

Maria ANTONIOU*

Cultural Ethos Constructed in Press Titles and Their Translation: The Case of Political Discourse

“Discovering the principles of language usage may be largely coincident with discovering the principles out of which social relationships, in their interactional aspect, are structured: dimensions by which individuals manage to relate to others in particular ways”.
(Brown & Levinson, 1987)

Abstract

The present study explores, from a contrastive point of view, the conditions that rule the political discourse in terms of linguistic politeness. By contrasting the data (examples drawn from press titles, mainly the French journal *Le Monde Diplomatique* and its' translations into Greek), we will be able to discover the underlying operations and constraints that regulate the use of such markers and to reach conclusions about the existence or not of symmetrical uses of our two languages. The theoretical framework followed is that of Brown and Levinson and the one of the Theory of Enunciation.

In the case of press titles translation, despite the possibility of using symmetrical structures in source text as well as in target text, different structures are mostly preferred. This discrepancy leads to hypothesis about different linguistic attitudes of each linguistic community reflected explicitly by the use of different syntactic/lexical markers. It is this awareness that enabled Brown and Levinson (1987: 248) to consider cross-cultural variation and recognise that some societies may be oriented towards one or the other type of politeness (i.e. negative or positive)», formulating the so called cultural ethos of each linguistic community.

Keywords: Politeness, Pragmatics, Intercultural Communication, Cultural Ethos, Headlines, Greek.

Introduction

In the field of pragmatics, politeness is a culturally defined phenomenon, sufficiently studied mainly because of its discursive importance and its serious implications in the interper-

* Paris 7-Denis Diderot University, France & Hellenic Open University, Greece,
adoniuom@otenet.gr.

sonal communication. Lakoff (1975, p. 64) defines politeness “as a means of minimizing confrontation in discourse [...] designed specifically for the facilitation of interaction” and explains that “politeness is developed by societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction” (Lakoff, 1989, p. 102).

Presuming that politeness is triggered similarly in all cultures is an assumption that has been rejected long time ago (Fraser¹, 1990; Nwoye, 1992). Lakoff (1973, p.45) had explained that politeness is developed by societies. Moreover, even within the same linguistic community, discrepancy can be observed, consisting in talking about the very same «thing or real-world situation» using descriptions which «may end up sounding utterly unrelated» Lakoff (1973, p. 46). Consequently, what is polite in one culture may be insulting in another. Therefore, literature concerning politeness focuses on linguistic markers, carriers of politeness. Through measuring and comparing those markers across genres of discourse and even cultures, scientists (pragmaticians, semioticians, linguists, etc.) try to decode the system of signs used to express (im)politeness and explain the characteristics of the world we live in, using «our linguistic behavior as a diagnostic of our hidden feelings about things» Lakoff (1975, p. 46).

Even though the analysis of political discourse is scarcely new, the present essay constitutes an attempt to explore the conditions governing political discourse in terms of linguistic politeness, as far as the Greek language is concerned in relation to the French source texts and compared to French language. We examine some linguistic markers with regard to the expression of politeness/impoliteness in French and Greek language. We attend to discover the force of signs, what language use can tell us; what are the underlying operations as well as the constraints regulating the use of such markers. We seek to look beyond the surface features, in order to discover the underlying organization of phenomena. We aim to prove how linguistic markers «guide metapragmatically aware readers into implicated assumptions and implicated conclusions retrieved» (Ifantidou, 2011; Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 1997a).

By contrastingly comparing the data, we reach to conclusions about the existence or not of symmetrical linguistics structures in French and Greek, and, presumably, about the underlying cultural values specific to each language, and, hence, to each linguistic group, in order to evaluate the characteristic of each group. Consequently, we address the subject of the so called cultural ethos (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 297). Moreover, via the comparison of source and target texts, we investigate the conditions and processes behind the linguistic markers that promote or restrict the various signs from reemergence. More precisely, we examine whether the Greek target version promotes patterns which privilege vantage point of politeness or, alternatively, favors options in the target text that do not assume politeness. In other words, we examine the degree of cross-cultural variation allowed between orientation towards positive politeness and negative politeness (Blum-Kulka, 1987).

The framework

Every society embraces certain forms of behavior as accepted and pertinent. Speakers who adjust to these specific socially drawn patterns of politeness are rendering communication successful and appropriate in that particular environment (Lakoff, 1975, 1990; Nwoye, 1992). The goal of politeness is to make all parties feel comfortable with one another.

We use the theoretical framework proposed by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1987) as well as that of the Theory of Enunciation (Culioli, 1974, 1985, 1990, 1999a, 1999b).

A major precept in politeness theory is that, in every day communication, language changes, regulated by the audience, who determines the strategies for compliance (Brown and Levinson, 1987). “Face” is constantly at risk, claimed Goffman (1971, p. 138), thus, in order to achieve our communicative goals, we try first of all not to put our “face” at risk. By extension, all linguistic acts need to be filtered, so that to contain the appropriate amount of the variable “politeness”, avoiding traces of impoliteness, which could lead to not accomplishment of one’s goal (Heng Wang, 2008).

Politeness is therefore “equivalent to *face-work*” (Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 2013, p.16; Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 1997b). Consequently, terms such as *face*, *positive and negative face*², *face threatening acts*, etc. are very frequent and figure among the most debated notions. Offering a short reminder about those terms, face wants is about people’s expectations concerning their public self-image, since one generally assumes these wants will be respected. *Positive face wants* is about being connected, admired, etc., while *negative face wants* is related to the need of independence and the desire not to be imposed upon, according to Brown and Levinson (1987). In such a context, orders/requests, suggestions/advice, reminding, threats/warnings/dares, offers/promises, compliments, expressions of emotions constitute *negative-face threatening acts*, while disapproval, criticism, complaints, accusations, contradictions, disagreements constitute *positive-face threatening acts*.

Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 131) go further proposing a list of 10 strategies that make use of negative politeness: “1) Be conventionally indirect, 2) Question, Hedge, 3) Be pessimistic, 4) Minimize the imposition, 5) Give deference, 6) Apologize, 7) Impersonalize Sayer (S) and Hearer (H), avoid the pronouns «I» and «you», 8) State the FTA as a general rule, 9) Nominalize, 10) Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebteding H”. These strategies are oriented towards hearer’s negative face, tending to “emphasize one’s deference to the addressee” (Huang, 2007, p. 116).

Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 102) list 15 positive politeness strategies: “1) Notice, attend to Hearer (H), 2) Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with hearer), 3) Intensify interest to H, 4) Use in-group identity markers, 5) Seek agreement, 6) Avoid disagreement, 7) Presuppose/raise/assert common ground, 8) Joke, 9) Assert or presuppose S’s knowledge of and concern for H’s wants, 10) Offer, promise, 11) Be optimistic, 12) Include both S and H in the activity, 13) Give (or ask for) reasons, 14) Assume or assert reciprocity, 15) Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)”.

