Pragmatic Aspects as Tools for Translators

Asst. Prof. Hashim Gatea Lazim
Muntaha Ali Abed
College of Arts - University of Basrah

Abstract:

Translation is considered to be an interdisciplinary field since it can be studied and applied to different branches of linguistics. One of the common features shared by translation and pragmatics is meaning. On the one hand, pragmatics seeks to identify and disambiguate the implicit meanings in a certain discourse; and on the other hand, translation requires explicating what is implicit in order to produce a correct and clear text. Moreover, pragmatics makes it easy to differentiate between meaning and use. Hence, translators can use the different aspects of pragmatics as tools which assist to analyze a certain discourse appropriately. Speech acts, cooperative principle, implicature, politeness, presupposition and deixis constitute the main aspects of pragmatics which are used in daily conversations whether written or spoken. Pragmatic aspects can be applied as useful tools to translation and can assist translators to identify the pitfalls and weaknesses in rendering a discourse. This paper also sheds light on the most common aspects of pragmatics in relation to translation with explanatory examples excerpted from Nathaniel Hawthorne's novel *The Scarlet Letter* and their translations which are analyzed and compared in order to highlight how translators deal with pragmatic aspects in their translations.

المظاهر التداولية كوسائل مساعدة للمترجمين

الاستاذ المساعد
هاشم كاطع لازم

الباحثة
منتهى علي عبد

جامعة البصرة / كلية الآداب

الملخص:-

تعبتر الترجمة حقلاُ متعدد الإختصاصات لإمكانية دراستها وتطبيقها في مختلف فروع علم اللغة .يعتبر المعنى صفة مشتركة بين الترجمة والتداولية وذلك لأن التداولية تبحث في تحديد وتوضيح المعاني الضمنية في خطاب معين .ومن جهة أخرى فإن الترجمة تتطلب تفسير ما هو ضمني من أجل إنتاج نص واضح وصحيح .علاوةً على ذلك، تسهل التداولية من التمييز بين المعنى والاستخدام .لذلك يمكن للمترجمين استخدام مختلف المظاهر التداولية كأدوات مساعدة في الترجمة من أجل تحليل أي خطاب على نحو مناسب .تعتبر الأفعال الكلامية ومبدأ التواصل والتضمين والتهذيب والافتراض(المسبق) والاشارة (باستخدام اللغة) أهم الصفات أو الوسائل التداولية والتي تستخدم في المحادثات اليومية سواء كتابةً أو شفوياً .يمكن تطبيق هذه المظاهر كأدوات مساعدة في عملية الترجمة والتي تساعد المترجم في تحديد الأخطاء ونقاط الضعف في عملية ترجمة الخطاب .يهدف هذا البحث إلى تسليط الضوء على أكثر المظاهر التداولية شيوعاً وعلاقتها مع الترجمة مع أمثلة توضيحية مقتبسة من رواية الحرف القرمزي لناثانيال هوثورن وثلاث من ترجماتها وتحليلها ومقارنتها من أجل تحديد كيفية تعامل المترجمين مع التعابير التداولية خلال عملية الترجمة.

1. Introduction

Translation is researched within the various areas of linguistic studies, particularly pragmatics which is "concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or a writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader)" (Yule, 1996: 3). So, it is concerned with studying languages in use. In translation, Hickey (1998: 4) defines pragmatics as an attempt to analyze translation procedures used in the process of translation by investigating "what is (potentially) done by the original author in or by the text, what is (potentially) done in the translation as a response to the original, how and why it is done in that way in that context".

Hatim and Munday (2004: 179) define translation as the restatement of what someone said or wrote in a certain language into another language. So, translation is a matter of restating texts and messages but not a matter of rendering their literal meaning. There are certain translation approaches which are related to pragmatics that assume translation as the study of the "intended meaning" (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 49), in that the translator is able to capture the intended meaning of the original text. This can be achieved by the translator's background knowledge of the pragmatic aspects involved in any text.

