

Face Management in Literary Translation

Dr. Yuan Xiaohui

University of Bristol, UNITED KINGDOM

ABSTRACT

Face constitutes an important interpersonal component via which people manage rapport with each other depending on their interactional goals. Face behaviour throughout the course of an interaction can indicate or manifest an interlocutor's personality, attitude and intentions. This paper focuses on investigating how face is depicted in Jane Austen's novel *Sense and Sensibility* where interpersonal dynamics feature and lead the plot, and how face is represented in the Chinese translation of this novel by Cheng Wei'an (2009). Using three excerpts and their translation as data, it is found that interpersonal face markers are sometimes omitted or toned down in the translation, and bald-on-record face strategies changed into off-record manners or redressed with concerns of hearers' negative or positive face wants. This, I claim, may impact on a reader's interpretation of interlocutors' personality, attitude and intentions. The change of face features in literary translation, however, ought not to communicate a different idea of the personality of the characters in the literary work and of their attitudes towards each other. Therefore, the paper suggests that translators need to develop a sufficient understanding of the representation of face portrayal in literary translation in order to assist readers from target cultures to better appreciate individual characters in the way that writers endeavour to portray and present to their readers. The data analysis also demonstrates evidence of translation leading to less explicit information about facework, presenting salient departures from the explicitation hypothesis in translation studies.

KEYWORDS: Composite Model of Face Management, explicitation, politeness, prefabricated orality, *Sense and Sensibility*

1. Introduction

Face constitutes an important interpersonal component manifesting how people use verbal and non-verbal language to manage rapport with each other depending on what they aim to achieve. Face behaviour throughout the course of an interaction can indicate or present an interlocutor's personality, attitude and intentions. Moreover, people from different cultures may initiate varied face behaviour which may be intended for the same attitude or purposes such as agreeing with someone, or showing disapproval. By the same token, similar face behaviour from people of different cultural backgrounds may embody vastly different attitude and intentions. As such, face strategies imbedded in our utterances and body language constitute a useful departure for investigating intercultural pragmatics.

Research on the representation of intercultural pragmatics has been burgeoning rapidly in recent years. For example, Hill (2006) argues that translations of the Bible text alone are not sufficient for helping audiences understand the message, and proposes in-text and out-of-text solutions for adjusting contextual mismatches between first-century Jewish and Adioukrou views to improve audiences' access to the contextual information. Moreover, Desilla (2012) investigates the interpretation and functions of implicatures¹ which are multimodally conveyed via the film dialogue, with the co-deployment of verbal and non-verbal cinematic signifiers, thus arguing that a conventional approach focusing on the dialogical text alone does not suffice for deciphering communicative intentions of implicatures. She calls for further investigations of the cross-cultural relay of implicatures in subtitled and/or dubbed films, ushering new avenues for studying implicatures in audiovisual translation studies. In the same vein, Dong (2011) focuses on the translation of humour in sitcoms into Chinese language, and also highlights the importance of multimodality in humour construal and understanding. She reaches the conclusion that a higher proportion of the presence of culture-specific humour, such as those underpinned by sexual innuendos and ethnic particularities in sitcoms, leads to more challenges of relaying in translations the communicative intentions entailed in the humour. It also causes greater difficulty for audiences to appreciate the humour.

The aim and scope of this paper focuses on the portrayal and the representation of a particular intercultural pragmatic phenomenon – *face* – in translation studies, especially, in literary translation. It is noteworthy that although the investigation of face features in audiovisual translation, in particular subtitling, has received increasing scholarly attention (e.g., Mason 1989; Hatim and Mason 1997; Kovačič 1996b, 2000; Bruti 2006, 2009; Yuan 2012), the area of face management in literary translation remains under-studied and the literature addressing it is comparatively sparse. Notably, Hickey (2000) concludes from his experiment² with English and Spanish subjects that the English group is able to quickly identify and recognise the negative politeness strategies manifested in the original English texts, while the Spanish group does not seem to perceive the linguistic behaviour in the literally translated texts to be politeness-related. In other words, the negative politeness expressions in the Spanish texts that are translated literally become unmarked for the Spanish readers. In the light of this finding,

¹ Implicature is proposed by Grice (1989: 24) as denoting the act of 'implying' when a speaker flouts one or more of the four Cooperative Principles in conversations.

² Six short fragments containing typical negative politeness expressions of request, apology and justification, giving thanks, request for forgiveness, thanks and justification of thanks, and apology or warning before giving bad news are extracted from David Lodge's novel *Therapy* as the experiment data.

Hickey stresses the importance of communicating and making salient the illocutionary dimension of texts, including politeness markers, in translation activities so as to achieve functional equivalence (House 1998) in cross-cultural contexts.

In search for a framework conducive to the analysis of politeness in translation, House (1998:57) proposes that “Lakoff’s simpler and more elegant approach [compared to Leech’s maxims and Brown and Levinson’s politeness model] seems to me more immediately applicable”. Nevertheless, Lakoff’s pragmatic rules of well-formedness serve merely as a prototype of politeness theory as it only sets normative standards for desired behaviour from an individual rather than provides a descriptive account of how people actually behave in interactions (Fraser 1990; Watts 2003). Therefore, Lakoff’s rules of politeness seems to be short of adequate capacity for analysing data that present dynamic social interactions.

This issue becomes salient when House (1998:67) tries to apply Lakoff’s politeness rules to analysing, with a view from the perspective of politeness, the representation of ‘interpersonal functional components’ in a business letter. In her analysis, grammatical elements of field, tenor and mode that comprise register are referred to, intertwined with discussions of covert and overt translation types, which render the departure and the direction of the discussion rather discursive, unclear and distracted away from the focus of politeness. This may be attributed to the fact that Lakoff’s general rules do not constitute any specific elements at the micro level with a capacity to unpackaging and facilitating the analysis of interpersonal markers. For example, in Lakoff’s ‘Rules of Politeness’ (Lakoff 1973:297), ‘Don’t impose’, ‘Give option’ and ‘Make A feel good – be friendly’ are simply laid out as three rules of interaction, without any explanations or suggestions of what verbal or non-verbal strategies may be used to fulfil the rules.

In view of the above issue, I propose in this paper a Composite Model of Face Management (CMFM) as a comprehensive face model with cultural variables to aid the analysis of face interactions in literary translation and to highlight the cultural-communication nature and function of translation activities. This proposition is underpinned in my recent work investigating face management in English-Chinese subtitling (Yuan 2012) where CMFM has proved its adequate sophistication and effectiveness for data analysis. I intend, in this paper, to investigate how face management features available in a source text are represented in the target text, using a Chinese translation of Jane Austen’s novel *Sense and Sensibility* as the source of my data. The purpose is to illustrate the issues of achieving interpersonal functional

equivalence in translation from the point of view of politeness, which constitutes one of the crucial components manifesting cross-cultural difference.

The paper includes 6 sections in total. In section 2, the strengths and the weaknesses of two key theories in the area of face, namely, Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework and Spencer-Oatey's (2000) postulations are reviewed critically to illustrate the reason and the necessity for developing the Composite Model of Face Management for data analysis. This is followed by detailed expositions of the model and its main components, including the notions, the strategies, the cultural and the contextual variables within the model. This constitutes the theoretical framework applied in this study. Section 3 discusses the research data that comprise three excerpts demonstrating the occasions of disagreement, apology and blaming from the novel *Sense and Sensibility* and its Chinese translation by Chen Wei'an. Data transcription and coding are subsequently explained to inform the main methodological aspects of this research. Attention in section 4 then turns to the analysis of face features in each of the excerpts, followed by the analysis of face characteristics represented in the corresponding translation. Following the extensive analysis, discussion is made in section 5 drawing the main analytical findings on how face features are (un)represented in literary translation and the implication for translation studies. Finally, section 6 summarises the main contributions of this research and suggests avenues for future research

2. Face Management

2.1 Development of the theory

Face management is oriented to politeness studies.³ The milestone theories in this area are Brown and Levinson's (1987) face model and Spencer-Oatey's (2000) rapport management framework. It is important to acknowledge from the outset that the composite model proposed in this present study is influenced by the above two traditional models. In the pure linguistic politeness studies which have developed into a growing discipline in its own right sitting within the umbrella of sociolinguistics, the trend of research has very recently started to move from the model approach to the discursive approach, which analyses politeness interactions in

³ The reason that we do not explicitly use the word 'politeness' is because it seems wrongly to indicate that research in this area has a salient focus on examining the social behaviour that is conducive to building and enhancing interpersonal harmony while neglecting interactions demonstrating the opposite purpose of ignoring and damaging harmony.

each situated context.⁴ Moreover, the Australian scholar Michael Haugh (2013) adventures into discursive psychology and ethnomethodology to evaluate politeness as a form of social practice. Although the above approaches appear illuminating for the investigation of politeness phenomena in specific interactional contexts, their applicability and relevance are undermined when politeness is approached from an interdisciplinary perspective, such as politeness in translation which constitutes the scope of this paper. The reason is that those approaches do not provide any overarching theoretical frameworks suitable to be drawn upon.

In the traditional models, Brown and Levinson (1987) propose that all competent adult members have two intrinsic face wants of individual freedom – negative face, and social recognition and inclusion – positive face. In detail, negative face refers to the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction, that is, to freedom of action and freedom from imposition. Positive face is the positive-consistent self-image or personality (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants. Departing from the face wants, they set up three super-strategies that people adopt when negotiating wants with one another in order to build and maintain social harmony, namely, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record strategies which are presented in Appendix 1. For the first time, they use a descriptive theory to explain how language is used in social interactions to achieve politeness, which is much more dynamic, powerful and applicable to analysing interactions than prior prescriptive rules of politeness (Lakoff 1973) and politeness maxims (Leech 1983), where guidance and desirable behaviour are simply laid out without much capacity for investigating how people interact, verbally and in body language, in social encounters.