Among others, Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 15) argue that there are three sociological variables that determine the weightiness of a Face Threatening Acts: 1) ‘the social distance’ (D) of Speaker and Hearer (a symmetric relation), 2) the relative ‘power’ (P) of Speaker and Hearer (an asymmetric relation) and 3) the absolute ranking (R) of imposition in the particular culture.

Brown and Levinson (1987, pp. 13-14, p. 48) compare the “cultures of positive politeness”, characterized by small social distance (U.S.A.) with the “cultures of negative politeness”, characterized by stronger hierarchy and greater interpersonal distance (Great Britain, Japan). It is mentionable that Goffman (1967), claiming that participants are required to act within the dictates of the socially required norm of behavior, had begun a similar discussion comparing the U.S.A. conception of face to the Chinese, even without giving more detailed information. As far as the Greek language is concerned, many studies (Marmaridou, 1987; Pavlidou 1994; Sifianou 1992, 2001; Kontossopoulos 1998; Symeon, 2000; Makri-Tsilipakou, 2001; Kanakis, 2007; Bella 2009; Antoniou, 2014a, 2014b) associate it to positive polite-

ness, while others (Kontossopoulos, 1998; Bidaud, 2012) are attributing to the French language a more negative politeness-oriented qualification.

Bayraktaroglu and Sifianou (2001, pp. 3-4) thoroughly demonstrate that “the distinction between ‘positive politeness and negative politeness’ based on the assumed universal needs of every individual to build and protect a social image for him/herself and the strategies allocated to this types of politeness are questioned on the grounds that societies are not similar in the face needs of their members. It is this awareness that enabled Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 248) to consider cross-cultural variation and recognise that some societies may be oriented towards one or the other type of politeness (i.e. negative or positive)”.

All these terms are referring to a variety of social strategies that construct co-operative social interaction across cultures. These remarks empowered Stephens (1992) to provide insights that “meaning is produced in terms of the interrelations between audience, text, other texts and socio-cultural determinations of significance” (pp.115-116), thus joining Yule’s (1996, p. 59) precept that a linguistic interaction is necessarily a social interaction. Furthermore, a connection between those terms and the term of *Intergroup relations* can be established, referring to interactions between individuals in different groups and to interactions taking place between the groups themselves collectively (parameters also studied by organizational theory and social psychology, cf. Kawakami, Amodio & Hugenberg, 2017). This will provide means for comprehending how the subject’s group membership affects his way of describing groups and evaluating their characteristics. For example, directness which connotes sincerity, straightforwardness and cordiality is highly valued among German and Hebrew languages (Katriel, 1986; Wierzbicka, 1991). What is here stated lead Giles (2012) to maintain that codes are strongly embedded in the cultures, their expression being influenced by a variety of social conditions (Philippaki-Warburton 1982, p.106; Oesterreich, 1990, p.122, 1994, p.3; Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1997b, p.70; Chadzisavidis 2000, p.134-135; Sifianou 2001, p. 4 and p.133; Chilton & Schäffner, 2002; Antoniou 2014a).

Let us now focus on some parameters hopefully helpful enough to understand the phenomena under examination. The association of politeness and indirectness has already been established by many linguists: Lyons (1977), Lakoff (1973), Levinson (1983), Brown and Levinson (1987), Crystal (2000 [1980]), Wierzbicka, (1991), Burke (1999), Sifianou (1992, 2001) and Sidiropoulou (1995) as far as Greek language is concerned. It is admitted that the more hierarchical a society is the more its system of politeness is formal and elaborated (Burke 1999). This point had been demonstrated by Brown and Levinson (1987), who put emphasis on the fact that “generally negative politeness realisations are forms useful for social distancing whereas positive politeness realisations are forms of minimising social distance” (p. 130).

Brown and Levinson (1987) consider that the politeness of a formula which contains a potentially threatening act for the *face* (FTA) is proportional to its degree of indirectness. This proposition is crucial to our study. It is obvious that the use of markers of politeness/impoliteness in our examples orientate discourse towards the presence/absence of strong statement (Lakoff, 1973, p. 57), thus towards a polite/ impolite direction, attributing accordingly characterisations to the enunciator and, ergo, to our languages of study.

Politeness and (in)directness are inevitably bound to each other. Culpeper (2013) offers an interesting historical description of politeness in British culture, by establishing an association between indirectness and politeness. He explains that “indirectness undoubtedly was given a boost in British society in the Victorian period, when values relating to the individual such as privacy and self-respect became highly prized” (Culpeper, 2013, p. 12).

Connecting (im)politeness and (in)directness appears to be Sifianou's conclusion (2001, p. 137), as far as the Greek-English couple of languages is concerned: "people are indirect in order to be polite". Sifianou continues indicating that "although indirectness is primarily a sentence level phenomenon, it affects discourse organisation as a whole" (2001, p. 4). In this respect, Philippaki-Warbuton (1982) had already drawn attention to the fact that, in Greek, there is not one typical word order schema (such as Subject-Verb-Object) and that all possible schemas, "all variations are produced by rules that are sensitive to syntactic features of the lexical elements of the preposition and to syntactic and pragmatic elements of the environment" (p. 106).³ This postulate reminds us of Morris' thesis (1938, p. 59) that "semiotic analysis comprises three conveniently distinguishable dimensions: the syntactical, the semantical and the pragmatic".

To enrich our research, we will, as well, use Culioli's (1974, 1985, 1990, 1999a, 1999b) framework of the theory of enunciation, which constitutes a reliable framework to approach a language from a linguistic point of view. It is remarkable that both frameworks, aside from using different approaches and terminology, reach the same conclusions. It is important to give a brief overview of Culioli's theory, in order to clarify the terminology we shall use during our analysis. The uttering act (enunciation) is defined as the production of a certain stream of speech (utterance), by a certain speaker (utterer, also called uttering subject – marked as *S0*-subject zero), at a certain moment in time, the utterance being addressed to a certain receiver (co-utterer) (see also Greimas & Courtés, 1993, p. 6). The uttering moment is seen as point zero/starting reference point, marked as *T0* (time zero). An uttering subject associated with a moment of speech constitutes the uttering situation, symbolized as *Sit0* (situation zero) (see also Antoniou, 2006).

Every utterance is located with relation to *Sit0* either directly or indirectly, the relation of location being either explicit or implicit (Desclés, 1995, p. 10). A temporal adverb such as *yesterday* establishes a relation of directness with the *Sit0* (i.e. *now*) since it is directly located/associated to *Sit0* by a relation that indicates [+prior (to now)]. *Tomorrow* is, also, directly located to *Sit0* by a relation that indicates [+posterior (to now)]. On the contrary, an item such as *beauty*, expressing an idea, is not located/associated directly to *Sit0*. It can, nevertheless, be located indirectly, through the presence of a verb accompanied by a temporal adverb, which will operate the anchoring to a particular situation (*Sit0*).

