Exploring Politeness: Analyzing the Arabic Translation In Jane Austen's Sense And Sensibility

Mariem Mahmoudi
Abdelmalek Essaâdi University, Morocco
mariemoudi390@gmail.com

Abdelkrim Chirig
Applied Language and Culture Studies (ALCS), Chouaib Doukkali University, El Jadida, Morocco

Abstract

Research shows that the concept of politeness is inherently intricate. The current paper examines the role of politeness in translation and highlights its significance as a chief aspect for translators. It focuses on the relationship between pragmatics and translation. The study analyzes the Arabic translation of selected chapters from Jane Austen's Sense and Sensibility, which takes place during the Victorian era and employs various linguistic elements that depict many aspects of politeness. The analysis discusses honorific titles and politeness expressions in both the source English text and its Arabic translation. Following a qualitative approach, Roger T. Bell's discourse parameters are implemented as the analytical framework. Through this examination, the paper highlights the relationship between translation and pragmatics while enhancing our understanding of cross-cultural linguistic differences. The results show that neglecting pragmatic features in translation (i.e., politeness) often due to specific factors can result in incomplete or poor translations, potentially altering the formality of the text unintentionally.

1. INTRODUCTION

Politeness in language primarily reflects the intricacies of human social interaction, involving the consideration of people's emotions, as well as the suitable acknowledgement of their social status and interpersonal connections (Brown, 2015). According to Thomas, politeness causes a lot of confusion as it includes many terms, theories and other theories refuting the former ones (2014). That is the first reason why we chose to identify some confusing terms; the second reason lies in the misunderstanding arising from the difference between politeness viewed from a linguistic angle and politeness personally observed, i.e., the common notion of politeness that people always associate with ways of speaking. Hearing about the theory of politeness, one may think that it is about manners and ethics one adopts and behaves according to so as to look friendly, caring, modest or even well-educated. Actually, it is much more complicated, especially when associated with discourse.

Usami differentiates between normative and pragmatic politeness as he explains that the first "refers to the traditional understanding of the degree of politeness intrinsic to linguistic expressions", while the second refers to "the functions of language manipulation that work to maintain smooth human relationships" (2006, p.20). Additionally, Spencer-Oatey states that politeness "is often interpreted as referring to the use of relatively formal and deferential language" (2000, p.2).

The theory of politeness is mainly about the linguistic, particularly pragmatic, concept of politeness. There are many studies conducted in this field; for instance, Brown and Levinson point out that one's self-esteem pushes one to use one politeness strategy over the other (1987). In spite of the criticism that Brown's and Levinson's politeness theory was faced with and is still facing, it is considered as the core of politeness theory. The latter includes various approaches focusing on various aspects like the speaker, and the hearer, both of them, the behavior or the culture to which the speaker and hearer belong.

There is no doubt that translation exceeds the linguistic level to the cultural one simply because when we translate a given message from one language to another; we do not transfer only the words and ideas, but also the traditions, the mentality, the history, the background and the whole atmosphere of the source message (Brandes, 2001). Thus, all those elements are purely cultural and implicitly get transferred to the target language. The main issue at hand pertains to the impediment in translating politeness and the extent to which its impact is maintained following the translation process.

1.1. Research Aim

One of the main objectives of this research is to focus on how the translator deals with politeness expressions, titles and models used in the novel under study; however, there are many problems that this paper raises. For instance, the translator should find the equivalences of all the expressions and titles in the target language (Arabic). And if the translator cannot find the exact equivalences, (s)he should consider omitting, substituting, or finding another solution while bearing in mind their significance in the context of the novel. Moreover, strategies like omission and substitution of those titles can potentially have negative consequences on the translation itself, risking the loss of the impact of the source text (ST) on the reader. Last but not least, preserving registers and discourse parameters is important to the target text (TT).

Another important objective is the significant feature of politeness in the initial text is usually ignored by translators. This research also stresses on the importance of the translator's linguistic, cultural and pragmatic knowledge and on the idea that the translation process surpasses the act of translating words and structures to concepts and "paralinguistic" elements.