Nevertheless, this theory suffers from two major drawbacks. Firstly, in terms of the scope of the super-strategies in the theory, they focus solely on interactions conducive to social harmony while behaviour that is intended to cause and augment friction and disharmony between interactants is not taken into account. This is rectified by Culpeper (1996) and Culpeper et al.'s (2003) impoliteness super-strategies. Culpeper et al. (2003: 1546) define impoliteness as 'the use of communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflicts and disharmony'. They postulate five super-strategies to achieve impoliteness: 1) bald-on-record impoliteness, 2) positive impoliteness, 3) negative

⁴ This is only one of the approaches proposed by scholars, who mainly belong to the Linguistic Politeness Research Group (LPRG) based in the Midlands.

impoliteness, 4) sarcasm or mock politeness, and 5) withhold politeness (Culpeper et al. *ibid*: 1554–5). These strategies are devised in line with Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework, and, therefore, can be perceived as an extension of the latter.

Secondly, with respect to the scope of the notion in Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory, the two intrinsic wants cannot encompass the role of identity and that of sociality rights and obligations in relationship management, and neither do they acknowledge any cultural underpinnings. In comparison, Spencer-Oatey's (2000) rapport management notion proves to be more enriched and inclusive since it explores not just face wants, but also social rights and interactional goals in its conceptualisation. Moreover, important contextual factors that may influence the interaction and its outcome are investigated, including participant relations in power (P), distance (D), and the severity of an imposition (R), number of participants, associated rights and obligations in social roles, and the nature of a communicative activity. However, in spite of these strengths, the rapport management theory is limited in its applicability to data analysis due to a lack of a set of pragmatic strategies that are capable of unpacking ongoing interactions.

2.2 In search of an analytical framework

In view of the above, a Composite Model of Face Management (CMFM) (Yuan 2012:77) is established as an overarching theoretical framework for analysing face features in interactional discourse and the representation of face characteristics in translation. CMFM can be illustrated as follows:

Notion	Strategy	Factors influencing strategy use		
Positive face	Positive politeness / Positive impoliteness / off –recordness protecting or attacking H ⁵ 's positive face	Face orientation face-enhancement face-maintenance	Contextual variables D, P, R number of participants	Interactional Goals
Negative face	Negative politeness / Negative impoliteness / off –recordness protecting or attacking H's negative face	face-neglect face-damage	social/interactional roles communicative activity	
Cultural influence over weighting of face wants and rights	Cultural influence over strategy use	Cultural influence over factor assessment		
Western: greater emphasis on volition		Far East : more sensitive to discernment		

Table 1 Composite Model of Face Management (Yuan 2012:77)

⁵ H=hear

CMFM draws upon the strengths of Brown and Levinson's theory and Spencer-Oatey's rapport management notion. Specifically, the notion of *face* in CMFM denotes both the public self-image and the fundamental sociality rights that every competent adult member effectively claims in their interactions with others. These two claims are reflected in two related aspects of the *face* notion, which constitutes positive face and negative face.

1. Positive face: the fundamental desire for people to (1) approve our wants, (2) positively evaluate our personal qualities and uphold our social identities, and (3) respect our rights of an appropriate association with others in consistence with the type of social relationship.
2. Negative face: the fundamental desire to (1) act freely from imposition and (2) have our disassociation rights respected by others in keeping with the type of social relationship.

(Yuan 2012:71-2)

Face in CMFM can be threatened in two ways: through threatening the public self-image and through threatening sociality rights. I have argued and illustrated (Yuan 2012:72-5) that Brown and Levinson's three sets of super-strategies for enhancing harmony and their extensive strategies for damaging harmony, which are formulated by Culpeper et al. (2003), have adequate sophistication to illustrate the management of sociality rights between interactants. The reason is that sociality rights constitute our fundamental legitimate face wants which are conducive to building and maintaining the public self-image. Therefore we believe that these legitimate face wants deserve the respect of others and that they must be fulfilled.

Face is a vulnerable entity full of emotional stakes. In social interactions, it is generally in everyone's best interest to maintain each other's face due to the mutual vulnerability of face. To achieve this, a person is expected to be able to identify certain kinds of acts, classified as being intrinsically face threatening, and to assess the nature and the severity of these face-threatening acts (FTA defined by Brown and Levinson 1987) in order to determine the appropriate strategies for carrying out the FTAs. For example, asking for a favour is deemed to threaten the hearer's negative face since it encroaches upon his/her space, and the hearer may feel constrained and obliged to honour the favour. In the light of such face dilemma, any rational person will seek to employ appropriate strategies to minimise the face-threatening effect. Depending on the size of an FTA and the feature of the interactional context, the possible sets of strategies in line with the downgrading effect of an FTA can be 1 doing the

FTA bald-on-record, 2 redressing the FTA towards the hearer's positive or negative face, i.e., positive or negative politeness strategies, 3 carrying out the FTA in an off-record manner, 4 withholding the FTA (Brown and Levinson 1987). For reference, full lists of positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record strategies are provided in Appendix 1. The bald-on-record strategy is clarified below.

With the bald-on-record strategy, a speaker carries out a face-threatening act with maximum efficiency where no mitigating devices are applied and face concerns are suspended in the interest of clarity. For example, it is often used in emergency where the face threat is considered insignificant, such as 'Watch out for that dog!'. When the FTA is primarily in the hearer's interest, the speaker tends to resort to bald-on-recordness. Sympathetic advice falls into this category, for example, 'Don't be so low. Cheer up!'. In the context of an obvious power imbalance between speaker and hearer, the bald-on-record strategy may be used by a speaker to exert authority, for example, 'Pull over! It's the police!'.

The bald-on-record strategy can only describe a very limited variety of phenomena as it generally occurs most often in interactions where the focus is task/information-oriented. However, in relationship-oriented interactions, which account for the majority of interpersonal encounters, appropriate management of face is deemed to be more important than clarity, hence, the necessity of employing relevant politeness strategies.

Specifically, positive politeness strategies refer to the acts that we initiate to protect each other's positive face wants, i.e., making others feel good. These can be expressed through claiming common ground with others, for example, attending to the interests and wants of others, seeking agreement, using in-group identity markers such as 'mate', and presupposing common ground with others. The intention of protecting positive face can also be achieved via conveying that both speaker and hearer are co-operators, for example, making offers and promises belong to this category. Last but not least, fulfilling others' wants, such as giving gifts and sympathy can also help to protect face and to build rapport between interlocutors.

In the same vein, in social interactions, negative politeness strategies are devised to inform others of speaker's intention to protect their negative face, i.e., showing respect to others' space. In particular, such strategies can be broadly divided into two categories. Firstly, a speaker tries to communicate to others his/her intention not to coerce or to impinge. For example, s/he may endeavour to be conventionally indirect, using hedges, or giving deference

to minimise the imposition when making a request. When acts involving possible imposition on a hearer have to be initiated, such as asking him/her to follow instructions, the speaker tends to make an apology first, to impersonalise both speaker and hearer, or to state the act as a general rule, such as 'It is required by the board that...'. Secondly, a speaker can claim indebtedness to a hearer, which expresses his/her awareness of the hearer's negative face, for example, 'I'd be very grateful if you would...'.

Both positive and negative politeness strategies can be expressed in on-record or off-record manners. The crucial difference is that for an utterance expressed in the off-record manner, more than one communicative intention may be attributed. Hence, a hearer has to infer the speaker's intention contained in the utterance through interactional contexts. The off-record manner may be resorted to when a speaker is unsure of the appropriateness for him/her to initiate a face-threatening act in a direct or on-record manner where the communicative intention is explicit. For example, A and B have been friends for just over a year. One day, A says to B 'I owe the water company £300. The debt collector has threatened to knock on my door if I don't pay it off by this Friday. But I won't get paid till the Monday after next week. Oh dear! What shall I do?'. Although in this context, A's intention may well be interpreted as prompting B to lend A some money, A, nevertheless, cannot be held responsible for saying that, and A can easily deny it if challenged. In this way, A not only achieves the protection of B's face by avoiding being imposing and intrusive, but also manages to avoid losing his own face which would have otherwise incurred should the request be put in an on-record way and then subsequently suffer from refusal.

When assessing the nature and the severity of an FTA and choosing appropriate face strategies, the speaker will take into account a few important factors which contribute significantly to his/her decision-making. These factors, as shown in CMFM, include face orientation, contextual variables, and interactional goals.

Face orientation indicates people's desire to manage their relations with others according to their preconceived intentions. In particular, people may hold any of the four types of face orientations:

1. Face-enhancement orientation: the speaker's desire to enhance the hearer's face-wants and/or right-claims in strengthening harmonious relations between them;

2. Face-maintenance orientation: the speaker's desire to satisfy the hearer's face-wants and/or right-claims in maintaining harmonious relations between them;
3. Face-neglect orientation: the speaker's lack of interest in the hearer's face-wants and/or right-claims detrimental to the relations between them (perhaps due to a focus on self);
4. Face-damage orientation: the speaker's challenge to, attack on or denial of the hearer's face-wants and/or right-claims impairing the relations between them.

The contextual variables that influence people's use of face strategies include 1) distance (D), power (P), and ranking of impositions (R), 2) number of participants, 3) people's rights and obligations associated with their social roles, and 4) the nature of a communicative activity.

Power (P) is believed to be in existence when an individual is able to control the behaviour of the other in a certain area, and both cannot have power in the same area of behaviour (Brown and Gilman 1960). The social distance (D) between speaker and hearer encompasses three possible components that could impact on people's expressions of semantic solidarity. They are social similarity/difference, length of acquaintance, and sense of like-mindedness. R indicates how people rank an imposition in the particular culture. The degree to which an FTA is perceived as a serious imposition can depend on the power and social distance parameters (Watts 2003). For example, asking for a cigarette from someone with much higher social status or a complete stranger constitutes a stronger FTA than asking a close friend.

