

59-An expositional study on the translation processes of politeness strategies through register analysis¹

Kadir SARIASLAN²

Korkut Uluç İŐİSAĞ³

APA: Sariaslan, K.; İřisağ, K. U. (2020). An expositional study on the translation processes of politeness strategies through register analysis. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, (21), 949-966. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.843463.

Abstract

It is known that every language and culture bear its own characteristics and ways of expressing politeness. However, politeness strategies that have been put forward so far have almost always referred to the pivotal taxonomy of Penelope Brown and Steven C. Levinson (1978). The four-super strategies classified to designate and adjust the appropriateness of actions or speech acts have been mostly useful, but the process of translating the strategies in question from one language to another has not only required criticism due to the uniqueness of languages but also led to modification at linguistic level. The motivation of creating the correspondent politeness strategy in the target language has provided translators with some amount of liberty, which has helped them deal with the phenomenon through functionality. The functional equivalence suggested by Juliane House and Basil Hatim and Ian Mason requires the analysis of register; field, mode and tenor. This study aims to assess the translational processes of requests, an example of directives, with a comparative approach comparing the four randomly chosen samples extracted from three translated versions of the worldwide famous play of Arthur Miller, *Death of a Salesman*. The core of the analysis is to assess the translation of negative, positive, bald on record and off record politeness strategies and note if any drastic deviations are made in the target texts that may potentially distort interpersonal relations and balance and the context of situation designated by the author for the original text.

Keywords: Linguistic politeness, register analysis, functional equivalence

Nezaket stratejilerinin kesit analiziyle çevrilme süreçleri üzerine açmılayıcı bir inceleme

Öz

Her dil ve kültürün kendi özellikleri ve nezaket ifade etme biçimlerine sahip olduđu bilinmektedir. Bununla birlikte, řimdiye kadar ortaya atılmıř olan nezaket stratejileri çođunlukla Penelope Brown ve Steven C. Levinson'ın merkezi sınıflandırmasına atıfta bulunmaktadır. Eylemlerin ve söz eylemlerin uygunluđunu dizayn etmek ve ayarlamak için sınıflandırması yapılan dört süper strateji çođunlukla faydalı olmuřtur, fakat söz konusu stratejileri bir dilden başka bir dile çevirme süreci sadece dillerin benzersizliđinden dolayı eleřtiri almakla kalmamıř aynı zamanda dilsel seviyede de deđiřiklik görölmesine yol açmıřtır. Hedef dilde eřdeđer nezaket stratejisini yaratma motivasyonu

¹ Bu makale birinci yazarın doktora tezinden hazırlanmıřtır.

² Öğr. Gör., Yalova Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu (Yalova, Türkiye), kadir.sariaslan@yalova.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3575-8319 [Arařtırma makalesi, Makale kayıt tarihi: 11.10.2020-kabul tarihi: 17.12.2020; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.843463]

³ Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakóltesi, Mütercim Tercümanlık Bölümü, İngilizce Mütercim Tercümanlık ABD (Ankara, Türkiye), korkut.isisag@hvb.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3569-4669

çevirmenlere bu olguyla işlevsellik ışığında ilgilenme olanağı getiren bir miktar özgürlük alanı sunmuştur. Juliane House ve Basil Hatim ve Ian Mason tarafından önerilen işlevsel eşdeğerlik, söylem alanı, söylem tarzı ve söylem doğası olarak nitelendirilen kesit analizinin uygulanmasını gerekli görmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, bir talimatlandırma örneği olarak ricaların çeviri süreçlerini, Arthur Miller'ın dünyaca ünlü tiyatro oyunu olan *Satıcının Ölümü*' adlı eserinden ve onun üç farklı çevirisinden rastgele seçilme yöntemi ile alıntılanmış olan dört örnekleme karşılaştırmalı bir yaklaşımla değerlendirmektir. Analizin özü olumsuz, olumlu, doğrudan veya dolaylı nezaket stratejilerini değerlendirmek ve yazar tarafından orijinal eser için düzenlenen kişilerarası ilişkiler ve durum bağlamları hususunda hedef metinlerde büyük çaplı sapmaların yaşanıp yaşanmadığını kaydetmektir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Dilsel nezaket, kesit analizi, işlevsel eşdeğerlik

Introduction

Throughout the years that translation has earned the title of a distinct scientific branch, many approaches have been adopted and utilized by scholars and academicians in order to add to the existing capacity of translation. One prominent and modern way of dealing with translation works is the use of pragmatics in the field. Linguistics and translation have been interrelated to each other for a long time, but the pragmatic perspective has been developed out of concerns that translation may ignore the social variables such as social status, differences in class rankings in the society, symmetrical and asymmetrical relations among people.

The linguistic politeness is at the very core of socio-cultural discussion and is one indispensable element that needs to be assessed thoroughly. However, the concept has not caught enough attention as defined by Hatim and Mason (1997) to be “underrepresented” in translation circles. The seminal work of Brown and Levinson (1978) has aroused not only a worldwide reputation of being the most eminent and comprehensive taxonomy of politeness strategies but also caused vehement dissidence as to its claims of universality of politeness. Categorized as positive, negative, bald on record and off-record by B&L (1978), the four super-strategies, are intended to fit into various social contacts people may have when they, as a natural fact, need to form a conversation. Once they are uttered, the speech acts, such as assertives, directives, commissives, expressives and declaratives (classified by Searle, 1976), have the potentiality to disrupt human relations, as a result of which B&L (1978) argue that a redressive action is needed, which, as they term it, is the linguistic politeness. The need to redress a speech event stems from the fact that people instinctually find it necessary to preserve their “face”, “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself” as Goffman puts it (1967: 5). Likewise, Kasper (1990) defines linguistic politeness as a strategic interaction not only to eliminate the probability of conflicts in social contacts but also to preserve and maintain existing harmonious relations.

