The Translation of English Politeness Marker in Giving Invitation into Indonesian: Does It Influence the Illocution?

Havid Ardi[1], Mangatur Rudolf Nababan[2], Djatmika[2] and Riyadi Santosa[2]
[1]*English Department of FBS, Universitas Negeri Padang, Jl. Prof. Dr. Hamka, Padang, Indonesia*
[2]*English Department of FIB, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Jl. Ir. Sutami No. 36, Surakarta, Indonesia*

Keywords: Invitation, Politeness Strategies, Translation Technique, Illocution Utterance.

Abstract: The utterance of invitation is sometimes used to show a polite attitude to others. However it is rarely attracted linguists' attention compared to other type utterances. Politeness strategies in invitation are not only appear in real conversation but also in literary works. In the translation of politeness markers, translators are influence with the cultural situation. Thus it raises a question how translators deal with politeness marker in giving invitation for intercultural context. This paper aims at investigating the translation of politeness markers in giving invitation used by the main characters in the novel Deception Point written in English by Dan Brown. Data were the utterances of invitation made by main characters in the novel Deception Point as source text and its two Indonesian translation versions as target texts. Data were taken by document analysis and focus group discussion in classifying the translation techniques. Then, data were analyzed by using speech act theory and felicity condition. The result show that 1) there are only four main characters who give invitation due to the felicity conditions of invitation, 2) bald on record, positive, and negative politeness strategies are used by the characters in mitigating the invitation utterances, 3) there are some changes in the illocution in translation caused by the implementation of translation technique to the politeness marker. It is suggested to use established equivalence technique in translating politeness marker to build mutual understanding and avoid modulation since it may change the illocution of the utterances.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PUBLICATIONS

1 INTRODUCTION

The utterance of invitation is sometimes used to show a polite attitude or hospitality to others since offers and invitation are speech event that usually use to show generosity (Leech, 2014, p. 180). Researchers have different opinion about the speech act category of invitation, some researchers, such as, Suzuki categorized invitation as Searle's EXPRESSIVE (1975:15) and Leech's CONVIVIAL (1983:104) in his work (Suzuki, 2009), invitation can be categorized as directive act (Searle, 1976, p. 11, 1999, p. 14), and invitation is also categorized as sub class of offer or commisive (Leech, 2014, p. 180). However, in this study, invitation is categorized as directive since its locution is to have the hearer to do something (Searle, 1999, p. 13) for the benefit if hearer.

As a speech act, although invitation may be used to show generosity, it also may result face threatening to the hearer or the speaker. Since invitation is a kind of utterance that cause the hearer to do something, a speaker still needs to use politeness marker to mitigate face threatening act in giving invitation. It is commonly known that directive acts are the speech acts which have high face threatening act (FTA) toward the hearer since the illocutionary force is to ask other to do something for the speaker (Cutting, 2008, p. 15). However, invitation has the illocution that give benefit or something nice for the hearer. Thus, it has specific politeness strategies that might be different from other directive act.

Some studies have been conducted related to speech act of invitation and its politeness, such as, the locution of invitation made by American students (Suzuki, 2009), politeness in the response to invitation (Bella, 2009; Suzuki, 2015). These previous studies mostly conducted in real life communication. In fact, politeness strategies in invitation acts do not only appear in real conversation but also in literary works, such as novel, movie, etc. Nowadays, such literary works are distributed all over the world by translation activities. It means the literary works are translated from one language into another language. However, each language have

Ardi, H., Nababan, M., Djatmika, . and Santosa, R.
The Translation of English Politeness Marker in Giving Invitation into Indonesian: Does It Influence the Illocution?.
DOI: 10.5220/0009316500110016
In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on English Language Teaching, Linguistics and Literature (ELITE 2019) - Promoting Global Diversity, Partnership and Prosperity through English Development*, pages 11-16
ISBN: 978-989-758-459-6
Copyright © 2020 by SCITEPRESS – Science and Technology Publications, Lda. All rights reserved

different politeness strategies depends on the culture (Kecskes, 2015; Reiter, 2000). Therefore, a politeness strategy in certain culture may have different responses to another culture. Thus it raises a question how translators deal with politeness marker in giving invitation for intercultural context.