Since translation and pragmatics share common features and seek to promote understanding and facilitating communication, translation should primarily be pragmatic (Hassan, 2011: 13). Sequeiros (2006: 1097) cites a major reason behind the fact that translation has become interrelated, on certain occasions, with pragmatics. The reason is the shifts accompanied with how translation is approached, i.e. how translation is seen and applied by its users. Sequeiros explains these shifts in a number of points. First of all, translation is now seen as a type of language use. This results from the fact that translators use their knowledge of the languages they deal with in their

daily communication. Or, it may be a result of some translated texts or utterances to be used in certain communications such as translating a text verbally (i.e. interpreting) between two persons where the interpreter functions as a mediator and a communicator. Second, considering translation as a sort of communication, it can be studied within the field of pragmatics. Here, studies of translation and pragmatics together should be laid within a practical framework in which translation is seen as a means of communication. Third, the recent developments caused by the numerous studies within pragmatics have made it possible to identify the various types of language use including translation; hence, it has become easy to limit the notion of translation to a pragmatic framework considering it as a verbal communication. In this context, House (2009: 5) asserts that “translation deals with the relationship between texts as actual uses of language”. Therefore, both translation and pragmatics fall under the term *communication* due to the fact that they are concerned with language use.

The translator's need for pragmatic knowledge lies in the need of focusing on how to render the intended meaning of the ST into the TT. In view of that, Hatim and Mason

(1997:57) assert that seeking a pragmatic meaning by the translator would assist her/him to identify and comprehend the intentionality, i.e. the intended meaning of a certain text or the intention of what the author of the ST refers to. Moreover, focusing on pragmatic facts and principles can help the translator to enhance the understanding of the text and consequently improving the quality of translation (Hassan, 2011: 1).

Bariki (2004: 10) assumes that translation is considered to be a subjective process which tries to create an effect similar to that of the original text on the readers of the TT. This can be asserted if translation is treated as a 'social action' based on pragmatics. In a pragmatic framework, translation is used to make "explicit (in TT) what is implicit in ST", and to "narrow the gap

between what is said and what is meant" (Aziz, 2003, 63 - 83 cited in Oufela, n. d.: 9-10). Implicit meanings are found in the various pragmatic aspects within a text. These pragmatic aspects contribute to the analysis of a text no matter what the purpose of that analysis is. According to some linguists, pragmatics is considered to be an independent level to analyze a text in any language (Sindhu and Karthika, 2013: 371). Analyzing a text from a pragmatic perspective requires the translator to have enough knowledge of the pragmatic aspects that are used in the analysis.

Even though pragmatics has been rarely considered in translation studies, it may be increasingly thought about in the various areas of translation such as interpretation, machine translation, etc. (Birner, 2013: 302).

2. Translation as Communication

Translation is a communicative field since it functions as a means of rendering facts, ideas, information, etc. from one language and culture into another. In this regard, House (2009: 11) stresses that the process of translation requires taking both language and culture into account; yet, the translator cannot separate them when s/he is involved in translating. Inasmuch as translation is a unique sort of communication, it can be interrelated with pragmatics which is concerned with how people use language in order to communicate what they have in their minds. Gutt (2000: 23 cited in Sequeiros, 2006: 1098) stresses this point by assuming that translation is best seen as “a matter of communication”. House (2009: 3, 13) regards translation as being a “secondary communication” since it aims to render ideas which already exist. The process of rendering these ideas from one language and/or culture into another language and/or culture implies a process of communication by considering language and culture as macro factors of such a process.

Translation is defined as “an act of communication, involving texts as sets of mutually relevant intentions, in which users (including translators) pre-suppose, implicate and infer meaning” (Mason, 1998: 170 cited in Baker, 2011: 230). Based on this definition, texts are intentions said or written by their authors carrying intended meanings which should be captured by the translator in order to produce these meanings in the TL. The ways by which the translator captures these meanings are based on what is communicated to her/him by means of specific pragmatic aspects. These factors include presupposition, implicature, politeness markers, etc. When a translator tries to presuppose a certain meaning in a certain text, s/he tries to communicate the meaning of that text for the readers of the TL, at the same time. Here, the translator has to do two major functions namely understanding the intention of the writer (i.e. intentionality) and seeking acceptability on the part of the readers. In this respect, intentionality is "the text producer's attitude", and acceptability refers to "the text receiver's attitude" (Abushihab, 2015: 113). Having achieved these two functions, the translation would be more readable and comprehensible by its receivers.