Given the significance of the concept, the question whether there could or must be a search of politeness equivalence between the source and the target text needs to be prioritized and evaluated in an empirical methodology. House (2001) argues that interpersonal relations must be taken into consideration if the primary goal of the translation is to attain functional equivalence. For this purpose, House (2001) suggests that register, defined by Baker as “a variety of language that a language user considers appropriate to a specific situation” (1992: 15), is to be analyzed in order to fully meet the requirements of functional equivalence fundamentally pertaining to semantic,

pragmatic and textual correspondence between the texts. Initially categorized by Halliday (1989) into three sub-branches as field, mode and tenor, the register analysis necessitates the context of situation to be realized, only then can the social projections of a textual analysis be exposed. This study aims to show varying perspectives of translators in their course of translating one major example of directives; requests within the light of the four-super strategies put forward by B&L (1978). The findings are to be assessed through the concept of pragmatic functionality in translation.

1. Face and linguistic politeness

The phenomenon of face was widely discussed by Erving Goffman who systematized his thoughts on a sociological basis with his essay *On Face-Work* (1967). The face defined as *the positive social image* was actually composed of social norms which he explained with the word *line* meaning a “pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which he expresses his view of the situation” (1967: 5). What Goffman claims is actually the existence of social borders around which people locate themselves, accept people and get accepted by them in return. If any party of a social contact dares to cross over these lines, then they will be subjected to criticism, exclusion or isolation from the social system. At this point, Goffman (1967) imposes a duty on people as *face-work*, the obligation to take actions consistent with the face of yours and those of others. Likewise, Grice (1975) suggests that people had better act in cooperation and be always open to keep the speech going in order not to cause confusion. Highlighting the significance of mutual understanding, Grice (1975) claims that there exists a social contract among people that helps them maintain healthy understanding of each other, which she calls *cooperative principle*. Just like the face-work, cooperative principle requires being consistent during the course of conversation.

B&L define face as “the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself” (1978: 61). The preservation of face clearly bears crucial importance in terms of social harmony, so linguistic politeness necessarily has a role in preventing people from committing face-threatening acts, which “intrinsically threaten face” (B&L, 1978: 60). Whenever there is a social interaction between people, the risk of a face threatening act automatically emerges, which comes to mean that face is something that may be vulnerable from time to time and may be harmed in any case of a want from others. In this sense, B&L put forth two main types of face that people may equip themselves in accordance with the context of situation:

a. positive face: the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others.

b. negative face: the want of every ‘competent adult member’ that his actions be unimpeded by others (1978: 62).

When positive face is adopted for a want, the speaker seeks to be approved of and admired by others. On the other hand, negative face is usually applied when people care very much about social distance and hierarchy between them and others. The two types of face in question have their own formalities or strategies of usage within linguistic boundaries. Watts specifically touches on the aims of the aforementioned types of face by his definition: “Politeness strategies will therefore be those which aim (a) at supporting or enhancing the addressee’s positive face (positive politeness) and (b) at avoiding transgression of the addressee’s freedom of action and freedom from imposition (negative face) (2003: 86). In addition, Mills states that “positive politeness is concerned with demonstrating closeness and affiliation (for example, by using compliments); negative politeness is concerned with distance and

formality (for example, through the use of apologies, mitigation, and hedges) (2003: 59). The negative politeness appears to be more effective method in terms of getting your want done because the motivation of keeping a negative face is not to be impeded by others. Leech states that the function of negative politeness is “mitigation, to reduce or lessen possible causes of offense” (2014: 11). Unlike negative politeness, positive politeness strategies are supposed to be useful among people with common background knowledge about each other, a form of intimacy is to be witnessed. Above all, as Watts (2003) states, linguistic politeness is a way of expressing consideration for others. The context of situation determines what strategy or strategies of politeness should be applied.

2. The four-super strategies of politeness

2.1. Positive politeness

Mullany defines positive politeness as “redressive action directed towards the addressee’s positive face, demonstrating that the hearer’s wants or needs are thought of as desirable” (1999: 120). In this sense, softening speeches is a technique frequently applied when special care is shown in order to refrain from harming others’ face. In addition to Mullany, B&L state that “redress consists in partially satisfying that desire by communicating that one’s own wants (or some of them) are in some respects similar to the addressee’s wants” (1978: 101). In order to assure the preservation of others’ face, Goffman states that one “employs courtesies, making slight modifications of his demands on or appraisals of the others so that they will be able to define the situation as one in which their self-respect is not threatened” (1967: 17). B&L (1978) put forward many strategies of positive politeness such as attending to hearer’s wants, exaggerating, intensifying interest to hearer, using in-group identity markers, seeking agreement, avoiding disagreement, asserting common ground, joking, conveying that speaker and hearer are cooperators and fulfilling hearer’s wants.

2.2. Negative politeness

B&L define negative politeness as “redressive action addressed to the addressee’s negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded” (1978: 129). In this type of strategy, more redress is meant to be used in order not to cross personal boundaries of people. Unlike the strategy of positive politeness, “negative politeness is concerned with distance and formality” claims Mills (2003: 59). In case of a face threatening act, the primary concern is not to be friendly as in positive politeness but to be formal and respectful. Therefore, redress is designated by the speaker in so meticulous way that it may not disturb the hearer, which will eventually lead to face-loss as cited by Goffman (1967). In this sense, Katz asserts that “negative politeness acknowledges and downplays the magnitude of the imposition to show respect for the addressee’s negative face (“if it’s not too much trouble, could you...”) (2015: 49). Being clear in the example sentence given by Katz, the speaker appears to be selective in linguistic terms and attentive in social distance. The main strategies of applying negative politeness are as follows; being conventionally indirect, questioning, hedging, minimizing the imposition, giving deference and apologizing. The most visible difference between the positive and negative politeness strategies is about the address words used. Keeffe, Clancy and Adolphs (2011) show in a diagram how the address words go from positivity to negativity and vice versa:

Level of formality	Category	Example	Politeness strategy
Informal ↑ ↓ Formal	<i>Endearments</i>	<i>honey, baby, love</i>	Positive politeness ↑ ↓ Negative politeness
	<i>Family terms</i>	<i>Mammy, Daddy, son</i>	
	<i>Familiarisers</i>	<i>mate, man, folks</i>	
	<i>First names familiarised</i>	<i>Brad, Jen</i>	
	<i>Full first names</i>	<i>Bradley, Jennifer</i>	
	<i>Title and surname</i>	<i>Mr Holmes, Dr Watson, Professor Moriarty</i>	
	<i>Honorifics</i>	<i>sir, ma'am, your honour</i>	