Methodology

After this overview of the existing literature on the subject, we proceed to a closer analysis of the translation of politeness between Greek and French. We shall try to find the extent to which certain syntactic features are used to fulfil pragmatic criteria of usage, whether syntactic traces of politeness are preserved or not in translation and how the degree of cultural proximity between the source language and the target language can influence the translation process.

Our remarks are based on a broad sample of collected examples, given that our corpus consists of 200 titles of press articles from the French journal *Le Monde Diplomatique* and their translations, dating from 2008 until May 2014. *Le Monde Diplomatique* is a French, left-wing, monthly newspaper, offering analysis and opinion on politics, culture and current affairs. We chose to draw our examples from this newspaper, given that it is a worldwide circulating and famous newspaper, whose translation is available in Greek. These two criteria seem pertinent

enough to lead us to exploring the cultural ethos of our two languages. It is equally understandable that the number of examples retrievable, that is appearing in the present essay, due to the lack of space, are necessarily very limited, but, hopefully, representative.

Undoubtedly, it would be precarious to come to conclusions concerning one language by examining only one type of texts (those treating political discourse). We are attempting to retrieve a plausible interpretation by examining different genres of discourse. In previous studies (Antoniou, 2014a, 2014b, 2015), we put under investigation humorous, sentimental and political discourse texts. As a result, there was overwhelming preference for positive modifications, due to the cultural preference for more positive politeness encounters. We are, at present, trying to advance our research by gradually taking into consideration more genres of texts.

Amongst the markers susceptible to study, we include impersonal and personal structures (orientation of the predicative relation), nominalization and the verbal aspect. As far as the choice of these particular markers is concerned, choosing these particular patterns was a deliberate and inductive choice, due to the high frequency of the phenomena in question among our corpus. It is apparent that these markers figure among the most recurrent in headlines (Chauveau, 2005a; Politis, 2014; Chadzissavidis, 2000). One additional reason consisted in that they contribute in the modification of perspective, a crucial parameter in discourse analysis (Kerbrat-Orrecchioni, 1997a) as well as in journalistic discourse, where the aim is mainly to attract the reader's attention, influence him/her and make financial profit rather than simply to inform (Van Dijk, 1985; Gotovos 1996; Chadzisavidis, 2000; Ifantidou, 2011). Apart that, even Brown and Levinson (1987) integrated these markers [(im)personal structures, nominalization] amongst the strategies that make use of negative politeness. Even from the sociosemiotic framework of critical linguistics, Kress's tenet (1985) comes to confirm our approach, reminding that "not only lexical semantics, but also syntactic structures of texts reveal ideological points of view to be disguised. Syntactic forms, such as active or passive voice, convey ideological perspectives and are hence the indexical signs of an ideology" (p. 31).

Political and journalistic discourse

Politics is a social activity that can be defined according to Chilton (2004, p. 3), "as a struggle for power, between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it". Aside that, it can also be defined as a spectrum of cooperation strategies, "as the practices and institutions that a society has for resolving clashes of interest over money, influence, liberty, and the like", which is also applicable at a micro level, where "there are conflicts of interest, struggles for dominance and efforts at co-operation between individuals, between genders, and between social groups of various kinds" (Chilton, 2004, p. 3).

The first question to answer is why we chose examples from the political discourse and titles of press articles. It is known that besides parliamentary debates, laws, government regulations and other institutional forms of text and talk, political discourse includes propaganda, political advertising, political speeches, media interviews, party programs, etc. (van Dijk 1997a). Schäffner (2004, p. 118) additionally points out that:

"It is generally acknowledged that the mass media play an important role in disseminating politics and in mediating between politicians and the public, also in a critical sense. The topics which qual-

ity newspapers discuss in texts on their front pages, in editorials and comments should therefore be good examples of political texts”.

Generally speaking, it is admitted that media are native to a particular cultural ethos. This implies that media cannot be evaluated apart from culture. They are integral to cultural ethos. By grounding his approach in the crucial question *What does the use of language in contexts we call ‘political’ tell us about humans in general?* Chilton (2004) assumes a link between language, politics and culture. It is unquestionable that Chilton is concerned about language phenomena used by political speakers in order to “imbue their utterances with evidence, authority, and “truth” and, thereby, achieve legitimacy in particular political contexts” (Chilton, 2004, p. 23). Barthes’ (1953) precept that “language is never innocent” is corroborated.

Coming to journalistic discourse and, more precisely to characteristics of headlines, Van Dijk’s (1985, p. 77) claims that “headlines may be used as expedient signals to make effective guesses about the most important information of the text”. Attention is to be drawn to the fact that most article headlines are emotionally marked by their authors, which leads Chadzisavidis (2000, p. 117) to conclude that: a) (headlines) do not only carry information but they also reflect the writer’s emotional and ideological attitude, and b) they intend to attract the reader’s attention and direct it to a certain point. For all the above reasons, headlines are emotionally and ideologically marked texts and not simply concentrated versions of the article following the headline.

Van Dijk’s (1985) assumption is likewise shared by Ifantidou (2011, p.91) who explains that:

“Headlines are often valued less for their summarizing function and more for their role as ‘riveting’ devices. Ambiguous, insinuating, humorous, playful headlines aim at attracting readers’ attention than conveying objective, or complete information”.

Nonetheless Ifantidou’s tenet seems more persuasive, given that it offers a more pertinent explanation about the authors’ intentions: attracting the readers’ attention (see also Ifantidou, 2009), thesis also shared by Chadzisavidis (2000). In addition to this preliminary approach, Chadzisavidis (2000) and Gotovos (1996) provide an even more relevant and realistic allegation about the function fulfilled by headlines, since they explicitly associate the media to financial profit and political influence, both attained through journalistic discourse.

Moreover, journalistic discourse, akin to political discourse, of which the intention is, undoubtedly to convince, even though claiming objectivity, uses language as a means of persuasion and even of control and manipulation (Fragoudaki, 1999; Chadzisavidis, 2000), transforming the espoused «spaciousness» of journalistic discourse into “tightness”, thus constitute a deception for the audience.

According to Chadzisavidis (2000, p. 71), a very common strategy used in the journalistic discourse consists in presenting the event as unique, far beyond imagination. Consequently, as explained by Fragoudaki (1999, pp. 155, 158-159, 170), the audience is asked not to communicate but rather, “through silence and passivity”, to accept and legitimate various exaggerations, since everything is done in the name of “objectivity”, of “information of the public opinion”, of “honesty”, etc. Thus, journalistic discourse, by the use of axiological words and structures (such as *we must*), succeeds in controlling the public opinion, «excluding» any possible doubt on behalf of the audience as pointed out by Fragoudaki (1999). As a result, journalistic discourse claims to be objective, even though it can never be so (Eco, 1999).