Communication is considered to be a "social affair" that can only be determined by certain contexts in social situations (Akmajian et al., 2001: 363). These contexts function as the main factors of every communicative act. Unlike semantics which seeks to analyze the meaning of expressions without concentrating on context, pragmatics depends mainly on context in which these expressions are said or written (Jafari, 2013: 2151). Furthermore, pragmatics is looked at as "a systematic way of explaining language use in context" (Sindhu and Karthika, 2013:372). In other words, in analyzing a text, pragmatics does not only concentrate on how a sentence is communicated, but also on the contextual meaning of that sentence. A successful communication must be accompanied by a comprehensible context. Thus, context is the major

factor in every type of communication. Hence, the context in which a sentence is uttered or written can be seen as a guide by which the translator can determine the exact meaning of what s/he aims to translate. In view of this, Hassan (2011: 17) states that "understanding pragmatic meaning requires identifying a context which makes sense of an utterance". Accordingly, Newmark (1988b: 134) maintains that meaning is determined by context; yet, not all meanings of every word in language are derived from the context, as in the use of proper nouns which refer to countries, rivers, etc. Moreover, translation being an act of communication has to be "contextually dependent" (Dueñas, 2004: 7), i.e. a translation is regarded an equivalent to the original if it is translated within the context in which it occurs.

There are various approaches and methods of translation presented by different translation theorists and linguists. One of these methods is Newmark's dichotomy, namely semantic translation and communicative translation. What is essential here is the latter one since it is related to communicative fields. Newmark (1988a: 47) defines communicative translation as the "attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership". Accordingly, Newmark's communicative translation cannot be seen as a general term for the whole process of translation; it is only a type of translation that attempts to render the ideas written in one language (SL) into another (TL). In spite of that, recent studies of translation by a number of translation theorists such as Juliane House refer to translation, as a whole, as a specific type of communication since its essential aim is to render information, ideas, facts, etc. from one language into another in an attempt to communicate what is there in the SLs to the TLs. Interpreting, being a special type of translation

concerned with oral speech, is a remarkable source of communication aiming at communicating what the speaker of the SL says to the listener of the TL.

Everyday communication between cultures is seen as commonplace nowadays due to the remarkable development of technology. Consequently, translators are no longer doing their missions in isolation, but they are looked at as “global ambassadors” offering their services to “an ever-increasing market” (Precup-Stiegelbauer and Tirban and Banciu, 2012: 166). Due to this, translators work as mediators not only between two different languages but also between two globalized communities which have different cultures and conventions affected by the massive development of communication. In this respect, the translator is considered to be a receiver and a sender (Gile, 2009: 42). On the one hand, the translator, as a receiver, reads the ST at the beginning in an attempt to comprehend and, on some occasions, analyze the message of that text. On the other hand, the translator's job as a communicator starts when s/he works as a sender of that message. Hence, translation as communication would need a translator as a communicator.

3. The Relationship between Pragmatics and Translation

Pragmatics is "the study of purposes for which utterances and texts are used" (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 169). Pragmatics does not only deal with utterances but also with written texts. A text can be either spoken or written, yet, it still refers to any passage (Abushihab, 2015: 113). According to Hickey (1998: 4), pragmatic approaches try to illuminate "translation procedure, process and product" by analyzing what is done in the ST by the original author, and what is done in the TT by the translator. Occasionally, pragmatic aspects are treated as rules which govern the way texts are formed to be linguistically correct (Gile, 2009: 226). When the translator understands these rules, s/he can simply analyze a sentence having one or more of these

pragmatic aspects. Considering these aspects as rules would facilitate the process of analyzing a text pragmatically whether the aim of this analysis is to comprehend the ST before translating or for the sake of finding out the pitfalls of the translators in the target texts. In this respect, analyzing a text pragmatically means to capture the meaning and the intention of the producer (Abushihab, 2015: 110). To this end, such type of analysis assists both translators and readers of any type of texts to comprehend the exact meaning of what is said or written.

