

From "Miss Bennet" to "Dearest, Loveliest Elizabeth!" - Translating Directness in Directive Speech Acts from the Perspective of Gender Roles

Ćurlin, Nika

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2023

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:183505>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom](#).

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-09-17**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Repository / Repozitorij:

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

From “Miss Bennet” to “Dearest, Loveliest Elizabeth!”
- Translating Directness in Directive Speech Acts from the Perspective of
Gender Roles

Master’s thesis

Student: Nika Ćurlin

Supervisors: Marina Grubišić, Vinko Zgaga

Zagreb, 2023.

Contents

Abstract.....	1
Sažetak.....	2
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Theoretical framework.....	4
2.1 Pragmatics.....	4
2.1.1 Speech act theory.....	4
2.1.2 Conversational implicature.....	9
2.1.3 Politeness theory.....	10
2.2 Translation and pragmatics.....	12
2.2.1 Text pragmatics.....	12
2.2.2 Overt and covert translation.....	15
2.3 Key concept: Directness.....	16
2.3.1 Modality.....	16
2.3.2 Direct and indirect SAs.....	19
2.3.3 Phrases and expressions.....	20
2.3.4 Address forms.....	21
2.3.5 Other.....	23
3. Aim, methodology and hypotheses.....	24
3.1 Aim and hypotheses.....	24
3.2 Methodology.....	25
3.2.1 Choosing Austen.....	25
3.2.2 Classification of Speech Acts.....	25
3.3 Qualitative analysis.....	27
3.3.1 Coding.....	27
3.3.2 Pragmatic analysis example.....	28
3.4 Summary of the findings.....	35
4. Conclusion.....	37
Bibliography.....	39
Appendix.....	41

Abstract

This paper deals with the translation of directive speech acts in Croatian renditions of Jane Austen's novel *Pride and Prejudice*. Although some research on pragmatics in Austen's writing has been conducted, there appears to be little research done on the relationship between pragmatics and translation. This study looks at the original text and two Croatian translations and examines the degree of directness expressed in directive speech acts made by male speakers as opposed to female speakers. Assuming that male and female characters in the original text show a significant difference in their degree of directness when expressing directive speech acts, this disparity was expected to be reflected in the Croatian translations as well. However, the Croatian translations were also expected to be generally 'more direct' taking into account the linguistic differences between English and Croatian. The original text was coded according to the type of speech act and the gender of the speaker, and the 'true' directive speech acts and their translation equivalents were extracted and evaluated according to the degree of directness shown in the utterance. The collected data was qualitatively analyzed and the findings show that female characters exhibited a greater degree of directness than the male characters across all three texts. Although there wasn't a great difference between the translations and the original text, Odlešić's translation was found to be more direct compared to the original and to Petrović's translation. These findings point to the value of pragmatic analysis as a translation tool to either avoid or faithfully depict the relationships between genders, depending on what is required by the source text.

Keywords: *translation studies, Pride and Prejudice, directive speech acts, pragmatic analysis, gender*

Sažetak

Ovo se istraživanje bavi prijevodom direktivnih govornih činova u hrvatskim prijevodima romana *Ponos i predrasude* autorice Jane Austen. Premda već postoje istraživanja govornih činova u ovom i u drugim romanima iste autorice, gotovo da nema istraživanja koja bi se bavila prijevodom govornih činova. U ovom će se radu usporediti izvorni tekst s dvama hrvatskim prijevodima te promotriti stupanj izravnosti u izražavanju direktivnih govornih činova s obzirom na rod govornika. Polazeći od pretpostavke da u originalnom tekstu postoji znatna razlika između načina izražavanja muških i ženskih likova u svrhu oslikavanja rodnih odnosa, očekivalo se da će se te razlike odraziti i u prijevodima, iako je za očekivati da će zbog razlika u hrvatskom i engleskom jeziku hrvatski prijevod općenito biti 'izravniji' u odnosu na izvornik. Od izvornika te dvaju prijevoda izrađeni su korpusi koji su zatim kodirani s obzirom na svrhu govornog čina, rod govornika te stupanj izravnosti te su dobiveni se podatci kvalitativno analizirali. Rezultati ovog istraživanja pokazuju da jezik utječe na oslikavanje rodnih odnosa te ukazuju na korisnost pragmatičke analize pri prijevodu. Na temelju zaključaka budući se prevoditelji mogu orijentirati pragmatičkom analizom kako bi u svom prijevodu ostvarili ili izbjegli određene slike rodnih odnosa, ovisno o tome zahtjeva li to izvorni tekst.

Ključni pojmovi: *znanost o prevođenju, Ponos i Predrasude, govorni činovi, pragmatička analiza, rod*

1. Introduction

Jane Austen's novels remain a popular reading choice among readers from across the world, which is why they are often retranslated, adapted into films and shows, and published in many different languages. Austen is known for her lifelike characters as well as her skill to bring a character to life through their speech and the narrator's subtle commentary. Her works have been the subject of studies in various fields, including literary theory (Normandin 2022), literary history (Nadeau 2009), sociology (Wilkes 2013), cognitive linguistics (Nelles 2014) and critical discourse analysis (Hua 2013). Many studies have also looked at Austen's works from the perspective of pragmatics and investigated a wide array of topics, such as conversational implicature (Alamoudi 2021), irony (Zhao 2011), hedges (Suryanikova and Julhijah 2018), and speech acts (Mardiani and Leviani 2022). However, few have concerned themselves with the translations of Austen's novels, despite them often being the subject of retranslation.

Austen's heroines are known for their bold personalities and their ability to skillfully navigate the specific sociocultural norms of their time, which determined the role and social relationships of women in society. Taking into account Austen's ability to depict the *Zeitgeist* as well as the relations between the characters through their speech and expressions, Austen's works present fruitful ground for pragmatic analysis with a focus on gender roles. Some studies on the way female protagonists in Austen's novels express themselves have been conducted when it comes to their addressing male characters, paying special attention to the use of irony, the degree of politeness, and the use of speech acts. However, translation of these phenomena has not been sufficiently studied.

This paper looks at the translation of directive speech acts in Jane Austen's *novel Pride and Prejudice*, focusing on the gender of the speaker. In order to explain how Austen presents gender roles and relations, I determined the degree of directness used by male and female characters when expressing directive speech acts in her text, and in the second phase I did the same with the translations. A difference between the texts was expected, considering the nature of the two languages as well as their linguistic and cultural norms. Finally, I looked at the degree of directness expressed in directive speech acts made by male as opposed to female characters in the Croatian translations so as to determine if they faithfully depict the gender roles and relations

presented in the source text. The results of this research should prove pragmatic analysis to be a useful tool for translators, especially when it comes to depicting gender roles and relations.

2. Theoretical framework

This chapter will give an overview of the theoretical background of speech acts, literary pragmatics and the relationship between pragmatics and translation. It will also provide an insight into other pragmatic theories that come into play in observing and analyzing dialogues, such as politeness theories and conversational implicature, which shall be used to describe the key concept of ‘directness’ as an aspect of linguistic behavior, which will serve as basis for the analysis presented later.

2.1 Pragmatics

2.1.1 Speech act theory

Pragmatics is a field of linguistics that studies language use. An especially prominent theory within the scope of pragmatics is the speech act theory that examines how people use language to affect others and the world around them. The founders of speech act theory are John L. Austin and John R. Searle, and their respective works *How To Do Things With Words* (1962) and *Expression and Meaning* (1979) represent the theoretical foundation on which contemporary approaches to speech acts still rely. They argued that language is not composed simply of statements used to describe the world or report information, but that language can be used to do things, such as make a promise, give advice and bind people in marriage.

Speech acts are realized through utterances, which are tokens of language not limited to sentences (Austin 1962, 6). Austin (1962) distinguished between two main types of utterances: constatives and performatives. He defined constatives as true-or-false statements and performatives as those utterances that do something, that perform a certain act. When it comes to performatives, Austin recognized that speech acts usually consist of three sub-acts. The first of these is the locutionary act, which he defined as “a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference” (Austin 1962, 108) – in other words, the literal meaning of an utterance as it pertains to the real world. The second part of a performative is the illocutionary act, to which the term ‘speech

act' usually refers. It is the expressed intention that goes beyond the surface meaning of what is uttered, such as asking for advice or apologizing. The final part of a performative is the perlocutionary act, which Austin defined as the consequences of making a speech act in reality – that which is achieved through a speech act, such as entering a marital relationship.

Searle (1979) added that an utterance can have more than one intended meaning or illocutionary act. An utterance in which a speaker directly expresses their intent is called a **direct speech act**, but if more is implied in the utterance than the speaker actually says, that is an **indirect speech act**. For example, a speaker might say “Close the window” to get another person to close a window. This is a direct speech act, as the only meaning of the utterance is to give an order, which the speaker does by using the imperative form - a prototypical construction for such an act. However, a speaker might also say “It’s a bit cold in here”. On the one hand, they are stating that they feel cold, implying that this is uncomfortable for them and that someone should amend the situation by closing the window. This is an example of an indirect speech act, as the sentence carries more than one meaning. Here Searle distinguishes between primary and secondary meaning – in this case, the primary meaning of the utterance would be the request that the window be closed by stating facts about the situation, which is the secondary meaning.

Austin stated, and Searle elaborated, that there are certain real-world conditions that need to be fulfilled in order for a speech act to be successful, and they called these felicity conditions. For example, in order for a request to be successful, the hearer needs to be able to fulfill the request made. Gordon and Lakoff (1971) later concluded that indirect speech acts are often performed by way of questioning the felicity conditions of the act. For example, if a speaker wanted to pose the request “Pass me the salt”, they could do so by asking “Could you pass me the salt?”, thus questioning the hearer’s ability to do so and automatically creating a more polite and more indirect request.

Brown and Levinson (1994) also use the term ‘indirect speech act’ in their politeness theory, which is partly founded in the theory of speech acts. They use the term to denote a conventionalized linguistic realization of negative politeness strategies (Brown and Levinson 1994, 42). For the most part, possible meanings of speech acts that fit into this category of ‘indirect SAs’ are requests, as their illocutionary force or meaning is often hedged in formal politeness.

Austin also differentiated between implicit and explicit performatives (1962, 32). Though they both achieve the same result as speech acts, they differ according to their forms. Explicit performatives contain what Austin refers to as **performative verbs** – unambiguous expressions that name the act they are performing, such as *order*, *bet*, *promise*, *bequeath* and so on. Explicit performatives are usually direct speech acts, as they make explicit the act that the speaker is performing. However, though implicit performatives are not as clear in naming the act, they can also be direct speech acts, as the context and the expressions used can make the intended meaning perfectly clear. For example, a speaker may say to someone “I order you to open the window”, which is an explicit performative containing the verb ‘order’, but their intention would be just as clear if they said “Open the window”. Searle adds that “in indirect speech acts the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and nonlinguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer” (1979, 31-32), which in linguistic terms would be their knowledge of speech acts, Grice’s Cooperative Principle, as well as their knowledge of the world.

Although Austin and Searle’s work is understood to be the foundation of speech act theory, seen as it was a popular topic among linguists of the 1970s and 1980s, many linguists since then have built upon the theory, including Steven C. Levinson. In his article titled *Speech Acts* (2019), Levinson gives an overview of speech act theory as it developed since Austin and Searle in different linguistic and scientific fields, including generative semantics, psycholinguistics and sociology. However, insight that studies in these fields offer focuses on speech acts as interactive language and the psychology behind the expressed intentions, which is not as relevant for this paper, since dialogue in literary works is artificial and does not fully represent real-life interactions. For this reason, Searlian analysis remains the best tool for the purposes of this thesis.

Levinson stated that the central problem with speech acts is the fact that they are not “simply or directly coded in the linguistic form” (2019, 203), which makes them very difficult to recognize and analyze. He also claimed that Austin and Searle did not pay much attention to the coding of speech acts, but rather assumed that speech acts were formed according to the three major sentence types: imperatives, interrogatives and declaratives. He adds that Searlian analysis does not account for the interactional nature of speech acts, instead it focuses on utterances as

individual occurrences and only takes certain real-life factors into consideration. This may be problematic when it comes to analyzing authentic conversations, but again, it is suitable for the analysis of written dialogues, as is the case in this thesis.

