

---

**| RESEARCH ARTICLE**

## **A Translation Study on Speech Acts Violating Politeness Maxim in Gerald's Game Novel**

**Gregorius Gyan Puruhito<sup>1</sup> ✉ M.R. Nababan<sup>2</sup> and Djatmika<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Student of Linguistic Department in Sebelaas Maret University, Indonesia

<sup>2,3</sup>Lecturer, of Linguistic Department in Sebelaas Maret University, Indonesia

**Corresponding Author:** Gregorius Gyan Puruhito, **E-mail:** [gyanpuruhto@gmail.com](mailto:gyanpuruhto@gmail.com)

---

**| ABSTRACT**

This study focuses on how the speech acts violating politeness maxim in a novel titled Gerald's Game are translated from English into Bahasa Indonesia. Therefore, this study has three main objectives: (1) to find out the types of speech act which could accommodate the violation of politeness maxim, (2) to find out the translation techniques used to translate the speech acts (3) to find out the impact of the translation technique toward the shift in the speech acts. This study adopted a descriptive qualitative method. The data are limited to speech acts violating politeness maxim from the English and Bahasa Indonesia version of Gerald's Game novel. The compiled data will be validated through Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and analyzed using the document analysis technique. All data will be categorized based on the type of illocutionary point, and then the translation technique will be analyzed. This study shows that there are 4 types of speech acts violating the politeness maxim: assertive, directive, expressive, and commissive. There are 16 different translation techniques used to translate the speech acts violating the politeness maxim. Among the translation technique, the application of the reduction technique causes a shift in the illocutionary point. The speech act is shifted from an expressive type into an assertive type. More considerations are needed before using the reduction technique to translate speech acts violating the politeness maxim.

**| KEYWORDS**

Speech act, politeness maxim, translation technique, shifting, illocutionary act

**| ARTICLE DOI:** [10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.1.19](https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.1.19)

---

### **1. Introduction**

People have been implementing politeness strategy as the act of maintaining social harmony. This strategy involves maintaining *face*, which Goffman (1967) divined as an individual's positive social value or public image that is assumed to be recognized by other people during a particular contact. The act of acknowledging *face* and mitigating potential offence is the embodiment of politeness strategy. By the same token, there is another perspective on politeness theory that emphasizes the importance of attributing value to other people. Leech states that to be polite is to speak or behave to other people in order to give them benefit or value (2014, p.3). When Speakers (S) are prioritizing Others' (O) value or when S is not prioritizing their own value, it would be considered as an act of politeness strategy. However, there are certain contexts where S intends to have a communicative discord or cause offence to O. Linguists address this phenomenon as impoliteness, which is considered behaviour that violates politeness.

Leech takes a maxim-based approach in describing politeness theory. Generally, a maxim is a constraint that influences S's communicating behaviour to achieve a particular intention (Leech, 2014, p.90). The intention of prioritizing the value of O is implied in the politeness maxim. Hence, impoliteness is an act of violating the politeness maxim. This kind of behaviour could be accommodated in speech acts, especially illocutionary acts. Searle (1976) classify illocutionary acts into five: assertive, directive, commissive, declarative, and expressive. Each class of speech act could represent an illocutionary point that violates politeness maxim and potentially cause conflict.

This phenomenon frequently occurs in literary works such as novels, where the writer could utilize speech acts and impoliteness behaviours as plot parts. Gerald's Game is a novel written by Stephen King which contains many conflicts throughout the storyline.

**Copyright:** © 2022 the Author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by Al-Kindi Centre for Research and Development, London, United Kingdom.

The conflicts revolve around the characters who keep prioritizing their own value or intention, which they accommodate in speech acts, hence violating the maxim of politeness and causing communicative discord. Problems emerge when this kind of speech acts need to be translated into another language. The concept of speech act violating politeness maxim is highly contextual and is bound to linguistic and cultural aspects. Transferring the whole meaning and interpretation into another language requires a comprehensive understanding of both source language (SL) and target language (TL), and thus, lack of consideration would cause distortion of information in the translation. However, adopting appropriate translation techniques could potentially support the translator to create an equivalent translation. There are some previous studies related to the topic. Prananta (2016) focuses on the translation of film subtitles containing impoliteness strategy in speech acts, Waluyo (2019) focuses on the translation of novels containing impoliteness strategy in speech acts, and Nafiah (2020) focusses on the translation of impoliteness strategy in specific illocutionary points in a novel. These three studies use Culpeper's theory (1996) to indicate the impoliteness strategy. Some of these studies focus on a limited type of speech acts and has not discussed the impact of translation technique toward the shift of speech acts. Based on these previous studies, the researcher aims to establish a broader translation study in a perspective of different impoliteness theories and analyze the shifts. This study focuses on (1) finding the type of speech act violating politeness maxim, (2) finding the translation technique used, and (3) analyzing the impact of the translation technique toward the shift of speech acts violating politeness maxim in Gerald's Game novel.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Politeness & Impoliteness