Figure 1. Semantic categorization of address terms

Much as being semantically designed, such classification of address terms seems to be valid for the measurement of politeness in English, at least. However, it cannot be alleged that the same protocol will provide the same results in other languages due to the natural discrepancy among languages. To give an example, in Turkish, there is a clear-cut difference between the singular pronoun ‘sen’, meaning the singular ‘you’ and ‘siz’ the plural ‘you’ in English. While ‘siz’ refers to social distancing and hierarchy variation, “‘sen’ shows the closeness/proximity or the lack of distance between the interlocutors”. (Yetkiner, 2008: 22)

2.3. Bald on record

Depending on Grice’s maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner, B&L (1978) suggest that bald on record is the purest form of wanting something. The speaker directly asks for what he or she wants and comes face to face with the hearer. The hearer is left no space to run away because the speaker is “sincere”, “perspicuous” and “relevant” in his words (1978: 95). Leech claims that the use of imperatives and direct commands is mostly seen in this strategy and he names this strategy as “the biggest risk for face” (2014: 33) Even though being bald on record seems to be the least polite way of wanting something, its use may vary according to what users apply it in what context. Watts puts forward that requests are also applicable via going on record but as a continuum of an ongoing interaction and adds “If you want to offer a second cup of tea to a guest, you are more likely to say *Have another cup of tea* than *Have another cup of tea, will you?*” (2003: 192). In this example, if the speaker really wants to serve another cup of tea to his or her guest, he does not necessarily use a tag question because the context will not allow that.

2.4. Off record

This strategy is specifically the most useful one when people do not want to risk their face at all because communication poses natural risks of being not understood or being misunderstood or being rejected. Ogiermann puts forward that “off-record request strategies offer an ‘out’ for both: the hearer, who may refuse to comply with the request by simply ignoring the hint, and the speaker, who can continue the conversation as if no request had been issued” (2009: 192). Most importantly, the use of off-record strategy provides the speaker, who jeopardizes his social identity in wanting something, with two advantages such as “satisfaction of the negative face to a greater degree than that afforded by the negative-politeness strategy and avoiding the inescapable accountability, the responsibility for his action, that on-record strategies entail” (B&L, 1978: 73).

3. Politeness in translation

The role of linguistics in translation studies has been questionable due to the accusations of neglecting the socio-cultural side of the field. Hornby states that the perspective of linguistics' role in translation studies began to change with "the crucial "pragmatic turn" which encouraged the emancipation of translation studies both from linguistics and from comparative literature" (2006: 35) Translation, illustrated by Nord as "a form of mediated cross cultural communication" (1997: 18), began to be viewed as a form of constant communication travelling across the languages and cultures. Considered to be a crucial element of social structure, linguistic politeness is nowhere to be ignored or neglected in translation studies as it is much more than an agent implemented in social interactions to show courtesy. Hatim and Mason state that linguistic politeness "covers all aspects of language usage which serve to establish, maintain or modify interpersonal relations between text producer and text receiver" (1997: 431). Linguistic politeness, an all-inclusive phenomenon, requires a much more meticulous care given all the uniqueness of cultures and language systems. In this sense, House points to an overall domination over a language together with all the cultural factors:

Language awareness enhanced by translation also promotes cross-cultural understanding, in that translation can trigger discussions about language and culture specificity and universality, about forms and functions of culture-conditioned expressions of politeness, routine formulas and phenomena relevant for transitions from one language to another. (2018, 147)

Concerning the overall aspects of cross-cultural transference and the challenges of the subject, Hatim and Mason argue that "the dynamics of politeness can be relayed trans-culturally but will require a degree of linguistic modification at the level of texture" (1997, 68). Hence, applying only a semantic approach in translation of politeness would be an idle exercise because politeness is an intricate issue requiring a broader insight and developing a functional approach. House claims that "an adequate translation is, then, a pragmatically and semantically equivalent one" (2015: 63). For this purpose, she proposes the use of register analysis.

4. Register and its analysis in translation

Defining register as "functional variation in language", Halliday states that it has three variables called as field, tenor and mode which respectively respond to the questions "what is going on; who are taking part; and what role the language is playing" (1989: 44). Register is basically the entire environment that lives both inside the text and outside the text because it encompasses a holistic approach to the evaluation of a text unit through its constituents. Munday (2008: 91) states that these are variables are bound to each other with a strand of meaning and these strands are actually the ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions which come into being with lexicogrammar, that is, the choices of wording and synaptic structure. To clarify these strands of meaning, Eggins (2004) presents a comprehensive categorization of register variables; field, tenor and mode:

The field of a text is associated with ideational meaning, which is realized through transitivity patterns (verb types, active/passive structures, participants in the process, etc.). The tenor of a text is associated with interpersonal meaning, which is realized through the patterns of modality (modal verbs and adverbs such as hopefully, should, possibly, and any evaluative lexis such as beautiful, dreadful). The mode of a text is associated with textual meaning, which is realized through the thematic and information structures (mainly the order and structuring of elements in a clause) and cohesion (the way the text hangs together lexically, including the use of pronouns, ellipsis, collocation, repetition, etc.) (in Munday, 2008: 91).

Egins differentiates between two types of mode as spoken and written which have their own characteristics. While the spoken language underlines the spontaneity phenomena and is strictly bound to context, free of grammatical rules and available for reductions in sentences, the written mode of language provides the writer time to think, make revisions whenever it is necessary and embellish sentences if desired. Baker (1992: 16) exemplifies the situation saying “a word such as *re* is perfectly appropriate in a business letter but is rarely, if ever, used in spoken English” pointing to the power of the mode on the linguistic choices. On the other hand, Halliday and Hasan (1985: 12) add to the bipartite classification of mode by providing a third alternative “the combination of the two” and draws attention to the language written to be spoken such as drama.