Levinson goes on to compare two systems of speech act recognition - the so-called 'bottom-up' and the 'top-down' approach. "Bottom-up information is whatever clues to speech act type can be found directly coded or cued in the signal, by lexical choice, construction, or prosody" (Levinson 2019, 208), however, this type of approach can be difficult to apply, as there is no perfect correspondence between form and function, especially across different languages. Nevertheless, some forms can become universally accepted and recognized as a certain action (for example 'Would you', 'Could you' as signals for requests). "Top-down information includes all the accumulated contextual and sequential information that forms the niche for the incoming turn" (Levinson 2019, 210), in other words, relying on common knowledge between participants, as well as the sequential location of the utterance. Levinson suggests the following methods for identifying speech acts: a) relying on metalanguage (such as performative verbs), b) examining the felicity conditions, c) identifying actions by their corresponding reactions (for example, *question-answer* or *offer-acceptance*), and d) taking into account the sequential position of the utterance.

This paper adopts the 'bottom-up' approach to speech act analysis, meaning that the existing formal features of a given utterance were considered first, but Levinson's proposed methodology was also of use in identifying speech acts.

2.1.1.1 Classification of speech acts

Austin proposed a classification of speech acts (SAs) that consists of five categories: Verdictives, Exercitives, Commissive, Behabitives and Expositives (Austin 2009, 150). 1) Verdictives are utterances that deliver a finding "upon evidence or reason as to value or fact" (Austin 1962, 152), and examples of such acts would be *convict*, *diagnose*, *assess*, *estimate* and *understand*. 2) Exercitives are statements through which one enacts power, right or influence, and here Austin gave such examples as *appoint*, *nominate* and *announce*, as well as *order*, *advise* and *entreat*. 3) Commissive are speech acts that "commit a speaker to a certain action" (Austin 1962, 156) and a typical example would be the act of promising. 4) Behabitives are speech acts with

which the speaker expresses their attitudes and feelings about the behavior of others, thus establishing social relations. Exemplary commissive performative verbs would be *thank, apologize, congratulate, welcome* and *commend*. 5) Expositives are utterances used in the conduction of arguments that directly show how the utterance fits into the course of the conversation through expressions such as *reply, argue* and *assume*.

Searle (1979) found Austin's taxonomy to be inconsistent, stating that Austin sometimes grouped unrelated actions into the same category, while ignoring other representative members of the same category, especially in the case of exercitives, which resulted in some categories overlapping. However, Searle also partially adopted Austin's taxonomy, because he recognized that speech act types can be grouped according to the shared felicity conditions (Levinson 2019, 201). His taxonomy of speech act types also consists of five categories: **assertives, commissives, directives, expressives** and **declaratives**.

1) Assertives, also referred to as representatives, are utterances through which the speaker expresses their opinion, so they have a true-or-false value. Some performative verbs with an assertive meaning are *suggest, believe, complain* and *conclude*.

2) Directives are acts by which the speaker attempts to get the hearer to do something. In this category one can find such actions as *order, request, beg, entreat, pray, permit, advise* and *ask*.

3) Commissives to a great extent cover the same acts found in Austin's category of the same name. This type of speech act commits the speaker to some future course of action, and the typical performative verb used in such cases is *promise*.

4) Expressives communicate the psychological state of the speaker about the situation at hand or about another person's conduct. In such cases the following expressions are used: *thank, congratulate, apologize, condole, deplore* and *welcome*.

5) Declarations are utterances that perform such acts as *appointing, marrying, pronouncing* and *firing*.

This taxonomy was also used for the purposes of this thesis, as contemporary speech act theories (such as conversation analysis) concern themselves with authentic spoken interactions, so they are not very suitable for an analysis of a literary text where the dialogue is premeditated and

not organic. For this reason, Searle's taxonomy is more applicable, but I shall also build on it with my own ideas, according to the needs of the research.

2.1.2 Conversational implicature

It has been established that in discourse there is not always a direct link between the form of an utterance and its intended meaning. We are aware in everyday conversation that what is said goes beyond the literal meaning of the spoken words. This makes speech acts one of the most important notions in pragmatics, as they are based on the property of words to perform actions, and not just be meaning-bearers.

In order to explain how speakers know to produce and interpret utterances in a way that will ensure that the addressee will understand their intended meaning, H. P. Grice presented a theory of intended meaning called conversational implicature in his work *Logic and Conversation* (1982). He suggested that conversations are guided by a presupposed set of rules in a joint effort of participants to get across the intended meaning. These rules are based on logic and due to the cooperative nature of interaction, they are combined in the general **Cooperative Principle** (CP) of language use.

Grice identified four main rules underlying the cooperative use of language which he called **maxims**, and they are the following:

- a) Maxim of Quantity: Make your contribution as informative as required, be brief.
- b) Maxim of Quality: Make your contribution one that is true and for which you have sufficient evidence.
- c) Maxim of Relation: Be relevant, which means you should adhere to the given topic of conversation and address the persons involved in it.
- d) Maxim of Manner: Avoid ambiguous expressions, be orderly. (45-46)

These four maxims can be summed up under the general Cooperative Principle: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." (Grice 1982, 45) The participants in a conversation are able to work out what the other is saying by believing them to

adhere to CP. In order to interpret the presence of conversational implicature, the hearer relies on: a) the conventional meaning of the used words, as well as the real-world identity of the mentioned references, b) CP and its maxims, c) the linguistic and extralinguistic context of the utterance, d) shared background knowledge, and e) the fact that all these items are available to all participants in the conversation (49-50).

In the context of a literary work, however, CP can be applied to more than just interactions between characters. The process of reading and writing is a cooperative effort between author and reader – the author tries to portray their story and ideas in a way that is understandable to the reader, who in turn makes the effort to understand what the author wanted to say. Leech and Short (2015) even argue that the CP should be even more strongly adhered to in a novel, because it is a written, premeditated form where the writer has plenty of time to choose what to say, so there should be no ‘glaring errors’. They add that “sometimes an author conveys what he wants to say directly, and sometimes via interchange between characters. In both kinds of cases we can expect conversational implicatures and other inferential strategies to be used” (Leech and Short 2015, 242). Of course, the author may choose to violate a certain maxim for the sake of creative liberty, but the reader also has the freedom to interpret certain elements of a literary work according to their subjective view. Moreover, the process of translation is also a cooperative effort, whereby the translator tries to understand the author’s intended meaning and portray it as faithfully as possible, according to the requirements of the translation and the target audience.

2.1.3 Politeness theory

The notion of politeness can be defined and interpreted in many different ways, but generally it is taken to mean socially appropriate conduct or behavior. The study of politeness and impoliteness as a linguistic phenomenon began in the 1970s with Robin Lakoff’s 1973 paper *The Logic of Politeness*, in which she discusses linguistic politeness through the lens of Grice’s Cooperative Principle, and the research that followed it established a broader view of politeness as a central aspect of social interaction.

According to Brown (2019), there are three analytical approaches to politeness: a) the view of politeness as a set of social norms, b) the view of politeness as adherence to Politeness Maxims, and c) the view of politeness as strategic face management (Brown 2019, 385-386). The first view

pertains to how the general population views politeness – as appropriate social conduct which is closely tied to certain linguistic forms and expressions that vary from culture to culture. In this sense, ‘what is polite’ can be taught through etiquette books, and besides linguistic formulations, certain gestures may be a required part of ‘proper’ interactions in different cultures, such as bowing in Asian societies. In contrast to this, the two other approaches, developed under the influence of Generative Semantics, try to analyze how speakers construct polite utterances and strategize being polite.

The second view is based on Grice’s CP and his Maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner. Robin Lakoff (1973) expanded on the Gricean framework and suggested that there are three pragmatic rules (‘Don’t impose’, ‘Give options’, ‘Be friendly’) that determine how a speaker will express themselves. She argued that politeness “is a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange” (Lakoff 1990, 34 in: Brown 2019, 385). Geoffrey Leech (1983) relied on Lakoff’s theory and Grice’s Cooperative Principle to develop his Politeness Principle: ‘Minimize the expression of impolite beliefs’. It is based on the six Maxims, similar to Grice’s, of Tact, Generosity, Approbation, Modesty, Agreement, and Sympathy. According to Leech, cross-cultural differences in politeness norms are a result of disparities between which maxims are deemed more important in particular cultures.

The third view is based on the concept of ‘face’, introduced by the sociologist Erving Goffman (1967, in: Brown 2019) who defined it as a person’s public self-image and considered it central to the notion of politeness, which in turn is crucial for maintaining public order. There are two kinds of face wants: positive face, the desire to be approved of and liked, and negative face, or the desire not to offend others (Brown 2019, 386). Brown and Levinson (1994) later developed this theory to define politeness as strategic face management, whereby speakers purposefully deviate from Grice’s CP Maxims in order to employ politeness strategies, thus communicating not only their intended meaning but also the message that they are being polite. They identified five general types of politeness strategies, “ranging from avoiding a face-threatening act (FTA) altogether, to carrying it out but ‘off-record’ (indirectly)” (Brown 2019, 386). Speakers choose how to construct a polite utterance depending on the weightiness of the FTA, which is assessed in different contexts based on three social factors: P - the relative power of participants in a

conversation, D - their social distance, and R - the intrinsic ranking of the degree of face-threatening in an imposition (Brown 2019, 386). For example, a person is more likely to be polite to superiors, because of their dominance in the dimension of social power, and speakers also tend to be more polite to strangers, as there is a greater social distance than when one is talking to people they are familiar with. This is reflected in the use of so-called T/V (*tu/vous*) pronouns of ‘power’ and ‘solidarity’, first described by Brown and Gilman (1960), which will be discussed in greater detail in the chapter on Directness.

Although this theory of politeness offers many useful insights into politeness as a functional motive for linguistic structure, this view is ‘biologically anchored’ and based on the socio-psychological concept of face, which differs across cultures. It is important to note, that politeness cannot be simply read off a given utterance – it depends on the context, and polite formulae do not necessarily guarantee politeness. However, this theory is not particularly useful for translation, because the interaction between the persons involved (writer, reader, and translator) is ‘indirect’ (House 1998, 57) and does not follow the speaker-hearer direction of communication.

2.2 Translation and pragmatics

The following section will provide insight into translation through the lens of pragmatics and give several pointers as to how a text and translating should be approached on the pragmatic level.

2.2.1 Text pragmatics

Translation has had many definitions throughout the history of what is known today as Translation Studies, but it is generally understood to be a rewriting of a text, usually in a different language, but also to make the original text more understandable and available to a certain audience. For example, a text could be rewritten in a simpler language suitable for a younger audience, or a text in an older dialect that is no longer used could be re-written in its contemporary equivalent. The process of rewriting does not only concern the lexical and grammatical spheres of language - in fact, it takes place on all linguistic levels, including pragmatics.

In his book *The pragmatic translator: an integral theory of translation* (2014) Massimiliano Morini examines the relationship between translation and pragmatics and gives an

overview of how this relationship has been approached in translation studies thus far. In doing so, he establishes a definition of ‘text pragmatics’ parallel to the notion of pragmatics in general.

According to Morini, if pragmatics is the study of how, when, and where speakers interact and how they try to influence the world through language, text pragmatics studies how texts interact with people and other texts, as well as how they try to influence the world (2014, 13). He divides pragmatics into three spheres, which are explained through different pragmatic theories and concepts. The first of these is concerned with the ‘where and when’ of language, explained by deixis. The second sphere has to do with how speakers relate to each other through language, and here conversational implicature and politeness theories come into play. The third sphere encompasses how speakers affect each other and the world through language, which is the concern of speech act theory (13). In view of these three spheres of pragmatics, he establishes three ‘functions’ of text pragmatics: the locative, interpersonal, and performative function.

The **performative** function relates to text-acts, namely how texts act in and upon the world. A written or published text has illocutionary force just like a spoken utterance, and it can definitely have perlocutionary effects on the real-world (Morini 2014, 13-15), for example it can be hated due to promoting unpopular ideologies and beliefs. It is the translator’s duty to take into account the intended and existing effects of a text and to translate the text-act as well. Moreover, the translator also has to analyze the potential or implied meanings of the source text, and every translator may offer a different interpretation of the original, just as they may offer different translation solutions on the levels of lexis and syntax. Finally, Morini asserts that it is important to keep in mind that, due to cultural and contextual differences, perfect equivalence between a translation and its source text cannot be achieved on the pragmatic level, just as it can’t on other linguistic levels (15-18).