Based on the notion of *face*, Goffman defines impoliteness from the perspective of a person performing a *face-attack* and states, "the offending person may appear to have acted maliciously and spitefully, with the intention of causing open insult" (1967: 14). It means impoliteness behaviour is done by S deliberately and with the intention of causing offence to O. Brown and Levinson (1978) then address this kind of person as doing *face-threatening acts* (FTA), and later develop a model of politeness strategy whose aim is to lower or mitigate FTA. Culpeper (1996) adds another point about the context of impoliteness behaviour: (1) S is deliberately doing face-threatening act (FTA); (2) O perceive any action or statement toward them as face-attacking; or (3) combination of (1) and (2). This theory implies that impoliteness is constructed in the interaction between S and O and can be both intentional and unintentional. Most impoliteness phenomena could be identified using these criteria.

In another perspective, Leech (2014) perceives the concept of politeness and impoliteness based on the attribution of value, and he emphasized that there is reciprocal asymmetry behaviour between the S and O. In pursuing politeness strategy, he argues that S tend to express or imply evaluative meanings unfavourable to S and favourable to O. Hence, in pursuing impoliteness strategy, S tend to express or imply evaluative meaning favourable to S and unfavourable to O. Based on this concept, Leech established General Strategy of Politeness (GSP) and its opposite which is General Strategy of Impoliteness (GSI). In GSP, Leech takes a maxim-based approach and lists five pairs of maxims representing the reciprocal asymmetry between S and O. Thus, GSI will consist of the lists of violations to those maxims. The details of GSI can be seen in the table below:

Violation of Maxim	Related pair of maxims	Label for the maxim violated
(M1) give an unfavourable/low value to O's wants	Generosity / Tact (Wants)	Generosity
(M2) give a favourable/high value to S's wants		Tact
(M3) give an unfavourable/low value to O's qualities	Approbation / Modesty (Quality)	Approbation
(M4) give a favourable/high value to S's qualities.		Modesty
(M5) give an unfavourable/low value to S's obligation to O	Obligation	Obligation (to O)
(M6) give a favourable/high value to O's obligation to S		Obligation (to S)
(M7) give an unfavourable/low value to O's opinions	Opinion	Agreement
(M8) give a favourable/high value to S's opinions		Opinion Reticence
(M9) give an unfavourable/low value to O's feelings	Feeling	Sympathy
(M10) give a favourable/high value to S's feelings.		Feeling Reticence

## **2.2 Speech Acts**

In the scope of Pragmatic, interpreting the meaning of an utterance in a communicative behaviour requires an understanding of the context of the situation surrounding the utterance. Utterances produced by S in a conversational context indicates that there is the intention that lies beyond, not just mere words. Regarding this phenomenon, Austin (1962) introduces the term performative utterance, wherein saying something, S is also doing something. This concept is later developed into the theory of Speech Act and is distinguished into 3 types: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary act. All of these types could occur in one single utterance. For instance, on the utterance 'Greet him', S is mentioning the word 'greet' that refers to the definition of 'to say hello to somebody' and the word 'him' that refers to 'the particular person S points at'. The locutionary act is indicated by S uttering information that refers to the general definition of the said words. The illocutionary act lies in the intention of S in conveying the utterance that is beyond the definition of the said words, which on that utterance S intends to urge or advise or force O to greet someone in particular. The interpretation of the true intention of S depends on the context surrounding the utterance. The perlocutionary act deals with the effect of the utterance, which in this case whether O will be persuaded by S to do 'greet' or not. The perlocutionary act shows that by saying something, S could potentially cause influence or effect on O.

To manage many possible implicatures of an illocutionary act, Searle (1976) categorizes this speech act into five different classes: assertive, directives, commissive, declarative, and expressive. Assertive covers speech acts that involve giving or stating information or condition in which fact is believed by S. Directive reflects the illocutionary point where S intend to make attempts to get O to do something. Commissive covers illocutionary points where S commits himself to the future course of action. Declarative is used by S to bring alternation of status or condition that match the utterance conveyed by S. Expressive includes speech acts which illocutionary point is to show the psychological state of S implied in the utterance toward certain condition. Furthermore, Searle and Vanderveken (1985) classify each class into more specific sub-speech acts, reflecting the specific intention of S. Each sub-speech act could accommodate S's intentions. Each of them could potentially violate the politeness maxim and cause social discord.