A second important contextual variable influencing strategy use relates to the number of participants taking part in a communicative event, either as speakers or hearers. In most cultures, face-management norms are number-sensitive, which means that what is said and how things are said could often be influenced by the number of people present, and whether they are all listening. For example, in many countries, it is far more face-threatening to be criticised publicly than privately.

A third contextual variable is related to participants' rights and obligations in interactive events. Through affecting people's assessments of rights and obligations, social/interactional roles influence their use of face management strategies. Thomas's example describing how two women initiated the request for stopping on a country bus serves as a good illustration of the importance of rights and obligations. The first woman simply called out: 'Next stop,

driver!’ before the bus approached a scheduled stopping place; while the second made the following verbal request for stopping at an unofficial stop: ‘Do you think you could possibly let me out just beyond the traffic lights, please?’ (1995:89).

In this case, parameters of power, social distance and imposition all held constant without any changes. The role relations are the same and it cost the driver no more effort to stop beyond the traffic lights than at the bus stop. The only difference lies in the rights and obligations of the event: the driver has an obligation to stop at the scheduled place, but has no such obligation in the second case. Therefore, the second woman chose very different linguistic strategies to pose her request, probably after assessing the implied rights and obligations in the event.

A fourth major factor influencing people’s use of rapport management strategies is the type of communicative activity that is taking place, for example, a training course or a court hearing.

The above four contextual variables may play both a standing and a dynamic role in influencing strategy use. The standing role perception is very similar to Fraser and Nolan’s conversational contract (1981:102), which postulates that based on previous experience we may have relatively stable conceptions of these contextual variables prior to the interactional event. However, in the course of an interaction, assessment of the variables can change dynamically with the unfolding of the event as the perception of power imbalance may have changed, and therefore an interlocutor may, for example, become more arrogant. To make interaction successful in terms of rapport management, interlocutors need to combine the dynamic assessment of context with their original standing assessment to determine an appropriate linguistic strategy choice.

It is very important to highlight in the postulation of CMFM that the face notion, face strategies and contextual factors all have to be considered against the background of cultural influence; such as what are regarded as legitimate rights in different cultures (e.g. abortion constitutes a right in China and sometimes in extreme circumstances could even be enforced as an obligation, but by no means is it regarded as a right in Ireland); what sort of behaviour is perceived to be appropriate for face-enhancement (e.g. a guest’s burping after a meal is seen

in Chinese culture as a compliment to the host's cooking but this is not the case in the UK); and what kind of power one holds in different cultures (e.g. according to Chen and Starosta (1997), a senior Chinese government official not only holds reward, coercive, legitimate powers over his/her subordinates, but also automatically acquires expert power, which may not be applicable in a Western culture). In this respect, Hill et al.'s (1986) research is pertinent and sheds light on our overall understanding of the matter. Specifically, they find that discernment constitutes a universal concern in all sociolinguistic systems. This means that we all have concerns of what would be considered appropriate or inappropriate behaviour when we use verbal or non-verbal means managing relationships with others in interactions, regardless of what cultures we come from. Nevertheless, when it comes to a particular interactional context, people from different cultures may attach different weight to factors subsumed under discernment and volition. In other words, people from some cultures have greater freedom to choose whether they want to be polite or not and how im/polite they want to be, while people from other cultures are more bound by strongly prescriptive social norms and therefore have less freedom to do so. These findings are incorporated into the formulation of CMFM.

This Composite Model of Face Management provides a dynamic theoretical framework for analysing how face management, which demonstrates the character's personality, attitude and intentions, is delineated in the original literary work and how it is represented in the translation. Specifically, the concepts of positive face and negative face help to identify and analyse the types of wants entailed in an interlocutor's intention, i.e., what s/he is trying to achieve in the interaction. The face management strategies, namely, positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record strategies have the capacity to illustrate and unpack a character's particular linguistic style through exhibiting the type of face markers featuring his/her utterances. They can reflect the character's personality and attitude in the interaction. Last but not least, the social and cultural factors identified in Table 1 enable the analyst to explain what factors may influence the use of interactional strategies in a certain context to achieve an intention. The building blocks within the CMFM, i.e., the notion, the strategy, and the social and cultural factors, collectively construe, present and delineate a character's attitude, personality and intention in a sequence of interactions. This may help to mitigate the

subjectivity in the analysis, enabling the analyst not to take the inferential process⁶ for granted and treat it as an ostensive process (Mason 2009). This composite model is used as the theoretical framework for analyzing interpersonal interactions contained in the data.

3. Data

The data used in this study comprise three extracts from Jane Austen's novel *Sense and Sensibility*,⁷ and its corresponding Chinese translation by Cheng Wei'an (Cheng) published in 2009. The novel is one of Austen's best-known masterpieces and is rich in dialogues between characters. It tells the story of two sisters' pursuing the thorny paths of love. Elinor is the elder sister who is mature, sensible and responsible. She falls for Edward, only to find out that he is already engaged to Lucy. Therefore, she feels obliged to keep her affection towards Edward to herself, as Marianne understands. Compared to Elinor, Marianne is naïve and trusting. She quickly falls in love with the charming but manipulative Willoughby, who is actually a womaniser and untrustworthy. Unbeknown to Marianne and her family, Willoughby has just made a young girl pregnant and then abandoned her before meeting Marianne. His patron, Mrs Smith, drives him away upon discovering this. But Willoughby lies to Marianne and her family that he is dispatched for business and is unable to visit the family within a year. Marianne is heart-broken but still cherishes the hope to be with him again until she finds out that he is married to another woman. Marianne rises above her sorrow with Elinor's help and finally finds happiness with Colonel Brandon who has always cared for her. In the meantime, Elinor and Edward are able to confess their love for each other when Lucy decides to dissolve her engagement to Edward and marries his brother who is wealthier.

The exchanges vividly portray the characters' distinct personalities through their use of language in interaction, for example, Elinor's salient use of positive politeness strategies in strong defence of Edward's taste for painting, her assertive and authoritative manner when challenging Marianne's doubts, and Marianne's subtleness when expressing her disagreeing views on this matter in example 1. These contribute to fascinating twists and turns featuring

⁶ Inference denotes, in this context, the analyst's inferring of the interlocutors' interactional pragmatics such as personality, attitude and intentions that reflect face management features. This process takes place in the analyst's mind. Ostension refers, in this context, to observable evidence independently showing what it is intended to communicate in the interactions.

⁷ The third edition of *Sense and Sensibility* published by Oxford University Press in 1988 is used as the source text.

dynamic changes of interpersonal relationships through joint constructions, such as Willoughby's awkwardness when offering reasons for leaving Marianne, implying his intention to sever the liaison with her in example 2. Example 3 presents Elinor's use of direct confrontation to press for a clear answer from Marianne, and Marianne's hedged reply with sarcasm to express her positions. Therefore, they provide optimal contexts for investigating the representation of interpersonal components in the novel and in the translation.

The three excerpts constitute the occasions of disagreement, apology, and expressions of blame. In politeness studies, these three contexts: disagreement (e.g. Shum & Lee 2013; Sifianou 2012; Rees-Miller 2000), apology (e.g., Jebahi 2011; Long 2010; Bataineh 2008), and blaming (e.g., Laforest 2009; Hongladarom 2007; Laforest 2002) constitute frequently investigated interactions as representative of im/politeness phenomena. Therefore, such an analytical practice can be extended into literary usage for studying their representation in literary translation. When selecting the data, I believe that it is necessary and productive to examine interactional features in the original texts and in the translation over an extended course of context and beyond the boundary of a single turn. This approach has proven pertinent and fruitful in analysing audiovisual dialogue and its translation (Pérez-González 2007; Yuan 2012). Hence, the three excerpts selected for this study reflect such an approach to data selection.

The Chinese translator for *Sense and Sensibility* Cheng is a reputed and experienced professional translator who holds a Doctorate Degree in Language and Literature Studies from the University of Columbia, USA. He has translated many other classic masterpieces. His translation of the novel is described as 'elegant, natural and fluid in language use. [It] vividly presents characters' subtle inner world, and fully re-exhibits the witty and refined exchanges between the interlocutors' (Meng 2009, my translation).⁸ Therefore, it serves as a good example to investigate whether and how face management is (un)represented in the translation of interpersonal exchanges, the impact of achieving naturalness when translating prefabricated orality on the (un)representation of face features in literary translation, and in turn the ultimate impact on translated text users.

The data is transcribed in a tabular format for ease of comparison and analysis. Specifically, lines of the original excerpts are denoted by Arabic numerals, and their corresponding

⁸ The original comment in Chinese '语言优雅，自然流畅，生动地展现了人物细腻的内心理世界，充分再现了主人公之间妙语连珠的精彩对白'。

translations by the same sequence of numerals plus the letter *t* indicating *translation*. Each line of the Chinese translation follows immediately after the original utterance or narration. Literal back-translation into English is also provided below the Chinese rendition. Due to the length of each extract, a shortened transcription is provided in the body of the paper, and a full version is given in the Appendix 2 for reader's reference.

4 Data analysis

Since the research objective is to examine the presence in literary translation of indicators of face management in the source fictional text, I will now investigate the three selected contexts from the perspective of face management and its representation in the translation. In the analysis, I apply the Composite Model of Face Management (see section 2).