Another significant factor to consider is the significance of registers and discourse parameters inside a text. Moreover, this study aims to know some essential points that the translator should not forget or ignore to get the appropriate version of the ST at the textual and conceptual levels. Comparing the Arabic version to the English one will enable us to find out if the translator will succeed in providing a translation that covers the textual and pragmatic aspects.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Politeness as a Discourse Parameter

In his book *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*, Bell (1991) discusses discourse and the relation between the speaker and the addressee, as well as the variables that control such relation. The individuals have the opportunity to become members of a group, provided that they possess and are willing to disclose specific measurable demographic attributes that are, for instance, gender, ethnicity, occupation, education, and age at a specific

point in time, and place of origin (Bell, 1991). Such characteristics (also known as *markers*), appear in an individual's speech and writing. This focus on the speaker-addressee relationship reminds us of the social variables claimed to assess the Face-Threatening Acts (FTA) seriousness which are the social distance between speaker and hearer, the relative power of both of them and the ranking of imposition within a culture. This means that cultural and social aspects play a prominent role in, if not substantially control, the interaction between two individuals.

The first element in discourse parameters, which include other scales, is the *tenor*. It is the *tone* in spoken or written language form through which the relationship between the speaker and hearer is directly or indirectly reflected. Formality, impersonality, accessibility and politeness are the levels of tenor that overlap, providing information about the addressee and, mainly, the speaker (1991).

Concerning politeness, Bell states that it "reflects the social distance in the addressee relationship between sender and receiver" (1991, p.187). Moreover, he distinguishes between two dimensions of politeness: horizontal and vertical. The first concept pertains to the quantitative disparity within social groups, specifically referring to the extent of separation among persons that possess similar demographic attributes as previously discussed. The second concept pertains to power dynamics associated with position, status, and authority. Consequently, the degree of politeness increases with the increase of distance either horizontal or vertical. Bell mentions that expressing politeness differs from one culture/language to another through personal pronouns like in French and German, titles or softening directives and imperatives by, for example, using the expression "please".

2.2. Politeness in Translation

2.2.1. Politeness Constraints in Translation

In light of what has been said, politeness is a kind of communication since the speaker expresses a certain idea, utterance, or behaviour in a certain way in accordance with his or her aim, the situation, or according to the addressee himself or herself. Therefore, there are mainly three factors that intervene and influence the choice of the speaker in opting for politeness or impoliteness in a given communicative event. Firstly, Text typology plays a pivotal role in determining the register utilized by the translator. Hatim (1997) clarifies that writers, irrespective of their domain such as literature, scientific reports, cultural articles, or political speeches, possess the autonomy to select between exposition, argumentation, or neither, along with the choice of employing explicit or implicit forms of discourse. This selection is influenced by various factors including the objectives of communication and social variables like distance, power, and imposition. Hatim underscores the importance of discerning the appropriate choice of expression for different contexts. The translator must adeptly discern the suitable style and level of expression dictated by the nature of the text, whether it leans towards formal, informal, or an intermediary tone. Secondly, the challenges posed by cultural disparities significantly impact the accurate representation of politeness in translation. Diverse cultures express politeness through distinctive culturally specific routine formulae, each embodying its own set of politeness norms. The comparison between languages underscores the unique functions and norms linked with politeness expressions and structures. For instance, the manner in which direct requests are made varies across languages; while Polish and Russian may employ direct requests, German and English opt for indirect strategies as a marker of politeness. This divergence highlights the imperative for translators to be well-versed in the source and target cultures to aptly convey politeness nuances and to address the inherent challenges in rendering untranslatable elements with contextual adaptability (Ogiermann, 2009). Ultimately, the distinction between formality and politeness introduces an intricate layer of complexity in the translation process. Formality underscores the extent to which attention is

devoted to structuring a message; heightened attention results in a more formal expression. Markers of formality are evident at both the lexical and syntactical levels. Politeness, rooted in the social dynamics between communicators, escalates as the interpersonal distance increases. Variations in linguistic expressions of politeness are exemplified by the use of personal pronouns and politeness modifiers like "please". While the distinction between formality and politeness may appear unclear, translators must adeptly navigate these subtleties to ensure faithful transmission of the intended message. A profound understanding of both source and target cultures and their linguistic intricacies is indispensable in effectively addressing these intricacies and ensuring a successful translation outcome (Bell, 1991).

2.2.2. Politeness Effect within the ST and TT

A text may lose some of its elements, especially those relating to pragmatics. In the case of politeness, Hatim and Mason (1997, p. 66) describe it as "inevitably underrepresented". This underrepresentation is often accompanied by the loss of the text's effect, particularly that of politeness. From a linguistic point of view, there is a hypothesis suggesting that "politeness is a universal feature of natural language communication" (1997, p. 68). This proposes, as regards translation, that "the dynamics of politeness can be relayed trans-culturally but will require a degree of linguistic modification at the level of texture" (p. 68). For instance, translators often face a challenge in translating some personal pronouns like *Vous* in French, *Sie* in German and *Voi* and *Lei* in Italian when it comes to expressing politeness and not the plural.