## **2.3 Translation**

The definition of translation is considered to be broader than converting words or text from SL into TL. Nida and Taber (1969, p.12) state that translation consists of recreating a message within a linguistic unit of SL into its closest natural equivalent in TL by considering its meaning and style. In accordance, Kridalaksana (1985) in Nababan (2003, p.19) emphasizes that examining the meaning and language style while translating are essential for achieving high-quality translation. Moreover, Nida and Taber (1969, p.33) state that translation involves an extensive process of analyzing, transferring, and reconstructing SL into TL. In this process, translators are required to observe the source language from the micro-level of language units such as sentence, phrase, word, or lower in order to formulate the proper meaning and style. Furthermore, observing the norm and cultural aspect of the TL is also required in order to produce a natural translation. To support the decision-making in the process of translation, the translator could utilize translation techniques. Molina and Albir (2002) develop a comprehensive model of translation technique which consists of 18 distinct techniques: (1) Adaptation, (2) Amplification, (3), Borrowing, (4) Calque, (5) Compensation, (6) Description, (7) Discursive Creation, (8) Established Equivalent, (9) Generalization, (10) Linguistic Amplification, (11) Linguistic Compression, (12) Literal Translation, (13) Modulation, (14) Particularization, (15) Reduction, (16) Substitution, (17) Transposition, and (18) Variation.

## **3. Methodology**

This research adopted a qualitative descriptive approach. Moleong (2005, p.6) states that qualitative research focuses on studying the phenomenon of human behaviour, action, motivation, or perception in a certain context. In this research, the researcher aims to study and describe the phenomenon of communicative behaviour, specifically speech acts that violate the politeness maxim in Gerald's Game novel. Moreover, the researcher aims to find the translation techniques used and analyze the impact of the techniques toward the shift of the speech acts. Thus, the data would be in the form of written utterances from both versions (English and Bahasa Indonesia) of Gerald's Game novels. The data is specified only to the words, phrases, or sentence which represents the use of speech acts violating politeness maxim. After the sample data are collected, a forum of FGD (Focus Group Discussion) is initiated in which the researcher and a group of linguists discuss and validate the data. This research is adapting document analysis as the data analysis technique. All of the data will be distributed into specific classifications based on the type of speech acts violating politeness maxim. Hereafter, the translation technique of each data will be identified and ultimately be used as the components to analyze the impact on the translation.

## **4. Result and Findings**

### **4.1. Types of Speech Acts Violating Politeness Maxim**

The study shows that there are 250 utterances representing the use of speech act violating politeness maxim in Gerald's Game novel. From those utterances, there are four different types of speech act found: assertive, directive, expressive, and commissive. Each type of speech act is classified further into sub-speech acts based on the specific illocutionary point intended by S. The details are summarized below:

Table.1 The Types and Frequency of Speech Acts Violating Politeness Maxim

Types of Speech Acts Violating Politeness Maxim	Types of Sub-Speech Act	Frequency	%
Assertive (71)	<i>Arguing</i>	55	22%
	<i>Affirming</i>	2	0.8%
	<i>Concluding</i>	5	2%
	<i>Denying</i>	9	3.6%
Directive (66)	<i>Asking</i>	2	0.8%
	<i>Telling</i>	17	6.8%
	<i>Insisting</i>	18	7,2%
	<i>Demanding</i>	17	6.8%
	<i>Forcing</i>	2	0.8%
	<i>Begging</i>	1	0.4%
	<i>Suggesting</i>	3	1.2%
Expressive (102)	<i>Warning</i>	6	2.4%
	<i>Mocking</i>	18	7,2%
	<i>Scorning</i>	35	14%
	<i>Insulting</i>	8	3.2%
	<i>Complaining</i>	9	3.6%
	<i>Protesting</i>	21	8.4%
	<i>Boasting</i>	2	0.8%
	<i>Blaming</i>	6	2.4%
Commissive (11)	<i>Lamenting</i>	3	1.2%
	<i>Refusing</i>	8	3.2%
	<i>Threatening</i>	3	1.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>250</b>	<b>100%</b>

From the table above, the most common type of speech act violating politeness maxim is expressive with a total of 102 data, while the least is commissive with a total of 11 data. It can be seen that expressive and commissive have the same number of sub-speech act types in which each speech act has 8 distinct types of sub-speech act. The least number of sub-speech types is found in commissive, which consists of two types only. Though expressive is the most common type of speech act violating politeness maxim, the most common sub-speech acts used to accommodate the violation of politeness maxim is *arguing* with the total of 55 data under the classification of assertive. The least type of sub-speech act violating politeness maxim to be found in the novel is *begging* with the total of 1 data only. Each sub-speech act has its own illocutionary point, which determines its use and function. Also, each sub-speech act could accommodate one or more violations of politeness maxim. A detailed explanation will be discussed below:

#### 4.1.2 Assertive

There are 71 performances of assertive speech acts which are violating the politeness maxim. The violation of politeness maxim could be accommodated in four different types of sub-speech acts: *arguing*, *affirming*, *concluding*, and *denying*. The most common type of sub-speech acts found within the assertive is *arguing* with a total of 55 data, while the least is *affirming* with a total of 2 data. Within the performance of these speech acts, there are two possible types of violation of politeness maxim accommodated: violation of agreement maxim (M7) and violation of generosity maxim (M1).