The data for this research displays the typical feature of prefabricated orality (Baños-Piñero and Chaume 2009) in which dialogue is carefully scripted to emulate a natural conversation with a view to helping readers identify with the portrayed fictional world (Delabastita 1989; Kozloff 2000; Pavesi 2008). Therefore, the style of the dialogue is influenced to a larger degree more by readers than by interlocutors in the text, as it is not really a case of interlocutors addressing each other, but rather the author addressing the reader via the fictitious dialogue. In view of this, the task for the translator may be considered to be transferring the spontaneous-sounding feature of the fictional dialogue to the TL in a convincing way to enable the target reader to interpret and identify with the fictional interaction in a similar way to the native reader. To achieve this, the transfer of face management via literary translation plays an important part, and it is from this particular perspective that the data will be analyzed.

1) Disagreement with compromise

Introduction of plots before the interaction

Elinor is Marianne's elder sister. Their relationship is close, loving and harmonious. They are expressing their views on Edward's taste for painting. Elinor is in love with him in secret, which Marianne appreciates.

Transcription of the interaction

1	“What a pity it is, Elinor,” said Marianne, “that Edward should have no taste for drawing.”
1t	“好可惜，艾丽诺，” 玛丽安对姐姐说道，“爱德华不喜欢绘画。” “Good pity, Elinor,” Marianne to sister said, “Edward not like drawing.”
2	“No taste for drawing,” replied Elinor, “why should you think so?”
2t	“你怎么会这样想？” “You how will this think?”
3	He does not draw himself, indeed, but he has great pleasure in seeing the performance of other people,
3t	他自己是不画，可是他很喜欢看别人画呀！ He himself is not drawing, but he very much like watching others drawing ya!
4	and I assure you he is by no means deficient in natural taste, though he has not had opportunities of improving it.
4t	我认为，他并不缺少天分，只是没有机会表现而已。 I think, he not lack talent, just is no chance show.
5	Had he ever been in the way of learning, I think he would have drawn very well.
5t	如果他学过画画，我相信他一定会画得很好。 If he learned drawing, I believe he is bound to draw very well.

In the source text (ST), Marianne initiates the exchange with Elinor by expressing her view, or rather her judgment, of a certain attribute of Edward in a bald-on-record manner that entails a salient face-threatening act (FTA) (line 1). In this case, although Edward is not present in the room, Elinor may well be affected by such an FTA due to her profound affection for Edward. As discussed, face is emotionally invested. Elinor has feelings for Edward and any negative comments about him can amount to FTAs to Elinor’s face. Marianne opts for such a direct verdict, the FTA of which is further augmented by the modal *should* highlighting the speaker’s marked surprise. The reason may be attributed to the short distance and great familiarity between her and Elinor, which renders politeness strategies for mitigating the FTA unnecessary, and to the fact that the FTA addressee – Edward – is absent during the exchange. As presented in CMFM in section 2, the parameter of distance (D) between the interlocutors, the number of participants in the interaction, and the type of communicative activity all constitute important contextual factors affecting people’s face management behaviour.

Marianne's linguistic directness could also be used by the author to depict the character's straight-talking personality, which forms a stark contrast to that of Elinor's. In the Chinese translation (1t), an off-record statement that 'Edward does not like drawing' is made, in which Marianne's non-mitigated personal judgment of Edward's attribute or capability is blurred. The statement constitutes an off-record strategy because more than one communicative intention could be attributed to the utterance, and the hearer has to infer the speaker's intention through the context. This renders Marianne's attitude to be more indirect and implied.

In the excerpt, Elinor appears to be shocked by Marianne's direct comment as she repeats it and follows it with an enquiry about the reason for her belief (line 2). In the Chinese translation (2t), the repetition highlighting Elinor's great surprise at the comment is omitted. Elinor's question to Marianne in line 2 functions as a disagreement expressed in an off-record manner rather than a gesture showing interest in or eliciting Marianne's explanations as Elinor continues with her own viewpoint of Edward's talent and taste (lines 3 to 7). She strongly defends Edward's talent by applying emphatic expressions such as 'I assure you' (line 4), 'by no means' (line 4), 'distrust...so much that' (line 6), and markers for emphasis including 'ever' (line 5), 'always' (line 6) and 'perfectly' (line 7). These expressions and markers could be adopted to underline Elinor's tremendous affections for Edward, hence the urge for her to defend his positive face. In the Chinese translation, although Elinor's viewpoint is communicated, her marked efforts to defend Edward's positive face manifested in her linguistic style are generally toned down. For example, in 4t, the emphatic expression 'I assure you' is rendered into an unmarked and conventionalised expression 我认为 [I think] which does not demonstrate the speaker's intention to persuade the hearer. In the same utterance, the adverbial phrase illustrating Elinor's determined tone in her claim 'by no means' is replaced by the Chinese adverb 并 which is normally used before the negative marker 不[not] for emphasis, but the tone is much weaker than 'by no means'. In 6t, the emphatic pattern 'distrust...so much that' is downgraded as 只不过 [it is only that], and the marker 'always (unwilling)' is toned down as 不太愿意 [not too willing], so is the marker for stress in line 7 'perfectly right'.

In the ST, Elinor then tries to enhance the validity of her standpoint by reminding Marianne bald-on-record of her own cordiality towards Edward (lines 8 to 10). In line 8, Elinor informs Marianne in a rather direct and imposing tone of what Marianne's thought actually is, which

is slightly mitigated by the conventionalised manner hedge ‘I hope’. The imperative command ‘you do not do...’ explicitly manifests Elinor’s non-negotiating attitude on the argument, and in turn her immense affection towards Edward. In the Chinese translation (8t), the bald-on-record claim is changed into a rhetorical question redressed towards the hearer’s negative face wants, with the particle 吧 serving as a device indicating speaker’s hesitance, uncertainty, and the willingness to give the hearer the right to judgments or decisions (Xu 2008). Therefore, the negative politeness in the translation renders Elinor’s linguistic style more indirect and less authoratative. Elinor’s marked tone in the original is further diluted in 10t when the emphatic expression foregrounding her belief ‘I am sure’ is not included in the translation.

Elinor’s passionate defence of Edward’s talent has inevitably put Marianne in a great dilemma (lines 11-13). To accentuate this, emphatic descriptives ‘on any account’ (line 12) and ‘impossible’ (line 13) are adopted in the narrative presumably to exaggerate Marianne’s intense inner struggle between her care for Elinor’s feelings and her inability to speak against her beliefs. In the corresponding translation (11t-13t), the dilemma and the intensity of her struggle are mitigated with the former descriptive omitted and the latter rendered as ‘not willing’, in which Marianne’s marked efforts and intention to protect Elinor’s feelings are understated.

Similar mitigations in the effect of interpersonal markers can be further found in the translation of Marianne’s effective statement of compromise (lines 14-17) which demonstrates her intensified efforts and intention to reach a common ground with Elinor’s salient standpoints. For example, manner hedge ‘not in everything equal’ (line 14) is adopted in the negative politeness strategy to reduce the extent of their disagreements. This is omitted in the translation (14t). Moreover, when paying compliments to Edward’s personality (line 16), exaggerative positive face markers ‘highest’ and ‘in the world’ are employed to accentuate Marianne’s extremely positive views. These are considerably toned down in the translation (16t). The same applies to the positive politeness enhancer ‘everything that is’ in line 17.

As explained in CMFM, people hold certain interactional goals prior to entering and during the course of an interaction. In this context, before the conversation broaching the subject on Edward’s artistic taste and ability, the two sisters were enjoying an informal conversation that helped to maintain and/or enhance their existing harmonious relationship. Therefore, both

interlocutors' face orientations in interaction may encompass face-enhancement and face-maintenance (cf. section 2). Nevertheless, when Edward's taste for drawing becomes the centre of exchanges, due to her affections towards Edward, Elinor's focus, shown in her linguistic style, seems to change from maintaining harmony with Marianne to strongly defending Edward's image, which renders her in direct disagreement with Marianne. Therefore, in terms of Elinor's face orientation towards Marianne from this moment, it has changed from face-enhancement or face maintenance to face-neglect. This may have prompted her adopting various bald-on-record politeness strategies. On the contrary, Marianne may still hold the face maintenance orientation with Elinor as she appreciates Elinor's feelings. This can explain Marianne's hesitance in expressing her views and her indirect manner. As shown in the analysis, the politeness strategies used by the characters manifesting their linguistic styles are generally toned down in the translation. This inevitably affects the representation of their marked attitude on the matter and their salient interactional goals. Specifically, in the source text, Elinor demonstrates a clear goal of firmly defending Edward and denying Marianne's claims. Nevertheless, in the Chinese narrative achieved via translation, her goal is not presented in such a salient manner as in the original.

2) Apology before sudden farewell

Introduction of plots before the interaction

In the novel, Willoughby is a despicable character who manipulates young women with his charm and then abandons them. He manages to form an apparently loving relationship with Marianne and to secure her mother and her sister's trust and fondness after spending time with them. Now he has to make a sudden and false farewell to them as he claims that his patron – Mrs Smith – dispatches him to London for business. But the real reason for his hasty departure, unbeknown to Marianne and her family, is that Mrs Smith is driving him away after finding out that he has just abandoned a teenage girl after making her pregnant. He is trying to explain, with pretence, to Marianne, her mother and her sister the urgency of the business and that he will probably not pay a visit again to the family this year. Marianne is heart-broken at the news. Her mother tries to assure Willoughby that he will always be welcome to her family.

Transcription of the interaction

1	“Is anything the matter with her?” cried Mrs Dashwood as she entered. “Is she sick?”
1t	“马丽安是怎么了？身体不舒服吗？”才一进屋，达什伍德太太就迫不及待地追问。 “Marianne is what up? Body not comfortable ma?” just once entered, Dashwood Mrs then hastily ask.
2	“I hope not,” he replied, trying to look cheerful, and with a forced smile presently added,
2t	威洛比勉强挤出了一丝微笑：“希望不是， Willoughby forced a faint smile, “hope not is,
3	“It is I who may rather expect to be ill – for I am now suffering under a very heavy disappointment!”
3t	感到不舒服的应该是我，因为我遇到一件令人沮丧的事情。” Feel not comfortable should be me, because I meet a frustrating thing.”
4	“Disappointment!”
4t	“令人沮丧的事情？” “Frustrating thing?”
5	“Yes, for I am unable to keep my engagement with you.
5t	“是的，本来答应和你们共进晚餐的，可是现在不行了。 “Yes, originally promised to you together having dinner, but now cannot.