Baudrillard (1988) insisted on the deceitfulness of the journalistic discourse, due not to western people’s incapability to understand but rather to their lack of will, the latter one being due

to deindividuation. By deindividuation Baudrillard (1988) implies the process of substitution of one's self-consciousness and action by action taken by mediators (journalists, politicians, etc.). According to Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2013), political texts "are intrinsically of a confrontational nature" (p. 21), thus they are bound by the notion of politeness and impoliteness.

All these parameters taken into account, we proceed to an examination of some linguistic markers that express (im)politeness, some linguistic devices employed by translators in order to register the creation of (in)directness, in order to comply to the Greek audience preferences or, to be more correct, to direct Greek audience towards a precise way of thinking, given that they are treating political discourse. Lakoff (1990) had explained that persuasion strategies differ from one culture to another, thus persuading different audiences about the same thing usually requires different means of persuasion. As explained by Venuti (1998) the inflow of either positive or negative modifications in the target text (translation) constitutes a crucial factor attributing the variable of "domesticating" or "foreignizing" to the translation. Politis (2002) had noticed that journalists usually manipulate audiences, while audiences are completely unaware of the variety of methods used to this purpose (see also Baker, 2006).

Corpus analysis

(a) Orientation of the predicative relation: (Im)personal, (In)direct, (Im)polite

<p>(1) <i>Qu'importe les critiques?</i> [lit. <i>what matter</i> the criticisms?] Guillaume Pitron, February 2014</p>	<p>Άλλα, ποιος νοιάζεται για τις κριτικές; [litt. <i>who cares_inherent-reflexive-verb</i> about the criticisms?] Guillaume Pitron http://www.monde-diplomatique.gr/spip.php?auteur369 (trans. Korina Vassilopoulou), Saturday 8 February 2014</p>
---	--

Examples such as (1) allow us to argue that the Greek translation is less polite comparing to the French original. We can invoke Guillemin-Flescher (1981, p. 486) explaining that:

"When the predication does not concern the origin of the action/process, there is often in French an impersonal construction (*il faudra l'envoyer*), an indefinite pronoun as Co (*on l'a envoyé en colonie de vacances*), an inanimate or a nominalized predicate as Co (*une faiblesse la saisit tout à coup*)".

For our case of study, when, in French, there is an inanimate Subject (henceforth Co) associated with an animate verb (*Qu'importe les critiques ?*), Greek language tends to establish homogeneity: both Co and verb become animate (Marmaridou, 1987; Chuquet and Paillard, 1989). So *Qu'importe les critiques?* [lit. *what matter* the criticisms?] is translated as *ποιος νοιάζεται για τις κριτικές*; [litt. *Who cares_inherent-reflexive-verb* about the criticisms?]. Therefore, while in French the predication does not address the origin of the action, which is obfuscated, in Greek, the abandon of the impersonal construction (containing the inanimate Subject/Co) in favor of a personal one (cf. *Who* instead of *The criticisms*) attributes to the utterance a more direct character, thus more aggressive and less polite (cf. Sifianou, 2001; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Sidiropoulou, 2002; Sifianou, 2008). Groussier and Rivière's (1996, p. 58) hypothesis associating [+animated] and [+determined] is, therefore, verified:

“the quality /animated/ constitutes a superior degree of determination compared to the quality /unanimated/ given that the later can be either *discrete* (discontinuity p.ex. *six daisies*) or *continuous* (continuity p. ex. *coffee, courage*) while the first is only animated/ and therefore more determined”.

It is significant to underline, in the Greek utterance, the presence of the passive form *βοιαζεται* care, which is, also, considered as a mark of negative politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987), given that passive form increases interpersonal distance between interlocutors and is, therefore, associated to distance/formality (Sifianou, 2008). The above observation (i.e. the association passive form to negative politeness) has, in addition, been related to formal/scientific and journalistic discourse (Holton et al., 1999; Sifianou, 2008).

Examples such as (2) lead to similar observations regarding the presence/absence of directness and therefore of politeness:

<p>(2) L’art de <i>gérer</i> un legs encombrant [litt. The art of <i>managing</i> a cumbersome legacy] Laurent Bonelli and Raffaele Laudani, January 2011</p>	<p>(2a) Η τεχνη του να διαχειριζεσαι μια ενοχλητικη κληρονομια [litt. The art of <i>managing_you</i> a cumbersome legacy] Bonelli Laurent and Laudani Raffaele, (trans. Haris Logothetis), May 2014 compare with another possible translation: (2b) Η τεχνη του να διαχειριζεται κανειζ μια ενοχλητικη συμπεριφορα [the art of <i>managing_imperfective aspect one/someone</i> a cumbersome legacy] also compare with: (2c) Η τεχνη του να διαχειριστη κανειζ μια ενοχλητικη συμπεριφορα [the art of <i>managing_perfective aspect one/someone</i> a cumbersome legacy]</p>
---	---

The structure of the example (2) illustrates that the French impersonal infinitive is translated by the 2nd person singular in (2a). In French, the use of impersonal expressions/infininitives, etc. establishes a *rupture* between the enunciator and his utterance, rendering the utterance more indirect/more negatively polite, since the co-enunciator is unmarked/not designated. On the contrary, the Greek utterance establishes a location relative to the co-enunciator (*répérage par rapport à l’énonciateur*, according to Culioli’s terminology) by using markers of the 2nd person singular (Guillemin-Flesche, 1981; Sidiropoulou, 2003; Sifianou, 2008). If so, it is well known that 1st/2nd person markers pronouns constitute “another linguistic device which supports preference for directness in the Greek press” (Sidiropoulou, 1995, p. 294). Consequently, Greek uses different markers to attach the enunciator to his utterance in an explicit way. As consequence of this *absence of distanciation /presence of strong statement*, the utterance becomes more direct, thus more positively polite, because of the use of the 2nd person singular, which constitutes an option among others without, nevertheless, being as *neutral*, or, to be more specific, as negatively polite as the impersonal infinitive structure of the original version.

At this point it is noteworthy to remind our reader that the use of the 2nd person singular is related to what is called *intersubjective relation* (also called *interpersonal relation*) and

which refers to the part of the meaning of an utterance that reflects social relationships between interlocutors (Antoniou, 2004).

The hypothesis that linguistic structure reflects social structure, although quit widespread, has been surmounted by Halliday (2007), who argues that language does not exist merely to reflect social structure. On the contrary, Halliday (2007) argues that there is a deep connection between language and social structure. “Rather we should say that linguistic structure is the realization of social structure, actively symbolizing it in a process of mutual creativity. Because it stands as a metaphor for society, language has the property of not only transmitting the social order but also maintaining and potentially modifying it. (This is undoubtedly the explanation of the violent attitudes that under certain social conditions come to be held by one group towards the speech of others)” (Halliday, 2007, p.255).