**Arguing:** The illocutionary point of *arguing* is when S intends to give reasons for or against something. When *arguing*, S's arguments tend to be the opposition of O's. In this case, it could be said that S gives a low value to O's opinion; thus, S violates the agreement maxim (M7). Example: "but if you really thought it was you he was seeing when he got that look in his eye, you were misled, toots."

**Affirming:** The notion of *affirming* is emphasized on how strong S is asserting something. When S is *affirming* facts firmly to O, S tends to ignore O's wants. In other words, S gives an unfavourable value to O's wants; thus, S violates the generosity maxim (M1). Example: "I'm not joking."

**Concluding:** The illocutionary point of *concluding* is when S decides or believes something as a result of some considerations that S has taken. While stating the conclusion, S tends to give low value to O's opinion. In this condition, S violates the politeness maxim, specifically the agreement maxim (M7). Example: "The total solar eclipse lasted just over a minute that day, Jessie . . . except in your mind."

**Denying:** The illocutionary point of *denying* is when S states a negation about a certain proposition. In other words, *denying* is when S says that something is not true. By doing this speech act, S tends to give an unfavourable value to O's opinion; thus, S violates the agreement maxim (M7). Example: "Jesus, tootsie, I'm not teasing you;"

#### **4.1.3 Directive**

There are 66 utterances that represent directive speech acts violating the politeness maxim. The violation of the politeness maxim could be represented in eight different sub-speech acts: *asking*, *telling*, *insisting*, *demanding*, *forcing*, *begging*, *suggesting*, and *warning*. The most common type of sub-speech act found within the directive is *insisting* with a total of 17 data, while the least is *begging* with only 1 data found. There are two different types of violation of politeness maxim that can be accommodated using these sub-speech acts: violation of tact maxim (M2) and violation of obligation (to S) maxim (M6).

**Asking:** There are two distinct uses of *asking*: when S is trying to ask a question or when S is trying to ask someone to do something. Both uses are considered directive since S attempts to get O to perform speech acts. Thus, while S is *asking* O to perform a speech act, S would likely prioritize their own wants, which violates politeness maxim, specifically tact maxim (M2). Example: "Can you be very, very good, Jessie?"

**Telling:** In the context of directive speech acts, *telling* is used by S to make O do something. The difference between *asking* and *telling* is that *telling* is performed with a higher degree of strength, and it is also used by S to imply a condition where S does not give O the option of refusal. This concept suggests the same violation of politeness maxim as *asking* where S gives unfavourable value to O's wants. Thus, S is violating tact maxim (M2) while performing the speech act of *telling*. Example: "Bring the keys back and unlock me."

**Insisting:** *Insisting* is considered a strong directive. If it is compared to *telling*, *insisting* has a greater degree of strength while it is performed. *Insisting* has a special illocutionary point in which it emphasizes the notion of persistence. In other words, S tends to perform *insisting* speech act when S persistently makes an attempt to get O to do something. In the performance of *insisting*, S tends to give favourable value to own wants; thus, it makes S violate tact maxim (M2). Example: "I want out of these cuffs. Are you hearing me?"

**Demanding:** *Demanding* is performed when S wants O to do something. The degree of strength of *demand* is considered to be greater than simply *asking* or *telling*. *Demanding* is also performed when S implies an intention in which O has to fulfil S's wants or desires. Based on the findings, there are two possible politeness maxims to be violated. While performing *demanding* speech acts, S tends to give favourable value to S's own wants, thus violating tact maxim (M2), or S tends to give favourable value to O's obligation to S, thus violating obligation (to S) maxim (M6). Example: "Wait just one goddamned minute here!", "You did, but I don't remember him ever apologizing to me."

**Forcing:** *Forcing* is considered to be a directive speech act with the greatest degree of strength where S tends to use violent verbal abuse or even physical abuse while performing the speech act. While *forcing*, S gives favourable value to S's own wants and intends to obtain or achieve something from O. This speech act violates politeness maxim, specifically tact maxim (M2). Example: "For now, spread those lovely legs, me proud beauty!"

**Begging:** The illocutionary point of *begging* is to request something to O while implying strong desire or strong need. While performing this speech acts, S tends to give high value to S's own wants; thus, it violates tact maxim (M2). Example: "Ruth, you have to help me!".

**Suggesting:** *Suggesting* has a weaker degree of strength than *insisting*. *Suggesting* speech act does not have the notion of persistence implied in its performance. However, *suggesting* has the same implication in which S want O to do something that O does not prefer to do. In this condition, S tends to give favourable value to S's own wants. Thus, the politeness maxim violated is tact maxim (M2). Example: "Just let him do it, and it will be done."