Described by Hatim and Munday (2004: 189) as “the linguistic consequence of the user’s purposive role in the language event”, the field of discourse roughly stands for what the language is about. The field of a text is determined by the text producer who can optionally change it any time. The disclosure of the field provides important amount of information about the text. Halliday claims that “there is not a great deal one can predict about the language that will be used if one knows only the field of discourse” (1978: 223). In this sense, Egins claims that “field is realized through just some parts of the grammatical system - in fact, through the patterns of processes (verbs), participants (nouns) and circumstances (prepositional phrases of time, manner, place, etc.)” (2004: 110).

Yetkiner states that “the most relevant concept to the politeness theory is the tenor of discourse” (2008: 36). In terms of politeness, social relations and status, directionality and indirectionality, activeness and passiveness are certainly of great importance, so the analysis of tenor, in specific, is undeniably necessary because the interpersonal meaning is formed out of people’s contact with each other in various contexts. Hatim and Mason state that the tenor of a text, which surrounds the entire relationship between the addresser and the addressee, can “be analysed in terms of basic distinctions such as polite-colloquial-intimate, on a scale of categories which range from formal to informal” (1990: 50). Formality and informality are the two basic determinants in terms of strategy of language use and appropriate wording. Egins suggests that informal situation of language use is seen in the cases of equal power, frequent contact and high affective involvement unlike the formal situation of use which is observed in the cases of unequal hierarchic power, infrequent or one-off contact and low affective involvement (2004: 101).

Yetkiner (2008) states that it is necessary to put forward the politeness norms in the source text and assess how possible it is to transfer them without making any deviations especially in terms of social distance and status. The distortion of social distance and status comes to mean a change in the hierarchical order designated by the source text producer who makes it possible through a specific pattern of lexis. House (2001) strongly holds the idea that seeking equivalence in register stands to be a natural goal for the translator who strives to maintain a pragmatic functionality in translation.

5. Methodology

The study aims to put forward any preference variations of three different translators while they struggle to transmit the requests and see if they care enough about the concept of face and linguistic politeness hidden in the original speech events. The register analysis, which is composed of three parts as field, mode and tenor, is the backbone of the study in question. Firstly, the original text is provided and then its register analysis is done. Afterwards, the three translated versions of the original text are presented along with the register analyses. To note one important detail, tenor is given much more

importance because it directly covers all aspects of interpersonal relations and is supposed to present tangible data for the evaluation and translation process of the four-super strategies of politeness classified by B&L (1978). The politeness strategies will be determined and if there are some deviations or mismatches between the texts, they will be explained according to the politeness maxims categorized by B&L (1978). The pragmatic functionality concept in translation studies stands to be the macro analysis agent in this sense. The decisions made by translators are examined through a comparative approach. The examples are extracted from Arthur Miller's play *Death of a Salesman* and its three translations done by Orhan Burian in 1952, Müge Ayşe Saraç in 1994, and Aytuğ İz'at – Y. Emre İz'at in 2010. The reason for choosing a play for the study is that dramas are pieces of art written to be spoken, thus they represent real conversation environment. The only concern of the research is to see what deviations, if there are so, are observed during the process of translating politeness from English to Turkish and how translators deal with the problem.

6. Data analysis

Sample 1:

Source text

Howard: [*Starting to go off.*] I've got to see some people, kid.

Willy: [*Stopping him.*] I'm talking about your father! There were promises made across this desk! You mustn't tell me you've got people to see—I put thirty-four years into this firm, Howard, and now I can't pay my insurance! You can't eat the orange and throw the peel away—a man is not a piece of fruit! [*After a pause.*] Now pay attention. Your father—in 1928 I had a big year. I averaged a hundred and seventy dollars a week in commissions.

Howard: [*Impatiently.*] Now, Willy, you never averaged—

Willy: [*Banging his hand on the desk.*] I averaged a hundred and seventy dollars a week in the year of 1928! And your father came to me—or rather, I was in the office here—it was right over this desk—and he put his hand on my shoulder—

Howard: [*Getting up.*] You'll have to excuse me, Willy, I gotta see some people. Pull yourself together. [*Going out.*] I'll be back in a little while. [*On Howard's exit, the light on his chair grows very bright and strange.*]

Willy: Pull myself together! What the hell did I say to him? My God, I was yelling at him! How could I!

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-distant, social status-power relation-request

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Employee to employer

Negative politeness: The employer seems to depend on their mutual past; however, the employee gets more and more indifferent and less interested in the conversation.

Tired of the employer's insistence, the employee tries to make up excuses and, in doing so, adopts a negative face to get permission to leave as he says "have to excuse me" as if it's a necessity.

The "have to" sounds like a threat coming from a higher status to the lower status.

Target text 1 (*Aytuğ İz'at – Y. Emre İz'at 2010*)

Howard: (Çıkmaya davranır) Birkaç kişiyi görmem gerek, babalık.

Willy: (*Onu durdurarak*) Ben senin babandan bahsediyorum! Bu masanın başında verilen sözler vardı! Bana bazılarını görmem gerektiğini söylememeksin... ben bu firmaya otuz dört yılımı verdim Howard, ama şimdi sigortamı ödeyemiyorum! Sen portakalı yiyip de kabuğunu atamazsın. İnsan bir meyve değildir! (*Biraz sessizlikten sonra*) Şimdi dikkat et. Senin baban... 1928'de, büyük bir yıl geçirmiştin. Haftada ortalama 170 dolar komisyon yapıyordum.

Howard: (*Sabırsızlıkla*) Şimdi Willy sen hiç ortalama...

Willy: (*Eliyle masayı yumruklar*) Ben 1928'de ortalama 170 dolar yaptım! Ve senin baban bana geldi... daha doğrusu ben bu ofisteydim... tam bu masanın başında...ve elini benim omuzuma atıp...

Howard: (*Kalkarak*) Bana izin vermelisin, Willy. Birkaç kişi görmem gerek. Kendine hâkim ol. (*Çıkarak*) Birazdan dönerim. (*Howard'ın çıkışında sandalyede olan ışık tuhaf bir şekilde daha iyi aydınlanır*)

Willy: Kendime hâkim olacaktım! Ben ona ne dedim ki? Aman Allahım ben ona bağıryordum! Bunu nasıl yapabilirim!