The **interpersonal** function relates to how texts interact with people, but also with other texts, so Grice’s theory of cooperation and Brown and Levinson’s theory of politeness are actually applicable to written texts: “The dialogue between text and reader(s) can be conducted in many different ways, the degrees and styles of cooperation and politeness varying along the axes of culture, genre, individual personality” (Morini 2014, 21) The text can address the reader directly, as is the case with informative texts, such as user manuals or advertisements, and with literary texts in which the narrator, character, or even translator addresses the reader. Additionally, the

relationship between text and reader is defined by how the text tells the reader what it wants to tell. For example, in a scientific article all relevant information will be immediately laid out for the reader in the abstract and then further explained along the rest of the text, whereas in a detective novel certain information and important details might be withheld from the reader and revealed later for the purpose of building suspense (21). Besides the relationship between text and reader, however, the intrapersonal relations within text cannot be disregarded, and this is especially evident in fiction and the relationships between fictional characters. Since the translator plays the role of the mediator between different culture's norms of politeness and cooperation, this task is rendered even more difficult in literary texts that can be transposed in time, space, and even realities. Morini claims that due to this pressure to respect socio-linguistic norms, most translators might "mould their texts so as to make them more acceptable, either of their own free will or because urged to do so by editors and publishers" (22-23).

The **locative** function relates to the geographical and temporal location of the text. Morini claims that displacement along both axes brings about the same issues for the translator (2014, 27). There are certain strategies that can be used according to the requirements of the translation: 'localization' is a possible strategy which entails transposing the original text into the context and environment of the target culture, but this also changes the cultural context and implications of the original text (26); 'historicizing' and 'modernizing' (27) are also possible strategies for transposing the text in time. The choice is ultimately left to the translator, but it can be influenced by many factors, not the least of which are the wishes of the editors and the publishers - in other words, the purpose for which the translation is created.

Applying this to translating Austen's work, the translator should respect the intended effect of a novel on its audience while paying special attention to the relationship between narrator and reader, as well as relationships between the characters. Finally, the translator needs to alert the reader to the spacial and temporal distance of the text by highlighting certain textual elements. For example, the translator can provide insight into the relationship between married partners in 19th century England through the use of certain T/V markers and nicknames.

2.2.2 Overt and covert translation

So far, we have established the general concerns a translator comes across when it comes to the pragmatics of a text, so now we shall return to politeness as a field within pragmatics. Juliane House (1998), adopting a broader view of politeness that accounts for cross-cultural variability, asserts that “the most important requirement for translation equivalence is that a translation have a function equivalent to that of its original” (63), and on this level of functional equivalence, politeness can be connected to the function of ‘interpersonal equivalence’ (64). Interpersonal equivalence operates on multiple pragmatic dimensions in which politeness plays an important role, including the ‘social attitude’ between the fictional characters, as well as the relationship between author and addressee(s).

Equivalence of function differs in two main types of translation: the ‘overt’ translation and the ‘covert’ translation: “An overt translation is usually preferred whenever the original is source-culture linked and has independent status in the source-language community; a covert translation is normally chosen when neither condition holds” (House 1998, 65). It follows that the role of the translator in the case of an overt translation is to preserve the meaning and implications of the original text, so as to give the target audience insight into the original text and its impact on the source culture. In the case of politeness displayed in the original text, the translator should leave the original linguistic choices “as intact as possible” by choosing communicatively equivalent expressions in the target language - “cross-cultural differences in politeness norms are thus not relevant in this type of translation” (65). In contrast to this, in a covert translation the translator has to re-create the events and functions of the original text within the cultural framework of the target culture, without including connotations from the source culture. This means the translator has the freedom, even the obligation, to implement “a cultural filter” that allows for differences in social, and thus also politeness norms (65-66)

According to House’s theory of politeness and translation, Austen’s works would definitely fall into the category of overt translations, as they are embedded in the source culture and should be preserved as such in the translations. It follows that the translator has the duty to preserve the degree of politeness and politeness strategies used in the utterances of the original text.

2.3 Key concept: Directness

In order to examine whether the characters' language truly reflects the gender roles and relations of Austen's time, the level of directness used in expressing directive speech acts in this novel will be measured. The term 'directness' has already been used and mentioned in the past, not the least by Searle (1979), Fairclough (Cutting 2002, 119) and Brown and Levinson (1994), in the context of posing requests and (negative) politeness among others. For the purpose of this research, the notion of directness was defined according to several factors relying on overlaps in speech act theory, politeness theory and conversational implicature.

2.3.1 Modality

The term 'modality' covers a wide range of meaning variations, such as ability, necessity, obligation, possibility, and the imperative meaning (Depraetere and Reed 2021, 207). These meanings can be expressed through various grammatical tools, including inflectional items such as sentence mood and auxiliary verbs, but even more so, non-inflectional items, including adverbials, particles, and hedges. The primary way of expressing modality in English is the choice of modal verbs and quasi-modals (207). What defines all modal utterances is that they do not represent situations as factual, but rather offer the speaker's comment on the situation (207), which is why all these different features have been grouped under the umbrella term 'modality'. However, they shall in turn be examined as separate directness factors.

a) **sentence mood** – It has been established that speech acts can be realized through formally very different utterances. On the level of syntax, speech act realizations are not bound to a single grammatical mood. On the contrary, SAs with the same pragmatic force can be realized as an imperative utterance ("Please open the window"), interrogative utterance ("Could you open the window") and a declarative utterance ("I'd like you to open the window"). However, there is an obvious difference in tone and, according to Searle (1979), "much of contextual dependence is realized in part in the syntactic structure of the sentence" (127). Therefore, certain formal structures shall be considered more direct than others, with respect to the equivalent grammatical features in Croatian.

In Croatian, there are three types of grammatical mood: '1) the indicative, 'indikativ', which corresponds to the indicative in English, 2) the conditional, 'kondicional', which is semantically similar to the use of certain modal verbs in English, such as 'could' instead of 'can', or 'might'

instead of ‘may’, and 3) the imperative, ‘imperativ’, which has a very similar function as the imperative mood in English. In the following analysis, utterances in the imperative mood in the original text and translations into the Croatian imperative shall be considered more direct than those in the indicative or conditional, when it comes to translations.

Example:

In the original text, Mrs. Gardiner advises Elizabeth not to encourage a romance between herself and Mr. Wickham by saying: “At least you should not remind your mother of inviting him.” Odlešić translated this in the following manner: “Barem ne podsjećaj majku da ga poziva.”, while Petrović translated it as: “Barem majku ne bi trebala podsjećati da ga pozove.” It is interesting that the three utterances show different levels of directness in this respect – in the original, the advice is expressed in the indicative, albeit with the use of the modal verb ‘should’, which still places it on the more direct end of the scale. The first translation is far more direct, as the translator chose to use the Croatian imperative “ne podsjećaj”, but the second translation shows a far more indirect effect, as the speaker uses the modal verb ‘trebati’ in the Croatian conditional “ne bi trebala”.

b) **modal verbs** – As the example for sentence mood shows, the choice of modal verbs also impacts the level of directness. Though Searle lists a number of expressions containing modal verbs that he considers typical in indirect formulations of directive SAs, his classification will be disregarded, as the expressions in question group together a variety of modals that express a wide spectrum of semantic propositions. Instead, I shall focus on Depraetere and Reed’s (2021) division of modal meanings according to epistemic and root modality.

Epistemic modality is based on the speaker’s judgement of the likelihood that the proposition is true (possibility: “That may be John” VS necessity: “That must be John”), and root modality is based on the speaker’s judgement of the factors influencing the actualization of the proposition (possibility: “You can get coffee here”, necessity: “The fish have to be fed every day”, ability: “Can you climb over the wall?”, volition “I can help you with that”) (210). Based on the possible meanings identified by the authors (210-213), for the purposes of measuring directness we could say that ‘can’ is more direct than ‘could’, as it would express a higher degree of certainty in the same context; in the same vein, ‘may’ is more direct than ‘might’, ‘will’ is more direct than ‘would’. Additionally, ‘must’ will in almost all contexts be considered rather direct, and ‘should’ and ‘ought to’ will be considered rather direct when expressing advice. However, it is important

to keep in mind that modals are “context-dependent expressions” (Papafragou 2008, 40), so their meaning cannot be determined on face-value, but rather evaluated based on the whole utterance and its context.

Example:

When Elizabeth advises Jane what to think about Mr. Bingley and his sisters, she says: “You must decide for yourself”, which has been translated quite directly by using the modal verb ‘morati’ in both versions: “O tom moraš sama odlučiti” (Odlešić 1997), “Moraš sama odlučiti” (Petrović 1997). The utterance thus remained a direct advice in all three texts. However, the use of the modal verbs is not always so transparent and has to be evaluated based on the context of the utterance.

c) **use of hedges** – Hedges are words or phrases speakers use to make their opinion slightly vague, so as not to cause a conflict or disagreement (Brown and Levinson 1994). Some examples of such expressions are ‘sort of’, ‘kind of’, ‘in a way’ and perhaps’. Hedges have already been connected to expressing speech acts and expressing politeness (Brown and Levinson 1994), and Leech and Short (2015) list them under indicators of politeness in written dialogues. Additionally, Suryanovika and Julhijah (2018) examined the use of hedges in expressing directive SAs made by six of Austen’s literary heroines and have found that hedges were used to express both hesitancy and certainty. The presence of hedges will thus be evaluated according to the context of the utterance.

Example:

In the conversation between Mrs. Gardiner and Elizabeth regarding Mr. Wickham, she advises her by saying: “Perhaps it will be as well if you discourage his coming here so very often.” This advice is hedged by the word ‘perhaps’ which is meant to soften the directive illocutionary force, so that Elizabeth would not feel pressured or imposed on. In contrast, when Mr. Collins asks for a private conversation with Elizabeth, Mrs. Bennet, who correctly supposes he wishes to propose to Elizabeth, eagerly replies: “I am sure Lizzy will be very happy—I am sure she can have no objection.” The hedge in this case is the expression ‘I am sure’, which Mrs. Bennet uses because she is speaking for her daughter, but it also lets Elizabeth know that she should comply with Mr. Collins' request. Therefore, the hedge actually makes the speaker’s meaning and intention clearer and more direct, which contributes to a higher degree of directness of the whole utterance.

2.3.2 Direct and indirect SAs

a) **direct or indirect SA** - As defined by Searle and Austin, an indirect speech act is an utterance that carries more than one meaning, that is, it performs more than one function. Additionally, Brown and Levinson (1994) stated that indirect speech acts are the most significant strategy of 'conventionalized indirectness'. Therefore, if an utterance is considered to be an indirect SA, it will automatically have a lower degree of directness in comparison to those SAs that only express one meaning.

Example:

There is an instance when Charlotte Lucas and Elizabeth Bennet are talking at a ball in Meryton, and Charlotte ends the conversation by saying: "I am going to open the instrument, Eliza, and you know what follows." This is evidently an indirect directive SA, as Charlotte is requesting that Elizabeth plays the piano for a while, but she does this by making a statement. Thus, the primary meaning of the utterance is assertive, describing what she will do and making a subtle comment to Elizabeth, while the second meaning is directive, requesting that she plays. This utterance is, therefore, rather less direct than it would have been had Charlotte simply asked Elizabeth to play.

b) **performative verbs** – Both Austin (1962) and Searle (1979) considered directive performatives – that is, speech acts containing performative verbs – to be more explicit in expressing the intention of the speaker. Therefore, utterances that contain performative verbs shall show a higher degree of directness.

Example:

In the interaction preceding their first visit to Rosings Park, Mr. Collins advises Elizabeth about her clothes in the following manner: "I would advise you merely to put on whatever of your clothes is superior to the rest, there is no occasion for any thing more." The performative verb in this case is 'advise' and it is reflected in both translations through the use of the verb 'savjetovati': "Savjetovao bih vam samo da odjenete svoju najljepšu haljinu, pa vam ništa drugo ne treba." (Ođlešić 1997), "Savjetovao bih Vam da jednostavno odjenete najbolju opravu koju imate, nema potrebe ni za čim više." (Petrović 1997).