The most common aspects of pragmatics are explained briefly in the next subsections with relation to pragmatics together with explanatory examples excerpted from Nathaniel Hawthorne's novel *The Scarlet Letter*. The translations of the excerpts are analyzed and compared in order to highlight how translators deal with pragmatic expressions during the process of translation. In the present analysis, the original text is marked as ST, the three translations employed are marked as TT1 (*Amira Kiwan's translation),* TT2 (*Mohammed Tarif Fer'aon's translation),* TT3 *(Edwar Abu Hamra*'s *translation)* respectively.

3.1 Speech Acts

A speech act is a communicative act that can be performed orally or in writing (Sindhu and Karthika, 2013: 372). Speech acts have a fundamental relationship with translation as they are related with how the meaning of what is said or written is carried by these acts. According to Bariki (2004: 7), if the speaker utters meaningful sentences, s/he definitely has intentions carried by these sentences. As such, speech acts become an essential part of translation. As the main purpose of translation is to comprehend the exact meaning of the ST in an attempt to render it into another language (TL), it is crucial to

analyze that text in terms of speech act theory by seeking the intention of the original writer.

In English/Arabic translation of speech acts, there are certain key points which should be identified. English and Arabic have different structures to perform a speech act. English speech acts are performed normally by using more indirectness than Arabic which is recognized by grammatical devices. Indirectness in speech acts is often achieved in Arabic by using lexical and other devices. For instance, requests in English are often performed by using a question as in *Can I have two kilos of sugar?*, whereas, in

Arabic, requests are performed by using simple declarative sentences or imperatives, as in the translation of the previous example, أعطني كيلوين من السكر or أريدُ كيلوين من السكر . (Sultan, 2007: 39). This shows that in rendering speech acts, or any other pragmatic aspects, the translator may change the whole structure in order to maintain the same effect of the speech act of the original sentence performed in a certain communicative exchange. Essentially, the translator should translate the intention not only the structure.

Hatim and Mason (1990 cited in Dueñas, 2004: 13) believe that translators have to achieve an equivalent illocutionary structure in the TT. Sultan (2007: 36-7) proposes that functional equivalence is the recommended approach for the translation of speech acts because the main aim, here, is to determine the pragmatic function of these speech acts (whether their function is to request, promise, threat, etc.). This approach works in deciding the function of the speech act in the ST and then finding the suitable equivalence of that speech act in the TL. In this regard, Hassan (2011: 13) stresses that "both pragmatics and translation utilize a functional view of language". This is because pragmatics seeks the function of what is said/written, and translation aims, in most occasions, to identify the function of the ST in order to translate according to that function.

To make a successful transfer of a speech act, the translator has to render the speech acts in ST into TT with "the same sense, force, and effect" (Oufela: n.d.: 4). Dealing with speech acts involves that the translator has to comprehend the illocution of the speech acts in the ST, and then, examine the potential speech acts in the TT in order to choose the most suitable one (Farghal and Almanna, 2014: 99). When the translator understands the locutionary act, s/he will identify the illocutionary force and then create the perlocutionary effect similar to that of the ST (Bariki, 2004: 11).

A speech act can be performed by only a single word such as saying “no” to express refusal (Hatim, 2000: 16, cited in Dueñas, 2004: 17). This can be seen as a problem that could be encountered by the translator since it depends mainly on the context in which such terms occur. A speech act, as a pragmatic aspect, is a very sensitive issue in translation. Many speech acts can be recognized only by the tone of their producers. Hence, speech acts in written texts would be much confusing to be recognized by the translator. Here, the context would be the solution of such matters. For instance, expressions such as *well! Okay! Oh!* etc. should be translated according to their tone and context because each one of them refers to a speech act that cannot be neglected or directly omitted. Such expressions carry specific meanings since they are said or written for the purpose of expressing surprise, hesitation, disapproval etc.