The text may experience a reduction in certain elements, such as politeness, which is both encoded and decoded, resulting in a diminished impact on who receives it. Hatim and Mason argue that politeness encoding encompasses several elements like intonation and the form of sentences that are "the linguistic features which constitute the best evidence of the management of the situation, the interpersonal dynamics and the progress of the conflictual verbal relationship" (1997, p. 73). But in a general sense, it may be said that Translation Theory primarily focuses on elucidating the implied meaning within a given discourse, rather than solely relying on the explicit content of the discourse itself. Such a thing may occur due to the translator's goal of conveying the *paralinguistic features* like facial expressions, gaze or intonation that go along with the dialogue and that are required to be expressed explicitly in the TT.

It is worth mentioning that it is hard for translators to keep all text's features, linguistic or paralinguistic ones; some of them need to be *sacrificed*. Consequently, there is no way the TT preserves the same degree of effect existing in the original text. It is imperative to consider the implementation of a sacrificial act. The potential consequence of this loss of effect is the potential for misinterpretation or the creation of a deceptive perception regarding the character's level of directness or indirectness. While in other types of text, which do not contain dialogues, it may also lead to deforming the original culture and language.

Accordingly, the process of translation goes through several stages whereby a number of the ST's elements get lost. Moreover, some constraints face the translator regarding the politeness subject, and that originate either from the text itself, the culture in which it was produced or other external factors. In case the translator does not pay attention to such constraints and tricks, the translation will be highly affected and may not be successful.

3. METHODOLOGY

This paper started with tackling the issue of politeness from a pragmatic side. The focus was not on politeness per se, since it is a rich subject to discuss, but it represented only a part

among others. The second part was a comparative study. To be succinct, we precisely selected four chapters - the second, third, fourth, and tenth - containing dialogues, especially those between male and female characters. Such dialogues showed the vertical and horizontal distance or hierarchy explained by Bell (1991), knowing that there were different relationships relating the characters in the novel.

It is important to mention that we used the Arabic version which was published by Dar Al-Ahlia in Aman, Jordan and which concluded in a series of published novels under the name of "سلسلة روائع القصص العالمية". In this part, cases of using titles and expressions of politeness were extracted from both ST and TT in order to classify them, describe them in detail, and compare them. This comparison was in terms of strategies used by the translator to deal with the use of titles, modals, and some phrases expressing request, refusal, or apology, detaching them from their textual meaning to analyze their pragmatic significance. Afterwards, we tried to explain the result of the analysis that enabled us to see the similarities and differences between the two languages concerning the parameter in question. Lastly, we drew a conclusion providing a summary and findings of the research.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The current section of the Arabic version of the Victorian novel *Sense and Sensibility* seeks to determine whether the translator has respected, considered, and implemented the ideas presented in the preceding pages. Only dialogues are to be considered in this part, though politeness can be investigated or monitored in narrative excerpts as well. To make it concise, clear and controllable, dialogues are to be taken from the second, third, fourth and tenth chapters of the aforementioned novel and its translation.

It may seem trivial to say that this Arabic version of the novel contains a number of mistakes that have, apparently, resulted from a lack of comprehension which leads to an unsuccessful translation in some segments. However, it is of high importance to mention that such mistakes, which may not be that serious, but still make the reader feel that it is not a full-fledged translation, are mainly due to using peculiar collocations in Arabic and literal translation. The following examples describe the lack of comprehension or concentration when translating:

1. كانت السيدة جينينجز أرملة بثروة مريحة for "Mrs Jennings was a widow, with a comfortable fortune" (p. 40).
2. يزال يستعمل بالكامل ذراعيه و رجليه for "he still has the full use of his arms and legs" (p. 42).
3. يعاني من ظهر سيئ for "did you not hear him complain of having a bad back ?" (p. 42).
4. قد يبدو لك أن من المدهش تماما بان حياتي دامت إلى عمر الأربعين العظيم for "it must seem to you quite astonishing that my life has lasted to the great age of forty" (p. 44).
5. إنني اعرفه جيدا تماما for "I know him extremely well" (p. 90).
6. كانت الآن قادرة على السيطرة على مشاعرها for "she was now able to control her feelings" (p. 198).

If we take the first, third, fourth and fifth examples, we will find that ثروة, ظهر, عمر and جيدا do not collocate with مريحة, سيئ, العظيم and تماما especially if associated with the context in which they are used in the novel; instead of saying ثروة مريحة, the translator could have put ثروة تكفيها مدى الحياة instead of ظهر سيئ s/he could use يعاني من آلام في الظهر and instead of اعرفه جيدا تماما, اعرفه كل المعرفة or تمام المعرفة would be better than what the translator did. Concerning the second and the last examples, we can describe the translation as inept since the original segments were literally translated.