Willoughby is delivering the news to Marianne, who is profoundly saddened and traumatised by it. She leaves the room weeping upon seeing her mother and her sister entering the room. Mrs Dashwood is greatly concerned for her daughter’s well-being, hence initiating the conversation with Willoughby (line 1). Willoughby’s awkwardness and pretentiousness are highlighted in the narration as ‘trying to look cheerful, and with a forced smile presently added’ (line 2). In the Chinese translation (2t), the manner adverbial ‘presently added’, accentuating Willoughby’s conspicuous efforts to pretend, and another similar attempt of his ‘trying to look cheerful’ are omitted. In the exchange, he then uses an emphatic sentence pattern ‘it is...that...’ to stress the ‘very heavy disappointment’ he is suffering (line 3). In the translation (3t), the marker ‘a very heavy disappointment’ is replaced by an unmarked expression ‘a frustrating thing’. The downgrading of his description of the terrible situation he is in, combines with the effect of the omissions in 2t, rendering the depiction of the

pretentiousness in his personality and his intention to hide the reason for leaving less marked than that in the novel.

In turn, Mrs Dashwood's great shock at what Willoughby said is demonstrated in her immediate repetition of the marker 'disappointment' followed by an exclamation mark (Line 4). In the translation, the shock is rendered into an unmarked question, hence the loss of the representation of her attitude. In the exchange, Willoughby tries to protect his own positive face of not being perceived to be inconsiderate and to show his respect for Marianne's family's association rights with him by offering an explanation (line 6). In the explanation, he stresses the unfavourable situation by describing how his powerful patron, who has considerable reward and cohesive powers over him, has dispatched him with an order, conveying in an off-record manner that he is unwilling to leave the family but has no other options. In the translation (6t), Willoughby's marked efforts and intention are significantly mitigated in a plain and brief statement.

In his next utterance (line 7), a sarcasm 'by way of exhilaration' is used to express his bitter disappointment of having to take his farewell. The literal meaning of the sarcastic expression violates the contextual expectation, conveying in a salient manner, his marked sentiment of utter annoyance. This marker showing Willoughby's attitude is not represented in the translation and renders 7t plain and unmarked.

In the exchange, Mrs Dashwood is noticeably surprised at this sudden farewell and enquires about the urgency of the business (line 8). Willoughby's reply is featured with an exaggerative emphasis, accentuating how urgent the business is, which serves as a convincing reason for his hasty farewell. This feature is translated into an unmarked 'yes' (9t) that cannot convey his attitude. Mrs Dashwood is clearly disappointed at the news (line 10), but still tries to show her respect for Willoughby's negative face want by acknowledging that it is Mrs Smith's order which detains him. Willoughby implies in his reply (lines 11-12) that he will not be able to revisit the family this year in an off-record manner to avoid direct FTAs to his own face and Mrs Dashwood's face. The off-record strategy is represented in the translation (11t-12t).

Nevertheless, Mrs Dashwood seems to be somewhat unhappy with Willoughby's reply as she initiates three rhetorical questions in parallel (lines 13-15). They demonstrate her great eagerness and determination to encourage Willoughby's visit. Her attitude is strong and

passionate, mixed with a kind of annoyance at his retreating answers. This seems to have touched Willoughby's innate sentiments, who may have mixed feelings of guilt, regret and gratitude, which is reflected in his markedly short response (line 16). The reserved response, in turn, triggers a moment of awkward and inexplicable silence (line 17).

Then Mrs Dashwood breaks the silence by making great efforts to communicate to Willoughby her respect for his negative and positive face wants. For example, a hedge to minimise the imposition in her repeated invitation – 'I have only to add' – features the beginning of the efforts (line 18). This negative politeness hedge is translated into an FTA 我再说一遍 [I again say it] in 18t, mitigating the speaker's intention not to impose. Then, she immediately expresses her full respect for Willoughby's judgement (lines 19-20) with the distal marker 'that' (Brown and Levinson 1987:205), and follows it by a positive politeness strategy exaggerating her unconditional trust of his integrity and inclination (line 21). The salient positive politeness utterance is omitted in the translation, weakening the representation of Mrs Dashwood's efforts of showing camaraderie with Willoughby.

Mrs Dashwood's repeated invitation and her passionate expression of camaraderie in the ST may have awakened Willoughby's sense of guilt even more (line 22). At last, he seems to intend to conclude such a difficult conversation where he could hardly offer any meaningful information by conveying his profound misery of not being able to enjoy the loving family's society (line 25). Using that as a sorrowful and rather convenient excuse, he leaves in haste. In the translation (25t), the excuse of misery is not presented. Hence, the representation of his intention and personality is missing in 25t.

As demonstrated in the exchange, prior to the entry of the conversation, Willoughby may hold the goal of delivering the news in such a manner that he would not come across as being inconsiderate and abrupt in order to maintain his positive image that has been construed to the Dashwood family. This may have a significant impact on his face features manifested in his linguistic and non-linguistic behaviour, for example, his pretentious body language, his hesitance and lack of clarity achieved via off-record strategies when providing reasons for his sudden farewell. These serve to highlight the difficult personal circumstances he was trying to convey to the Dashwood family, in order to endow his behaviour with certain legitimacy, and help him achieve face-maintenance orientation with the family.

Other contextual factors that may influence his face strategies could include the parameter of distance (D) and the number of participants. Although Willoughby and Mrs Dashwood's daughter Marianne have been in a love relationship known by the family, the relationship is not consolidated by any ritual or legal procedures, such as an engagement or a marriage, which would have otherwise reduced the distance between Willoughby and Mrs Dashwood as son-in-law and mother-in-law. In other words, their relationship is rather distant and this may give Willoughby the entitlement of not explicating his clear reasons for the farewell. In turn, Mrs Dashwood may not perceive herself in a position to press Willoughby for clearer explanations for his behaviour. This can also explain why Mrs Dashwood, despite her salient intention to encourage Willoughby's revisit, chooses positive politeness strategies instead of bald-on-record face threats when expressing her strong hope. Moreover, the presence of Marianne's sister – Elinor, may also give Willoughby excuse for not fully unfolding the background information to his departure.

All the above factors contribute to shaping and influencing interlocutors' face strategies. The toning-down of such strategies in the translation, as analysed previously, can affect the representation of Willoughby's personality and intention, and Mrs. Dashwood's attitude in the translation, and in turn, the reader's appreciation of such interpersonal dynamics when having to rely on the translation. For example, the reader of the translation may not be able to appreciate Mrs Dashwood's intense inner struggle, her dilemma of on the one hand desperately wanting to encourage Willoughby to revisit the family, and on the other hand trying to communicate her intention not to press him too much on that. Moreover, they may have difficulty in recognising Willoughby's hypocritical characteristics through the translation, too.

3) Expressions of blame

Introduction of plots before the interaction

Willoughby has left Marianne and her family for London. After a few months, family friend Mrs Jennings invites Marianne and Elinor to visit and stay at her home in London. Marianne readily accepts the invitation with the hope to hear from or encounter Willoughby there. She sends him a letter upon her arrival. She has been waiting for his reply or visit in great eagerness. After a week's disappointment, Marianne becomes uneasy and agitated. One day, the servant comes in with a letter. The following interaction ensues.

Transcription of the interaction

1	“For me!” cried Marianne, stepping hastily forwards.
1t	“是我的！” 玛丽安抢上前去接过来。 “Is mine!” Marianne rushed forward to take it.
2	“No, ma’am, for my mistress.”
2t	“小姐， 是给太太的。” “Ma’am, is for mistress.”
3	But Marianne, not convinced, took it instantly up.
3t	玛丽安不信， 拿起信来看。 Marianne not convinced, picked up letter to read.
4	“It is indeed for Mrs Jennings – how provoking!”
4t	“是给珍宁斯太太的， 真气人！” “Is for Mrs Jennings, really provoking!”
5	“You are expecting a letter then?” said Elinor, unable to be longer silent.
5t	“你在等信吗？” 艾丽诺再也忍不住了。 “You are waiting letter ma?” Elinor not longer can be silent.

Marianne rushes to take the letter with great excitement and with a firm belief that the letter is for her from Willoughby, regardless of what the servant says (lines 1-3). When she finds out that it is for Mrs Jennings, she seems more than upset (line 4). Having observed Marianne’s highly fluctuating mood over the past few days, Elinor asks (line 5) with great concern. Marianne’s reply (line 6) demonstrates her foul mood due to being upset and her unwillingness to open up to Elinor. This is represented in the translation 6t.

Elinor initiates a bald-on-record FTA in line 7 and shows her intention to press for greater openness in Marianne. In the translation 7t, the bald-on-record FTA is changed to a question redressed to Marianne’s negative face wants, mitigating Elinor’s firm claim and her salient intention. Marianne’s reply (line 8) is markedly direct and confrontational. She explicitly points out the target of her retaliation – Elinor, and reinforces the FTA by purposefully repeating the target *you* with emphasis in tone. This is not represented in 8t. She then follows

the blame with a sarcastic comment – ‘you have confidence in no one’. The *echoic mention*⁹ (Wilson and Sperber 1992) in the sarcasm explicitly refers to Elinor’s blaming Marianne for having no confidence in her. In return, Marianne expresses her strong attitude of disapproval of such a blame by accusing Elinor of the same. The sarcasm via *echoic mention* is represented in the translation.