The following example illustrates how misunderstanding the speech act of the ST may lead to different speech act in the TL which causes failure in achieving the pragmatic equivalence:

ST: "**I charge thee** to speak out the name of thy fellow-sinner and fellow-sufferer!" (p. 61)

TT_1:" ... أوصيكِ بالإفصاح عن اسم شريكك في الإثم والمعانا"(p. 58)

TT_2:" ... **أطلب منك** أن تخبرينا باسم شريكك في الخط"(p. 25)

TT_3:"! **فإنني آمرك** لتقولي علناً اسم شريكك الخاطئ وشريكك في دفع العقاب" (p.50)

In this example, a speech act of ordering is identified which belongs to directives (a type of speech acts). The speaker in this case must have the right to give an order, i.e. s/he must have a felicity condition which enables him/her to order someone. In this context, the minister Dimmesdale (the protagonist of the novel) has the authority to order Hester (the heroine of the novel) to reveal the name of the child's father in the middle of the crowd. The tone he uses is directive which must be preserved in the TT. By comparing the three translations above, it is noticed that in TT1, the translator failed in rendering the same effect of the ST by using a verb of advising **أوصيكِ** . Thus, it seems to the reader of the TT that the speaker is not ordering the addressee but advising her. In TT2, the translator also could not preserve the same effect of the ST by translating the order as **أطلب منك** as if the speaker is requesting something. In TT3, however, the translator succeeded in rendering the same pragmatic effect carried by the verb by providing a pragmatic equivalent similar to the message stated in the ST which is **آمرك** even though he has mistranslated the descriptive phrase **thy fellow-sinner and fellow-sufferer** which refers to Hester's secret lover.

3.2 Presupposition

Yule (1996: 25) defines presupposition as the speaker's prior assumption of a certain utterance. In translation, presuppositions can be captured easily by the translator since they are considered to be background assumptions governed by certain lexical items called presupposition triggers (Farghal and Almanna, 2014: 94). These triggers function as indicators that can be identified directly in the sentences or texts to be translated. This leads to facilitate the process of translating these sentences or texts in an attempt to

transfer them correctly to the TL. Occasionally, translators might misunderstand what the author of the ST has in her/his mind. This causes a massive failure in rendering the author's main ideas which lead the translator to reproduce a totally different message in the TT. In this regard, Munday (2001: 98) asserts that presuppositions are problematic in translation when “the TT receivers cannot be assumed to possess the same background knowledge as the ST receivers”. This comes as a result of having cultural differences or the translated text is translated after a long time which makes the original information deactivated by the original reference. Munday (2001: 98) cites an example that illustrates such problems: “*I discussed this issue in Washington”*. The speaker/writer of this sentence presupposes that the word ‘Washington’ refers to the seat of the government of the US in this context. If the receiver or the translator of this sentence is not familiar with this issue, s/he would presuppose that Washington, here, refers to the state where the speaker/writer discussed that issue. Hence, there should be a shared knowledge between the translator and the original author.

In the following example, presupposition is lexical triggered by **enough** which refers in this context to something happened in the past and is still happening.

ST: “Hast thou not **tortured** him **enough**?” said Hester, noticing the old man’s look. (p. 154)

قالت أستير وقد لاحظت نظرة الرجل العجوز" :**ألم تعذبه بما فيه الكفاية؟**(p. 332) " TT:$_1$

TT$_2$: .. قالت هيستر بعد أن لاحظت نظراته ؟**ألم تعذبه بما فيه الكفاية**(p. 86)

TT$_3$: شاهدت هيستر تلك النظرة في وجه العجوز فسألته" :**ألم تلحق به مايك من الكرب؟** " (p. 86)

Here, Hester tries to stop Chillingworth (the antagonist in the novel) from hurting Dimmesdale. In fact, the tense of the sentence also refers to a

presupposition which is structural triggered by the tense in which the act of torturing starts in the verb **tortured.** In all TTs, the translators have succeeded in preserving the two presuppositions by finding a suitable pragmatic equivalent to the ST.

3.3 Implicature

Implicatures are the result of flouting one or more of the co-operative maxims (Gricean) which leads to misunderstanding the implied meaning of what the speaker says. Munday (2001: 99) assumes that these maxims are flouted intentionally to make a possibly humorous effect. Problems facing the translator, in this regard, happen if the maxims of the TL differ from those of the original. For instance, in a translation from English into Arabic of a book on Arabic political humor, an obscene joke about God is omitted in the Arabic TT so as not “to upset local sensibilities” (Munday, 2001: 99). The difference in the two cultures means a difference in how the maxims of manner and politeness work. Thus, the translator, here, needs to possess enough knowledge of the differences in co-operative principles in both languages and cultures of the ST and the TT (Munday, 2001: 99).