2.3.3 Phrases and expressions

a) **expressions such as ‘please’ or ‘pray’ and adverbials for amplification** – Searle (1979, 40) considers the phrase ‘please’ to be an explicit marker of directive SAs, so utterances containing this phrase shall be seen as more direct. Additionally, Leech and Short (2014) list routine apologies such as ‘pardon me’ under indicators of politeness in written dialogue. They also mention adverbials as a category of pragmatic modifiers, explaining that they “tend to intensify or strengthen the meaning associated with a strategy, in the neg-politeness context of requests they generally mitigate or soften the directive force” (2014, 160). Since they can affect the meaning and directive force in both directions (Leech 2014), their role shall be interpreted based on the context of a given utterance.

Example:

The following is an example of a less direct use of an adverb from Odlešić’s translation. In the scene when the newly engaged Elizabeth and Mr. Darcy talk at the end of the novel and Elizabeth advises Mr. Darcy: “You must learn some of my philosophy”, which Odlešić translated as: “Morate donekle prihvatiti moju filozofiju.” The adverb ‘donekle’ (‘almost’, ‘somewhat’) softens the directive force of the advice, thus making the utterance less direct. An example of a more direct use of an adverbial would be when Mr. Bennet responds to his wife’s long report about Mr. Bingley’s dancing at the ball the previous evening: “For God’s sake, say no more of his partners” – the use of ‘for God’s sake’ makes this utterance rather direct.

b) **expressions used for the sake of politeness** – this is a category I am including based on my knowledge and study of Austen’s novels and the language she uses. Austen was influenced by the eighteenth-century view of Dr Johnson that “the best conversation was that which most approximated to the written language” (Leech and Short 2015, 253), so there is nothing unusual about a higher degree of formality she uses in her dialogues, especially for morally superior characters. Consequently, she tends to utilize certain expressions in order to achieve a greater degree of politeness, such as “may I ask” or “if I may be so bold as to...”, which Leech (2014) also refers to as “hedged performatives” (165). For this reason, the presence of such phrases in a given utterance shall mark a smaller degree of directness.

2.3.4 Address forms

a) **titles and nicknames** – The way that characters address one another is a significant factor in establishing tone in a literary work, which is particularly true for novels of the nineteenth century, as differences in social status were more evidently expressed through speech and the way people conversed. “There is a scale of politeness running roughly from titles of respect (My lord, madam) to titular prefixes (Mr, Miss) to surnames (Smith, Brown) to first names (Cecilia, Thomas) and to pet names and endearments (Cissy, Tom, my dear); but a wide range of combinations including these and other possibilities can be selected to signal various degrees and kinds of social distance” (Leech and Short 2014, 248). Brown and Levinson (1994) also consider using address forms a strategy of positive politeness – by using a certain address form that shows intimacy or solidarity, the speaker may ‘soften’ the force of their utterance, especially in the case of directives such as commands and requests (107-108). This feature shall be interpreted as more or less direct according to the context, meaning the social status and relationship of the participants.

Example:

When Mr. and Mrs. Bennet affectionately address Elizabeth as ‘my child’ or ‘my love’, this is considered less direct than when they address her by the nickname ‘Lizzy’, which is what everyone who is familiar with her usually calls her.

b) **T/V markers** – Brown and Gilman (1960) presented the basic distinction between using pronouns along the lines of ‘power’ and ‘solidarity’. Essentially, the usage of the T (*tu*) pronoun will be symmetrical if both speakers have an equal position of power and feel solidary. Such a relationship may be found between two friends. In contrast, the V (*vous*) pronoun will be used symmetrically if the speakers share the same position of power, but do not share a feeling of solidarity, for example co-workers. Finally, the T/V pronouns will be used asymmetrically in cases where the power-relations are imbalanced, for example an employer will address an employee by using T forms, while the employee will address his superior using V forms.

The T/V forms used in the Croatian translations of *Pride and Prejudice* are a topic worth paying attention to. Namely, as English doesn’t distinguish between T/V forms, it was left to the interpretation of the translator to decide what pronouns they deemed appropriate according to the social norms of the time period in which the novel was written and takes place, as well as the

context of the conversations. There are several examples of relations between characters that are worth mentioning.

When it comes to married partners, such as Mr. and Mrs. Bennet, Odlešić decided to use T-forms in both directions, and he goes so far as to switch to T-forms of address when Elizabeth and Mr. Darcy get engaged, as they addressed each other using the V-forms beforehand. Petrović, however, chose to use V-forms between partners, so there is no change in Mr. Darcy and Elizabeth's modes of addressing each other after they get engaged.

Both translators decided to use V-forms for situations when children would address their parents and other older family members, and T-forms for parents addressing their children or siblings addressing each other, as their relationship is more familial. However, it is worth noting that Petrović did not use the chosen T/V forms consistently, instead she would sometimes switch from the V-form to the T-form in the middle of an interaction. This happened in two similar instances. Elizabeth would normally address her father and her aunt, Mrs. Gardiner, using the "Vi" forms, but in two instances she switched to "ti". This switch appears random, as nothing changes in the relationship between the characters that would justify a change in the way they converse, and they later switch back to V-forms.

Overall, we can conclude that Petrović's translation is far more indirect than that of Odlešić in this aspect, as Odlešić used T-forms notably more often, especially between characters whose relationship is of a more intimate nature, such as Mr. and Mrs. Bennet, being a married couple, and Mr. Bingley and Mr. Darcy, who are very good friends. Though interestingly enough, Odlešić also decided not to use the graphic marker for V-forms, which in Croatian is the capitalized personal pronoun "Vi" and possessive pronouns "Vaš" and the morphological variations thereof.

c) **displacing technique** – In his analysis of Austen's *Emma* and three Italian translations of the novel, Massimiliano Morini (2007) reflected upon Austen's use of the 'displacing' technique, "by means of which [a character] addresses one person while seeming to address another" (16). According to his analysis, this technique is used to make an indirect question or statement, so the use of this technique marked utterances with a lower degree of directness.

Example:

When discussing how giving a ball at Netherfield might affect those residing there, Mr. Bingley

says to his sister: “If you mean Darcy, he may go to bed, if he chuses, before it begins”, thus addressing Mr. Darcy in the third person, despite his being in the room at the time. Such instances were deemed less direct than if the speaker would have simply addressed the person directly.

2.3.5 Other

a) **repetition** – diving into Austen’s writing, I have found that her characters often repeat the same request or question multiple times in a row, without the reader being informed of the other characters reaction, creating a sense of urgency and, therefore, a greater degree of directness in addressing others. This is especially true of Mrs. Bennet and Lady Catherine de Bourgh, the latter of whom, whilst usually giving advice to anyone who will pay her attention, also has the tendency to go into lengthy monologues, in which she asserts her opinion as the right one and her advice as most valuable by repeating it in various forms. This particular trait of Austen’s writing will therefore be taken into account as a factor showing a greater degree of directness.

b) **graphic markers** – As Leech and Short (2015) have pointed out, in the written medium there is a necessary lack of tone and intonation which in everyday conversation plays a crucial role in carrying over one’s point. However, conversational tone can be expressed in the written language through varying degrees of politeness and formality, the way that the characters address each other and, most notably, graphological markers. For example, if a character would stress a word using the tone of their voice and cadence, this word can in a written dialogue be italicized. Another obvious example of a graphological marker is the exclamation point, which marks the speaker raising their voice so as to be better heard and understood. Such examples of use of graphological markers shall contribute to a higher degree of directness of a given utterance.

c) **rhetorical questions** – When a speaker poses a rhetoric question, they automatically express more than the surface meaning of their words by choosing a question form without eliciting an answer. This ambiguous nature of rhetoric questions, ensures that its presence in a speech act will make it less direct.

Example:

At the very beginning of the novel when Mr. Bennet is teasing Mrs. Bennet by refusing to visit Mr. Bingley at his new house, Mrs. Bennet replies “Nonsense, how can you talk so!” Despite the author choosing not to use a question mark (as this is not really a question), the structure of the sentence is that of a question. However, Mrs. Bennet clearly does not expect her husband to answer

her, instead what she is trying to say is “You shouldn’t talk so” or simply “Don’t talk so”. Therefore, this is an indirect directive SA by which Mrs. Bennet is reproaching Mr. Bennet and asking him not to tease her, and the fact that it is in the form of a rhetorical question makes it less direct, though on the whole this utterance falls on the rather direct end of the directness scale.

3. Aim, methodology and hypotheses

3.1 Aim and hypotheses

The aim of this thesis is to explore how the formation of speech acts serves to depict gender roles and relations between characters, as well as to show the use of pragmatic analysis as a translation tool, especially when it comes to literary texts in which gender relations play an important role. To this end, I looked at the expression of directive SAs in Jane Austen’s novel *Pride and Prejudice* and in two Croatian translations of the same novel, one written by Tomislav Odlešić (1997) and the other by Lile Petrović (1997). Specifically, the degree of directness in expressing directive SAs will be examined in order to determine if there is a great difference in the degree of directness used by male characters in comparison to female characters. Since Jane Austen is known and beloved for her ability to show a character’s personality through the way they speak, it is expected that male and female characters show great difference in this respect, which serves to depict gender roles and relations typical of English Georgian society at the turn of the 19th century.

The first hypothesis states that male characters in *Pride and Prejudice* show a greater degree of directness in their use of directive SAs in comparison to female characters. The reason behind this is the fact that men had a more dominant role in society at that time, and this is expected to be reflected in the way they address others, particularly women. However, other factors, such as class and social standing of the characters as well as their age will be taken into account, because these also play a role when it comes to politeness, as Brown and Levinson’s (1994) face-saving theory of politeness explains.

The second hypothesis proposes that directive SAs will show a greater degree of directness in the Croatian translations in comparison to the original text, considering the difference in linguistic and cultural norms between the two languages.

Furthermore, the third hypothesis states that in the translations male characters will produce directive SAs with a greater degree of directness than female characters, as is expected of the original text as well.

Finally, the fourth hypothesis proposes that there will not be a great difference in the degree of directness used in the two translations, despite the difference in the gender of the translators.

3.2 Methodology

3.2.1 Choosing Austen

As previously mentioned, many scholars have taken an interest in different facets of Austen's works. This fact can be attributed to their unique nature as novels of sensibility written at the turn of the 19th century, and presenting a unique female perspective on the role of women in British genteel circles of that time. Additionally, Austen is praised for her skill to imply more than what is said, not only through clever comments as the narrator, but also through the way the characters talk and address each other. However, few studies have concerned themselves with the translation of Austen's works, which is why I take a special interest in it.

When choosing Croatian translations for analysis, I decided on the ones written by Tomislav Odlešić and Lile Petrović, because they were published in the same year. I was unable to find information on why two translations were requested at the same time, and there is also no mention of which edition of the original text they used in their translations. However, we can assume that the slight changes that may have been made in the different editions were not so significant as to impact the translations, and consequently, the findings of this thesis.

3.2.2 Classification of Speech Acts

As previously stated, for the purposes of this research, the adopted taxonomy of SAs is that of John Searle (1979); however, certain aspects have been adapted, considering the particular nature of the material and the restrictions of Searle's views.

A separate category was established under the title Ambiguous Assertives. Utterances that fall into this category are, for example, rhetorical questions and expressions used for the sake of

being polite. Austen's characters often use rhetorical questions to indirectly express their opinion, condemn the actions of other characters, or instruct them in how they should act, but more often than not, a single rhetorical question fulfills multiple of these functions at once. For this reason, the nature of rhetorical questions has been labeled as "ambiguous", and since they are mostly used as guarded statements, they fall under the scope of Assertives.

In a similar vein, it has been noted that Austen's characters often use such expressions as "Might I ask?" or "If you would be so kind...", which sometimes stand alone and other times are embedded in a speech act. In most cases, they are used as openers or closers, and despite often having the formal features of a question, they serve the purpose of marking that the speaker is being polite and respectful. Although this does not constitute a proper assertion, they are better suited for the category of Ambiguous Assertives than for any other category.