**Warning:** In the context of the directive, a warning is considered as strong advice where S wants O to do or not to do something. In this case, S's wants tend to be in opposition to O's wants. Thus, the performance of *warning* will violate tact maxim where S tends to give high value to S's own wants. Example: "If you just lie there pretending this is a bad dream you got from sleeping on your left side/ you're going to die in handcuffs."

#### 4.1.4 Expressive

There are 102 expressive speech acts that violate the politeness maxim. The violation of the politeness maxim could be represented in eight different sub-speech acts: *mocking*, *scorning*, *insulting*, *complaining*, *protesting*, *boasting*, *blaming*, and *lamenting*. The most common type of sub-speech acts found within the expressive is *scorning* with a total of 35 data, while the least is *boasting* with a total of 2 data found. There are seven different types of violation of politeness maxim that could be accommodated using these sub-speech acts. The violated maxims are generosity maxim (M1), tact maxim (M2), approbation maxim (M3), modesty maxim (M4), agreement maxim (M7), sympathy maxim (M9), and feeling reticence maxim (M10).

**Mocking:** *Mocking* is an expressive speech act whose intention is to ridicule somebody else in a playful manner. This performance of speech act is likely to be perceived by O as unkind and disrespectful. While S performs this speech act, S tends to give an unfavourable value to O's quality. Thus, S is violating the politeness maxim, especially the approbation maxim (M3). Example: "You don't have a Porsche body just now,"

**Scorning:** *Scorning* has a greater degree of strength than *mocking*, and there is no playful manner in performing a *scorning* speech act. When *scorning*, there is an implication in which S thinks about O as not worthy of any respect. There are two possible violations of maxim accommodated using this speech act. While *scorning*, S tends to give low value toward O's quality. This makes S violates the approbation maxim (M3). In other cases, performing *scorning* implies a violation of politeness maxim in which S tends to give unfavourable value to O's feeling; hence feeling maxim (M9) is violated. Example: "You are just so goddamned inconsistent, so goddamned sarcastic."

**Insulting:** The illocutionary point of *insulting* is implied in the intention of S offending O. The degree of strength is considered the strongest compared to *mocking* and *scorning*. In performing this speech act, S tends to give unfavourable value to O's qualities which includes name-calling and the use of offensive words. The politeness maxim violated within *insulting* is the approbation maxim (M3). Example: "Nora Callighan was a prying bitch!"

**Complaining:** In the context of expressive speech acts, *complaining* is used by S to express feelings of annoyance, unhappiness, or discontent about O. There is two possible violation of politeness maxim within the performance of *complaining*. S tends to give low value to O's quality and also give high value to S's own feeling. Thus, the violated maxims are approbation maxim (M3) and feeling reticence maxim (M10). Example: "All she'd do is squeak, in other words."

**Protesting:** The illocutionary point of *protesting* is implied in the intention of S showing an expression of strong dislike or disapproval of something. There are four different violations of the politeness maxim that could be accommodated while *protesting*. There are tendencies of S to give low value to O's wants, give high value to S's own wants, give a low value of O's quality, and give low value to O's opinion. Hence, the violated maxims are generosity maxim (M1), tact maxim (M2), approbation maxim (M3), and agreement maxim (M4). Example: "What in God's name gives you the right to do something like that?"

**Boasting:** Boasting has an illocutionary point in which S expresses excessive pride in something S has or does. In performing this speech act, S tends to give a high or favourable value to S's qualities. By doing so, S is considered to be violating the modesty maxim (M4). Example: "No hardscrabble spud-farmer in Aroostook County works any harder than I do,"

**Blaming:** S uses the speech act of *blaming* when S intends to express anger and place the responsibility of something, usually bad, on O. The finding shows that while *blaming* something on O, S tends to give unfavourable value to O's feelings. Thus, the violated politeness maxim is the sympathy maxim (M9). Example: "If he's dead, it's his own damned fault,"

**Lamenting:** The illocutionary point of *lamenting* is implied in the intention of S showing feelings of grief or sadness to O. This performance of speech acts is considered to be violating the politeness maxim because S tends to give high value to S's own feelings. Thus, the violated maxim is the feeling reticence maxim (M10). Example: "I can't go through this again!"