Accordingly, different structures allow clauses to realize different interpersonal meanings in text, any change at this feature, either in the original text or in its translation, reflecting modifications in the interpersonal relations and vice-versa. Fairclough (1995) evoked that *conversationalization* consists in using the 2nd person in order to create proximity/closeness and, hence, serve the discourse of the market, which he termed “marketization” (Fairclough, 1992, 1995), referring to the process by which a discourse is changed pursuant to the market model.

It would be appropriate to point out that the Greek language possesses an *impersonal* alternative, such the impersonal pronoun κανεις [ka’nis (=nobody)]+ 3rd person singular, as in (2b) and (2c), which increases the distance among the interlocutors and is, therefore, considered as being orientated as more negatively polite (Charaudeau, 2006; Sifianou, 2008). This would have resulted in the translation να διαχειριζεται κανεις μια ενοχλητικη συμπεριφορα [the art of managing *imperfective aspect one/someone* a cumbersome legacy], which is both completely acceptable and more faithful to the original. It would perfectly convey the author’s intention for indirectness. Nevertheless, not adopting this option constitutes a strategic process of *dramatization*, as demonstrated by Charaudeau (2006). Charaudeau continues attributing the journalistic manipulation operated in headlines to the fact that headlines operate a focalization which brings on scene an event by intensifying it. Politis (2014) also shares this viewpoint, ascribing the use of 1st and 2nd person to the creation of dramatization

Speaking of dramatization, Chadzisavidis (2000) explained that dramatizing constitutes a deformation, a common path leading to accentuating (dramatizing) the event and, hence, *creating certain ways of thinking* (pp.71-72). This deformation actually constitutes a biased approach that conveys to journalistic discourse a sense of spaciousness, which offers an alibi for exculpation of any guilt on behalf of the newspaper. Similarly, Sorning (1988) explained that both the hypothetical equality of utterer and co-utterer and the creation of a friendly environment should be considered among the more successful persuasion strategies, on the condition of adequate linguistic choices (Bakakou-Orfanou, 2008).

<p>(3) Ø Révolte américaine contre les ogres du fast-food [litt. Ø American revolt against the ogre of fast-food] Thomas Frank, February 2014</p>	<p>Η καταρρευση του μυθου των φαστ-φουντ [litt. The demolition of the myth of fast-food] Thomas Frank (trans. Korina Vassilopoulou), 1st March 2014</p>
---	---

Examples such as (3) are also interesting:

In this case, there is still discrepancy in the degree of determination. We claim that, in French, as explained within the theory of enunciation, the zero determiner always refers to the notion and expresses *qualification* (not quantification). Therefore, the Greek version constitutes an alternative pattern which differs in the degree of *markedness* it exhibits: it prefers deictic specificity, appearing through a definite determiner [*H(The)*] instead of a zero determiner (\emptyset) in the original version. Bouscaren and Chuquet (1987, p. 83) explain that:

“The zero determiner (or absence of another mark) followed either by singular or plural, always refers to the notion, that is to the underlying predication of the constructed notional domain. Eg. “oil” = “what is oil” as opposed to what is not oil. It is about the qualitative value of the noun without any quantitative specification”.⁴

Moreover, Bouscaren and Chuquet (1987, pp. 83-84) add that, depending on the context, we interpret the noun as referring either to generality (*généralité*) or to individuals (specific but undetermined), but in both cases zero determiner maintains its main and *qualitative value* of referring to the notion (*renvoi à la notion*).

In the Greek utterance, the definite article *H(The)* indicates a clearly different degree of determination. It is the marker of pinpointing operation (*opération de fléchage*), where the collapse of the fast-food myth is one among others (other collapses), an element that is set apart. The definite article makes of the noun *κατάρρευση* (collapse) a representative of the class of collapses. Consequently, replacing non-determined elements with more determined ones influences *the degree of qualification/determination* and renders the utterance more direct and, thus, less negatively polite, as already argued.

(b) Verbal aspect

Examining further the example (2), more interesting assumptions can be drawn as far as politeness is concerned. It is worth taking into consideration another relevant point, which concerns the incidence of the verbal aspect in Greek. *Διαχειρίζεσαι/διαχειρίζεται* (in 2a and 2b) is in the *imperfective aspect*, while *διαχειρίζεται* (in 2c) is in the *perfective aspect*.

In Greek, the use of the *imperfective aspect* appears normal in this context (*να διαχειρίζεται/να διαχειρίζεται κανείς*). The use of the *perfective aspect* (*να διαχειρίζεται/διαχειρίζεται κανείς*) would not have been possible. It would seem quite peculiar. This is the reason why the existence of this readily available option (the perfective aspect) is not actually used, since it does not register culturally compatible cognitive schemata. The explanation to this distinction is offered by Sidiropoulou (2003) who associates *directness to the durative (i.e. imperfective) aspect*. Because of the “open-ended attitude with respect to time specification” (Sidiropoulou, 2003, p. 124), the durative aspect also constitutes “another instance of subjectification”, of directness and, consequently, of absence of negative politeness (Sidiropoulou, 2003; Giannakidou & Zwarts 1999; Theophanopoulou-Kontou, 1999).

(c) Nominalization

Continuing our comparative study, we examine examples (4) and (5):

<p>(4) <i>Quand la Chine grisonnera</i> [litt. when China will be/become grey] Isabelle Attané, June 2011</p>	<p><i>Κινεζοί με γκριζα μαλλιά</i> [litt. Chinese with grey hair] Attané Isabelle, (transl. Vassilis Papakrivopoulos), Sunday 3 June 2012</p>
---	---

<p>(5) Immigrés dans les rets de la mafia calabraise « Ils voulaient des bras, ils ont trouvé des hommes » [litt. Immigrants (caught) in the nets of Calabrian mafia {super-script title} – They wanted arms, they found men] {main title}] Christophe Ventura, November 2010</p>	<p>Κομπινεζ με επιδοτησειζ και μεταναστεζ στην Καλαβρια Αφρικανοι στα διχτυα της μαφιαζ [litt. Rackets with subsidies and immigrants in Calabria {superscript title} – Africans (caught) in the net of mafia] {main title}] Ventura Christophe, (transl. Vassilis Papakrivopoulos), Sunday 30 January 2011</p>
--	---

Such examples are characterized by the change in the grammatical category of the components of the phrase. More precisely, while in the French original *verbal phrases* prevail, in the Greek translation they turn to *nominal phrases*. This pattern creates *distanciation* of the enunciator concerning his/her utterance (Guillemin-Flescher 1993 [1981], pp. 477-478). Brown and Levinson (1987) had also characterized nominalization as a *distance creating device* (p.131) that raises the level of formality, concluding that nominalization is a negative politeness orientated phenomenon, perspective also adopted by Sidiropoulou (2002, 2003).