The focus on the translation and the mistakes that were made is not intended to diminish the translator's proficiency, but rather serves as proof indicating the presence of mistranslations in

certain sentences. Consequently, it is possible that there are also inaccuracies in the translation of politeness features, bearing in mind that such features may not always be explicitly evident in the text. Mistakes might manifest not just at the lexical level, but also at the pragmatic and semantic levels.

In the very beginning of the novel, an introductory passage is presented whereby the author engages the reader through the utilization of the personal pronoun "you" and the possessive adjective "your". This rhetorical device prompts contemplation over the wisdom of openly expressing one's emotions compared to maintaining a calm demeanor, occasionally bordering on indifference. The original segment that expresses this is: "If you have strong feelings, is it better to express them, eagerly and passionately, to the whole world? Is it wise? And if you always show the world a calm face and a quiet voice, does this mean there is no passion, no fire inside your heart?" (p. 7).

The translator made an effort to ensure accurate translation by providing the following:

"إذا كانت لديك مشاعر قوية، هل من الأفضل التعبير عنها بلهفة و عاطفية إلى العالم كله؟ هل هذا عمل حكيم؟ و إذا أظهرت دائما للعالم وجها هادئا و صوتا هادئا، هل يعني هذا انه ليس هناك أي عاطفة، ليس هناك أي نار في قلبك؟"

Concerning the translation, it can be considered satisfactory, taking into account that the translator evasively chose not to vocalize (شكل) the words "لديك" and "قلبك", since in Arabic, as in other languages, the feminine and masculine forms are distinguished from each other, so as to avoid the problem of gender discrimination letting the reader chose the one that suits him/her. This solution is quite intelligent and mentioned here to depict the importance of the translator's interference.

The responsibility for justifying and explaining the selection of certain words, structures, or strategies in a translation lies solely with the translator. Therefore, any analysis or criticism of the translation should be grounded in an examination of the translator's choices and interference.

Coming to commenting on the translation of politeness features, we will start with the use of *titles* in the novel, some illocutionary acts like apologizing and inviting and the context in which they were put, and the last point, which is the relationship linking the distance between the interlocutors and their utterance, in other words, how the horizontal or vertical distance affects the speaker's choice of how to say something.

5.1. Titles

Titles, despite their association with conventional notions of politeness rather than politeness theory, serve as a common element across cultures and languages. They function as an indicator of politeness; whether in Arabic or in English, titles indicate the person's sex, approximate age and whether the person is married or not, especially women. Regarding the aforementioned novel, the author employed many titles that subtly convey the social status and position of the addressee. However, the inquiry at hand is to the translator's approach in rendering these titles into another language.

The titles Mr., Mrs. and Miss were translated as السيد, السيدة and الآنسة like Mrs. Dashwood (p. 29), which became السيدة داشوود, such translation is considered to be correct. Nevertheless, the translator chose sometimes to keep the title as it was mentioned in the ST; for instance, lady Middleton (p. 36), Mrs. Jennings (p. 42), Sir John (p. 52), Madame (p. 204) and Lady Miss Steel (p. 204) all were kept as they are: ليدي ميدلتون, مسز جينينجز, سير جون, مادام and مس ستيل السيد .

Conversely, the translator opted, in other segments, for translating the word *lady* by السيدة الماجدة or the *gentleman* by السيد الماجد; s/he translated, for example, "the ladies had to ask his name and age" (p. 37) by كان على السيدات الماجدات أن يسألن عن اسمه و عمره (P. 36). It seems that the translator made a choice by not keeping one translation of the title; sometimes the title was directly substituted by its equivalent in Arabic (Mr.: السيد), transliterated (Miss: مس) or supported by another descriptive word (Lady: سيدة ماجدة).

This inconsistency is generally to be avoided in translation, but the translator seems to vary his/her propositions of titles' equivalents. Such decision might be based on specific reasons one of which may be the effect of the title itself in the English society and literature. For instance, the word lady has a cultural content that makes *lady* not only a word to address a woman politely or to describe her excellent manners and behavior, but also a word that is treated differently in American and British English based on the different aspects of the two cultures. As explained by Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary, the word "lady" is used in "an informal way to talk to a woman, showing a lack of respect" in American English, while in the British one lady is an old-fashioned word referring to "a woman belonging to a high social class" or a title used "by a woman who is a member of the nobility, or by somebody who has been given the title *lady* as an honor (Hornby, 2015). The wives and daughters of some members of the nobility and the wives of knights are also called "Lady".