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-distant, social status-power relation-request

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Employee to employer

Negative Politeness: The employer seems to depend on their mutual past; however, the employee gets more and more indifferent and less interested in the conversation

Tired of the employer's insistence, the employee tries to make up excuses and, in doing so, adopts a negative face to get permission to leave as he says "have to excuse me" as if it's a necessity.

The "have to" sounds like a threat coming from a higher status to the lower status.

Target text 2 (*Müge Ayşe Saraç 1994*)

Howard: (Çıkmaya yönelirken) Birilerini görmem lazım çocuk.

Willy: (Onu durdurarak) Baban hakkında konuşuyorum! Bu masada verilmiş sözler vardı! Bana birilerini görmem gerektiğini bahane olarak göstermemelisin – bu firmaya 34 yılımı verdim, Howard ve şimdi sigortamı ödeyemiyorum! Portakalı yiyip kabuğunu atamazsın – İnsan bir meyve kabuğu değildir! (Bir an durduktan sonra) şimdi kulak ver. 1928 benim için büyük bir yıl olmuştu. Komisyonlarla haftada ortalama 170 dolar kazanıyordum.

Howard: (sabırsızca) Bak Willy sen hiç bir zaman

Willy: (Masayı yumruklayarak) Ben 1928 yılında haftada 170 dolar kazanıyordum ve baban bana geldi - daha doğrusu ben burada bürodaydım, baban da tam bu masanın karşısındaydı – ve elini omuzuma koydu-

Howard:(Kalkarak) Kusuruma bakma Willy birilerini görmem lazım. Kendine gel. (Dışarı çıkarken) Hemen dönerim. (Howard'ın çıkmasıyla sandalyesindeki ışık giderek artar ve tuhaflaşır.)

Willy: Kendime geleyim! Ona ne dedim ki, Allahım ona bağıryordum! Nasıl yapabildim!

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-distant, social status-power relation-request

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Employee to employer

Positive politeness: The employer seems to show understanding to the employee as he seeks a way to be pardoned by the employer and personalizes the excusing term in Turkish as "kusuruma bakma", which makes the request look more positive and sound like the intimacy still prevails in their relationship and the conversation.

The threat seems to lower down to a more minimum level.

Target text 3 (*Orhan Burian 1952*)

Howard: (Gitmeye davranır) Göreceğim kimseler var.

Willy: (Onu durdurur) Babandan bahsediyorum! Şu masanın başında bir takım vaatler edilmişti! Bana, göreceğim kimseler var diyemezsin. Bu müesseseye otuz dört senemi verdim, Howard, şimdi sigorta taksidimi ödeyemiyorum! Portakalı yeyip kabuğunu atmaya benzemez – insandır bu, yemiş parçası değil! (Biraz durduktan sonra.) Şunu iyi dinle. Baban – 1928, çok kazançlı bir senemdi, haftada ortalama yüz yetmiş dolar komisyon alacak kadar iş yapmıştım...

Howard: (Sabırsızlanır) Canım Willy, senin hiç ortalama...

Willy: (yumruğunu masaya vurur) – 1928 senesi haftada ortalama yüz yetmiş dolar kazandım! Baban da gelip – daha doğrusu ben odadaydım – şu yazıhanenin başında elini omuzuma koydu...

Howard: (kalkar) Müsaade edeceksin Willy, göreceğim kimseler var. Kendini biraz toparla. (Çıkarken) Ben birazdan gelirim. (Howard çıktıktan sonra iskemlenin üstüne düşen ışık hem çok parlaklaşır, hem acıipleşir.)

Willy: Kendimi toparlayacakmışım ha? Ona ne dedim ki? Aman yarabbi, ona bağırdım ben! Nasıl da oldu bu!

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-distant, social status-power relation-request

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Employee to employer

Bald on Record: The employer appears to give a direct order to the employee and the threat is maximum.

Unlike the attitude he adopts in the previous sentence in which he uses an endearment word “canım” (i.e.dear in Eng.) as an introductory word, he turns to sound like more negatively as he gets more tired of the continuity of the conversation.

Sample 2:

Source text

Biff: I gotta talk to the boss, Mom. Where is he?

Linda: You're not going near him. Get out of this house!

Biff: (with absolute assurance, determination) No. We're gonna have an abrupt conversation, him and me.

Linda: You're not talking to him!

(Hammering is heard from outside the house, off right. Biff turns towards the noise.)

Linda: (suddenly pleading) Will you please leave him alone?

Biff: What's he doing out there?

Linda: He's planting the garden!

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-intimate

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Mother to son

Negative politeness: Contrary to the intimate flow of conversation, the mother stops to plead her son to do something and sounds dictating.

She uses no signs of intimacy, nor in-group id. markers and seems to mean what she wants.

She does not want to be rejected or impeded.

Target text 1

Biff: Reis'le konuşmam lazım, anne. Nerde o?

Linda: Yanına yaklaşamazsın. Defol bu evden!

Biff: (Kesin, güven verici ve kararlı) Hayır. Kısa ve öz bir konuşma yapacağız. Ben ve o.

Linda: Onunla konuşamazsın!

(Dışardan, sağdan çapa sesleri gelir. Biff sesin geldiği yöne döner)

Linda: (Birden valvarırcasına) Lütfen onu yalnız bırakır mısınız?

Biff: Ne yapıyor orada?

Linda: Bahçeye tohum ekiyor!

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-intimate

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Mother to son

Negative politeness: Contrary to the intimate flow of conversation, the mother stops to plead her son to do something and sounds dictating.

She uses no signs of intimacy, nor in-group id. markers and seems to mean what she wants.

She does not want to be rejected or impeded.

Target text 2

Biff: Patronla konuşmam lazım, anne. Nerede o?

Linda: Onun yanına yaklaşmayacaksın. Git bu evden!

Biff: (tam bir kararlılık ve kendine güvenle) Hayır. O ve ben konuşacağız.

Linda: Konuşmayacaksın onunla!

(Sağ tarafta, evin dışında çekiç sesleri duyulur. Biff sesin geldiği tarafa döner.)

Linda: (Aniden yalvararak) Lütfen onu yalnız bırakır mısınız?

