, marital status, education level and similar considerations are some of the factors that may also govern the translator's choices between different address terms and pronouns. A few conclusions to be noted concerning sociolinguistic categories can be given as follows:

1-The characters who share similar characteristics (age, marital status, social status, sex, education level) tend to address each other with T form.

2-The older ones tend to receive V form from younger individuals, the younger ones tend to -receive T form from younger ones in general.

3-Age and solidarity are effective factors in the pronoun selection between close acquaintances. Reciprocal T form is preferred when both of the participants are young.

It is also possible to say that the sociolinguistic variables are not sufficient in explaining the choice address terms. There are other factors that may be considered to affect this usage. In fact, the use of address terms and second person pronouns seem to be much more complicated than one may think. The translator's task is even more challenging since s/he is making this selection in his/her native language in the name of British/American characters in a foreign setting and foreign contexts. However, since the address terms from which s/he will make a choice are in Turkish and since the translators themselves are Turkish and living within Turkish culture they may be partially reflecting their native habits and norms in this process.

The relationships between the characters may be effective and guide the translator in pronoun selection as well.

1-Close body ties override age or sex and any other factor.

2-Close family members address each other using reciprocal T forms.

3-Distant acquaintances reciprocate V form.

7. General Conclusion

Continual interplay of scientific methodology as through of sociolinguistics applied to translations yield fruitful results because it not only gives references to future translators and explains how norms can be used but also brings fresh perspectives of thought and provides models of study. The interplay between translation, literary translation and socio-linguistics is extremely fruitful as each are supplemented by the norms of the other. Central concepts of sociolinguistics are of importance in translation studies.

Power and solidarity may be considered to be the basic concepts in the formulation or the reflection of identity. Speech is viewed as a reflection of the social relations between the speaker and addressee, most particularly the power and solidarity manifested in the relationship. Power as can be deduced by the definition stated in the introduction is self-explanatory, on the other hand, solidarity has many facets, thus becoming harder to locate or define and it concerns the social distance between people-

their shared experiences, how many social characteristics they have in common, and beyond this how far they are prepared to share this formulated intimacy and other factors (Hudson, 1993, p. 122).

The choices made while speaking may be viewed as the way in which identity is reflected. This involves focusing on “how the individual wishes to view himself/herself” or “the willingness to claim for either ones self- or by others- a social role, in such a way that is influenced by the self-presentation of that said individual (Fasold, 1990, p. 259). The interplay between these factors is reflected in the reciprocated or non-reciprocated use of language and in the corpus of the study through certain linguistic social marked variables, address forms.

From a certain perspective of study, factors forming the basis for power and solidarity in relations also reflect the identity of the participants in the interaction in question. The reciprocity and non-reciprocity of these reflections is reflected through the language use of participants. Reciprocity may be defined as participants in an interaction harping on equal footing whereas non-reciprocity may be defined as unequal footing. The notions of reciprocity and non-reciprocity and the instances of these language situations may serve as the indicators of power and solidarity relations and hence as the markers of identity of the individual both in terms of the addresser and the addressee.

All the societal, emotive or contextual implications are in continual interplay and to be able to draw definite boundaries between them, when one is passive and the other active or when a certain set dominates the other; is clearly impossible as this would require the analysis of the thought process of individuals. But, notions of power, solidarity and the formulation of identity are also central to these implications. Thus, these notions are in direct correspondence with the usage of language in society.

In considering these “points of view,” one is able to note that especially when the corpus of data is comprised of a literary text and its translation, sociolinguistic concepts, with clear cut definitions and applications in spoken language need to be further explained or supplemented and categorized with other aspects in translation studies.

The main reasons behind this, are initially the fact that the literary text no matter how far the author is able to reflect societal norms is initially fictional, secondly an “application” of the individual authors norms (of course formed by the society in which he/she lives), and thirdly the written realization of these (versus a spoken one). So a study such as the one undertaken needs to consider that “formulated instances” (characterization, plot etc.) are societal “reflections” and not “societal realities”. The differences of perspective can be considered as a minor one since this reflection is directly in correspondence with reality. (Cases such as science-fiction or direct transcriptions of spoken language are not of the essence in this discussion). But once again there is “the reality” as viewed and “reflected” by an individual as one may define the author who is not in direct interaction in a speech situation.

A second reason for supplementing and validating societal implications lies with the translated text. In the instance of a translated text, another individual besides the

author (governed by the same factors affecting the author) and a second language and culture and society are present. The translator while undertaking the task of reformulation (translating the work) has to consider multi-dimensional systems such as linguistic units, societal norms, cultural realities and the like. At this point, the “input data” of the translator also needs to be outlined. First of all, there is the source text, a text written by a certain individual with a certain way of expression taken from a certain language with certain governing sociolinguistic realities. Secondly, there is the language of the translation, its linguistic manifestations, its norms. Thirdly, there is the translator as an individual hindered or helped, equipped (at times lacking) by all the factors also effecting the author which have been stated above.