The inclusion of ماجدة in سيدة can be justified by the fact that سيدة alone does not comprehensively express the concept of a lady, as the latter incorporates the individual's high social status or rank as a cultural element. In contrast, سيدة can refer to any woman belonging to various socioeconomic classes, including those who are economically disadvantaged; therefore, the translator decided to keep the word lady, in some cases, as it is and replace it by سيدة ماجدة in others. Another example which depicts the translator's choice to transliterate a word rather than translate it, though it does not belong to the category of titles, is the word sofa; "placed her carefully on a sofa in the sitting-room" (p. 51) was translated as "وضعها بحرص على الأريكة, "صوفا في غرفة الجلوس (p. 50). As we all know, sofa has an equivalent in Arabic, which is الأريكة, but the translator preferred to transliterate it, maybe because, for the translator, it would not convey the full meaning, especially at the cultural level; yet such hypothesis is not highly persuasive.

Unfortunately, this interpretation cannot be extended to the remaining titles, specifically *Sir* and *Miss*, as they possess Arabic counterparts that fully convey the original lexical elements. Titles. Though we may not be aware of their role, titles have a significant presence in the novel and in daily conversations generally; they identify the position of the speaker and receiver and somehow the strategy followed by the two in communicating with each other.

5.2. Illocutionary Acts and Politeness

Through the segments selected from the novel, there are several illocutionary acts that are indirectly related to the theory of politeness since both of them, illocutionary acts and the theory of politeness, are tightly associated with pragmatics. To know how the interlocutors express their intentions, wants and desires, in the light of politeness theory, the following segments were chosen and followed by their analysis in order to avoid any confusion:

1 -"I am glad of your promise. Now I would ask you one more thing. Tell me that not only your home will remain the same, but that I shall always find you and your family unchanged, and that you will always consider me with the kindness which has made you all so dear to me" (p. 71).
…

-"Is Marianne ill? Cried Mrs Dashwood.

-"I hope not," he replied, trying to look cheerful. Indeed, it is I who may expect to be ill, as I am now suffering under a very heavy disappointment. I am unable to visit you any longer. My cousin, Mrs Smith, has this morning decided to send me to London on business. As a poor dependent relation, I must do what she asks. I have already left Allenham, and now I have come to say goodbye to you" (p. 73)

The following brief dialogue transpires between the character of Mr. Willoughby, who is often regarded as Marianne's romantic partner, and who visits Marianne with the intention of communicating his permanent departure, and Mrs. Dashwood, Marianne's mother. The mother has fear subsequent to observing her daughter's response. It is worth noting that her inquiry is not intended to ascertain Marianne's state of health, but rather to ascertain the cause behind her daughter's tearful ascent to the upper floor. Willoughby responds to the mother in a highly polite manner, expressing his intention to depart and likely not return. Willoughby expresses his gratitude to Mrs. Dashwood in an indirect manner and implores her to remain unchanged. This might be interpreted as an implicit confession of his admiration for her and her daughters, as well as the delightful experiences he shared with them.

We can consider that Willoughby used an ambiguous and indirect way to express his opinion and feelings towards the Dashwood ladies; it is the off-record strategy, while Mrs. Dashwood chooses to be indirect but not ambiguous opting for negative politeness. In the Arabic version, the translator tried to keep the same degree of ambiguity and indirectness respecting the way the writer put it. The translator put (pp. 70-72):

"أخبريني بأن بيتك لن يبقى على حاله فقط، بل سأجدك أنت وعائلتك دائما بلا تغيير وأنكن ستعاملنني دائما بالرقة التي جعلت منكن كلكن عزيزات علي إلى هذا الحد"

"إنه أنا الذي أتوقع أن أكون مريضا، حيث إنني أعاني الآن من خيبة أمل ثقيلة أنا لم أعد قادرا على زيارتكن"

2   -"This is very unfortunate. But Mrs Smith's business will not keep you from us for very long, I hope."
-"He reddened as he replied, "You are very kind, but I have no hope of returning to Devonshire immediately. My visits to Mrs Smith are never repeated within the year"
-"And is Mrs Smith your only friend? Is Allenham the only house where you are welcome? My dear Willoughby! Surely you do not need to wait for an invitation to Barton Cottage?" (p. 75).