When translating a dialogue between characters, translators have to make sure that the implicatures should also be the same in the TT and be grasped likewise by the target readership, otherwise that interaction might not make sense for the new readership (Dueñas, 2004: 17). In translating implicatures, implicated meanings in the ST should remain implicated in the TT (Farghal and Almanna, 2014: 100) in order to keep the implicit intention of what the author wants to imply. By doing so, the translator gives a chance to the reader to try her/himself to grasp the implied meaning of what is said or written. In this regard, Newmark suggests that the readers should not “be handed everything on a plate” explaining everything to them (Munday, 2001: 44)

because the translator's mission is to reproduce the same message with its effect to the readership.

One of the problems of translating implicatures is that some of these implicatures are a result of violating one or more maxims of cooperation which may cause confusion for the translator (i.e. the translator often does not realize that certain maxims are violated and this violation leads to produce certain implicatures). Moreover, many translators fail to “assess the effectiveness of target translation product to preserve the implied meaning of ST” (Oufela, n. d.: 7-9). These problems can be solved by concentrating on the context in which a text occurs because it helps the translator to determine how an implicit meaning can be translated (Oufela, n. d.: 7-9). The following example explains how implicature is translated into the TL:

ST: "**A pure hand needs no glove to cover it!”** (p. 141)

$TT_{:1}$ " إن اليد النظيفة لا تحتاج إلى كف يغطيها" (p. 296)
TT_2: ... لأن يداً طاهرة كيدك لا تحتاج إلى قفازات لتغطيها. (p. 77)
TT_3: " يغطيها إن اليد الشريفة النقية لا تحتاج إلى قفّاز" (p. 157)

Violating the maxim of manner (a type of cooperative maxims) is caused by being indirect. This would give rise to manner implicature. The context of this quote is that an old sexton is praising Dimmesdale by describing him as a pure man who has no sins. His appraisal is expressed indirectly but it implicates innocent intention towards the addressee. The translators in the TTs have succeeded in rendering this implicature by providing a pragmatic equivalence with the same implicature of the ST and maintaining the indirectness of the ST in order to produce an implicature equivalent to the implicature of the ST. Readers of the TTs can understand the translated implicature easily depending on the context in which it is said.

3.4 Politeness

Politeness is deemed to be “a feature of language in use” and “a feature in human communication” (Wang, 2014: 271). Because of this, it should be easy for the translator to deal with polite expressions to be translated. Yet, some cultures have completely different conventions from others. As such, politeness becomes a sensitive phenomenon in this respect (Wang, 2014: 272). To be sure, politeness as a phenomenal feature of language and translation as a communicative act of language are both cross-cultural issues. This obliges the translator to be both bilingual and bicultural. Hatim (1998: 96) maintains that the translator has to estimate the politeness in ST which is involved in the norms and conventions in both the SL and its culture; then, s/he would be able to understand and to render politeness into the TL and its culture. Analyzing politeness in translation can be applied at the level of terms which involve politeness. For instance, to identify politeness in a text, the translator can trace some markers as in *addressing terms*, *mitigating devices* such as: please, would you mind, pardon, etc., *euphemism*: using terms such as fat instead of overweight or stupid instead of less able, etc. (Almanna, 2014: 130), or at the level of pragmatic models specified to study politeness as a pragmatic principle. Brown and Levinson's model and Geoffrey Leech's model which discuss politeness pragmatically can be adopted in such studies. The following example is analyzed according to Leech's maxims of politeness (Leech, 2014: 90-2):

ST: **"I thank you from my heart, most watchful friend**," said the Reverend Mr. Dimmesdale, with a solemn smile. "**I thank you, and can but requite your good deeds with my prayers**." (p. 199)

TT_1: قال السيد المحترم ديمسدايل بابتسامة جادة :"**اشكرك من قلبي** ياصديقي الأشد يقظة . **اشكرك ولا يسعني مكافأة جميل صنيعك إلا بصلاتي** ". (p. 472)

TT_2 **أشكرك من أعماق قلبي** أيها الطبيب الحاذق ..قال الموقر ديمسديل بابتسامة وقورة، **ولا يسعني إلا أن أشكرك بصلواتي**: . (p. 117)