Biff: Dışarda ne yapıyor?

Linda: Bahçeyi ekiyor!

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-intimate

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Mother to son

Negative politeness: Contrary to the intimate flow of conversation, the mother stops to plead her son to do something and sounds dictating.

She uses no signs of intimacy, nor in-group id. markers and seems to mean what she wants.

She does not want to be rejected or impeded.

Target text 3

Biff: Reis'le konuşacağım var, anne. Nerede?

Linda: Onun yanına bile yaklaşacak değilsin. Çık bu evden!

Biff: (Büyük bir emniyet ve katiyetle) Hayır. Onuna konuşacak iki çift sözüm var.

Linda: Onunla konuşmayacaksın diyorum!

(Evin dışından, sağ taraftan doğru çekiç sesleri gelir. Biff sese doğru döner.)

Linda: (birdenbire yalvarmaya başlar) Ne olur onu yalnız bırak

Biff: Dışarda ne yapıyor?

Linda: Bahçeye tohum ekiyor!

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-intimate

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Mother to son

Bald on record: The intimate flow of conversation continues with mother's bald on record statement, maximizing the want by the expression 'Ne olur', begging someone to do something.

No negativity exists in the request as there is no questioning or hedging the words but a direct – undressed speech event.

Sample 3:

Source text

Biff: Did you see the new football I got?

Willy: (examining the ball) Where'd you get a new ball?

Biff: The coach told me to practice my passing.

Willy: That so? And he gave you the ball, heh?

Biff: Well, I borrowed it from the locker room. (He laughs confidentially)

Willy to Happy: (laughing with him at the theft) I want you to return that.

Happy: I told you he wouldn't like it!

Biff: (Angrily) Well, I'm bringing it back!

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-intimate: showing sympathy by laughing, mitigated want,

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Father to Son

Negative politeness: The father uses redressed speech to be indirect and does not want to be impeded.

He presses cost to hearer and creates less threat and risk to his own face.

Target text 1

Biff: Yeni topumu gördün mü?

Willy: (Topu inceler) Yeni ha? Nereden buldun?

Biff: Koçumuz pas çalışmalarını yapmamı istedi.

Willy: Ya, demek öyle! Topu sana verdi ha?

Biff: Şey, malzeme odasından ödünç aldım. (Sinsi sinsi güler)

Willy: (Bu hırsızlık onu da güldürür) Onu geri vereceksin.

Happy: Razi olmayacağımı söylememiş miydin?

Biff: (Kızgın) Ama geri götüreceğim!

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-intimate: showing sympathy by laughing, mitigated want,

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Father to Son

Bald on record: The father uses non-redressed speech being direct in his want, maximizing imposition, and pressing cost to hearer

But he causes more threat for himself by risking his own face

Target text 2

Biff: Yeni aldığım futbol topunu gördün mü?

Willy: (Topu kontrol eder) Nereden aldın onu?

Biff: Koç paslara daha fazla çalışmamı söyledi.

Willy: Öyle mi? Sana da topu verdi, ha?

Biff: Tamam, soyunma odasından ödünç aldım. (Gizlice güler)

Willy: (Biff'le birlikte hırsızlığa güler) Onu geri götürmeni istiyorum.

Biff: (Sinirlice) Peki, geri götürüyorum.

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-intimate: showing sympathy by laughing, mitigated want,

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Father to Son

Negative politeness: The father uses redressed speech to be indirect and does not want to be impeded.

He presses cost to hearer and creates less threat and risk to his own face.

Target text 3

Biff: Yeni topumu gördün mü?

Willy: (Topu gözden geçirir) Yeni top nerede buldun?

Biff: Antrenör paslara çalışayım diye verdi.

Willy: Öyle mi? Demek topu sana verdi?

Biff: Öyle gibi bir şey; malzemenin durduğu odadan aldım. (Bir sır söylemiş gibi güler).

Willy: (Bu hırsızlığa onunla güler) Onu götürüp geri vereceksin.

Happy: Ben sana razı olmaz demedim mi?

Biff: (Kızgın) Peki, geri götürüyorum işte.

Register analysis

Field: Asymmetrical-intimate: showing sympathy by laughing, mitigated want,

Mode: Written to be spoken

Tenor: Father to Son

Bald on record: The father uses non-redressed speech being direct in his want, maximizing imposition, and pressing cost to hearer.

But he causes more threat for himself by risking his own face.

Sample 4:

Source text

Willy to Charley: (With difficulty) Charley look... I got my insurance to pay. If you can manage it- I need a hundred and ten dollars. (Charley doesn't reply for a moment, merely stops moving)

Willy: I'd draw it from my bank but Linda would know, and I...

Charley: Sit down, Willy.

Willy: (moving forward the chair) I'm keeping an account of everything, remember. I'll pay every penny back. (He sits.)

Charley: Now listen to me, Willy.

Willy: I want you to know I appreciate...

Charley: (sitting down on the table) Willy, what're you doing'? What the hell is goin' on in your head?

Willy: Why, I'm simply...

Register analysis

Field: Symmetrical –changing social status- hierarchy-power relation

Mode: Written to be Spoken

Tenor: Two Socially Distant Neighbors

Off Record: By using implicature, Willy, feeling obliged to borrow money, does not coerce Charley, a well-off and socially higher positioned neighbor.

The speaker minimizes threat to hearer and less imposition is created thanks to the conditional sentence.

Target text 1

Willy: (Zorlukla) Charley bak... Sigortamı ödemem gerek. Eğer gücün yetiyorsa...yüz on dolara ihtiyacım var. (Charley bir an cevap vermez ve hareketsiz kalır.)

Willy: Bankadan çekerdim ama o zaman Linda bilir ve ben...

Charley: Otur Willy.

Willy: (*Sandalyeye doğru yönelir*) Her şeyin hesabını tutuyorum, biliyorsun. Her kuruşunu geri öderim. (*Oturur*)

Charley: Şimdi beni dinle Willy.

Willy: Bilmeni isterim, ne kadar minettarım...

Charley: (*Masanın başında oturur*) Ne yapıyorsun? Canına yandığının kafanda ne var senin?