Some researchers have conducted studies on the translation politeness markers in some other directive act, such the translation of politeness in the command in literary work (Ardi, Nababan, Djatmika, & Santosa, 2018a; Zhao, 2009), command in film subtitle film (Mubin, 2015; Pratama, 2014), politeness in the request and the translation of directive act (Ardi, Nababan, Djatmika, & Santosa, 2016). However, previous research did not explore the impact of the translation of politeness markers to the illocution of the speech event. Moreover, invitation is rarely studied by previous researchers as this speech act is in between directive and commissive act (Leech, 2014, p. 180).

Actually, studies on politeness studies started by Lakoff who introduced politeness as interpersonal relation system that was designed to enhance interaction by minimizing conflict and confrontation potential that might be happened in human interaction (Lakoff, 1973). Then the theory developed by Brown & Levinson in 1978 (1987), Leech in 1983 (2014), and Blum-Kulka. Brown and Levinson proposes the five politeness strategies to mitigate the impact of FTA. Although there are many critics on Brown and Levinson's theory (Eelen, 2014; Leech, 2014), the theory proposed by Brown & Levinson can differentiate politeness strategy clearly.

This study used Brown and Levinson's theory (1987) since the theory can explain politeness strategy clearly. In order to face mitigation, Brown and Levinson propose that there are 5 super strategies that can be used by the speaker, they are bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off record strategy, or just keep silent (P. Brown & Levinson, 1987). Bald on-record (BOR) strategies focus on the effectiveness of the message without any redress to mitigate FTA. BOR strategy is marked by the structure of the utterance that is mostly in imperative form, such as, 'Come in!' Then, Positive Politeness (PP) strategies reduce the FTA to the hearer by keeping the positive face by showing that speaker wants what hearer's wants. There are some positive politeness markers, i.e., expressing common ground, in-group identity markers, avoid disagreement, jokes, be optimistic, involve both speaker in the utterance. Next, Negative Politeness (NP) is usually intended to save the hearer's negative face by that related to hearer's territory and self-determination. NP strategy is marked by expressing pessimistic, indirectness, decreasing the imposition, using hedges & questions, apologising, and using the plural forms of pronouns to minimise the imposition. Off Record (OR) strategy is indicated by using connotations instead of direct requests. The speaker sometimes uses metaphor, rhetorical questions, and understatement, all kinds of hints to communicate the speaker's wants (see Brown and Levinson, 1987 for details). Moreover, the selection of politeness strategy is also affected by the context of situation between the speaker and hearer. Brown & Levinson (1987) say that the selection strategy is affected by the position (power), within the proximity of the speaker and the hearer (distance), and the rank of imposition (Rx).

Translation technique is defined as a way implemented in solving translation problems in the translation text. Many translation scholars used various and different term for this phenomenon, such as, translation procedure (Newmark, 1988), translation strategies (Baker, 2018, Machali, 2008). In the translation process, translators employ various strategies to solve the translation problems. Strategies are the ways to find a suitable solution for a translation unit. The solution will be materialized by using a particular technique (Molina & Albir, 2002). Therefore, translation strategies are part of the translation process, and translation techniques employed in the translation text (Molina & Albir, 2002).

This paper aims at investigating the impact of translation of politeness marker into the illocution of invitation act used by the main characters in the novel Deception Point written by Dan Brown (2001). This novel is chosen since this novel have been translated twice (2006 and 2015) by different translators. Previous researcher have exposed about refusal set in the novel and its 2006 translation (Rusjansyah, 2015), however there is no comparison with the new version of translation. Meanwhile, other researchers found that there is a change in the politeness marker of command (Ardi et al., 2018a). Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a research whether the translation causes the changes on the illocutionary act in the two translation versions?

The paper has three research question, they are: 1) what main characters used invitation act in the novel Deception Point. 2) What politeness strategies are used in the source text? 3) What is the effect of the translation of politeness marker to the illocution in the target language?

2 METHODS

This was qualitative research with content analysis research design that is aimed at describing the impact of the translation of politeness marker in the target text. Sources of data were the novel Deception Point written by Dan Brown (2001) as a source text (ST), and the two Indonesian translation version issued in (2006) translated by Isma B. Koesalamwardi and Hendry M. Tanaja published by PT Serambi Ilmu Semesta (Jakarta) as target text 1 (TT1) and the second version issued in (2015) translated by Dwijani Nimpoena published by PT Bentang Pustaka (Yogyakarta) as target texts 2 (TT2). Data were the utterances of invitation made by main characters in the novel Deception Point in the source text and the translation of the utterances in the two Indonesian translation version in the target texts. There are seven main characters, they are Gabriele Ashe (GA), Marjorie Tench (MjT), Rachel Sexton (RS), Sedgewick Sexton (SS), Michael Tolland (MT), William Pickering (WP), and Zachary Herney (ZH). Data were categorized by using codification based on the speaker and hearer, and its politeness strategy. Data were taken by document analysis, and tally the frequency of invitation made by the main characters and the politeness strategy used. Translation technique were identified by focus group discussion by involving informants. Then, data were analyzed by domain, taxonomy, and componential analysis (Spradley, 1980). The politeness strategy were categorized based on Brown & Levinson (1987), the illocution was analyzed based on speech act theory (Yule, 1996).