In this particular segment, Mrs. Dashwood appears to convey her melancholy by characterizing the situation as "unfortunate" and exhibiting a sense of solidarity and sympathy. Additionally, she displays a tendency to encourage Willoughby to make a commitment to visit her in the future through the use of phrases such as "will not" and "I hope." These linguistic choices reflect her hesitancy and ambivalence. By employing the phrase "will not," she implicitly suggests that if Willoughby possesses the desire and intention to visit, external factors, such as Mrs. Smith, should not hinder his decision. However, she swiftly transitions to expressing her hope, which serves to mitigate the assertiveness of her prior statement and prevent any potential discomfort for Willoughby.

After she embarrassed him, as shown by the narrator's expression "he reddened as he replied" manifesting that he understood the implicit meaning of her words, Mrs. Dashwood asks Willoughby rhetorical questions hinting that he is welcomed, then uses a more direct tone saying "surely you do not need to wait for an invitation…" and softens her utterance by "My dear". She occasionally exhibits a tendency to employ positive politeness strategies, demonstrating solidarity, as well as negative politeness strategies in relation to others, before reverting back to the employment of positive politeness once more.

3 -"I am perfectly happy with both. Has not his behaviour to Marianne, for at least the last fortnight, shown that he loved her and considered her his future wife? Is it possible, Elinor, to doubt their engagement? Willoughby must be aware of your sister's love for him. How could he leave her, perhaps for months, without telling her of his affection?"

-"Oh Elinor, I do not understand you! You prefer to believe in bad rather than good. Do you suspect Willoughby? But is he not a man of honour and feelings? You cannot really think he is deceiving Marianne?" (pp. 77- 79).

Mrs. Dashwood poses a sequence of rhetorical questions to Elinor, compelling her to reconsider her view on Willoughby, towards whom she harbors reservations and apprehensions regarding his potential to inflict harm onto her sister. From a pragmatic perspective, it is not necessary for the connection between a mother and daughter to involve a high level of politeness. Consequently, their conversations are anticipated to be straightforward and without any attempts to address or rectify potential issues. This can be referred to as a *Baldly on Record* strategy.

In addition to that, the last question is an attempt to urge Elinor to inform her mother about anything this latter does not know; "you cannot really think he is deceiving Marianne?" is a negative sentence from which the reader may expect that there is an implicit addition, for example, "you cannot really think he is deceiving Marianne, can you?". This addition can show that implicit desire and insistence of the mother.

In the Arabic version, the translator did not make any effort to shed light on this point; لا يمكنك أن تفكري حقا في أنه يخدع ماريان is the translation provided and which cannot, in spite of the question mark, be a question in Arabic even if it were in English, simply because both languages have different systems; therefore, the translator had to interfere and add something that would not only explain what is said, but also what is implicated like أنا مخطئة or ليس كذلك هل.

4 "I have found you out, miss, in spite of your cleverness. I know where you spent the morning"
Marianne blushed, and said quickly, 'Where'?

Mrs Jennings smiled knowingly. "I hope you like your house, Miss Marianne. It is certainly very large, and when I come to see you in, I hope you will have refurnished it. It badly needed new furniture when I was last there." (P. 67)

The old lady, Mrs. Jennings, attempts to publicly humiliate Miss Marianne by revealing her whereabouts in the morning, so engaging in a behavior that challenges Marianne's social standing. As a result, Mrs. Jennings has the potential to cause Marianne to experience embarrassment and physical trembling. Mrs. Jennings cunningly responded to Marianne's question by providing a description of the house and suggesting the idea of refurbishing it, rather than directly informing her about the specific house she saw with Willoughby. She deliberately chose to employ an off-record approach, which was effectively demonstrated in the translation, despite the presence of a few mistakes (p. 66).

" آمل أن تحبي منزلك يا مس ماريان، إنه يقينا واسعا جدا و حين آتي لأراك فيه آمل أن تكوني قد أعدت تأثيثه إنه يحتاج حاجة ماسة إلى أثاث جديد حين كنت هناك آخر مرة"

5   "Yes", Sir John added to Elinor, "he is well worth catching. He has a house and land in Somerset as well. And if I were you, I wouldn't allow my younger sister to have him, despite all this falling down hills. Miss Marianne must not expect to have all the men to herself. Brandon will be jealous if she does not take care."
"I do not believe," said Mrs Dashwood, smiling, "that either of my daughters will make any attempts at what you call catching him. It is not an employment to which they have been fought up. Men are very safe with us, however, that he is a respectable young man, whom we can meet socially" (p. 54).