Pursuant to the theory of enunciation, *nouns* refer to notions and they can be presented to the enunciator as more or less specified (particularized). The degree of determination/specification of the noun is determined in accordance with the presence/absence of determination. A *noun* can be registered within a span ranging from generality (also mentioned as pure and simple expression of a notion) to the absolute singularity of the unique occurrence. In our study cases, the presence of nominal phrases in translation, deprived from determination, refers to the concept expressed by the nouns to a purely *qualitative* level, without reference to any particular situation. There is no *quantification/identification* of particular elements, fact that allows us to assume that nouns refer to the pure and simple notion (Chuquet & Paillard 1989, pp. 42-43). Given this explanation, the association of «pure notion» with the *distanciation* of the enunciator as well as *negative politeness* becomes undeniable.

Sifianou (2001), joining these conclusions of the theory of enunciation, explicitly attributes to the case of *nominalization* the will to *avoid reference* to the agent, in other words, promotes the creation of a certain *distance* of the enunciator from his utterance (p5). This is undoubtedly the reason that nominal phrases are traditionally associated to a more *erudite* level of language, where *distanciation* is predominant (Sidiropoulou, 2004, p. 14).

Speaking of *distanciation*, two of the most frequent linguistic ways used for triggering *distanciation* are also tackled by Lagane (1997), who underlined the growing use of nouns to the detriment of verbs in the case of journalistic discourse, attributing it to the growing influence of jargon in human sciences, qualified as “analytic and constative” (p. 44). More precisely, Lagane (1997) concluded that this tendency (the prevalence of nouns over verbs), used for the sake of objectivity, is inclined to the simple descriptive designation of things and abstraction, even though it results in burdening of the text. The relevance of *abstraction* with the term of *distanciation* used so far within the frame of the theory of enunciation is undisputable.

Another technique converging to what Lagane qualifies as syntactic *burdening* of the text is depicted consisting in the *abuse of either abstract or technical words*. Consequently, to quote but few of Lagane’s examples, “a choice becomes an option, one’s address, his contact information” (1997, p. 44). Using abstract or technical words along with the prevalence of nouns over verbs is instantiated what Politis (2014, pp. 166-167) qualifies as *rhetorical vo-*

cabulary, the purpose of which resides in impressing or, at least, attracting the attention of the audience by convincing about the importance of the transmitted information.

As far as examples (4)-(5) are concerned, we argue that the Greek translation is more negatively polite, compared to the original, due to nominalizations. Nominalization, that is the very common pattern of preferring a noun instead of a verb and moreover an abstract noun, bears witness about a rupture with the situation of enunciation. This pattern being equally possible in French, its absence in our examples renders the French utterances more direct, thus less negatively polite/more positively polite. Of course, we could consider that the copula *are* (i.e. caught) is omitted in the example (5). However, even seen through this prism, the tense switch is considered by Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 120) as a positive politeness strategy (Sidiropoulou 2002, p. 56). The tense switch consists in that *voulaient* is a past continuous, while, in the Greek translation, the copula would be in present simple [are (caught)]. This differentiation could be regarded as a compensation process, conferring to the utterance a slightly positively polite character.

Apparently, there are counterexamples as well, such as the examples (6)-(7), where nominalization in the original is translated by a verbal construction.

<p>(6) Déception au sein de la gauche américaine <i>Le procès</i> de M. Barack Obama [litt. Disappointment within the American Left {superscript} – Mr Barack Obama’s <i>trial</i> {main title}] Eric Alterman, October 2011</p>	<p>Ο ομαπαμα χανει την πιστωση του στην αμερικανικη αριστερα [litt. Obama <i>loses</i> his credit with the American Left] Alterman Eric, (transl. Geor. Protogerou), Sunday 20 November 2011</p>
<p>(7) Entre rivalités tribales et intervention occidentale <i>Libye, les conditions de l’unité nationale</i> [litt. Between tribal rivalries and Occidental intervention {superscript} – Libya, <i>the conditions of national unity</i> {main title}] Patrick Haimzadeh, September 2011</p>	<p>Το Εθνικο Συμβουλιο απεναντι στην ιδιομορφη βεδουινικη παραδοση Η ενοτητα στη Λιβυη περναι απο τις φυλες [litt. The National council against the peculiar Bedouin tradition {super-script} – The unity in Libya <i>passes</i> through the tribes {main title}] Haimzadeh Patrick, Sunday 9 October 2011</p>

This diagnostic has some interesting implications: in the Greek translation of the example (6), the predicative relation is oriented towards the *agent* of the process (cf. *loses*). Therefore, even though the simple present tense (*enestotas*) is an aoristic verbal form, i.e. not having any temporal value and referring to the notion (Antoniou, 2000, 2003), the predicative relation is clearly associated to a specific occurrence of *lose*, thus it becomes *more determined/orientated* towards a specific occurrence. Consequently, by using a verbal phrase instead of a nominal one, the translator is opting for a more determined, more direct as well as less negatively polite expression, inducing diversification in both levels: denotation and connotation, to recall Barthes’s (1964) terminology.

Conclusion

Our comparative study leads us to the conclusion that, in the translation of French article titles into Greek, literal translation is rarely applied (Sidiropoulou, 1995) and that different linguistic structures are used, despite the existence of symmetrical structures in the two languages of study. Furthermore, it appears that politeness markers expressing a linguistic attitude also reflect the attitude of each linguistic community.

In Greek, the use of different markers attaches the enunciator to his utterance in an explicit way. On the contrary, the use of impersonal expressions/infinitives in French establishes a rupture between the enunciator and his utterance, rendering the utterance more indirect, more negatively polite. Hence, given that in translation the absence of rupture is not transmitted, there is a *stylistic/pragmatic differentiation*. Differentiation in the level of denotation but, more crucially, in the level of connotation (cf. Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 1977, pp. 208–233). The organization of the utterances in Greek has as its center the subject/enunciator (Marmaridou, 1987, p. 734), while, in French, the center is set according to the relation enunciator/co-enunciator, just as in the English language (Marmaridou, 1987, p. 734). Consequently, it seems that it is the French language that tends to be prone to *social distancing* whereas Greek language prefers structures that *minimize social distance* and attribute to the utterance a more marked/direct thus more positively polite character. Similarly, while the original promotes patterns which privilege vantage point of negative politeness, the target version favors options that assume mainly positive politeness.

These conclusions associating directness with positive politeness in Greek seem to be valid not only for the case of article titles, which is a specific genre of discourse. It is notable that previous studies (Antoniou, 2014a, 2014b, 2015) concerning the expression of politeness in comics show evidence corroborating the very same conclusions, such as solidarity of the enunciator towards the co-enunciator, proving Greek to be a very positively polite and very emotional language indeed (Sifianou, 1992; Symeon, 2000).

Furthermore, the aim of political discourse translation and more precisely of article titles consists in attracting the readers' attention rather than in just being faithful to the original text. Therefore, the use of various modifications is absolutely comprehensible, even anticipated. The translator's using all prior modifications bears witness to the translator's intervention aiming to formulate the audience by exploiting certain characteristics of its idiosyncrasy.