Elinor, in the ST, is observably surprised and confused by Marianne’s response. She tries to defend her innocence in an affirmative manner by making another bald-on-record statement – ‘I have nothing to tell’, which is further accentuated by an emphatic adverbial – ‘indeed’. Such a style is consistent with her assertive tone from the beginning of this interaction, which demonstrates her determinedness to press Marianne for openness. This is mitigated in the translation 9t when Elinor’s bald-on-recordness is changed into a question redressed to Marianne’s negative face – ‘What do I have to hide from you?’.

In this exchange, Elinor is seen to show her salient intention to open Marianne up as she is understandably concerned for Marianne’s emotional well-being. This explains her marked directness in her linguistic strategies. Nevertheless, Elinor’s firm attitude in the ST shown in her consistent bald-on-record manners when conversing with Marianne is diluted due to the application of negative politeness in the translation. Although this may not affect the reader’s understanding of the content of the exchange, it may impact on their interpretation of the interpersonal dynamics between Marianne and Elinor, for example, Elinor’s attitude and intention.

5 Discussion

Section 5 presents a comparative analysis of face management features exhibited in the three excerpts from Jane Austen’s novel *Sense and Sensibility* and their representation in Cheng’s translation. It is found that interpersonal face markers are sometimes omitted or toned down in the translation, and bald-on-record face strategies changed into off-record manners or redressed with concerns of hearers’ negative or positive face wants. Such omissions,

⁹ In the echoic mention theory, Wilson and Sperber (1992: 59) argue that irony ‘is a variety of echoic utterance [that] simultaneously expresses the speaker’s attitude or reaction to what was said or thought’. They propose that verbal irony invariably involves the expression of an attitude of disapproval, thus indicating the speaker’s dissociation of him/herself from the echoed saying or thoughts.

mitigations and changes in the translation of the face markers and strategies available in the ST, over the course of an interaction, can present a very different picture/scenario in terms of the protagonists' personality, attitude and intentions. For example, in extract 1, Elinor's linguistic and interactional style is marked, direct and firm, which can be attributed to, and in turn reflect her profound affection towards Edward and her insurmountable zest to defend his talent. Such style is predominantly achieved by bald-on-record face strategies and emphatic expressions. However, in the translation, face markers are omitted, and bald-on-record strategies changed into off-record strategies, rendering Elinor's style unmarked, indirect, and less firm. This, I claim, may affect communicating effectively via the translation to the reader the author's particularised and intended portrayal of Elinor's strong feelings and her salient attitude. In other words, although this will not affect a reader's understanding of the unfolding plots, it may have an impact on his/her interpretation of interlocutors' personality, attitude and intentions. Therefore, it is imperative to achieve interpersonal functional equivalence from the perspective of face portrayal in literary translation, to enable the reader from the target culture to adequately appreciate the particularities of each individual character's characteristics that the author endeavours to communicate. This claim can be further tested and corrected in future studies by reader-response experiments which could provide evidence of translation impact on text users.

The data of this research, although only constituting three exchanges, point to an interesting phenomenon in relation to explicitation in translation studies. Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995:342) postulate explicitation as 'a stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation'. Blum-Kulka (2001) explores explicitation connected with shifts of overt and covert textual markers signifying cohesion and coherence in translation, and formulates the explicitation hypothesis in which she argues that it is the translation process itself rather than any specific differences between a particular pair of languages that bears the main responsibility for explicitation. Thus she suggests that 'explicitation is viewed as inherent in the process of translation' (Blum-Kulka 2001:19). Related research work, such as Séguinot's (1988) examination of translations from English into French and from French into English, and Klaudy's (2001) investigation of the relationship between explicitation and implicitation in literary translation from Hungarian into English, German, French and Russian and vice versa, further confirms the explicitation

hypothesis, i.e., explicitation is a universal strategy of translation, regardless of language-pair and direction of translation.

Nevertheless, as demonstrated in the analysis of the three exchanges in this research, the representation of an individual character's personality, attitude and intentions manifested through certain face features is actually *implicated* in the translation. For example, at the beginning of excerpt 1, Marianne's expression of her view on Edward's taste of painting is explicit, achieved by a bald-on-record strategy. In the translation, her view is communicated via an off-record utterance, featuring implicitation. Moreover, throughout the excerpt 1, Elinor's explicit attitudes, such as her shock (in line 2) and her strong defence (in lines 3-10) achieved mainly via on-record and bald-on-record statements with face markers for emphasis, are generally rendered into off-record expressions or rhetorical questions where her attitudes are implicated. By the same token, Marianne's intense inner struggle and her salient efforts to reach a compromise with Elinor, expressed explicitly in the ST through exaggerative face markers, become implicit in the translation. Along the same line, in excerpt 2, Willoughby's pretentious personality and his intention to manipulate the situation are delineated in an explicit way underpinned by various face markers and sarcasm in his linguistic strategies. Nonetheless, as demonstrated in the analysis in section 4, his personality and intention are implicated in the translation due to the absence or downgrading of the sarcasm and face markers. Mrs Dashwood's intention strongly to encourage Willoughby's return while not appearing to impose is implicated in the translation due to omission of salient face markers and hedges adopted in her original utterances. Similar examples of less explicit information conveyed in the translation of Elinor's intention and Marianne's attitude, from the perspective of face management, are present in excerpt 3. These constitute an interesting departure from the general explicitation trend and a challenge to the *claimed universality* of the explicitation hypothesis that deserves further study.

6. Conclusion

This study has for the first time drawn from a Composite Model of Face Management (CMFM) to investigate face management in literary translation. It offers a systematic alternative to prescriptive politeness rules in the assistance of explaining and illustrating the face features presented in the literary texts and their representation in the translation. The study is also, to the best of my knowledge, the first to illustrate observable departures from the explicitation hypothesis in translation studies, from the perspective of face management.

Using English literary texts translated into Chinese as the data, it is shown that translation leads to less explicit information about facework, challenging the universality of explicitation rule. In future research, more studies on implicitation or explicitation of facework in translation can be explored and underlying factors contributing to implicitation/ explicitation of face features can be investigated. Moreover, the semantic differential technique can be used to elicit reader's response to face management features displayed in the novel and to those represented in the translation in order to provide independent empirical evidence of translation impact on text users.

Contact:

Dr. Xiaohui Yuan

School of Modern Languages

University of Bristol

21 Woodland Road

Bristol

BS8 4TU

Email: xiaohui.yuan[a]bristol.ac.uk

Appendix 1 – Illustrations of positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record strategies

1	Notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, need, goods)	Goodness, you cut your hair! You look really cool with your new hair style! →(FTA) By the way, I came to borrow some flour.
---	--	---

2	Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)	A: Look at the weather! B: Oh, yeah, isn't it just ghastly the way it always seems to rain just when you've hung your laundry out! →(FTA) So may I borrow your iron?
3	Intensify interest to H	I come down the stairs, and what do you think I see? – A huge mess all over the place...→(FTA) So, can I borrow your Hoover?
4	Use in-group identity markers	(FTA) Help me with this bag here, will you pal?
5	Seek agreement with safe topics or repetition.	Oh, you got a new car! Isn't it a beautiful colour! →(FTA) Do you still have any paint left?
6	Avoid disagreement	I kind of want Florin to win the race, since I have bet on him.
7	Presuppose/raise/assert common ground	I had a really hard time learning to drive, didn't I? You know it well! You taught me.
8	Joke	Ok. Would you mind if I tackle those cookies now?
9	Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants	Look, I know you want the car back by 5pm. →(FTA) So should I go to town now?
10	Offer, promise	I'll drop by some time next week→(FTA) if you can pick up the mail for me.
11	Be optimistic	Good pal, I knew I'd find you here. Look, I'm sure you won't mind→ (FTA) if I borrow your typewriter.
12	Include both S and H in the activity.	It's been 3 hours since the lunch. Let's have a cookie, then (i.e., me).
13	Give (or ask for) reasons	What a beautiful day! Why don't we go to the seashore! →(FTA) Come on!
14	Assume or assert reciprocity	I'll do the garden for you, → (FTA) if you write the homework for me.
15	Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)	A: A small gift, Mom. Happy Mother's Day. B: Thanks Tom. It's really nice of you. A: I am glad you like it, Mom.→(FTA) May I borrow some money?

Positive Politeness Strategies (Brown and Levinson 1987)

1	Be conventionally indirect	You are just beside the cupboard. Can you please pass the salt to me?
2	Question, hedge	You're quite right in commenting on this matter. I do agree in a way.
3	Be pessimistic	The bag is quite heavy. Perhaps you'd care to help me.
4	Minimise the ranking of imposition	I just ask you if you could lend me a single sheet of paper.
5	Give deference	Excuse me, Sir, but would you mind if I close the window?
6	Apologise	I hate to impose, but...
7	Impersonalise speaker and hearer	It is said to be so.
8	State the FTA as general rule	International regulations require that the fuselage be sprayed with DDT.
9	Nominalise	It is real regret that we can not do that.
10	Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H	I'd be eternally grateful if you would...

Negative Politeness Strategies (Brown and Levinson 1987)

1	Give hints	It's cold in here. (c.i. ¹⁰ Shut the window)
2	Give association clues	Are you going to market tomorrow...? There's a market tomorrow, I suppose. (c.i. Give me a ride there)
3	Presuppose	At least, I don't go around boasting about my achievements. (c.i. someone else does)
4	Understate	A: How do you like Josephine's new haircut? B: It's all right. (c.i. I don't particularly like it)
5	Overstate	There were a million people in the Co-op tonight! (c.i. That's why I am late)

¹⁰ c.i. stands for 'conversationally implicates'.