In this short dialogue, it is evident that Mrs. Dashwood, despite her smile, harbours disapproval towards Sir John's advice on the subject of attracting a man. She expresses her disapproval of her daughter's engagement in a low-cost activity, emphasizing that men are safe in their presence. This feeling conveys her annoyance. Sir John has a spontaneous and straightforward communication style while addressing Mrs. Dashwood, utilizing both baldly on-record strategies and occasional positive politeness. In contrast, Mrs Dashwood responds sharply and immediately to Sir John, despite maintaining a smiling demeanour, as a consequence of feeling threatened. She expresses a reluctance to envision her daughters pursuing romantic relationships with men. Instead, they hold the belief that her daughters are deserving of respect, possess good manners, and should not be subject to such thoughts. This observation was similarly evident in the Arabic translation (p. 53).

" لا أصدق أن أيا من ابنتي ستقومان بمحاولات بما تدعوه الإمساك به، إنا ليس وظيفة أنشئتا عليها، الرجال آمنون معنا مهما كانوا أغنياء "

6   "You know much more of the matter than I do," said Elinor, surprised, "if you have any reason to expect that." (p. 91).
"Don't pretend it's not true, because you know it's what everybody in London is talking of."
"My dear Mrs Palmer!"

Elinor conveys her profound surprise at any claims made by Mrs. Palmer on the romantic involvement between her sister Marianne and Willoughby. As of yet, no concrete information has been verified regarding Elinor's relationship development, and only her immediate family is privy to this information. However, Mrs. Palmer's claim caught Elinor off guard and proved to be quite vexing. This was primarily due to Mrs. Palmer's directness in issuing a command, "don't pretend," and her confident manner of speaking. The expression "My dear Mrs Palmer" indicates an indirect redressive action using "my dear" that softens the utterance. It is as though she desires to express "Mrs. Palmer, stop it please"; this action greatly vexed Elinor, who employed positive politeness in order to effectively communicate her message.

The production of each utterance is influenced by its context environment, and the selection of each communication technique is determined by the topic and context of the conversation, the interlocutors involved in the interaction, and the relationship that connects them. The subsequent section will address the aforementioned relationship. It has been observed that the Arabic translation is largely similar to the English version, with the exception of certain omitted details that may hold significant importance. Moreover, without a full understanding of what the writer wants to say beyond words is very important and has to be taken into account.

5.3. Vertical and Horizontal Distance

Vertical or horizontal distance is one of the factors influencing the speaker's choice of politeness strategies. In each of the above discussed examples there is an interaction between two (or more) persons sharing or, sometimes, not sharing the same social class or rank, intellectual background, age, and so forth; consequently, based on these similarities or differences, the speaker, at times unconsciously, selects a particular tone and manner of articulating their idea.

As we consider the first dialogue between Mrs. Dashwood and Willoughby or the one between Marianne and Mrs. Jennings as an example, it seems that the old ladies, Mrs. Dashwood and Mrs. Jennings, are indirect and hint at knowing more than the two young people, but it is important to mention that they vary their strategies to opt sometimes for ambiguity and for directness in some other times. In fact, they have no concrete authority over Marianne and Willoughby except for being older than them, which implies a great deal of respect.

This feature of age is less present in the fifth example since Sir John is not significantly older than Mrs. Dashwood and is regarded as one of her supportive acquaintances; therefore, their intentions and opinions are directly expressed. Similarly, age is not the controlling aspect in the third example, because the relationship between Mrs. Dashwood and her daughters, Elinor and Marianne, is a close relationship, which does not need or enforce any specific kind of behavior or talk. Moreover, indirectness is used only to avoid FTA.

For instance, in the sixth example, it illustrates the importance of the nature of the relationship; Elinor and Mrs. Palmer share a similar age and are within the same social circle. However, it is worth noting that Mrs. Palmer is a married woman and is regarded as a foreigner by Elinor. As a result, their relationship necessitates a typically formal tone; yet, Mrs. Palmer engaged in spontaneous and informal conversation with Elinor, exceeding the boundaries by discussing and asking about certain personal matters.

It is of great importance to mention that it is not only the social class, age, and background that matter, but also the sex of the addressee; young people are supposed to respect and address seniors in a polite way. This latter is expected to be raised between two persons of the opposite sex as well, maybe more than between two of the same sex. In the novel, which reflects the Victorian society, titles and formal polite register are crucial, particularly between women and men. Such importance is the result of several factors, mainly historical and cultural.