Notes

¹ Fraser holds: «The social norm view of politeness assumes that each society has a particular set of social norms consisting of more or less explicit rules that prescribe a certain behavior, a state of affairs, or a way of thinking in a context». According to Nwoye, within the social norm view politeness is “seen as arising from an awareness of one's social obligations to the other members of the group to which one owes primary allegiance”. On the other hand impoliteness comes up as one's behaviors are contrary to the norms in the given society».

² *negative face* (the want of self-determination, i.e. the want that one's freedom of action should not be impeded by others) and *positive face* (the want of approval, i.e. the want that one's own wants should also be desirable to others).

³ Our translation from the Greek original.

⁴ Our translation from the French original.

References

- Alexandris Ch., & Fotinea, S. E. (2005). Χρήση των μορίων διαλογου ως δεικτές “θετικής” και “μη θετικής” ευγενειάζ σε διαλογικά συστήματα της Νεας Ελληνικής [The Use of Dialogue Particles as Markers of ‘Positive’ and ‘Non-Positive’ Politeness in Dialogical Systems of Modern Greek]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics*. 25, 31-37.
- Antoniou, M. (2000). *Etude contrastive de l’aoriste grec et des formes verbales par lesquelles il est représenté en français*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Paris 7-Denis Diderot University. Villeneuve d’Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.
- Antoniou, M. (2003). Ο Ενεστώτας της Νεας Ελληνικής: ένας αχρονός ρηματικός τύπος [Enestotas (Present tense) in Modern Greek: an Atemporal Verbal Form]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics*. 23, 669-679.
- Antoniou, M. (2004). The Translation of Advertisement: French, Greek, English. In M. Sidiropoulou & A. Papaconstantinou. (Eds.) *Choice and Difference in Translation. The Specifics of Transfer* (pp.115-127). Athens: The National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. Selected papers of the International Conference on Translation, University of Athens, Department of English Language and Literature, 3-6 December 2003.
- Antoniou, M. (2006). Comparative Study of the Present Perfect in Modern Greek, Bulgarian, French, English and Spanish. In Katarina Rasulic, Ivana Trbojevic. (Eds.) *English Language and Literature Studies: Interfaces and Integrations 75*, vol. I. (pp. 249-260). Belgrade: Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade. Proceedings of the International Conference «English Language and Literature Studies: Interfaces and Integrations», English Department, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade (Serbia), 10-12 December 2004.
- Antoniou, M. (2014a). Politesse et traduction: le cas du couple grec moderne et français. In Andrejs Veisbergs (Ed.) *Language for International Communication: Linking Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp.250-261). Riga: University of Latvia Press. Selected papers of the 2nd International Symposium Department of English Studies and Centre of Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities, 23-24 May 2013, Riga, Latvia.
- Antoniou, M. (2014b). Μεταφραζόντας την συναισθηματικότητα. Η περίπτωση Γαλλικής-Ελληνικής [Translating Sentimentality: The Case of French-Greek]. *Intercultural Translation Intersemiotic*. 3 (2), 13-22. <http://ejournals.lib.auth.gr/iti>.
- Antoniou, M. (2015). *Μεταφραζόντας τίτλους άρθρων εφημερίδων: η περίπτωση της Le Monde Diplomatique* [Translating Newspaper Article Titles: The Case Study of *Le Monde Diplomatique*]. *Selected Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Department of Mediterranean Studies, Aegean University, Rhodes, 26-29 September 2013. pp. 114-124.
- Bakakou-Orfanou, A. (2008). Προφορικότητα και πολιτικός λόγος [Orality and Political Discourse]. In A. Moser, A. Bakakou-Orfanou and allii. *Γλωσσηζή χαριν* [In favor of Language] (pp. 389-401). Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict. A narrative account*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Barthes, R. (1953). *Le degré zéro de l’écriture*. Paris: Gonthier.
- Barthes, R. (1964). Eléments de sémiologie. *Communications*. 4, 91-135.
- Baudrillard, J. (1988). «The Masses: The Implosion of the Social in the Media». In M. Poster & J. Baudrillard (Eds.), *Selected Writings*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bayraktaroglu, A., & Sifianou, M. (2001). *Linguistic Politeness Across Boundaries: The Case of Greek and Turkish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bella, S. (2009). Invitations and politeness in Greek: The age variable. *Journal of Politeness Research* 5, 243-271.
- Bidaud, S. (2012). Sur la perte de vitalité du diminutif en français. *Revista de Filología Románica*. 29(1), 51-58.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests : Same or different ? *Journal of Pragmatics*. 11, 131-146. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(87\)90192-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(87)90192-5).
- Bouscaren, J. (1991). *Linguistique Anglaise. Initiation à une grammaire de l’énonciation*. Paris: Ophrys.
- Brown, P., & Levinson S. (1987). *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Burke, P. (1999). Les langages de la politesse. *Terran*. 33, 111-126. Accessed the 23rd February 2014 in <http://terrain.revues.org/2704#tocto1n2>.
- Buscaren, J., & Chuquet, J. (1987). *Grammaire et textes anglais. Guide pour l'analyse linguistique*. Paris: Ophrys.
- Chadzisavidis, S. (2000). *Ελληνική γλώσσα και δημοσιογραφικός λόγος. Θεωρητικές και ερευνητικές προσεγγίσεις*. [Greek Language and Journalistic Discourse. Theoretical and Research Approaches]. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Charaudeau, P., & Maingueneau, D. (2002). *Dictionnaire d'analyse de discours*. Paris: Seuil.
- Charaudeau, P. (2005a). *Les médias et l'information : L'impossible transparence du discours*. Bruxelles: de Boeck.
- Charaudeau, P. (2005b). *Quand l'argumentation n'est que visée persuasive. L'exemple du discours politique*. Retrieved January 20, 2014 from http://www.patrick-charaudeau.com/IMG/pdf/2005_e_Argum-_et_pers_uasion_Burger_.pdf.
- Charaudeau, P. (2006). Discours journalistique et positionnements énonciatifs. *Frontières et dérives. Semen*. 22. Retrieved January 15, 2014 from <http://journals.openedition.org/semen/2793>.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Chilton, P. & Schäffner, C. (1997). Discourse and Politics. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.). *Discourse as social interaction. Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 206-230). London: SAGE, Vol. 2.
- Chuquet, H., & Paillard, M. (1989). *Approche linguistique des problèmes de traduction. Anglais/français*. Paris: Ophrys.
- Crystal D. [2000 (1980)]. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. London: Deutsch.
- Culioli, A. (1974). À propos des énoncés exclamatifs. *Langue française*. 22, 6-15.
- Culioli, A. (1985). *Notes du séminaire de DEA*. Poitiers: Département de Recherches Linguistiques (Université Paris VII).
- Culioli, A. (1990). *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation. Opérations et représentations*. Tome 1. Paris: Ophrys.
- Culioli, A. (1999a). *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation. Domaine notionnel*. Tome 3. Paris: Ophrys.
- Culioli, A. (1999b). Des façons de qualifier. In A. Deschamps & J. Guillemin-Flescher (Dir.). *Les opérations de détermination, quantification/qualification* (pp. 3-12). Paris: Ophrys.
- Culpeper, J. (2013). Impoliteness: Questions and Answers. In D. Jamet & M. Jobert (Eds.). *Aspects of Linguistic Impoliteness*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Desclés, J.-P. (1990). Les référentiels temporels pour le temps linguistique. *Modèles Linguistiques*. 16(2), 9-36.
- Eco, U. (1999). *Η σημειολογία στην καθημερινή ζωή*. [Semiotics in Everyday Life]. Thessaloniki: Malliaris.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Fragoudaki, A. (1999). *Γλώσσα και Ιδέολογία. Κοινωνιολογική προσέγγιση της Ελληνικής Γλώσσας* [Language and Ideology. Sociological Approach of the Greek Language]. Athens: Odysseas.
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on Politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 14, 219-236. Retrieved February 20, 2016 from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90081-N](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-N).
- Giannakidou, A. & Zwarts, F. (1999). Aspectual properties of temporal connectives. In A. Mozer. (Ed.). *Greek Linguistics '97: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics* (pp.107-113). Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Giles, H. (Ed.) (2012). *The Handbook of Intergroup Communication*. New York: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. [(1967) 1955]. On facework: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In E. Goffman (Ed.), *Interaction ritual. Essays in face-to-face behavior* (pp. 5-46). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gotovos, T. (1996). *Ρατσισμός: κοινωνικές, ψυχολογικές και παιδαγωγικές οφείζεις μιας ιδεολογίας και μιας πρακτικής*. [Racism: social, psychological and educational aspects of an ideology and a practice]. Athens: Ministry of National Education and Religions (YPEPTH).
- Greimas, A. & Courtés J. (1993). *Sémiotique. Dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage*. Paris: Hachette Supérieur.
- Groussier, M.-L., & Rivière, Cl. (1996). *Les mots de la linguistique. Lexique de linguistique énonciative*. Paris: Ophrys.