Willy: Niçin? Ben sıradan...

Register analysis

Field: Symmetrical –changing social status- hierarchy-power relation

Mode: Written to be Spoken

Tenor: Two Socially Distant Neighbors

Off Record: By using implicature, Willy, feeling obliged to borrow money, does not coerce Charley, a well-off and socially higher positioned neighbor.

The speaker minimizes threat to hearer and less imposition is created thanks to the conditional sentence

Target text 2

Willy: Charley, bak...(güçlülükle) Ödemem gereken bir sigortam var. Eğer verebilirsen- yüz on dolara ihtiyacım var. (Charley bir an cevap vermez, bütün hareketi durur).

Willy: Bankadan çekecektim ama Linda öğrenecekti ve ben...

Charley: Otur, Willy.

Willy: (*sandalyeye doğru giderek*) Herşeyin hesabını tutuyorum, biliyorsun. Kuruşu kuruşuna geri ödeyeceğim. (*Oturur*.)

Charley: Dinle beni, Willy.

Willy: Şunu bilmeni isterim ki her zaman takdir...

Charley: (*Masanın üzerine oturarak*) Willy, ne yapıyorsun? Allah kahretsin aklından neler geçiyor?

Willy: Neden? Ben yalnızca...

Register analysis

Field: Symmetrical –changing social status- hierarchy-power relation

Mode: Written to be Spoken

Tenor: Two Socially Distant Neighbors

Negative politeness: Willy acts without showing enough timidity, but he still has negative face fearing his want may be refused. He risks his own face by saying ‘verebilirsen’, revealing his want directly.

The if clause diminishes the magnitude of the want but the original off record strategy is not preserved.

Target text 3

Willy: Charley bana bak... (Güçlkle) Sigorta taksitimi vermek lazım, senin için müsaitse, yüz on dolara ihtiyacım olacak. (Charley bir an cevap vermez; ama durur, yürümez)

Willy: Bankadan alırdım ama Linda anlayacak, ben de...

Charley: Otur Willy.

Willy: (İskemleye doğru gider) Hepsinin hesabını tutuyorum, merak etme. Santimine kadar ödeyeceğim. (Oturur.)

Charley: Şimdi beni dinle, Willy.

Willy: Kıymet bilmiyor deme...

Charley: (masanın üzerine oturur) Willy, ne oluyor sana? Kafanın içinde neler dönüyor?

Willy: Hiç, sade...

Register analysis

Field: Symmetrical –changing social status- hierarchy-power relation

Mode: Written to be Spoken

Tenor: Two Socially Distant Neighbors

Off Record: By using implicature, Willy, feeling obliged to borrow money, does not coerce Charley, a well-off and socially higher positioned neighbor.

The speaker minimizes threat to hearer and less imposition is created thanks to the conditional sentence.

7. Findings and discussion

In the first sample, it is seen that the field of register is a workplace where a failing employee is in the aim of reaching out to his employer who is not so much interested. Contrary to their common history, the employer chooses a negative form of politeness while asking for a leave. The wording in the request is especially important in sensing the tone as the modal “*have to*” stresses the urgency. Directly confronting the hearer, the speaker actually does not seem to be asking for permission, but keeps a negative face and pretends to do so. Also, the speaker keeps the imposition at a certain degree. Target text 1 seems to follow the framework of the negative politeness and the modality of obligation in the source text continues in the target just like the imposition power of the speech act. However, target text 2 appears to be different as the translator changes the course of negativity into positivity. The dictating voice created by the modal “*have to*” in the source disappears, instead the speaker asks to be pardoned by the hearer by his expression “*kusuruma bakma*”. It feels like the speaker shows understanding and empathy and is also careful about the hearer’s face. On the other hand, in target text 3, it is evident that the translator chooses to perform bald on record strategy as it is seen the speaker gives a direct command to the hearer. The imposition is maximized and the cost to the hearer is increased.

The second sample is an example of a conversation between a mother and his son whose relationship is intimate. The politeness strategy adopted by the mother is a negative one because the mother prohibits his son from nearing his father who is busy doing some stuff in the garden. The structure of the request, which sounds dictating and threatening, is a deliberately asked question as the mother locates herself at a safe point where she cannot be turned down. The word ‘*please*’ functions like a diminutive term useful for mitigating the strength of the request, but it also stresses the urgency and seriousness of the request. Translators in the target text 1 and text 2 have basically the same patterns of politeness as seen in the original text. The translator in the third target text, though, follows a

different procedure in he goes bald on record. The question form, the negativity as well, disappears; a much more intimate form of speech takes its place. The term '*ne olur*' is a begging word and useful when direct want is prioritized. However, by developing an undressed way of speech, the speaker takes more risk of harming her own face, which may potentially damage their overall interpersonal relations.

The third sample shows the scene of a father-son conversation which generally feels intimate as they speak about football, not a serious subject. The field of the register is asymmetrical, yet intimate and it takes place in the backyard of their house, which also adds informality to mode of their speech. Even though the father shows understanding to his son's unpermitted borrowing of the football, he does not let his son keep it and forces him to take it back. Therefore, he keeps a negative face in an indirect request. Target text 1 and 3, though, are undressed directives pointed at the son. The negativity created in the original is maintained, but the imposition and the threat to the hearer is maximized with the bald on record strategy. While increasing the cost to the hearer, the speaker is actually increasing the risk of damaging his own face. The second target text, though, is similar to the original text in that it is redressed speech act and the speaker is careful enough not to risk his own face as he keeps a negative face.

The fourth sample presents an asymmetrical relationship, which used to be symmetrical in the past, between two neighbors one of whom is doing well in business, the other is not. Willy, the inferior one, acts timidly while he expresses his need of some money. Going off record, the speaker does not directly and explicitly reveal his want, instead, by hedging words he uses if conditional to lessen to his already covert request. The timidness of the speaker and his implicit way of speech constitutes the core of the register and minimizes threat and cost to the hearer to the lowest level possible. Target text 1 and 3 show similar strategy of linguistic politeness given the fact that if conditional continues to exist and the covert form of the request is kept intact by the corresponding words in Turkish '*gücün yetiyorsa* and *müsaitse*'. However, the translator in the second target text chooses to use the word '*vermek*' i.e. '*give or lend*' in English, which makes the off record strategy disappear. The speaker keeps a negative face fearing that his request will be rejected and, though, he not only increases the risk of damaging his own face but also increases the imposition on the hearer.