Another alteration of Searle's original taxonomy has been made in the category of Expressives, which now also include wishes. Despite often formally corresponding to conditional clauses, which in most cases are used for advising – a type of directive SA – wishes are found to express the speaker's emotional state about a given situation, rather than trying to affect the outside world. In some cases, they might also serve as jabs intended to influence the hearer's behavior or actions, but this aspect can be compensated for through the classification of primary and secondary meanings in indirect SAs. Therefore, wishes will generally be sorted into the Expressives category.

To sum up, the following categories of speech acts will be used in the analysis of the original text:

1. Assertives: this category includes such acts as general statements, opinions, reports, suggestions, and the Ambiguous Assertives subcategory, encompassing rhetorical questions and expressions used for the sake of being polite.
2. Directives: this category includes such acts as orders, requests, advice, and giving and asking for permission, and is the focal point of this thesis.
3. Commissives: this category is composed mainly of promises.
4. Expressives: this category includes such acts as apologies, expressing thanks, congratulations, and wishes.
5. Declaratives: this category includes such acts as firing, marrying, and pronouncing.

3.3 Qualitative analysis

3.3.1 Coding

The first step in testing the hypotheses of this thesis was reading Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* and identifying all speech acts found in the dialogues. The SAs were marked according to the established classification in the encoding program CATMA (*Computer Assisted Text Markup and Analysis*). An overwhelming majority were identified as Assertives, followed by Directives. Moreover, indirect SAs were found across all categories.

All directive SAs were extracted and a corpus of directive SAs and their translation equivalents in the two translations by Odlešić and Petrović was created via MS Excel. A total of 686 directive speech acts was found, among which 270 are questions, 84 are indirect questions and 332 are what will be referred to as ‘true directives’. This last category consists of utterances performing functions such as *advice, request, command, permission, forbidding* and *persuasion*, and has been found more transparent for the purposes of this research in comparison to questions and indirect questions, thus the name ‘true directives’. The final phase of research into the level of directness has been conducted only in this category of directive SAs.

Table 1: an example of coding on a “Direct” utterance

Utterance	gender	indirect	gl. način/m	modal verb	hedgin	please' and	expres	perfori	displac	titles a	T/V foi	repetit	graphii	rhetori	function
Austen Lizzy, I insist upon your staying and hearing Mr. Collins.	Female	No	Declarative/in	Doesn't apply	Doesn't a)	Doesn't apply	No	Yes	No	Direct	Other	Yes	Yes	No	command Direct
Odlešić Lizzy, naredujem ti da ostaneš i saslušas gospodina Collinsa.	Female	No	Declarative/in	Doesn't apply	Doesn't a)	Doesn't apply	No	Yes	No	Direct	Other	Yes	No	No	command Direct
Petrović Lizzy, zahtijevam da ostaneš i saslušas g. Collinsa.	Female	No	Declarative/in	Doesn't apply	Doesn't a)	Doesn't apply	No	Yes	No	Direct	Other	Yes	Yes	No	command Direct

Table 2: an example of coding on an “Indirect” utterance

Utterance	gender	indirect	gl. način/m	modal verb	hedgin	please' and	expres	perfori	displac	titles a	T/V foi	repetit	graphii	rhetori	function	com	int
Austen My dear, I have two small favours to request.	Male	Yes	Declarative/in	Doesn't apply	Indirect	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Indirect	Other	No	No	No	request + assertion	Indirect	
Odlešić Draga moja, moram te zamoliti za dvije male ljubaznosti.	Male	Yes	Declarative/in	Direct	Indirect	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Indirect	Other	No	No	No	request + assertion	Indirect	
Petrović Draga moja, zatražit ću dvije male usluge.	Male	Yes	Declarative/in	Doesn't apply	Indirect	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Indirect	V	No	No	No	request + assertion	Indirect	

Table 3: an example of coding with different degrees of directness; an example of mistranslation

Utterance	gender	indirect	gl. način/m	modal verb	hedgin	please' and	expres	perfori	displac	titles a	T/V foi	repetit	graphii	rhetori	function	
Austen It must make you better satisfied that your other four are single.	Female	Yes	Declarative/in	Direct	Doesn't a)	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't a)	Other	No	No	No	indirect question + advice	Indirect
Odlešić Zato budi zadovoljna što su ostale četiri neudane.	Female	No	imperative	Doesn't apply	Doesn't a)	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't a)	Other	No	No	No	advice	Direct
Petrović To bi Vas moralo veseliti više od činjenice da su ostale još četiri djevojke.	Female	Yes	Kondicionala	Direct	Doesn't a)	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't a)	V	No	No	No	indirect question + advice	Indirect

The directness factors were judged based on the context of the utterance, and they were evaluated according to their transparency and the achieved level of directness, which can be noted in the use of different color codes. The color scale ranges from red to green, the former representing maximum directness, and the latter representing maximum indirectness. For example, the use of a performative verb is marked red, as both Austin (1962) and Searle (1979) found this to be the most direct and literal way of performing a speech act. In contrast, indirect SAs and rhetorical questions are marked green because they guarantee a higher level of indirectness, as has already been

established. Certain directness factors such as adverbs and address forms were less transparent and had to be evaluated according to the context of the utterance. These were coded based on the effect they produce, be it more direct or indirect, and marked by less intense colors – orange for higher levels of directness and light green for indirectness. The color yellow was used as a neutral option in the absence of a given (in)directness marker. A unique formula was developed to count the value of the cells depending on their color (yellow – 0, orange and light green -1, red and green – 2) and, based on the greater numeric value on the directness scale, it would write ‘Direct’ if most factors contributed to greater directness, or ‘Indirect’ if most factors contributed to greater indirectness.

3.3.2 Pragmatic analysis example

In this chapter, an interaction from the novel will be analyzed, so as to show how the degree of directness in directive SAs was determined. Only in the case of ‘true directives’ will the translations also be analyzed, as these were the focal point of the research, and translation equivalents were only extracted and coded in these cases. The conversation in question takes place closely after Mr. Collins proposes to Elizabeth and she refuses him. In her anxiety for Elizabeth to accept the proposal, Mrs. Bennet goes to Mr. Bennet and asks him to change Elizabeth’s mind. The two translations will be marked ‘TO’ for “Odlešić” and ‘TP’ for “Petrović”, and the original text will be referred to as ST (“source text”).

Mrs. Bennet leaves Mr. Collins and hurries over to her husband and says:

*“Oh, Mr. Bennet, you are wanted immediately; (1) we are all in an uproar. (2) You must come and make Lizzy marry Mr. Collins, for she vows she will not have him; and if you do not make haste he will change his mind and not have **her**!” (3)*

Utterance (1) is a direct SA with directive illocutionary force. As the speaker addresses the hearer by using their name, and amplifies the urgency of the expressed request through the adverb ‘immediately’ (see Leech 2014) and the assertive SA (2) that follows, this is considered to be a rather direct SA. The request is then elaborated on in utterance (3), which is also a directive SA. The speaker uses the modal verb ‘must’ which shows a high degree of directness, and explains the

¹ my highlight, originally in italics

motive behind the request through a conditional clause, which is often used to express advice (see Leech 2014) – another possible function of directive SAs. Additionally, the final word is stressed through the use of italics (see Leech and Short 2015), which further contributes to the high level of directness of the utterance.

Utterance (1) was translated as “Oh, Bennete, potreban si nam odmah”, which is structurally very close to the ST, due to the passive voice and the use of the address form “Bennete”, but the T markers and the absence of the title “Mr.” (= “gospodine”) makes this translation even more direct than the ST. In contrast to this, the same utterance in TP – “Oh, g. Bennet, hitno Vas trebam,…” – is decidedly less direct due to the use of V forms and the title “g.” (“gospodine”), following the ST. However, in utterance (3) both translators interpreted the modal ‘must’ through the Croatian equivalent modal ‘morati’: “Moraš otići k Lizzy i nagovoriti je na udaju za gospodina Collinsa jer ona veli da ga neće; ako se ne požuriš, on će se predomisliti, pa više neće ni on htjeti nju” (TO), “Morate doći i natjerati Lizzy da se uda za g. Collinsa jer ona tvrdi da to neće učiniti, a ako ne požurite, on će se predomisliti i više je neće htjeti” (TP). TP is once again slightly less direct than TO due to the difference in T/V forms, but compensates for this factor by preserving the graphological marking of the word “je” (=“her”), which does not appear in TO. Additionally, in TO Mrs. Bennet uses the more colloquial verb ‘veli’ as opposed to TP’s ‘tvrdi’, showing a higher degree of informality, which is consistent with Odlešić’s use of T-forms between married partners, as it shows intimacy and familiarity. In comparison, TP sounds almost distant and cool, stressing the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. Bennet raised his eyes from his book as she entered, and fixed them on her face with a calm unconcern which was not in the least altered by her communication.

“I have not the pleasure of understanding you,” (4) said he, when she had finished her speech. “Of what are you talking?” (5)

Utterance (4) is an indirect SA, primarily an assertive SA politely expressing confusion, and secondarily a directive – an indirect request for clarification. In contrast, utterance (5) is clearly a question, which is a separate subcategory of directive SAs (Searle 1979), because questions automatically demand an answer from the addressee.

“Of Mr. Collins and Lizzy. Lizzy declares she will not have Mr. Collins, and Mr. Collins begins to say that he will not have Lizzy.” (6)

“And what am I to do on the occasion? (7) It seems a hopeless business.” (8)

“Speak to Lizzy about it yourself. (9) Tell her that you insist upon her marrying him.” (10)

In response to Mr. Bennet’s question (5), Mrs. Bennet answers with an assertive SA informing him of what has transpired between Mr. Collins and Elizabeth and what the current situation is (6). Utterance (7) is interesting because, considering Mr. Bennet’s character, it can be interpreted as a rhetorical question - an ambiguous assertive expressing his attitude that there is nothing he can do to amend the situation, which is further underlined by his next statement (8), a straightforward assertive SA. However, Mrs. Bennet either doesn’t catch her husband’s meaning or chooses to ignore it, because her response (9) reads more like a command than as her giving him advice in response to his question (7). We can understand her responding in this way, as she feels he is not taking an active enough interest in the situation and she needs his influence to persuade Elizabeth to change her mind.

Mrs. Bennet’s responses (9) and (10) could be understood as a single speech act, as they are formally similar and perform the same function of a command or request, however I decided to look at them separately because of their formal differences. Utterance (9) is a direct directive SA in the imperative, so it is immediately highly direct, whereas utterance (10) is somewhat more complex, because Mrs. Bennet is telling her husband exactly what to say to their daughter, and thus in a way indirectly posing the request to her. The translations of the former utterance (9) are rather similar: “Porazgovaraj osobno s Lizzy” (TO), “Razgovarajte s Lizzy o tome” (TP). Both are in the imperative form, thus maintaining the level of directness expressed in the ST, the only difference is visible in the T/V forms. The same can be said for the following utterance (10): “Kaži joj da zahtijevaš da se uda za njega” (TO), “Recite da zahtijevate da se uda za njega” (TP) as both are in the imperative, with a visible difference in T/V forms.

“Let her be called down. (11) She shall hear my opinion. (12)”

Mrs. Bennet rang the bell, and Miss Elizabeth was summoned to the library.

“Come here, child, (13)” cried her father as she appeared.

Utterances (11) and (13) are straightforward direct SAs that express requests, though the former shows use of the displacing technique (see Morini 2007), as Mr. Bennet is calling Elizabeth to him by way of asking his wife to do it, and the latter is slightly softened by the use of the affectionate address-form ‘child’ (see Leech and Short 2014) – translated as “dijete” in both TO and TP. Both utterances are in the imperative form, which is preserved in the two identical translations and even further underlined by the use of the Croatian T-pronoun: “Dođi ovamo, dijete.” Utterance (12) is actually an indirect SA, as it is primarily an assertive stating why Elizabeth should be called down, but it also serves as a commissive – a promise to Mrs. Bennet that he will do as she says and talk to Elizabeth.