3 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This articles focuses on the main characters in using invitation act, politeness strategies in the source text, and the effect of the translation of politeness marker to the illocution in the target language.

3.1 Main Character using Invitation

This part focuses on the utterances expressed by the seven main characters in the novel Deception Point. After conducting document analysis, it was found there are only four characters who produced invitation acts to others. The number of invitation found in the ST performed by the main characters are shown in table 1. For details, table 1 shows the occurrence of invitation speech act in the ST.

Table 1: Frequency of invitation made by main characters.

Invitation		Strategy in the Source Text			
Speaker	Freq.	BOR	PP	NP	OR
SS	5	3	1	2	-
MT	3	0	4	3	-
WP	1	0	1	-	-
ZH	1	0	1	1	-
Total	10	3	7	6	-
Percentage		18.8	43.8	37.5	-

Explanation:
BOR: Bald on Record strategy
PP: Positive Politeness strategy
NP: Negative Politeness strategy
OR: Off Records strategy

Table 1 shows that there are only four main characters who made invitation acts. They are SS, MT, WP, and ZH. SS as the senator as the antagonist character uses the most invitation act show his generosity and polite attitude by using invitation to give good impression his hearer. M. Tolland (MT) as the partner Rachel only uses 3 invitation acts (protagonist). Then, other characters, WP as the director of NRO (antagonist) and ZH as the character of president use only once invitation (protagonist).

In this novel, the antagonist uses invitation act to show that he is a good person. Actually, it is used to camouflage his bad behavior. The invitation acts are used to show that the characters show his polite attitude to the hearer. Therefore, the use of invitation acts is to show polite attitude of the characters.

3.2 Politeness Strategies used in Source Text

This part focuses on the utterances expressed by the seven main characters in the novel Deception Point. After conducting document analysis, it was found there are only four characters who produced invitation acts to others. The number of invitation found in the ST performed by the main characters are shown in table I. For details, table I shows the occurrence of invitation speech act in the ST.

Invitation act is usually used to show polite attitude, however the speakers still need to use the politeness strategies to mitigate FTA. Table I shows that positive politeness (PP), negative politeness (NP), and bald on record (BOR) politeness strategies are used by the main characters to mitigate FTA in producing invitation utterance consecutively. These findings also indicates that most of the characters used positive politeness as the strategies to anticipate FTA, such by showing in groupness to show close relation. Related to their power, mostly the characters who have higher position who use invitation to show

politeness and their generosity to the hearer. Interestingly, SS as the antagonist character use the most invitation to impress the other characters or as the way to camouflage his bad figure.

The utterances of invitation performed by SS are mostly given to impress his hearer. For instance, example 1 shows the invitation made by SS to his daughter RS showed that he is a good father.

Example 1/SS-RS
ST: "…. Stop by the office one of these days and say hello. (p. 24)

Example 1 shows that SS used bald on record strategy to show their closeness in inviting Rachel to come to his office. He express this invitation in public area to show that that he has good relation to his daughter. SS mostly use bald on record strategy whenever the invitation show his generosity. He used positive politeness to offers a drink for his staff, Gabrielle as show in example 2 and 3.

Example 2/SS-GA
ST: "Have a seat. Enjoy a soda. (p. 497)

Example 3/SS-GA
ST: "Drink, Gabrielle? (p. 497)

Example 2 shows that SS again use bald on record since he wanted to show his generosity and good attention to reduce FTA since he just have negative thinking about GA. Since, GA just kept silent, he used positive politeness strategy in example 3. WP also use invitation to camouflage his attitude to others.