TT_3: قال الوزير" :شكراً لك من كلّ قلبي وسوف أعوّض عن أعمالك من خلال صلواتي" (p. 236)

Thanking someone is a polite action which can be expressed in different ways using different expressions. The maxim that refers to this type of acts is called *obligation of self to other* maxim. It involves that the speaker should give high value to self's obligation towards others. In other words, it is an appropriate obligation to thank someone who offers you a service or any kind of help. In this example, Dimmesdale thanks Chillingworth for giving him a special care during his illness using sentences that show his heartfelt gratitude to Chillingworth. In the three translations, though rendered in different structures, the translators have maintained the maxim intended in the original.

3.5 Deixis

Birner (2013: 114) defines deixis as “the phenomenon of using a linguistic expression to “point” to some contextually available discourse entity or property”. Deixis is classified into three main types: personal (or person) deixis, spatial (or space) deixis, temporal (or time) deixis. Further studies on this topic have proposed other very important types which are: social deixis (which is a sub-type of personal deixis) and discourse deixis. In translation, deixis (or deictic expressions) is extremely context-dependent aspect. To translate a deictic expression, the translator should pay attention to its referent (Hassan, 2011: 75). As the translator deals with two different languages with, in most times, two different systems, s/he has to identify differences in these systems. For instance, the pronoun *you* in English may refer to one person,

two or more. Its Arabic translation would vary according to the reference of that pronoun. Hence, its equivalence can be أنتن , أنتم , أنتما , أنت , ت أن according to the context in which the deictic expression occurs. Hickey (1998: 7) confirms that the translator should “re-create the original message using a deictic perspective appropriate to the target language and avoiding undue influence of the original patterns". The translator has to render the setting of the original text including time, place, and situation. Consider the following example:

ST: "**We** will sit down **a little way** within the wood, and rest ourselves." (p. 164)

TT_1: " **سنجلس هنا بعد مسافة** قصيرة **في الغابة ونستريح** ." (p. 366)

TT_2: تعالي يا بنتي **نرتح** قليلاً. (p. 96)

TT_3: " سوف نجلس على **مسافة بعيدة** قليلاً داخل الغابة **ونرتاح** قليلاً " (p. 190)

Person deixis observed in this example is in the first person pronoun **we** and the possessive pronoun **ourselves**. The first one is translated into Arabic as an implied pronoun in the verb **نجلس** in TT1 and TT3 implicitly means نحن . In TT2, the translator has omitted the sentence in which this pronoun is used. The second one which is possessive is translated as a subject pronoun implied in the verbs **نستريح , نرتح** and **ونرتاح** . Though the three translators have changed the type of the pronoun, the reference is still the same. Hence, the translations are all correct.

Spatial deixis is observed in **a little way** which means a little far. In TT1, the translator has misunderstood the exact meaning of this phrase translating it as the opposite of what is intended in the ST as **مسافة** قصيرة . In TT2, the translator did not mention where Hester and her daughter will sit. By this he failed in preserving the deixis mentioned in the ST. In TT3, the translator has succeeded in finding out the correct equivalent of the ST which is مسافة بعيدة قليلا .

4. Conclusion

Translators may face pragmatic problems in translating almost any text. In **speech acts**, such problems occur if the translators fail to comprehend the exact meaning of a locution. Most of translation failures are caused by paying less attention to what is behind the word, i.e. the implied meaning of what is said. Misunderstanding implications leads to a loss of the ST **implicatures** intended in the ST. In translating pragmatic **presuppositions**, translators have to pay attention to the implied meaning of what is presupposed by utterances. In this regard, translators should not translate something into a TL that the reader of that language cannot understand. Consequently, they can manage this issue in finding a suitable pragmatic equivalence in the TL or trying to explain it in a footnote or any other way(s) to share the same assumption carried in the ST. As a pragmatic aspect, **politeness** cannot be figured out and analyzed unless it occurs in a specific situation and in a specific context. Both situation and context are essential in recognizing the appropriateness and inappropriateness of using certain polite expressions in certain contexts. **Deixis** can be problematic in the process of translation since the use of deictic expressions depends on the reference encoded by these expressions. Pragmatic failures occur if the translator misunderstands the situation and context in which these deictic expressions are uttered. Pragmatic analysis is then a means of clarifying ambiguities and obscure ideas resulting from pragmatic factors.