“I have sent for you on an affair of importance. (14) I understand that Mr. Collins has made you an offer of marriage. Is it true? (15)” Elizabeth replied that it was. “Very well (16)—and this offer of marriage you have refused? (17)”

“I have, sir.” (18)

“Very well. We now come to the point.” (19)

Utterance (14) is a direct assertive SA informing Elizabeth that her father wishes to talk to her about something important. The topic of the conversation is introduced in the following utterance (15) in which Mr. Bennet first asks Elizabeth to confirm the truthfulness of Mrs. Bennet’s report to him, and judging from his use of the hedge “I understand” see (Leech 2014) we can conclude that he doesn’t fully trust his wife and that is why he is asking his daughter for confirmation. Utterance (15) is, therefore, an indirect directive SA with the meaning of question. Elizabeth’s response is not reported directly, but Mr. Bennet’s reaction is in the form of an assertive SA (16) which serves as closing (see Levinson 2019), showing Elizabeth that he understands what happened. This is followed by another question (17) posed in the declarative form with, presumably, rising intonation, judging by the use of the question mark (see Leech and Short 2014). This time Elizabeth’s answer is reported (18) and it is an assertive SA with the notable use of the formal and distant title ‘sir’ instead of, for example, ‘father’ (see Leech and Short 2014), signaling that Elizabeth understands the gravity of the situation, but also that she is standing her ground and wants her parents to respect her decision. Utterance (19) is another closing statement (see Levinson 2019) with which Mr. Bennet concludes that he has been brought to speed and that they have identified the cause of the problematic situation, which should be discussed at this point.

“Your mother insists upon your accepting it. Is it not so, Mrs. Bennet? (20)”

“Yes, (21) or I will never see her again. (22)”

Utterance (20) is an indirect directive SA, since it serves as a question, but Mr. Bennet first states Mrs. Bennet’s opinion and then asks for her confirmation by addressing her directly. The following sentence can actually be split into two SAs, the former (21) being Mrs. Bennet’s confirmation of her husband’s statement, and the latter an indirect SA with both an assertive and commissive function. Namely, Mrs. Bennet is stating what will happen to her relationship with her daughter if she disobeys her, so it functions as a sort of promise with a threatening tone, though Mrs. Bennet is not addressing Elizabeth directly, but instead uses the displacing technique see (Morini 2007) to signal her anger and not wishing to speak to Elizabeth directly.

*“An unhappy alternative is before you, Elizabeth. From this day you must be a stranger to one of your parents. (23) Your mother will never see you again if you do **not**² marry Mr. Collins, and I will never see you again if you do. (24)”*

The first two sentences (23) are assertives, whereby the first serves as an announcement of Mr. Bennet’s decision, and the second is an invitation for Elizabeth to choose one of the two options. Utterance (24) is an indirect SA – primarily it is an assertive SA, a statement of two possible outcomes of the situation at hand, but secondarily we can understand it as a directive SA by which Mr. Bennet is advising Elizabeth not to marry Mr. Collins, as he thinks this is a bad decision and he would be disappointed in her if she were to accept him. The contrast between the opinions of both parents is further underlined by the italicization of the word ‘not’ (see Leech and Short 2014), and the directive force is stressed through the use of the adverb ‘never’ (see Leech 2014). While TP preserves the graphological marking of the stressed word (“Tvoja majka te ne želi više vidjeti ako se *ne* udaš za g. Collinsa,...”) and even goes a step further and stresses the alternative (“a ja te ne želim više vidjeti ako se *udaš* za njega”), TO doesn’t feature any graphological markings. However, both translations preserved the adverb ‘never’ in the Croatian equivalent ‘više / više nikada’, and the whole utterance is made even more direct through the use of the T markers, thus all three versions show a high degree of directness.

² my highlight, originally in italics

Elizabeth could not but smile at such a conclusion of such a beginning; but Mrs. Bennet, who had persuaded herself that her husband regarded the affair as she wished, was excessively disappointed.

*“What do you mean, Mr. Bennet, by talking in this way? (25) You promised me to **insist**³ upon her marrying him. (26)”*

Utterance (25) is an indirect SA and an ambiguous assertive, being a rhetorical question – Mrs. Bennet does not expect an answer from her husband, but rather the question is meant as a reprimand for what he is saying and thus not honoring their agreement. Her disappointment is further underlined by her addressing her husband by name in the middle of the utterance. The following statement (26) is an indirect SA - primarily an assertive reminding Mr. Bennet that he promised to make Elizabeth accept Mr. Collins’ offer, and secondarily an indirect request that he does as promised, further underlined by the stressed word ‘insist’ (italicized). Here we can once again argue that Mrs. Bennet is also posing a displaced request to her daughter through Mr. Bennet. So, although at first glance this utterance seems as a simple statement, it is in fact a very direct request. The level of directness was to a great degree preserved in both translations, though TO again doesn’t preserve the graphological marking of the stressed word, while TP does: “Obećali ste mi da ćete *inzistirati* na braku.” However, TO compensates for this factor through the use of T forms, unlike in TP in which V forms are used between married partners: “Obećao si mi da ćeš zahtijevati da se uda za njega”. Additionally, all three versions of the utterance can be considered highly direct due to repetition being a factor – throughout the scene Mrs. Bennet makes it plain several times that she wants Elizabeth to marry Mr. Collins and tries through various methods of manipulation, threat, ordering and begging to make everybody do her bidding.

“My dear,” replied her husband, “I have two small favours to request. (27) First, that you will allow me the free use of my understanding on the present occasion; (28) and, secondly, of my room. I shall be glad to have the library to myself as soon as may be. (29)”

Although this could all be understood as a single indirect SA, because the pragmatic force behind the statement is that of a request, I have decided to split it into two utterances, due to the differences in the formal structure.

³ my highlight, originally in italics

The first utterance (27) serves as an opening (see Levinson 2019), as it is simply a statement announcing that Mr. Bennet will make two requests, but it cannot be categorized as a directive SA by itself, as no request has yet been expressed. Though the performative verb ‘request’ is used, thus making the whole utterance rather direct (see Austin 1962, Searle 1979), it is counterbalanced by the use of the affectionate nickname ‘my dear’ (see Leech and Short 2015). Additionally, the utterance sounds even more polite and indirect due to the hedge ‘small’ (see Leech 2014), signaling the speaker’s wish not to impose and create conflict. TO version “Draga moja, moram te zamoliti za dvije male ljubaznosti” does feature a pet name (‘draga moja’) and the equivalent performative verb ‘zamoliti’, but the speaker also uses the modal ‘moram’, which contributes to a greater degree of indirectness, making him sound apologizing for making a request, but at the same time highlighting the pressing need and urgency of the request. In contrast, this utterance was translated as follows in TP: “Draga moja, zatražit ću te dvije male usluge”, preserving the nickname and the performative, but at the same time using the future tense. This achieves a completely different effect from TO’s ‘moram zamoliti’, as in TP the request seems less urgent. However, both translations preserve the hedge in the request: ‘male ljubaznosti’ /’male usluge’.

In the next utterance (28), Mr. Bennet asks his wife to ‘allow’ him the use of his room, and this asking for permission appears so extremely polite that it reaches an ironic tone. Moreover, the speaker uses the modal ‘will’ which is also highly direct in comparison to the alternative ‘would’ or ‘may’ (see Leech 2014, Depraetere and Reed 2021). The translations reflect this ironical politeness by using the verb ‘dopustiti’ (= ‘allow’) in the imperative form, thus achieving an even higher degree of directness than the original utterance: “Prvo, dopusti mi da slobodno rasuđujem o tom problemu...” (TO), “Prvo dopustite mi slobodnu procjenu trenutačne situacije” (TP). However, they once again differ in the use of T/V markers.

Finally, in utterance (29) Mr. Bennet directly, but politely, expresses his request to be left alone and implies that he does not wish to discuss this subject any longer. The use of the modal ‘shall’ is once again a choice guaranteeing a higher level of directness than, for example ‘should’ or ‘would’ (see Depraetere and Reed 2021). The phrase ‘I shall be glad’ is also extremely polite (Leech 2014), but his sense of urgency is underlined by the adverbial ‘as soon as may be’. In contrast, the equivalent utterance in TO is far more direct, as certain parts are omitted, leaving a single shorter sentence: “...i drugo, želim što prije biti sam u ovoj knjižnici.” Though the Croatian

modal ‘željeti’ and the expression ‘be glad to’ have a similar meaning, in this context this modal is more direct and sounds final. Additionally, TO preserves the adverbial of urgency, which is translated as ‘što prije’. In comparison, TP is practically a calque of the original utterance on the level of sentence structure: “...i drugo, slobodno korištenje moje sobe. Bit će mi drago da me ostavite samog u knjižnici što je prije moguće.” The expression ‘shall be glad to’ is directly translated in the future tense, leaning on the semantic aspect of the modal ‘shall’ to express future: ‘bit će mi drago’. The adverbial is also preserved in the phrase ‘što je prije moguće’. In conclusion, TP and the original are both rather indirect, while TO is highly direct.

3.4 Summary of the findings

The qualitative analysis of ‘true directives’ yielded the following results. Out of the total 332 items extracted from the ST, two items did not have a translated equivalent in TO and one was missing in TP. In the original text, 248 utterances were made by a female speaker, and 84 were made by a male speaker. This great disparity in the number of directive utterances can be attributed to two characters who produced a major part of directive SAs found: Mrs. Bennet and Lady Catherine de Bourgh, but I will elaborate on that later.

Table 3 – Number of “Direct” and “Indirect” utterances according to the speaker’s gender

Texts	Gender	“Direct”	“Indirect”
Austen	F	175	73
	M	47	37
Odlešić	F	182	65
	M	52	31
Petrović	F	178	69
	M	48	36

The analysis of the extracted data has shown that female characters display a higher degree of directness in directive SAs in comparison to male characters. In the ST, 67.2% of all ‘true’ directives were labeled as “Direct” and 32.8% as “Indirect”, in the TO 70.9% of all utterances were “Direct” and 29.1% were “Indirect”, and finally in the TP 68.3% of the utterances were

“Direct”, leaving 31.7% as “Indirect”. TO shows a greater degree of directness than was used in the ST, though the difference is not statistically significant. The fact that there isn’t a great disparity between the three texts shows that both authors stayed true to the nuances and implications of the original text. Out of the 84 directive SAs made by male characters in the ST, 47 were “Direct” (56%) and 37 were “Indirect” (44%), whereas out of the 248 directive SAs made by female characters, 175 were “Direct” (70.6%) and 73 were “Indirect” (29.4%). Out of the 247 extracted directive SAs made by female speakers in TO, 182 (73.7%) were “Direct” and only 65 (26.3%) were “Indirect”. As for the directive SAs made by male characters, a total of 83 was found, 52 were “Direct” (62.7%) and 31 (37.3%) were “Indirect”. In TP the total number of directive SAs made by female characters was 247, 178 of which were “Direct” (72.1%) and 69 were “Indirect” (27.9%). Out of the 84 directive SAs made by male speakers, 48 were “Direct” (57.1%) and 36 were “Indirect” (42.9%). TP displayed the lowest degree of directness overall, and this shows a significant difference between the two translations, though this disparity cannot be wholly attributed to the gender of the translators, but also to their interpretations of the ST.

The findings of this analysis show that the first and third hypotheses were incorrect, as male speakers displayed a lower degree of directness when expressing directive SAs in comparison to female speakers across all three texts. Since TO had a higher frequency of Direct utterances in comparison to ST, this proves the second hypothesis, stating that Croatian translations would be more direct than the original text. However, TP showed the lowest degree of directness in comparison to the other two texts, especially when it comes to TO, which was the problem expressed in the fourth hypothesis. Unfortunately, this disparity cannot be attributed solely to the difference in genders, as there is a number of factors that need to be taken into account, such as the interpretation of the translator, their research into the socio-linguistic conventions of 19th century England, and the purpose of their translation. In conclusion, both translators managed to preserve the implications and tone of the original text in most cases, which has been proven by the conducted pragmatic analysis.