6	Use tautologies	If I won't give it, I won't. (c.i. I mean it!)
7	Use contradictions	A: Are you upset about that? B: Well, yes and no.
8	Be ironic	Beautiful weather, isn't it! (to postman drenched in rainstorm)
9	Use metaphors	Harry's a real fish. (c.i. Harry swims like a fish)
10	Use rhetorical questions	How was I to know...? (c.i. I wasn't)
11	Be ambiguous	John's a pretty sharp cookie.
12	Be vague	Looks like someone may have had too much too drink.
13	Over-generalise	Mature people sometimes help do the dishes.
14	Displace H	Could you please pass me the stapler? (One secretary in an office asks another, in circumstances where a professor is much nearer to the stapler than the other secretary. Professor's face is not threatened, and he can choose to do it himself as a bonus 'free gift')
15	Be incomplete, use ellipsis	Well, I didn't see you...

Off-record Strategies (Brown and Levinson 1987)

Appendix 2 – Full transcription of the three excerpts

Excerpt 1

1	“What a pity it is, Elinor,” said Marianne, “that Edward should have no taste for drawing.”
1t	“好可惜，艾丽诺，” 玛丽安对姐姐说道，“爱德华不喜欢绘画。” “Good pity, Elinor,” Marianne to sister said, “Edward not like drawing.”
2	“No taste for drawing,” replied Elinor, “why should you think so?”
2t	“你怎么会这样想？” “You how will this think?”
3	He does not draw himself, indeed, but he has great pleasure in seeing the performance of other people,
3t	他自己是不画，可是他很喜欢看别人画呀！

	He himself is not drawing, but he very much like watching others drawing ya!
4	and I assure you he is by no means deficient in natural taste, though he has not had opportunities of improving it.
4t	我认为，他并不缺少天分，只是没有机会表现而已。 I think, he not lack talent, just is no chance show.
5	Had he ever been in the way of learning, I think he would have drawn very well.
5t	如果他学过画画，我相信他一定会画得很好。 If he learned drawing, I believe he is bound to draw very well.
6	He distrusts his own judgement in such matters so much that he is always unwilling to give his opinion on any picture,
6t	他只不过是对自己的鉴赏力缺乏自信，所以不太愿意对任何画作发表意见。 He only is to own taste lack self confidence, so not too willing on any drawings express opinions.
7	but he has an innate propriety and simplicity of taste, which in general direct him perfectly right.”
7t	不过，他有一种与生俱来的品味，能够果断地赏评。” But, he has a kind inherent taste, able to decisively evaluate.
8	“I hope, Marianne,” continued Elinor, “you do not consider him as deficient in general taste.
8t	艾丽诺接着说：“玛丽安，我想你不会认为他连一般的鉴赏力都不具备吧？ Elinor continue say : “Marianne, I think you not will consider him average taste yet not possess ba?
9	Indeed, I think I may say that you cannot, for your behaviour to him is perfectly cordial,
9t	你不会有那种想法的，对吧？因为你对他也很亲切， You not will have that kind thinking, correct ba? Because you to him as well very cordial,
10	And if <i>that</i> were your opinion, I am sure you could never be civil to him.”
10t	要是你真有那种想法的话，肯定不会对他那么热情的！” if you really had that kind thinking, sure not will to him that enthusiastic!”
11	Marianne hardly knew what to say.
11t	玛丽安不知该说什么才好

	Marianne not knows say what would be good
12	She would not wound the feelings of her sister on any account,
12t	她不想伤害姐姐， She not want hurt sister,
13	and yet to say what she did not believe was impossible. At length she replied:
13t	又不愿说些言不由衷的话，只好说 and not willing say some words against belief, have to say
14	“Do not be offended, Elinor, if my praise of him is not in everything equal to your sense of his merits.
14t	“要是我的赞赏和姐姐所看到的优点不一致， 请你不要生气。 “If my praise to sister seen merit not match, please you not angry.
15	I have not had so many opportunities of estimating the minuter propensities of his mind, his inclinations and tastes as you have,
15t	因为我没有太多机会去了解 and 体会他的想法， 爱好和志趣等方面的细微倾向。 Because I not have too many opportunities to understand and appreciate his thoughts, hobbies and inclinations etc. aspects minuter propensities
16	but I have the highest opinion in the world of his goodness and sense.
16t	但是， 我很欣赏他的善良和见识。 But, I very appreciate his kindness and insights.
17	I think him everything that is worthy and amiable.”
17t	我觉得他是很可敬可亲的。” I think he is very worthy and amiable.”

Excerpt 2

1	“Is anything the matter with her?” cried Mrs Dashwood as she entered. “Is she sick?”
1t	“马丽安是怎么了？ 身体不舒服吗？” 才一进屋， 达什伍德太太就迫不及待地追问。 “Marianne is what up? Body not comfortable ma?” just once entered, Dashwood Mrs then hastily ask.

2	“I hope not,” he replied, trying to look cheerful, and with a forced smile presently added,
2t	威洛比勉强挤出了一丝微笑：“希望不是， Willoughby forced a faint smile, “hope not is,
3	“It is I who may rather expect to be ill – for I am now suffering under a very heavy disappointment!”
3t	感到不舒服的应该是我，因为我遇到一件令人沮丧的事情。” Feel not comfortable should be me, because I meet a frustrating thing.”
4	“Disappointment!”
4t	“令人沮丧的事情？” “Frustrating thing?”
5	“Yes, for I am unable to keep my engagement with you.
5t	“是的，本来答应和你们共进晚餐的，可是现在不行了。 “Yes, originally promised to you together having dinner, but now cannot.
6	Mrs Smith has this morning exercised the privilege of riches upon a poor dependent cousin by sending me on business to London.
6t	今天早上，史密斯太太派我到伦敦去办事。 Today morning, Smith Mrs dispatched me to London do things.
7	I have just received my dispatches, and taken my farewell of Allenham, and by way of exhilaration I am now come to take my farewell of you.”
7t	我刚刚受命出差，就要离开艾伦汉了。现在来向各位辞行。 I just accepted order to be dispatched, going to leave Allenham. Now to everyone farewell.
8	“To London! And are you going this morning?”
8t	“去伦敦？非得今天上午就出发吗？” “To London? Must this morning leave ma?”
9	“Almost this moment.”
9t	“是的！” “Yes!”
10	“This is very unfortunate. But Mrs Smith must be obliged, and her business will not detain you from us long, I hope.”

10t	“真遗憾。不过史密斯太太的话你必须遵办。希望你去的时间不会太久。” “Really pity. But Smith Mrs’ words you must follow. Hope you gone time not will too long.”
11	He coloured as he replied, “You are very kind, but I have no idea of returning into Devonshire immediately.
11t	威洛比的脸涨得通红：“不过我没把握会很快回来。 Willoughby’s face flushed with bright red : “But I no confidence will very soon come back.
12	My visits to Mrs Smith are never repeated within the twelvemonth.”
12t	我很少在一年之内来拜访史密斯太太两次。” I seldom within one year come visit Smith Mrs twice.”
13	“And is Mrs Smith your only friend?
13t	“难道你在这里只有史密斯太太一个朋友吗? “You here only have Smith Mrs one friend ma?
14	Is Allenham the only house in the neighbourhood to which you will be welcome?
14t	只有艾伦汉庄园欢迎你吗? Only Allenham estate welcomes you ma?
15	For shame, Willoughby. Can you wait for an invitation here?”
15t	亲爱的威洛比！你也可以接受我们的邀请呀！” Dear Willoughby! You too can accept our invitation ya!”
16	His colour increased, and with his eyes fixed on the ground he only replied, “You are too good.”
16t	威洛比的脸更红了。他盯着地板，低声说道：“您真是太好了。” Willoughby’s face more red. He stares at the floor, low voice says : “you (V) really are too good.”
17	Mrs Dashwood looked at Elinor with surprise. Elinor felt equal amazement. For a few moments everyone was silent. Mrs Dashwood first spoke.
17t	达什伍德太太有些惊讶地看了艾丽诺一眼，艾丽诺也同样惊讶。沉默了一会儿，达什伍德太太又开口。 Dashwood Mrs has some surprise looks at Elinor, Elinor too the same surprised. Silence for a while, Dashwood Mrs again open mouth

18	"I have only to add, my dear Willoughby, that at Barton cottage you will always be welcome,
18t	“亲爱的威洛比，我再说一遍，巴顿乡舍永远欢迎你。 “Dear Willoughby, I again say once, Barton estate for ever welcome you.
19	for I will not press you to return here immediately,
19t	我不勉强你立即回来， I not force you immediately come back,
20	because you only can judge how far <i>that</i> might be pleasing to Mrs Smith,
20t	因为只有你才能判断，这样做会不会让史密斯太太不高兴。” because only you can judge, this way do will not cause Smith Mrs unhappy.”
21	And on this head I shall be no more disposed to question your judgement than to doubt your inclination.”
21t	(no translation)
22	“My engagement at present,” replied Willoughby confusedly, “are of such a nature...that...I dare not flatter myself.”
22t	威洛比有些慌乱地说：“我要办的差事，是那种，那种……唉，我实在说出口……” Willoughby has some panic says: “I will do business, is that kind, that kind...ahh (sigh), I really say cannot from mouth.
23	He stopped. Mrs Dashwood was too much astonished to speak, and another pause succeeded. This was broken by Willoughby, who said with a faint smile,
23t	他没再继续说。达什伍德太太十分惊讶，大家又静默半晌。威洛比打破了缄默，淡然一笑，说道： He not again continues to say. Dashwood Mrs very surprised. Everyone silent for a while. Willoughby break the silence, faint a smile, says
24	“It is folly to linger in this matter.
24t	“这样耗下去，真蠢。 “This way linger on, really stupid.
25	I will not torment myself any longer by remaining among friends whose society it is impossible for me now to enjoy.”
25t	我就不再久留了。”

	I then no long stay.
26	He then hastily took leave of them all and left the room.
26t	他匆匆离开了房间 He hastily left the room.