#### 4.1.5 Commissive

There are 11 commissive speech acts that violate the politeness maxim. The violation of politeness maxim could be accommodated in two different sub-speech acts: *refusing* and *threatening*, where *refusing* is the most common type of sub-speech acts found with a total of 8 data, and *threatening* is the least with a total of 3 data. There are two different types of violation of politeness maxim that could be accommodated using these sub-speech acts: violation of generosity maxim (M1) and violation of tact maxim (M2)

**Refusing:** *Refusing* is used when S intends to show unwillingness to do something or unwillingness to accept an offering or invitation. In performing this speech act, S tends to give unfavourable value to O's wants; hence generosity maxim (M1) is violated. Example: "I don't want to remember, Ruth"

**Threatening:** The illocutionary point of *threatening* is shown in S's intentions to cause trouble if O could not get what S wants. In performing this speech act, S tend to give high value to S's own wants; hence tact maxim (M2) is violated. Example: "But if you continue screwing around and teasing me, I'll go straight to my sister's from here, find out who did her divorce, and call her."

**4.2 Translation Techniques**

The study found that there are 16 different translation techniques used to translate speech acts violating the politeness maxim in Gerald's Game novel. The techniques are established equivalent, variation, explicitation, pure borrowing, modulation, implicitation, reduction, paraphrase, transposition, discursive creation, compensation, literal translation, adaptation, particularization, linguistic compression, and neutralization. The details are summarized below:

Table 2. The Frequency of Translation Technique

Translation Technique	Frequency	%
Established Equivalent	1035	
Variation	228	
Explicitation	76	
Pure Borrowing	70	
Modulation	51	
Implicitation	32	
Reduction	17	
Paraphrase	14	
Transposition	12	
Discursive Creation	10	
Compensation	10	
Literal Translation	8	
Adaptation	2	
Particularization	2	
Linguistic Compression	1	
Neutralization	1	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1569</b>	

From the table above, the translation technique that is commonly used to translate speech acts violating politeness maxim is established equivalent with total usage of 1035. The second most common translation technique used is a variation with total usage of 228. There is two translation technique that is considered the least translation technique used, which are linguistic compression and neutralization. A detailed explanation will be discussed below:

**4.2.1 Established Equivalent**

This technique emphasizes the use of familiar terms, phrases, or expressions that are recognized in TL in accordance with TL's general language use or dictionary. A total of 1035 established equivalent techniques are used by the translator on all types of speech acts violating politeness maxim. Example:

SL: Listen, Gerald.  
 TL: Dengarkan, Gerald.

The word listen is translated into dengarkan using an established equivalent technique. The word dengarkan is a familiar term that is commonly used in TL' daily life and also dictionary as a directive verb to indicate an attempt to make O listen to S.

**4.2.2 Variation**

This technique is utilized to alter the linguistic (or paralinguistic) elements which affect the aspect of linguistic variation such as style, tone, dialect, etc. This technique is the second dominant technique used to translate speech acts violating the politeness maxim. Example:

SL: You can practically see his IQ going down ten points for every inch that grin spreads.  
 TL: Kau Jelas dapat melihat IQ-nya turun sepuluh angka untuk setiap inci yang bertambah dalam seringainya itu.

The variation technique is used on the pronoun you on SL to produce the word Kau on TL. The use of these variation techniques indicates an adjustment in the context of language style. In SL, the speech act is uttered in a context of an informal situation. Thus,

the language style produced in TL should be in the same context. In Bahasa Indonesia, there is a linguistic custom where the pronoun used in an utterance will commonly be adjusted to the context of where the utterance is used, whether it is in a formal or informal situation. The pronoun Kau is a proper pronoun to be used in an informal situation, which is as equivalent as you in SL.

#### 4.2.3 Explicitation

Explicitation is utilized to take certain language units of SL, which is rather implicit, to be produced in TL more explicitly. This technique lets the translator add some information or explanation, which aim is to aid the TL readers to grasp the main idea of SL more easily. Example:

SL: You can't kid yourself about that because I won't let you.

TL: Kau tidak dapat membohongi diri tentang hal itu, karena aku tidak akan membiarkanmu berbuat begitu.

The phrase berbuat begitu in the TL has an equal meaning of doing that. The phrase does that is not written in SL because its meaning is already implied in the clause because I won't let you. The additional phrase berbuat begitu is generated in TL to ease the reader to understand the whole meaning of the sentence.

#### 4.2.4 Pure Borrowing

The pure borrowing technique lets the translator borrow a word, term, or expression from SL to be used in TL without any changes. Example:

SL: You don't have a Porsche body just now.

TL: Kau tidak memiliki tubuh Porsche sekarang.

The word Porsche refers to a type of sleek sports car. The form of the word Porsche is preserved as it is in SL because TL readers are already familiar with that term. Thus, pure borrowing is used, and any changes are not necessary.

#### 4.2.5 Modulation

Modulation technique is used to alter the perspective, focus, or cognitive category of a language unit. The changes could be done on the lexical or structural aspect.

SL: Bring the keys back and unlock me

TL: Bawa kemari kuncinya dan buka borgol ini.