On the other hand, ZH as president, he does not frequently use invitation. Meanwhile, MT as RS partner use invitation to show his friendliness. For instance, in example 4 and 5, an invitation made by MT to his friend RS:

Example 4/MT-RS
ST: "Okay, let's see if anyone has ever seen an oceanic fossil similar to our little space bug." (p. 442)

Example 5/MT-RS
ST: "Sorry to hear that. When this is over, you'll have to come out and visit me on the Goya. I'll change your mind about water. Promise." (p. 198-199)

In example 4, MT invited RS to check the fossil in the internet. In this invitation he used negative politeness marker in form of hedges (okay). He also used positive politeness marker by involving hearer (let's). Then, in example, it can be seen that MT used positive politeness by showing optimism and promise since they are in a trouble. He convince RS that the problem will be over and she should come to his boat.

3.3 The Effect of Translation Politeness Marker to the Illocution in the Target Language

Then, the last point, the effect of translation technique to the illocution in target text. Firstly, the politeness markers in the Target Texts (TT) are compared to show how the translators translated the politeness markers from ST into TTs. It is shown in the following tables, Table 2 and Table 3 that there are some illocutions that changed from invitation into another speech acts. The changes of the illocution in translation caused by the implementation of translation technique to the politeness markers. The distribution of politeness strategies between Source Text (ST) and Target Texts (TT) can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2: Comparison of politeness strategies in invitation strategies.

Text	Politeness Strategies			Tot	
	BOR	PP	NP		
	%	%	%	Tot	%
ST	18.75	43.75	37.50	16	100
TT1	6.67	40.00	53.33	15	100
TT2	7.14	42.86	50.00	14	100

Table 2 shows that the use of bald on record and positive politeness strategies are reduced in target text (TT), meanwhile negative politeness strategies are increased. Off record strategies are not used both in the ST and TTs. Moreover, the impact of these changes also influence the illocution in the target text as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Comparison of invitation speech act in the texts.

Text	SS	MT	WP	ZH	Total
ST	5	3	1	1	10
TT1	5	2	-	1	8
TT2	5	1	1	1	8

Table 3 shows that the distribution of invitation acts in the source text (ST) and in the target texts (TTs). In the ST there are ten utterances of invitation but they are reduced into eight invitation in the both

TTs. It is caused by the changes of politeness markers also change the illocutionary of the utterances. It is shown in the examples below for details.

The example 6 below shows the translation of invitation made by William Pickering (WP) to his staff, Rachel Sexton (RS).

Example 6/ST: 30/TT1:29/TT2:31/WP-RS
ST : "Agent Sexton, have a seat." (30)

TT1: "Agen Sexton, duduklah." (29)
BT : "Agent Sexton, sit down."

TT2: "Agen Sexton, silakan duduk." (31)
BT : "Agent Sexton, have a seat."

In the example WP, the head of NRO, invited his staff Rachel Sexton (RS) to sit in front of him to show his generosity. As a staff, RS has no power, and WP has close social distance, and the invitation has low rank of imposition (P=0, D=0, R=1). WP's utterance has the illocution of invitation to show WP's generosity to his staff by offering the staff to have a seat on the chair in his office. However, in TT1, the utterance become a command to sit down. Although the reaction are the same, the illocution in TT1 indicates that WP gave command to sit down rather than gave an offer to sit. It is caused by reduction technique. Although there is an addition technique for "lah" particle that function as negative politeness to minimize imposition. The changes of invitation act into command is possible since WP has Power and authority to give command to his staff in normal condition. Meanwhile, in this context the utterance is given to show generosity and for the benefit of the hearer. In TT2, the translator used established equivalence of "have a seat" into "silakan duduk". Thus, a translator need to consider an appropriate translation of politeness marker in the target language as it may give different impact in the target language.

As mentioned by Leech invitation is a directive act which provides benefit for the hearer (Leech, 2014, p. 180). This finding supports Leech's theory that invitation shows the generosity of the speaker (Leech, 2014). Therefore, the translators need to reproduce the equal effect to the reader in the target language. The translator should also be careful in the translation process to anticipate that the same politeness markers may have different effect in another culture (Kecskes, 2015).

Based on the findings above, it can be seen that the translation of politeness marker in the target texts can cause the changes of the illocutionary act. These findings support Keckes findings that politeness marker in each culture has different function (Kecskes, 2015; Kecskes & Horn, 2007). The translators need to find equivalence translation by using established equivalence technique to maintain the illocution and politeness.

It also support previous research conducted by Ardi, et al that politeness in giving advice and command should be translated well by considering the function and the effect of that politeness marker in the TT (Ardi, Nababan, Djatmika, & Santosa, 2018a, 2018b). It also indicates that the position or power of the speaker may influence the illocution in the translation of politeness marker since it may be changed into another speech act.