The unexpected disparity in the degree of directness employed by the female and male speakers can be attributed to the character types found in both categories. The principal male characters in the novel are Mr. Darcy and Mr. Bennet. Despite speaking from a position of power resulting from their gender, as well as their class and age, respectively, they both performed rather

indirect directive utterances. In the case of the former, this can be explained due to his reserved and proud disposition, whereas the latter enjoys making snide and sarcastic comments as a part of his sense of humor. As for the female characters, a great number of extracted directive SAs were made by Lady Catherine de Bourgh and Mrs. Bennet, both of whom are older women who enjoy giving orders and expressing their opinion about everybody's life/behavior, which is why they have no scruple with expressing their wishes directly.

4. Conclusion

This thesis offers a comparative analysis of directness in expressing directive speech acts in Jane Austen's novel *Pride and Prejudice* and two Croatian translations of the novel, written by Tomislav Odlešić (1997) and Lile Petrović (1997). In order to define the notion of 'directness', an overview of literature and theories concerning speech act theory, conversational implicature and politeness theory was provided.

Though the terms 'direct' and 'indirect' have been used throughout these various fields of pragmatic topics, I was able to establish certain overlaps and similarities and I summarized them under thirteen factors that were evaluated in order to determine the degree of directness in a given utterance. Those factors are the following: indirect SAs, grammatical mood/"glagolski način", the use of modal verbs, hedging, the use of 'please' and adverbs of amplification, expressions used for the sake of politeness, performative verbs, the displacement technique, forms of address, T/V forms, repetition, graphological markers and the use of rhetorical questions. After categorizing all SAs in the original text according to a modified version of Searle's taxonomy of SAs, directive SAs were extracted and sorted into questions, indirect questions and 'true' directives. A corpus of utterances belonging in the latter category and their translation equivalents was made and evaluated according to the 13 directness factors.

The findings show that directive SAs performed by female characters displayed a greater degree of directness in comparison to those made by male characters across all three texts. Moreover, the ratio of 'Direct' and 'Indirect' utterances was fairly similar in all three texts. However, the translation written by Odlešić proved to be more direct than the original text, and there was a noticeable difference in the level of directness between the two translators, whereby Petrović chose more indirect forms in the majority of cases, whereas Odlešić chose more direct

translation solutions. However, it is not possible to attribute this disparity solely to the translator's gender, as it also depends on their interpretation and research into the original text.

This thesis proves the usefulness and value of pragmatic analysis in the translation of works with pragmatically complex dialogues, such as period pieces, whose atmosphere and storylines are determined by the socio-cultural norms of the time period in which they take place. This is especially true for overt translations, whose very nature dictates that the translator keeps the nuances and connotations of the original text and transposes them as faithfully as possible into the target culture.

Bibliography

Primary sources:

- Austen, Jane. 1997. *Ponos i predrasude*. Translated by Lile Petrović. Zagreb: Fidas.
- . 1997. *Ponos i predrasude*. Translated by Tomislav Odlešić. Zagreb: Katarina Zrinska.
- . 2009. *Pride and Prejudice*. New York: Greenwich House.

Secondary sources:

- Alamoudi, Abdulrhman Saleh et al. 2021. "Conversational Implicature in Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*: A Pragmatic Analysis of the Bennet's Discourse." *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research* 04. doi:1047191.
- Austin, John L. 2009. *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Penelope. 2019. "Chapter 20: Politeness and Impoliteness." In *The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics*, by Yan Huang, 383-399. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1994. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Roger, and Albert Gilman. 1960. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity." In *Style in Language*, by T. A. Sebeok, edited by T. A. Sebeok, 253-276. MIT Press.
<http://www.mapageweb.umontreal.ca/tuitekj/cours/2611pdf/brown-gilman-pronouns.pdf>.
- Cutting, Joan. 2002. "Speech acts and power." In *Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for students.*, by Joan Cutting, 119-122. Florence: Routledge.
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/keris/Doc?id=10016807&page=13> .
- Depraetere, Ilse, and Susan Reed. 2021. "Mood and Modality in English." In *The Handbook of english linguistics*, by Bas Aarts, April McMahon and Lars Hinrichs, edited by Bas Aarts, April McMahon and Lars Hinrichs, 207-228. West Sussex: Blackwell Pub.
- Gao, Haiyan. 2013. "Jane Austen's ideal man in *Pride and Prejudice*." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 384-388. doi:104304.

- Gordon, David P., and George Lakoff. 1971. "Conversational postulates." *Paper presented to the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago.
- Grice, H. P. 1982. "Logic and Conversation." In *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Arts*, by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- House, Juliane. 1998. *Politeness and Translation*. Vol. 12, in *Topics in Translation: The Pragmatics of Translation*, by Leo Hickey, 54-71. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hua, Chen. 2013. "Critical discourse analysis of women language at the lexical level in Sense and Sensibility." *Social Sciences and Humanities* 347-361.
[http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.4\(2\)/2013\(4.2-37\).pdf](http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.4(2)/2013(4.2-37).pdf).
- 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*, by Claudia W. Corum, Thomas Cedric Smith-Stark and Ann Weiser, edited by Claudia W. Corum, Thomas Cedric Smith-Stark and Ann Weiser, 292-305. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- . 2014. *The pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey N., and Mick Short. 2015. "Conversations in the Novel." In *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*, by Geoffrey N. Leech and Mick Short, 231-254. London: Routledge.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2019. "Chapter 10: Speech Acts." In *The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics*, by Yan Huang, 199-216. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ma, Xiaoyu. 2016. "A Case Study on Characters in *Pride and Prejudice*: From Perspectives of Speech Act Theory and Conversational Implicature." *International Journal of English Linguistics* 6 (4): 136-143. doi:105539.
- Mardiani, Ridha, and Bela Sonia Leviani. 2022. "Speech Acts Analysis of *Pride and Prejudice* Novel by Jane Austen." *Jurnal ilmiah fakultas keguruan dan ilmu pendidikan* 8 (1): 137-147. doi:1035569.

- Morini, Massimiliano. 2007. "Say what you mean, mean what you say: a pragmatic analysis of the Italian translations of Emma." *Language and Literature* (SAGE Publications) 6 (1): 5-19.
- . 2014. *The pragmatic translator: an integral theory of translation*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Müller, Wolfgang G. 2018. "Irony in Jane Austen: A Cognitive-Narratological Approach." In *How To Do Things With Narrative: Cognitive and Diachronic Approaches*, by Jan Alber and Greta Olson, edited by Jan Alber and Greta Olson, 43-64. Boston: De Gruyter. doi:101515.
- Nadeau, Katherine. 2009. "Jane Austen's Persuasion: A Study in Literary History." *Digital Commons RIC*. November 12. Accessed 06 28, 2023. https://digitalcommons.ric.edu/honors_projects/2/.
- Nelles, William. 2014. "Jane's Brains: Austen and Cognitive Theory." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies* 16 (1): 6-29. doi:105325.
- Normandin, Shawn. 2022. *Jane Austen and literary theory*. London: Routledge.
- Papafragou, Anna. 2008. *Modality: Issues in the semantics-pragmatics interface*. Bingley: Emerald.
- Searle, John R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suryanikova, Citra, and Novita Julhijah. 2018. "Directive speech acts and hedges presented by female main characters of Jane Austen's novels." *Lingua Cultura* 12 (4): 345-350. doi:1021512.
- Wilkes, Cristopher. 2013. *The small, secret sociology of Jane Austen*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Yu, Xin. 2006. "Money and Marriage - The Matrimonial Value Orientation in Pride and Prejudice." *Science and technology* 132-133.
- Zhao, Hong. 2011. "A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to Verbal Irony: A Case Study of Ironic Utterances in Pride and Prejudice." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (1): 175-82. doi:101016.

	Austen Well, then, you need not be under any alarm. Odešić Dobro, nemaš razloga za strah.	Female	No	Declarative/inc	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	No	No	No	persuasion	Direct
	157 Petrović Tada se ne moraš bojati. Austen Elizabeth, you are not serious now. Odešić Elizabeth, ti nisi ozbiljna.	Female	No	Declarative/inc	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	No	No	No	persuasion	Direct
	158 Petrović Elizabeth, sada nisi ozbiljna. Austen Perhaps it will be as well if you discourage his coming here so very often. Odešić Možda bi bilo dobro da se pobrineš da on ne dolazi ovamo tako često.	Female	Yes	Declarative/inc	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Direct	Other	No	No	No	request + assertion	Indirect
	159 Petrović Možda bi bilo jednako dobro da ga ne ohrabruješ na česte posjete. Austen At least you should not remind your mother of inviting him. Odešić Barem ne podsjećaj majku da ga poziva.	Female	Yes	Kondicional	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	No	No	No	request + assertion	Direct
	160 Petrović Barem majku ne bi trebala podsjećati da ga pozove. Austen But do not imagine that he is always here so often. Odešić No, nemoj misliti da je on ovdje uvijek ovako često.	Female	No	Declarative/inc	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	No	Yes	No	advice	Direct
	161 Petrović Ali nemojte misliti da on inače često dolazi. Austen I shall depend on hearing from you very often, Eliza. Odešić Nadam se da ćeš mi vrlo često pisati, Lizzy.	Female	No	Kondicional	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	No	No	No	advice	Direct
	162 Petrović Nadam se da ćeš mi često pisati, Eliza. Austen And I have another favour to ask. Will you come and see me? Odešić Htjela bih te još nešto zamoliti. Hoćeš li me doći posjetiti?	Female	Yes	Imperative	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Direct	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	No	No	No	persuasion + assertion	Direct
	163 Petrović Mollia bih te za još jednu uslugu. Hoćeš li me doći posjetiti? Austen Promise me, therefore, to come to Hunsford. Odešić Stoga mi obećaj da ćeš ti doći u Hunsford.	Female	Yes	Imperative	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	No	No	No	persuasion + assertion	Direct
	164 Petrović Stoga mi obećaj da ćeš doći u Hunsford. Austen My father and Maria are to come to me in March, and I hope you will consent to be of the party. Odešić Otac i Maria doći će mi u ožujku i nadam se da ćeš pristati pridružiti im se.	Female	No	Imperative	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Direct	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	Yes	No	No	request	Direct
	165 Petrović Otac i Maria doći će k meni u ožujku i nadam se da ćeš im se pridružiti. Austen If you will only tell me what sort of girl Miss King is, I shall know what to think. Odešić Rekneš li mi samo kakva je djevojka gospođica King, znač ću što treba misliti.	Female	Yes	Declarative/inc	Doesn't apply	Direct	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Direct	Other	No	No	No	request + wish	Direct
	166 Petrović Kad bi mi samo rekla kakva je djevojka gđica King, znala bih što da mislim. Austen Well, have it as you choose. Odešić Dobro, neka bude kako ti hoćeš.	Female	Yes	Declarative/inc	Doesn't apply	Direct	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Direct	Other	No	No	No	request + wish	Direct
	167 Petrović Dobro, ne k' vam bude. Austen Take care, Lizzy; that speech savours strongly of disappointment. Odešić Pazi, Lizzy, ono što si rekla jako miriš na razočaranost.	Female	Yes	Kondicional	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Direct	No	No	No	Direct	Other	No	No	No	request + wish	Direct
	168 Petrović Pripazi, Lizzy, tvoje riječi snažno odišu razočaranjem. Austen I pray make haste and come into the dining-room, for there is such a sight to be seen! ... Make haste! Odešić Požuri se u blagovonicu, vidjet ćeš nešto vrlo neobično. ... Požuri odmah dolje.	Female	No	Imperative	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Direct	No	No	No	Direct	Other	No	No	No	request + wish	Direct
	169 Petrović Molim te požuri i sidi u blagovonicu jer se tamo doista ima što vidjeti! ... Požuri i odmah sidi. Austen Only look at her. Odešić Pogledaj je samo.	Female	No	Imperative	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Direct	No	No	No	Direct	Other	Yes	Yes	No	request	Direct
	170 Petrović Samo je pogledaj. Austen Do not make yourself uneasy, my dear cousin, about your apparel. Odešić Draga moja rođakinja, nemojte se osjećati nelagodno zbog svoje odjeće.	Female	No	Imperative	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Direct	No	No	No	Direct	Other	No	No	No	request	Direct
	171 Petrović Nemojte se osjećati nelagodno, draga moja rođakinja, zbog svoje odjeće. Austen I would advise you merely to put on whatever of your clothes is superior to the rest, then Odešić Savjetovao bih vam samo da odjenete svoju najljepšu haljinu, pa vam ništa drugo ne treba.	Female	No	Imperative	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Direct	No	No	No	Direct	Other	No	No	No	request	Direct
	172 Petrović Savjetovao bih vam da jednostavno odjenete najbolju opravu koju imate, nema potrebe ni za čim Austen Oh then—some time or other we shall be happy to hear you. Odešić Onda ćemo jednom zgodom imati zadovoljstvo čuti vas.	Female	No	Kondicional	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Direct	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	No	No	No	advice	Indirect
	173 Petrović Oh tada, prije ili kasnije, bit će nam drago da Vas čujemo. Austen Our instrument is a capital one, probably superior to—you shall try it some day. Odešić Naš glasovir je prvorazredan, vjerojatno je bolji nego... Iskušat ćete ga jednog dana.	Female	Yes	Declarative/inc	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	No	No	No	request + assertion/wish	Indirect
	174 Petrović Naše glazbalo je veoma dobro, vjerojatno bolje od... Trebate ga isprobati jednog dana. Austen You cannot be more than twenty, I am sure,—therefore you need not conceal your age. Odešić Uvjerena sam da vam nije više od dvadeset, pa stoga nije potrebno da tajite svoje godine.	Female	Yes	Declarative/inc	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	No	No	No	request + assertion/wish	Indirect
	175 Petrović Ne možete imati više od dvadeset godina, sigurna sam, i stoga nema potrebe da krijete svoje godine. Austen Let me hear what it is. Odešić Da čujem.	Female	Yes	Declarative/inc	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	No	No	No	advice + assertion	Indirect
	176 Petrović Reci mi da čujem o čemu se radi. Austen Then pray speak aloud. Odešić Onda, molim te, govori glasno.	Female	No	Imperative	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Direct	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	Yes	No	No	request	Direct
	177 Petrović Onda, molim te, govori glasno. Austen I must have my share in the conversation, if you are speaking of music. Odešić Moram sudjelovati u razgovoru ako je riječ o glazbi.	Female	No	Imperative	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Direct	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	Yes	No	No	request	Direct
	178 Petrović Moram sudjelovati u razgovoru ako govorite o glazbi. Austen ...and pray tell her from me, that she cannot expect to excel, if she does not practise a great deal. Odešić Molim te, poruči joj od mene da ne može očekivati nikakav velik uspjeh ako ne bude mnogo vježbala.	Female	Yes	Declarative/inc	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	Yes	Doesn't apply	Other	Yes	No	No	request + assertion	Indirect
	179 Petrović Molim te, reci joj u moje ime da ne može očekivati sjajne uspjehe bez veoma mnogo vježbanja. Austen I assure you, madam, that she does not need such advice. Odešić Uvjeravam vas, gospođo, da njoj nije potreban takav savjet.	Female	No	Imperative	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Direct	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	Other	Yes	No	No	request + assertion	Indirect
	180 Petrović Uvjeravam Vas, gospođo, da ona ne treba takvog savjeta. Austen I have told Miss Bennet several times, that she will never play really well, unless she practise a great deal. Odešić Rekla sam gospođici Bennet više puta da nikad neće svirati uistinu dobro ako ne bude više vježbala.	Female	Yes	Declarative/inc	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	Yes	Doesn't apply	Other	Yes	No	No	request + assertion	Indirect
	181 Petrović Više puta sam rekla gđici Bennet da nikad neće uistinu dobro svirati ako ne bude više vježbala. Austen ... and though Mrs. Collins has no instrument, she is very welcome, as I have often told her, to accompany me. Odešić Budući da gospođa Collins nema glasovir, kazala sam joj nekoliko puta da može dolaziti svaki dan.	Female	Yes	Declarative/inc	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	Yes	Doesn't apply	Other	Yes	No	No	advice + assertion	Indirect
	182 Petrović Kako gđa Collins nema glazbalo, ona je u Rosingsu dobrodošla. Više puta sam joj rekla da svakodnevno	Female	Yes	Declarative/inc	Direct	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Yes	No	Yes	Doesn't apply	Other	Yes	No	No	advice + assertion	Indirect