From the example above, there is an alteration in the object's perspective used in the phrase. In SL, the object is me, which refer to 'the speaker', while in TL, the object is altered into borgol ini, which refers to 'the handcuff constraining the speaker'. The object needs to be altered because it needs to adjust the verb buka used in TL and to avoid ambiguous meaning. However, this alteration does not distort the meaning because both of the phrases could be considered equal meaning.

#### 4.2.6 Implication

This technique is considered the opposite of explicitation. Implication could be used to make a language unit form SL appear more implicit in TL as long as the meaning could be implied in the related language unit. Example:

SL: I don't like you when you're like this, Jessie.

TL: Aku tidak suka kalau kau seperti ini, Jessie.

The translator uses implication on the clause don't like you to make the object you excluded in the TL. The object could be implied because the idea of the object is not necessarily mandatory to be on the clause tidak suka. It is because in the next clause, the word Kau, which is equal to you, is mentioned.

#### 4.2.7 Reduction

Reduction is used to shorten or suppress some information in TL. It could be applied to a rather complex term or sentence in order to make it more understandable. However, improper use of reduction techniques could potentially omit some important information or messages. Example:

SL: You are just so goddamned inconsistent, so goddamned sarcastic.

TL: Kau benar-benar tidak konsisten, begitu sinis.

The reduction technique is used to suppress the element of swearing represented in the word goddamned so that it would not appear in TL. In this case, the use of reduction is influenced by the consideration of the idea in which none of the swearwords in TL could equally represent the word goddamned.



#### **4.2.8 Paraphrase**

The paraphrase technique is used when some rearrangement of information or message is needed in order to make the meaning clearer. It tends to ignore the semantic aspect of the SL in order to maintain its pragmatic aspect. Example:

SL: Let's cut to the chase, dear: you murdered him.

TL: Mari kita langsung ke pokok persoalannya, Sayang: kau membunuhnya.

The translator paraphrases the idiom cut to the chase to ease TL readers to grasp its actual meaning. The phrase langsung ke pokok persoalannya does not have an equal semantic aspect as in SL, but its meaning is considered as pragmatically equal.

#### **4.2.9 Transposition**

Transposition is used to change the grammatical category of a language unit. Example:

SL: I mean it.

TL: Aku sungguh-sungguh

The above example shows that the transposition technique is used to change the grammatical category of verb, which is represented in the word mean, into an adverb, which is represented in the word sungguh-sungguh. The difference would not cause distortion on the meaning as long as the replacing word has an equal function as SL.

#### **4.2.10 Discursive Creation**

This technique is used to produce a temporary equivalence of language unit, which is considered unpredictable and out of context. Example:

SL: At its maximum width, your killer corporate lawyer of a husband looks like a janitor on work release from the local mental institution.

TL: Pada kelebaran seringainya yang maksimum, suaminya yang pengacara ini tampak seperti penjaga pintu rumah sakit jiwa.

The term in SL originally refers to 'a janitor', but after it is translated using discursive creation, it became penjaga pintu Rumah Sakit Jiwa which mainly refers to 'a gate keeper'. Each term appears to represent a different occupation, but each can be used as an element in conveying a similar intention. In this case, each term can be used as an element of *mocking*.

#### **4.2.11 Compensation**

Compensation is used to place a language unit or stylistic effect in another part of TL because those kinds of an element could not be placed in the same position as in the SL. Example:

SL: Now, however, I'd like you to shut up long enough for me to take my shot. Okay?

TL: Namun, sekarang aku ingin kau tutup mulut cukup lama agar aku dapat mencobanya. Oke?

The word, however, is translated equally into the word namun, but it is not placed in the same position as in the SL. The compensation technique alters the position of the word namun in order to adjust its characteristic, wherein TL cannot be placed in the middle of a clause.

#### **4.2.12 Literal Translation**

A literal translation is used to translate certain language units word for word. The usage of this technique tends to ignore the context of the language unit. Example:

SL: My God, Gerald, this stopped being fun for me almost as soon as we started.

TL: Astaga, Gerald, permainan ini sudah tidak menyenangkan bagiku hampir seketika sesudah kita memulainya.

The phrase hampir seketika sesudah is the product of literal translation of almost as soon as possible. This translation is considered to be out of context and thus susceptible to distortion of meaning and readability.

#### **4.2.13 Adaptation**

Adaptation is used to adjust certain cultural elements of SL with the ones from TL culture. Example:

SL: I dunno, toots, I don't see its shadow in the driveway.

TL: Entahlah toots, aku tidak melihat bayangannya di halaman.

The term driveway is commonly found in SL culture. However, in TL culture, it is considered not common. Thus, the term needs to be adapted to the TL culture, and the word Halaman is used as it has the closest concept of the driveway.

#### 4.2.14 Particularization

Particularization is the use of the more precise or more specific term in TL. Example:

SL: So maybe you deserve to be right here, handcuffed to this bed.

TL: Jadi, mungkin kau memang pantas berada di sini, terborgol di tiang ranjang.