Moreover, in the previous research different politeness strategies are different from different culture as found by (Suzuki, 2009; Bella, 2009; Suzuki, 2015) related to invitation in real life. In this fiction works, politeness strategies are also used to show the characterization of the people in the novel (Ardi, Nababan, Djatmika, Santosa, 2018a). Thus, the translators should keep them in the translation result.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Based on this research, it can be concluded that 1) power, distance influence the characters who create invitation due to the felicity conditions of invitation; 2) the positive and negative politeness strategies are employed by the main characters in mitigating face threatening act in giving invitation; 3) the implementation of translation technique to the politeness marker cause the changes in the translation texts. It is suggested the translators to use established equivalence in translating politeness marker to build mutual understanding and avoid modulation since it may change the illocution of the utterances.

Moreover, it is suggested for further research to check the translation quality of politeness strategies in the Indonesian novels. The translation quality shows how good a translator finds the equivalence translation that keep the politeness and illocution of the speech act.

REFERENCES

Ardi, H., Nababan, M. R., Djatmika, & Santosa, R. 2016. Politeness strategy in Indonesian translation: Has it already changed? In *International Seminar Prasasti III: Current research in linguistics* (pp. 355–361). Surakarta: Program Studi S3 Linguistik Universitas

Sebelas Maret. Retrieved from https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/prosidingprasasti/article/view/1536/4414

Ardi, H., Nababan, M. R., Djatmika, & Santosa, R. 2018a. Characters' politeness strategies in giving command: Should translators keep them? *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies – Vol, 24*(2), 181–1933. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2402-14

Ardi, H., Nababan, M. R., Djatmika, & Santosa, R. 2018b. The impact of translation techniques on politeness strategies in giving advice. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, *166*, 483–488.

Bella, S. 2009. Invitations and politeness in Greek: The age variable. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, *5*(2), 243–271. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1515/JPLR.2009.013.

Brown, D. 2001. *Deception point*. New York: Pocket Book.

Brown, D. 2006. *Deception point (Titik muslihat)*. (I. B. Koesalamwardi & H. M. Tanaja, Trans.). Jakarta: PT Serambi Ilmu Semesta.

Brown, D. 2015. *Deception point*. (I. D. Nimpoeno, Trans.). Yogyakarta: PT Bentang Pustaka.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cutting, J. 2008. *Pragmatic and discourse: A resource book for students*. Oxon: Routledge.

Eelen, G. 2014. *A critique of politeness theories*. London & New York: Routledge.

Kecskes, I. 2015. Intercultural impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *86*, 43–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.05.023

Kecskes, I., & Horn, L. R. 2007. *Explorations in pragmatics: Linguistics, cognitive and intercultural aspects*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Leech, G. 2014. *The pragmatics of politeness*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mubin, H. F. F. 2015. *Analisis terjemahan kalimat yang mengakomodasi kesantunan tuturan menyarankan (suggesting) dalam film Argo (2012)*. Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta.

Pratama, I. D. 2014. *Analisis perbandingan strategi kesantunan tuturan memerintah dalam film "The Amazing Spiderman" dan dua versi terjemahannya (subtitle VCD dan subtitle amatir) serta dampaknya pada kualitas terjemahan*. Universitas Sebelas Maret.

Reiter, R. M. 2000. *Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Rusjansyah, A. 2015. *Analisis terjemahan kalimat yang merepresentasikan tuturan penolakan dan rangkaiannya (refusal set) pada novel 'The deception point' dan dampaknya terhadap kualitas terjemahan*. Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta.

Searle, J. R. 1976. A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, *5*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500006837

Searle, J. R. 1999. *Expression and meaning; Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spradley, J. P. 1980. *Participant observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Suzuki, T. 2009. How do American university students "invite" others?: A corpus-based study of linguistic strategies for the speech act of invitation. *The Cultural Review (Waseda Commercial Studies Association)*, *35*(9), 85–106.

Suzuki, T. 2015. How politeness is controlled in invitations, their acceptances and refusals in English: A case study in the U.K. 文化論集第, *47*(9), 69–87.

Yule, G. 1996. Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zhao, W. 2009. Literary criticism and the creation of Ibsen's image in China. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, *17*(3), 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/09076760903038981

SCITEPRESS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PUBLICATIONS