Engaging in polite conversation does not necessarily equate to displaying genuine politeness. The theory of politeness analyzes the person's utterances, written or spoken, and not the person's real intention, will or thoughts. An individual who exhibits hypocritical behavior may engage in polite conversation despite harboring negative feelings towards the addressee, so concealing his/her true unfriendly disposition from others. Sell (2014) argues that in the context of British history, politeness was associated with a deceptive form of refinement rather than genuine emotional sensitivity. Hence, it is crucial to see politeness as a metaphorical veil that masks a latent expression of assertiveness or dominance. This implies that the expression of politeness may not consistently indicate the genuine benevolence of the speaker,

but rather may serve as a façade behind which s/he conceals his/her hypocrisy, animosity, and lies.

6. CONCLUSION

Culture plays a significant role in this research as politeness is inherently influenced by cultural norms and values. And this is demonstrated by the amount of research conducted in this area. These studies draw comparisons among a number of languages like Chinese, Japanese, German and Korean which are excessively studied due to their specific aspects and features concerning politeness and indirectness in particular. The aforementioned languages' speakers are considered to use more polite expressions and high degree of indirectness as a strategy in their utterances trying to avoid embarrassing or producing any FTA.

Many translators, especially beginners, do not pay attention to the pragmatic features of the ST; frequently, translators prioritize certain features such as structure, terminology, or overall context due to various factors such as time constraints. Consequently, the emphasis on specific elements may result in neglecting other aspects of the text, leading to an incomplete or poor translation; As an illustration, the translator has the potential to inadvertently change a work that is originally formal in nature into one that is informal. As previously stated, it is frequently sacrificed.

This paper was an attempt to show the link between pragmatics and translation at the level of politeness, which is one of the meeting points of the two fields. In relation to politeness, the concept revolves around the individual's ego, as the decision to adopt a particular politeness strategy over another is contingent upon the individual's egoic position and level of resilience. In the context of interpersonal communication, individuals with a weak personality or feelings of inferiority may employ positive politeness as a strategic approach. It is important to note that his/her motivation for doing so is not rooted in genuine concern for the addressee's well-being or a desire to prevent potential embarrassment. Rather, the use of positive politeness stems from apprehension regarding the addressee's response and the potential negative consequences that may arise as a result. Likewise, some may employ less direct approaches not due to their closeness to the addressee or their anticipation of a favorable response, but rather because they perceive themselves as superior to others and believe that any utterance they make should be endorsed by the receiver. Therefore, the psychological aspect of both the speaker and listener plays a significant role in shaping their mutual communication. And this arises from people' perceptions of one another and their level of awareness regarding the other person's power dynamics and the strength or vulnerability of their ego.

The researchers cited in this paper have established and developed multiple approaches to elucidate and explore the concept of politeness, both within the field of pragmatics and translation. The general viewpoint among them is that there is a need to differentiate between the concept of politeness as a theoretical construct and the personal attribute of being a courteous person commonly regarded as a desirable trait. Moreover, it may, if not for sure, be useful to focus on the psychology of the interlocutors in order to come out with new findings concerning pragmatics and politeness in particular.

REFERENCES

Bell, R. T. (1991) *Translation and translating: Theory and practice*. London and New York: Longman.

Brandes, M. (2001). Translational text analysis. *Brandes. Moscow*.

Brown, P. (2015). Politeness and language. In *The International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences (IESBS),(2nd ed.)* (pp. 326-330). Elsevier.

Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.

Hatim, B. (1997). Communication across cultures. *Translation Theory and Contrastive Text*.

Hornby, A. S. (2015). Oxford advanced Learner's dictionary of current English.

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). doi:10.1515/jplr.2009.011

Sell, R. D. (2014). The politeness of literary texts. In *Literary Pragmatics (Routledge Revivals)* (pp. 208-224). Routledge.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). Introduction: Language, culture and rapport management. *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures*, *19*.

Thomas, J. A. (2014). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Routledge.

Usami, M. (2006). Discourse politeness theory and cross-cultural pragmatics. *W:] Asako Yoshitomi, Tae Umino, Masashi Negishi (red.) Readings in second language pedagogy and second language acquisition: In Japanese context. Amsterdam: John Benjamins*, 19-42.

About the Authors

Mariem Mahmoudi *is a PhD researcher at Abdelmalek Essaadi University of Tetouan, Morocco. She participated in many international conferences. She is a teacher of English. Her research interests are literary translation, Cultural Studies and Pragmatics.*

Abdelkrim Chirig *is a PhD candidate in the Applied Language and Culture Studies Lab at Chouaib Doukkali University (UCD) of El Jadida, Morocco. He holds a Master's degree in Translation Sciences and Linguistics and his current doctoral research is focused on the intersection of Translation, Literature, and Gender. Abdelkrim has a wide range of interests, including Translation, Media, Advertising, Semiotics, and Literary Translation.*