The term tiang ranjang has the same concept of 'pillar of bed', which is considered to be more specific than a bed. The term tiang ranjang is used in order to convey a clearer description to the TL reader.

#### 4.2.15 Linguistic Compression

This technique is utilized to integrate some elements of SL into TL. Example:

SL: No hardscrabble spud-farmer in Aroostook County works any harder than I do.

TL: Tidak ada petani kentang di Aroostookcounty bekerja lebih keras daripadaku.

The words in the phrase than I do is integrated into a single word, daripadaku. This technique is used to generate more concise terms in TL and make the translation shorter.

#### 4.2.16 Neutralization

Neutralization is a translation technique used in translating an element of language typical to SL into a standard form in TL.

Example:

SL: *Why does a woman have a mouth and a cunt?*

TL: Mengapa seorang wanita mempunyai sebuah mulut dan sebuah liang senggama?

The term cunt is considered a strong taboo word related to a woman's sexual organ and often be used as swearwords. By using the neutralization technique, the translator could adapt the taboo word into its standard form in TL, which is sebuah Liang senggama. This technique is used because it is considered uncommon or too odd to use a taboo word in mentioning something that refers to a woman's sexual organ in TL culture. However, both terms could be used as a similar element in conveying a similar illocutionary point, which is *mocking*.

### 4.3 The Impact of Translation Techniques

Among the translation of 250 speech acts violating politeness maxim, the study shows that there is one shift that occurred as the impact of the translation technique used. The shift occurred on the aspect of the illocutionary point of a speech act. The detail can be seen in the data below:

SL: Jeepers-creepers, tootsie—he's going to goose you, not stick a cattle-prod up your ass.

TL: Sayang - ia akan menyodokmu dari belakang.

The type of speech act in the SL is identified as an expressive speech act violating the politeness maxim. The illocutionary point reflected in this expressive speech act is identified as *mocking*. The intention of *mocking* could be seen from the context of S, who is using some mockery expressions in the speech act, that are jeepers-creepers and not stick a cattle-prod up your ass. In the translation process, it is identified that the translator decides to use the reduction technique to translate both expressions, which results in both expressions being omitted in TL. It turns out that the omission of the expressions is causing the illocutionary point to shift from expressive to assertive. Specifically, it shifts from *mocking* to *concluding*. Without the mockery expression, the speech act in TL will be bound to the illocutionary point of assertiveness. This kind of shift could potentially affect the translation quality since there is a distortion of the message. However, the study found that translation techniques other than reduction techniques do not cause shifts on illocutionary points. It is also found that all kinds of translation techniques do not cause a shift in the type of the violation of politeness maxim.

## 5. Conclusion

Based on this study, there are four types of speech act found among 250 speech acts violating politeness maxim performed in Gerald's Game novel, which is assertive, directive, expressive, and commissive. Each type of speech act could be classified into more specific sub-speech acts. It is found that in translating the speech acts, the translator utilizes 16 different kinds of translation techniques, that are established equivalent, variation, explicitation, pure borrowing, modulation, implicitation, reduction, paraphrase, transposition, discursive creation, compensation, literal translation, adaptation, particularization, linguistic compression, and neutralization. Among the translation technique, only the reduction technique potentially cause a shift in the

illocutionary point of speech act, specifically from *mocking* into *concluding*. It is advised to take more consideration before using the reduction technique on translating speech acts violating politeness maxim.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Acknowledgement:** Much appreciation for the supervisors of this research, Prof. Drs. M.R. Nababan, M.Ed., M.A., Ph.D and Prof. Dr. Djatmika, M.A.

### References

- [1] Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [2] Brown, P. & Levinson S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Culpeper, J. (1996). "Towards an anatomy of impoliteness". *Journal of Pragmatics*. 25: 349–367.
- [4] Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.
- [5] Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [6] Moleong, L. J. (2005). *Metode penelitian kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- [7] Molina, L. & Albir A. H. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta: Translator's Journal*. 47 (4): 498-512.
- [8] Nafiah, C. (2020). *Analisis terjemahan ketidaksantunan dalam seri keempat novel harry potter and goblet of fire*. Thesis. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- [9] Nida, E.A & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- [10] Nababan, M. R. (2003). *Teori menerjemah bahasa inggris*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [11] Prananta, A. Y. (2016). The reconstruction of impoliteness strategies as a device for characterization in the subtitle of 'the big bang theory'. *Current research in linguistics*. 3: 115-121.
- [12] Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Searle, J. R. & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Waluyo, N, S, & Djatmika (2019). Assertive speech acts as a strategy revealing impoliteness: A case of translation quality in translated novels the silkworm and the cuckoo's calling. *Fifth Prasasti International Seminar on Linguistics*. Doi: 10.2991/prasasti-19.2019.73