The claims of universality of B&L in their taxonomy of politeness strategies have drawn serious amount of criticism especially when the arch west-east cultural variation is concerned. The linguistic projections of politeness are not in an exceptional position to assert that there is only one and the same path of applying politeness in all languages. Leech, touching on the subject, states that "B&L focus on the individual, however appropriate to the West, is quite inappropriate to the group orientation of Eastern cultures, specifically those of China and Japan" (2005: 2) Similar to Leech, Matsumoto (1988) argues that the theory of Brown and Levinson are not able to answer to the needs of Japanese and Japanese social structure in which honorifics are necessarily used to specify the different status of interlocutors. Another opposition to the standard definitions of politeness comes from Tretyakova who expresses her position saying "dimensions of cross-cultural and intercultural differences mostly lie in social norms reflecting the differences in politeness standard norms. The very interpretation of politeness concept is different in different cultures" (2016: 657). Also, Yetkiner (2008) states that Turkish society is quite sensitive about social attitudes of people and supports the existence of social borders among people.

Given the diversity of ways of expressing linguistic politeness, the randomly chosen samples given in the study reveal that translations, done in different years, do not show exact sameness and some

strategies of politeness applied in the source text are replaced with other types of strategies. Linguistic modification required at the level of texture to relay the dynamics of politeness, suggested by Hatim and Mason (1997) could be seen in the samples. Hatim and Munday (2004: 191) argue that the consistency of the register is directly related to the cohesion and coherence of a text, therefore, the preservation of register as possible as it is, is a duty that needs to be prioritized. Concerning the functional equivalence between texts, Yetkiner states that “it is necessary to do register analysis in order to analyze the textual content from a linguistic aspect, and to distinguish the stylistic differences and to uncover all intertextual dynamics inside the text” (2008: 36). Emphasizing the importance of register equivalence, Gregory suggests that “the establishment of register equivalence can be seen then as the major factor in the process of translation; the problems of such equivalence, a crucial test of the limits of translatability” (1980: 466). Thus, the duty of exposing the register behind every speech event not only helps to identify linguistic background behind texts but also makes it a valuable and valid method of analysis in translation studies.

Conclusion

It has been observed that negative and positive forms of politeness dominate the whole taxonomy of B&L (1978) and bald on record and off record strategies function like side techniques that govern the positive or negative face of people. It is true that politeness strategies might differ from region to region and linguistic variations are necessarily existent due to the unique characteristics of languages. This fact makes it hard to do the translation of speech acts, like the requests as studied in this study.

It is also seen that the functionality equivalence is a major concern for translators. Even though functionality provides some degree of freedom with translators in their choice of wording, language style and syntactic transformations, any deviation that happens in politeness strategies might specifically distort the interpersonal relations which are designated and planned by the producer of the original text. Therefore, translators need to keep in mind that linguistic politeness is not only an issue about courtesy rules in the society, but, more importantly perhaps, it is also the primary language tool that adjusts the power of the remarks uttered in speech events, and controls the balance of human relations.

The register analysis is an effective tool that helps translators evaluate translation as the continuation of a communication. Its application in the study has proved to be helpful in exposing those relations and maintain the balance specifically designed by the author for the original text. However, it is obligatory to do more research with much more amount of data in order to develop a wider insight into the issue.

References

- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation*. London, UK: Routledge
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. (1978). *Politeness Some Universals in Language Usage*: Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Eggs, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (2nd ed). London, UK: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Goffman, E. (1967). “On Face-Work, An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction”. *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York: Doubleday.
- Gregory, M. J. (1980) Perspectives on Translation from the Firthian Tradition. *Meta* 25 (4), 455-66.

- Grice, H.P. (1975). 'Logic and Conversation' In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics*, Volume 3. New York: Academic Press. pp. 41-58.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1989). *Spoken and Written Language*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Hatim, B. and I. Mason. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London, UK: Longman.
- Hatim, B. , I. Mason. (1997). "Politeness in Screen Translating", in: Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge. 430-446.
- Hatim, B., Munday, J. (2004). *Translation an Advance Resource Book*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hornby, M. S. (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company
- House, J. (2001) Translation Quality Assessment: Linguistic Description versus Social Evaluation, *Meta*, 46, 2, June, 243-257
- House, J. (2015). *Translation Quality Assessment, Past and Present*. New York, USA: Routledge
- House, J. (2018). *Translation The Basics*. New York, USA: Routledge
- Kasper G. (1990). 'Linguistic Politeness: Current Research Issues.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 193-218.
- Katz, M. (2015). Politeness theory and the classification of speech acts. *Working Papers of the Linguistics Circle of the University of Victoria* 25(2), 45-55.
- Leech, G. N. (2005). Politeness: IS there an East and West Divide?. *Journal of Foreign Languages*. Lancaster University: UK
- Leech, G. N. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the Universality of Face: Politeness Phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12, 403-426.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mullany, L. (1999). *Linguistic Politeness and Sex Differences in Broadcast Interviews*. Leeds working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics. Leeds, UK
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London, UK: Routledge
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publication.
- O'Keefe, A., Clancy, B., & Adolph's, S. (2011). *Introducing Pragmatics in Use*. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Ogiermann, E. (2009). Politeness and In-directness across Cultures: A Comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian Requests. *Journal of Politeness Research Language Behaviour Culture* 5(2):189-216
- Searle J. R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Cambridge University Press Language in Society*, Vol. 5, No.1 (Apr., 1976), pp. 1-23
- Tretyakova, T. P. (2016). On Politeness in Translation. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences* 3 (2016 9) 653-661
- Yetkiner, N. K. (2008). İncelik Kuramı ve Yüz Olgusu Bağlamında Çeviri Çalışmalarında İşlevsel-Edimbilimsel Eleştiri Yöntemi Uygulaması. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi*. Cilt 19, 31-50.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press