Excerpt 3

1	“For me!” cried Marianne, stepping hastily forwards.
1t	“是我的！” 玛丽安抢上前去接过来。 “Is mine!” Marianne rushed forward to take it.
2	“No, ma’am, for my mistress.”
2t	“小姐， 是给太太的。” “Ma’am, is for mistress.”
3	But Marianne, not convinced, took it instantly up.
3t	玛丽安不信， 拿起信来看。 Marianne not convinced, picked up letter to read.
4	“It is indeed for Mrs Jennings – how provoking!”
4t	“是给珍宁斯太太的， 真气人！” “Is for Mrs Jennings, really provoking!”
5	“You are expecting a letter then?” said Elinor, unable to be longer silent.
5t	“你在等信吗？” 艾丽诺再也忍不住了。 “You are waiting letter ma?” Elinor not longer can be silent.
6	“Yes, a little – not much.”
6t	“是的！ 但也不完全是。” “Yes! But too not completely is.”
7	After a short pause, “You have no confidence in me, Marianne.”
7t	稍停片刻后， 艾丽诺接着说：“你是不是有什么事瞒着我？” Pause a bit while after, Elinor followed saying “you yes or not have something not tell me?”
8	Nay, Elinor, this reproach from <i>you</i> – you who have confidence in no one!”
8t	“才不呢！ 你才有事瞒我呢！” “Actually no ne! You actually have something not tell me ne!”

9	“Me!” returned Elinor in some confusion. “Indeed, Marianne, I have nothing to tell.”
9t	艾丽诺感到错愕，“玛丽安，我有什么事瞒着你？” Elinor felt confused and wronged, “Marianne, I have what thing not tell you?”
10	“Nor I,” answered Marianne with energy, “our situations then are alike. We have neither of us anything to tell – you because you do not communicate, and I because I conceal nothing.”
10t	“我也没有。”玛丽安口气坚决地说，“我们的情况一样！没有什么好说的，你是什么也不肯说，我是什么也没隐瞒。” “I too not have.” Marianne tone determined saying, “Our situation the same! Nothing good to say, you are nothing not would say, I am nothing not tell.”

References

- Baños-Piñero, Rocio and Frederic Chaume (2009) ‘Prefabricated Orality A Challenge in Audio- visual Translation’. Available online at [http://www.intralinea.it/specials/dialectrans/eng_more.php?id=761_0_49_0_M] (accessed 2 November 2013).
- Bataineh, Ruba Fahmi (2008) ‘A Cross-cultural Comparison of Apologies by Native Speakers of American English and Jordanian Arabic’, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(4): 792-821.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana (1986) ‘Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation’, in J. House and S. Blum-Kulka (eds) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition*, Tübingen: Narr. 17-35.
- Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman (1960) ‘The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity’, in T. A. Sebeok (ed.) *Style in Language*, Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 253–76.

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson (1987) *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruti, Silvia (2006) 'Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Translation of Implicit Compliments in Subtitles', *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 6: 185–97.
- Bruti, Silvia (2009) 'Translating Compliments and Insults in the Pavia Corpus of Film Dialogue: Two Sides of the Same Coin?', in M. Freddi and M. Pavesi, (eds) *Analysing Audiovisual Dialogue Linguistic and Translational Insights*, Bologna: Clueb, 143–63.
- Chen, Guo-Ming and William Starosta (1997–8) 'Chinese Conflict Management and Resolution: Overview and Implications', *Intercultural Communication Studies VII*: 1–17.
- Cheng, Wei'an. (2009) 理智与情感 *Sense and Sensibility*, 哈尔滨出版社 Haerbin Publishing Ltd.
- Culpeper, Jonathan (1996) 'Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3): 349–67.
- Culpeper, Jonathan, Derek Bousfield and Anne Wichmann (2003) 'Impoliteness Revisited: with Special Reference to Dynamic and Prosodic Aspects', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(10–11): 1545–79.
- Delabastita, Dirk (1989) 'Translation and Mass-communication: Film and TV Translation as Evidence of Cultural Dynamics', *Babel*, 35(4): 193–218.
- Desilla, Louisa (2012) 'Implicatures in Film: Construal and Functions in Bridget Jones Romantic Comedies', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(1): 30–53.
- Dong, Haiya (2011) *On Translation of Humour in Sitcoms*, Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Folkart, Barbara (1991) 'Le Conflit des énonciations. Traduction et discours rapporté', Montréal: Les Éditions Balzac.
- Fraser, Bruce and William Nolan (1981) 'The Association of Deference with Linguistic Form' in J. Walter (ed.) *The Sociolinguistics of Deference and Politeness*, The Hague: Mouton, 93–111.
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason (1997) 'Politeness in Screen Translating', in L. Venuti, (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, 430–45.
- Haugh, Michael (2013) 'Im/politeness, social practice and the participation order', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 58(1): 52–72.
- Hickey, Leo (2000) 'Politeness in Translation between English and Spanish', *Target* 12 (2): 229–40.
- Hill, Beverly, Sachiko Ide, Shoko Ikuta, Akiko Kawasaki and Tsunao Ogino (1986) 'Universals of Linguistic Politeness: Quantitative Evidence from Japanese and American English', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10 (3): 347–71.

- Hill, Harriet (2006) *The Bible at Cultural Cross-Roads: From Translation to Communication*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Hongladarom, Krisadawan (2007) 'Don't Blame Me for Criticizing You: A Study of Metapragmatic Comments in Thai', in W. Bublitz and A. Hübler (eds) *Metapragmatics in Use*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- House, Juliane (1998) 'Politeness and Translation', in L. Hickey (ed.) *The Pragmatics of Translation*, Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 54-71.
- Jebahi, Khaled (2011) 'Tunisian University Students' Choice of Apology Strategies in a Discourse Completion Task', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2): 648-662.
- Klaudy, Kinga (2001) 'The Asymmetry Hypothesis. Testing the Asymmetric Relationship between Explications and Implications' Paper presented to the Third International Congress of the European Society for Translation Studies, Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies, Copenhagen 30 August - 1 September 2001.
- Kovačič, Irena (1996) 'Subtitling Strategies: a Flexible Hierarchy of Priorities', in C. Heiss and R. M. Bollettieri Bosinelli, (eds) *Traduzione multimediale per il cinema, la televisione e la scena*, Bologna: Clueb, 297-305.
- Kovačič, Irena (2000) 'Thinking-aloud Protocol – Interview – Text Analysis' in S. Tirkkonen-Condit and R. Jääskeläinen (eds) *Tapping and Mapping the Processes of Translation and Interpreting*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 97-110.
- Kozloff, Sarah (2000) *Overhearing Film Dialogue*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Laforest, Marty (2002) 'Scenes of Family Life: Complaining in Everyday Conversation', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(10-11): 1595-1620.
- Laforest, Marty (2009) 'Complaining in Front of a Witness: Aspects of Blaming Others for their Behaviour in Multi-party Family Interactions', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(12): 2452-2464.
- Lakoff, Robin (1973) 'The Logic of Politeness; or Minding Your P's and Q's', in *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 292-305.
- Leech, Geoffrey (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*, London: Longman.
- Long, Christopher (2010) 'Apology in Japanese Gratitude Situations: The Negotiation of Interlocutor Role-relations', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(4): 1060-1075.
- Mason, Ian (1989) 'Speaker Meaning and Reader Meaning: Preserving Coherence in Screen Translating', in R. Kölmel and J. Payne, (eds) *Babel: The Cultural and Linguistic Barriers between Nations*, Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 13-24.
- Mason, Ian (2009) 'Translator Moves and Reader Response: the Impact of Discoursal Shifts in Translation', in B. Ahrens, L. Cerny, M. Krein-Kuhle and M. Schreiber, (eds) *Translationswissenschaftliches Kolloquium*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 55-70.

- Meng, Jin. (2009) 评‘理智与情感’汉译本的文体再现 ‘The Stylistics in the Translation of *Sense and Sensibility*’, 文学翻译 *Journal of Literary Translation* 156-183.
- Pavesi, Maria (2008) ‘Spoken Language in Film Dubbing: Target Language Norms, Interference and Translational Routines’ in D. Chiaro, C. Heiss, & C. Bucaria, (eds.) *Between Text and Image: Updating Research in Screen Translation*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 79–99.
- Pérez-González, Luis (2007) ‘Appraising Dubbed Conversation: Systemic Functional Insights into the Construal of Naturalness in Translated Film Dialogue’, *The Translator*, 13 (1): 1–38.
- Rees-Miller, Janie (2000) ‘Power, Severity, and Context in Disagreement’, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(8): 1087–1111.
- Séguinot, Candace (1988) ‘Pragmatics and the Explicitation Hypothesis’, *TTR: Traduction Terminologie, Rédaction* 1(2): 106-114.
- Shum, Winnie and Cynthia Lee (2013) ‘(Im)politeness and Disagreement in Two Hong Kong Internet Discussion Forums’, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 50(1): 52-83.
- Sifianou, Maria (2012) ‘Disagreements, Face and Politeness’, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(12): 1554-1564.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen (2000) *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport Through Talk Across Cultures*, London: Continuum.
- Thomas, Jenny (1995) *Meaning in Interaction. An Introduction to Pragmatics*, London: Longman.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet (1995) *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*, trans. of Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) by Juan C. Sager and Marie-Josée Hamel, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Watts, Richard (2003) *Politeness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber (1992) ‘On verbal irony’, *Lingua*, 87(1–2): 53–76.
- Xu, Jingning (2007) *Discourse Modality of Mandarin Chinese*, Kunlun: Kunlun Press.
- Yuan, Xiaohui (2012) *Politeness and Audience Response in Chinese-English Subtitling*, Oxford: Peter Lang.