A third reason is the nature of translated texts. Translated texts by definition are “translated”, in some form “transferred” thus not original; but on the hand not supplementary but primal. This nature of translated texts has led translation scholars to develop the notion of “hybrid” text. A hybrid text as Schäffner and Adab (2000, p. 169) define is a text that results from a translation process. It shows features that seem somehow ‘out of place’/ ‘strange’/ ‘unusual’ for the receiving culture, i.e. the target culture. These features, however are not the result of a lack of translational competence or examples of ‘translationese’, but they are evidence of conscious or deliberate decisions by the translator. So keeping in mind that the corpus of data is a hybrid text by nature also helps to explain both the systematicity and the (in places) inexplicableness or unsystematicity (though less rarely) of the data.

All these considerations lead to a change in perspective when evaluating and analyzing power and solidarity relations. The issue or the central concern becomes the integration (and the degree of integration and overlap) of the norms (both linguistic and social) of the two languages and societies concerned. Thus, the relationships formed on the basis of “real” source language societal norms are reformulated through the perspectives of the translator who utilizes target societal norms are reformulated through the perspective of the translator who utilizes target societal norms to express a hybrid text which is actually functional on two planes (the source and target societies) and which lives in a third dimension or plane (the hybrid text). Power constituting variables are thus the variables of this hybrid text, once again based on the source, but on the other hand reflecting the target while forming a third text.

The identity of the characters in the novels studied are formulated primarily through the author, who in turn takes the norms of the source society, time and language into consideration. At this juncture both the authors descriptions of the characters and the dialogues of the characters are the primary tools which the translator has at his/her disposal to be able to replicate and translate. In this reformulation process, the network of all these variables mentioned so far, along with various considerations, many points of view come into play in the choices the translator makes. These choices on the other hand are also influenced by the target language and society. What the translator creates is a hybrid social system based on the merger of all stated features. In this hybrid system s/he makes choices concerning T and V forms, address

terms and when not to regard or disregard the norms of the author. But all these are further restricted by the limitations of the target linguistic systems.

Thus, it would be appropriate to state that sociolinguistic methodology when applied to translation corpuses forms basis on which systematic findings may be deduced. But the multifaceted nature of translation requires supplements to these because of the use of literary texts and the linguistic differences between the languages. Further research of a similar nature may be able to contribute to both Sociolinguistics and Translation Studies and may support the notions in this study or may be able to show their shortcomings thus leading to the other studies.

References

- Alcott, L. M. (1994). *Little women*. Oxford- New York: Oxford University Press.
- Assis Rosa, A. (2000). The negotiation of literary dialogue in translation: Forms of address in Robinson Crusoe Translated into Portuguese. *Target*, 12(1), 31-62.
- Balpınar, Z. (1996). The use of pronouns of power and solidarity in Turkish. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 287-294.
- Bayraktaroğlu A. & Sifianou M. (2001). *Linguistic politeness across boundaries: The case of Greek and Turkish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Brown, R., Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.). *Style in language* (pp. 252-275). Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Dinçkan, Y. (2004). *The linguistic analysis of T and V forms: Describing the systematicity of the interpretations of the translators in translating address terms from English into Turkish*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1979). Sociolinguistics rules of address. In J. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics: Selected reading* (pp. 225-240). England: Penguin Books.
- Eğit, Y. (1992). Günümüz Türkçesinde hitap biçimleri. In A. Konrat (Ed.). *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics* (pp. 27-38). Eskişehir: Anadolu University.
- Fasold, R. (1990). *The sociolinguistics of language*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Friedrich, P. (1971). Structural implications of Russian pronominal usage. In W. Bright (Ed.). *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference* (pp. 270-300). The Hague Paris: Mouton and Co.
- Hudson, R.A. (1993). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- König, G. (1990). Türkçe'de sen/siz adlarının ikinci tekil şahıs için kullanımına toplumbilimsel bir yaklaşım. In A. S. Özsoy and H. Sebüktekin (Eds.). *IV. Dilbilim Sempozyumu Bildirileri* (pp. 175-184). İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Levshina, N. (2017). A Multivariate study of T/V forms in European language based on a parallel corpus of film subtitles". *Research in Language*, 2(15), 153-172.
- Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Özcan, F. H. (2016). Choice of address terms in conversational settings. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(1), 982-1002.
- Saxton, M. (1995). *A modern biography*. Canada: Harper Collins Canada Ltd.
- Schäffner, C. & Adab B. (2001). The idea of the hybrid text in translation: Contact as conflict. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 2, 167-180.
- Upton, C. & Widdowson, J.D.A. (2006). *An atlas of English dialects: Region and dialect*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1990). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Warren, J. (2006). Address pronouns in French: Variation within and outside the workplace. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29(2), 16.1–16.17.