	Austen <i>Prost</i> is all to be forgot. Odlešić <i>Prošlost</i> treba zaboraviti.	Female Female	Yes Yes	Declarative/inc Declarative/inc	Doesn't apply Direct	Doesn't apply Direct	No No	No No	No No	Doesn't apply Other	No No	Yes No	No No	advice/request + assertion advice/request + assertion	Direct Indirect
314	Petrović To sve treba zaboraviti. Austen Oh, Lizzy, do any thing rather than marry without affection. Odlešić Oh, Lizzy, ne možeš učiniti ništa gore nego da se udaš bez ljubavi.	Female Female Female	Yes No No	Declarative/inc Imperative Declarative/inc	Direct Doesn't apply Direct	Doesn't apply Direct Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	advice/request + assertion advice advice	Direct Direct Direct
315	Petrović Oh, Lizzy! Napravi sve, samo se nemoj udati bez ljubavi. Austen My dearest sister, now <i>be</i> serious. I want to talk very seriously. Odlešić Najmilija sestro moja, uozbilji se. Hoću da ozbiljno razgovaramo.	Female Female Female	No No No	Imperative Imperative Imperative	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Direct Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Direct Indirect Indirect	Other Yes Yes	Yes No Yes	No No No	advice request request	Direct Direct Direct
316	Petrović Draga sestro, budi ozbiljna! Želim ozbiljno razgovarati. Austen Let me know every thing that I am to know, without delay. Odlešić Odmah mi kaži sve što trebam znati.	Female Female Female	No No No	Imperative Imperative Imperative	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Direct Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Indirect Other Doesn't apply	Yes No No	Yes No No	No No No	request request request	Direct Direct Direct
317	Petrović Ispričaj mi sve, odmah. Austen Lizzy, you must walk out with him again, that he may not be in Bingley's way. Odlešić Lizzy, moraš opet ići u šetnju s njim da ne bi smetao gospodinu Bingleyju.	Female Female Female	No No No	Imperative Declarative/inc Declarative/inc	Doesn't apply Direct Direct	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Direct Other Direct	No No No	No No No	No No No	request request request	Direct Direct Direct
318	Petrović Lizzy, moraš opet s njime u šetnju kako ne bi smetao Bingleyju. Austen I advise Mr. Darcy, and Lizzy, and Kitty, to walk to Oakham Mount this morning. Odlešić Savjetujem gospodinu Darcyju, Lizzy i Kitty da odšetaju danas do brda Oakham.	Female Female Female	No No No	Declarative/inc Declarative/inc Declarative/inc	Direct Direct Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Direct Other Direct	No No No	No No No	No No No	request request request	Direct Direct Direct
319	Petrović Preporučam g. Darcyju, Lizzy i Kitty, da jutros odšetaju do Oakham Mounta. Austen It is all for Jane's sake, you know; and there is no occasion for talking to him except just now and then. Odlešić To činiš, znaš, zbog Jane; nije potrebno da ga stalno zabavljaš razgovorom, nego samo povremeno	Female Female Female	No No No	Declarative/inc Imperative Imperative	Doesn't apply Direct Direct	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No No No	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Direct Other Direct	No No No	No No No	No No No	request/advice request/advice request/advice	Direct Direct Direct
320	Petrović No nadam se da se ne ljutiš, to je za Janeino dobro, znaš, a s njim i ne moraš prestano govoriti. Austen Go to your father; he wants you in the library. Odlešić Idite k ocu, čeka vas u knjižnici.	Female Male Male	No No No	Imperative Imperative Imperative	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Direct Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	request/advice request/advice request/advice	Direct Direct Direct
321	Petrović Idite ocu, čeka Vas u knjižnici. Austen You do not know what he really is; then pray do not pain me by speaking of him in such terms. Odlešić Ti ne znaš kakav je zapravo, pa te stoga molim da mi ne zadaješ bol takvim riječima o njemu.	Female Female Female	No Yes Yes	Imperative Declarative/inc Imperative	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No Yes No	No No No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	request + assertion request + assertion request + assertion	Direct Direct Direct
322	Petrović Vi ne znate kakav je on uistinu, stoga Vas molim, ne zadajte mi bol govoreći tako o njemu. Austen But let me advise you to think better of it. Odlešić No dopusti da ti preporučim da se predomisliš.	Female Male Male	Yes No No	Imperative Declarative/inc Declarative/inc	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No Yes Yes	No Yes No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	request + assertion advice advice	Direct Direct Direct
323	Petrović No, dopusti da te posavjetujem da još jednom razmisliš. Austen My child, let me not have the grief of seeing you unable to respect your partner in life. Odlešić Dijete moje, poštedi me patnje da gledam kako ne možeš poštivati svog životnog druga.	Female Male Male	No Yes Yes	Imperative Imperative Imperative	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Indirect Other Indirect	No No No	Yes No No	No No No	request/advice + assertion request/advice + assertion request/advice + assertion	Indirect Direct Direct
324	Petrović Dijete moje, ne dopusti da vidim kako ne poštuješ svoga životnog druga. Austen If any young men come for Mary or Kitty, send them in, for I am quite at leisure. Odlešić Ako kakvi mladići dođu po Mary i Kitty, pošalji ih ovamo, baš nemam nikakva posla.	Female Male Male	No No No	Imperative Imperative Imperative	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	request request request	Direct Direct Direct
325	Petrović Ako neki mladić dođe po Mary ili Kitty, pošalji ga ovamo jer sam vrlo dobre volje. Austen you must and shall be married by a special license. Odlešić X	Female Female Female	No No No	Imperative Declarative/inc Declarative/inc	Doesn't apply Direct Direct	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Doesn't apply	Yes No No	No No No	No No No	advice/request advice/request advice/request	Direct Direct Direct
326	Petrović Moraš se i vjenčati i vjenčat ćeš se po posebnoj dozvoli. Austen But, my dearest love, tell me what dish Mr. Darcy is particularly fond of, that I may have it tomorrow. Odlešić Najdraža ljubavi moja, reci mi koje jelo gospodin Darcy osobito voli, da mu se spremi za sutra.	Female Female Female	No No No	Imperative Imperative Imperative	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Indirect	Yes No No	No No No	No No No	advice/request request request	Direct Direct Direct
327	Petrović Ali, najdraža, reci mi koje je omiljeno jelo g. Darcyja da ga mogu sutra pripremiti. Austen Now be sincere; Odlešić Budi sada iskren;	Female Female Female	No No No	Imperative Imperative Imperative	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Direct Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	request request request	Direct Direct Direct
328	Petrović Budite iskreni... Austen But make a virtue of it by all means. Odlešić No prikaži to kao vrlinu.	Female Female Female	No No No	Imperative Imperative Imperative	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	request request request	Direct Direct Direct
329	Petrović Ali dobro, gledajte na to kao na vrlinu. Austen My good qualities are under your protection, and you are to exaggerate them as much as you can. Odlešić Moje su dobre osobine pod tvojom zaštitom i možeš ih uveličavati koliko god je moguće.	Female Female Female	No No No	Imperative Imperative Imperative	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	request request request	Direct Direct Direct
330	Petrović Vi tako i tako mislite o meni samo dobro i možete do mile volje uveličavati moje vrline... Austen You need not distress yourself. Odlešić Nemaš razloga žalosti ti se.	Female Male Male	No No No	Imperative Declarative/inc Imperative	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Doesn't apply Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	request persuasion/advice persuasion/advice	Direct Direct Direct
331	Petrović Nemojte se uzrujavati. Austen But it ought to be done; and if you will give me a sheet of paper it shall be done directly. Odlešić No to treba učiniti, pa ako mi dadeš list papira, odmah ću se latiti tog posla.	Female Male Male	No Yes Yes	Imperative Declarative/inc Declarative/inc	Doesn't apply Direct Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply Direct Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	Doesn't apply Other Doesn't apply	No No No	No No No	No No No	request request + assertion/promise request + assertion/promise	Direct Direct Direct
332	Petrović Ali, to treba učiniti, i to odmah, ako mi date list papira.	Female	Yes	Declarative/inc	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	Doesn't apply	No	No	No	request + assertion/promise	Indirect