REFERENCES

Abushihab, I. (2015). 'A Pragmatic Stylistic Framework for Text Analysis'. International Journal of Education, Vol. 7, pp. 110-118. Retrieved from: www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/ije/article /download/70 15/5838 on 22th Dec. 2015.

Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A., Farmer, A. K., and Harnish, R. M. (2001). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication,* 5th ed. MIT Press: Cambridge.

Almanna, A. (2014). *Translation Studies Exemplified from Cicero to Peirre Bourdieo: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Sayyab Books Ltd.

Baker, M. (2011). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation, 2nd Edition*. London & New York: Routledge.

Bariki, O. (2004). 'On the Relationship between Translation and Pragmatics'. Retrieved from: www.unilorin.edu.ng/publications/ bariki/bariki2.doc on 2nd Jan. 2015

Birner, B.J. (2013). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dueñas, M. (2004). 'Pragmatic Approach to the Contrastive Analysis of a Literary Work and Two of its Translations'. Retrieved from: publicaciones.ua.es/filespubli/pdf/02144808RD23841241.pdf on 22th Dec. 2015.

Farghal, M., & Almanna, A. (2014). 'Some Pragmatic Aspects of Arabic/English Translation of Literary Texts'. Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature, Vol. 6, pp. 93-114.

Gile, D. (2009). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Revised Edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hassan, B. A. (2011). *Literary Translation: Aspects of Pragmatics*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Hatim, B. (1998). 'Text Politeness: A Semiotic Regime for a More Interactive Pragmatics'. In: Hickey, L. (ed.). The Pragmatics of Translation. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.

Hatim, B. and Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. London; New York: Routledge.

Hawthorne, N. (1988). *The Scarlet Letter*. Beirut: York Press.

Hickey, L. (ed.). (1998). *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters LTD .

House, J. (2009). *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jafari, J. (2013). 'The Pragmatic Analysis of Wilde's Comedy: The Importance of Being Ernest'. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 3, pp. 2151-2156. Retrieved from: www.academy publication.com/issues/pa st/tpls/vol03/1 2/01.pdf on 8th Dec. 2014.

Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories an Applications*. London: Routledge.

Newmark, P. (1988a). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall International.

Newmark P. (1988b). *Approaches to Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.

Oufela, M. (n. d.). 'The Importance of the Analysis of Pragmatic Components in Translation Process'. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/7309834/TheImportanceoftheAnalysisofPragmaticComponentsinTranslationProcess on 12th Jan. 2016.

Precup-Stiegelbauer, L., Tirban, N. and Banciu, V. (2012). 'Translation as a Means of Communication in a Multicultural World'. International Proceedings of Economics Development & Research, Vol. 39, pp.166-9. Retrieved from: http://connection.ebscohost. com/c/articles/833 63118/translation-as-means-communication-multicultural-world on 23th Jan. 2016.

Sequeiros, R. (2006). 'Translation, Pragmatics'. In: Mey, J. (ed.). Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics. Oxford: Elsevier.

Sindhu, K. and Karthika, G. (2013). 'Pragmatics as an Independent Level of Language Analysis in Linguistics'. Indian Journal of

Applied Research, Vol. 3, pp. 371-5. Retrieved from: http://www.worldwidejournals.com /ijar/file.php?val=May_2013_1367504274_b5612_111.pdf on 12th Jan. 2016.

Sultan, K. (2007). 'The Semantics, Pragmatics and Translation of Speech Acts'. Retrieved from: www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=10866 on 23th Dec. 2015.

Wang, F. (2014). 'A Model of Translation of Politeness Based on Relevance Theory'. Open Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 2, 270-277. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jss.2014.29045 on 7th Jan. 2016.

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

أبو حمرا، ادوار .) 2014 (.الحرف القرمزي .بيروت :دار الحكايات.

فرعون، محمد طريف .) 2008(.الحرف القرمزي .دمشق :دار أسامة.

كيوان، أميرة .(2007) الحرف القرمزي .بيروت :دار البحار.