- Guillemin-Flescher, J. (1981). *Syntaxe comparée du français et de l'anglais: Problèmes de traduction*. Paris: Ophrys.
- Webster, J. (Ed.). (2007). *Language and Society*. By M. A. K. Halliday. Cornwall: M. A. K. Halliday.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (2002). Politesse. In P. Charaudeau & D. Maingueneau (Eds.). *Dictionnaire d'analyse du discours*. (pp.439-443). Paris: Seuil.
- Harris, S. (2001). Being politically impolite: extending politeness theory to adversarial political discourse. *Discourse and Society*. 12(4), 451-472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926501012004003>.
- Haug, M. (2007). The Discursive Challenge to Politeness Research: An Interactional Alternative. *Journal of Politeness Research Language Behaviour Culture*. 3(2), 295-317. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2007.013>
- Hernández, M.J., & Cortes, C. (Eds.) (2005). *La traducción periodística*. Escuela de traductores de Toledo, Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Cuenca.
- Holquist, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Holton, D., Mackridge, P., & Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (1999) *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. Athens: Patakis.
- Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ifantidou, E. (2009). Newspaper headlines and relevance: ad hoc concepts in ad hoc contexts. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(4). 699-720. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2008.10.016
- Ifantidou, E. (2011). *Genres and Pragmatic Understanding*. Athens: Patakis.
- Jamet, D., & Jobert, M. (Eds.) (2013). *Aspects of linguistic impoliteness*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kanakis, K. (2007). *Εισαγωγή στην Πραγματολογία. Γνωστικές και κοινωνικές οψεις της γλωσσικής χρήσης* [Introduction to Pragmatics. Cognitive and Social aspects of Language Use]. Athens: Kostas Kanakis and Publications of the Twenty First.
- Katriel, T. (1986). *Talking straight: dugri speech in Israeli Sabra culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kawakami, K., Amodio D. M., & Hugenberg K. (2017). Intergroup Perception and Cognition: An Integrative Framework for Understanding the Causes and Consequences of Social Categorization. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. 55 <http://amodiolab.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Kawakami-Amodio-Hugenberg-2017.pdf>.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1977). *La connotation*. Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1990). *Les interactions verbales I*. Paris: A. Colin.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. [1997a (1980)]. *L'énonciation. De la subjectivité dans le langage*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1997b). A multilevel approach in the study of talk-in-interaction. *Pragmatics*. 7(1), 1-20.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (2002). Politesse. In P. Charaudeau & D. Maingueneau (Eds.). *Dictionnaire d'analyse du discours*. (pp.439-443). Paris: Seuil.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (2013). Politeness, impoliteness, non-politeness, «polirudeness»: the case of political tv debates. In D. Jamet & M. Jobert (Eds.), *Aspects of linguistic impoliteness* (pp.16-45). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kress, G. and Hodge, R. (1993). *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kontossopoulos, N. (1998). *Γλωσσες και διαλεκτοι της Ευρώπης* [Languages and dialects of Europe]. Athens: Grigori.
- Lagane, J. (1997). L'évolution du langage radiophonique. *Communication et langages*. III, 39-52.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and Woman's Place. *Language in Society*. 2(1), 45-80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500000051>.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York, Harper and Row.
- Lakoff, R. (1989). The limits of politeness: therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua*. 8, 101-129. (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter).
- Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking power: the politics of language in our lives*. New York: Basic books.

- Lahiani, N. (2010). Argumentation et Impolitesse dans les débats politiques à caractère polémique. *Lexis Special 2: Theoretical Approaches to Linguistic (Im)politeness*. 61-69, http://lexis.univ-lyon3.fr/IMG/pdf/Lexis_special_2_-_Lahiani.pdf.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Makri-Tsilipakou, M. (2001). Congratulations and bravo! In A. Bayraktaroglu, & M. Sifianou (Eds.). *Linguistic Politeness Across Boundaries: The Case of Greek and Turkish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Marmaridou, S. (1987). Semantic and pragmatic parameters of meaning: On the interface between contrastive text analysis and the production of translated texts. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 11(6), 721-736. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(87\)90110-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(87)90110-X).
- Moirand, S. 2008 (2007). *Les discours de la presse quotidienne. Observer, analyser, comprendre*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Morris, Ch. (1938). *Foundations of the Theory of Signs. International Encyclopedia of Unified Sciences* 1(2). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morris, Ch. (1946). *Signs, Language and Behavior*. New York: Braziller.
- Nwoye, O. G. (1992). Linguistic politeness and socio-cultural variations of the notion of face. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 18, 309-328. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(92\)90092-P](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90092-P).
- Oesterreich, P. L. (1990). *Fundamentalarhetorik. Untersuchung zu Person und Rede in der Öffentlichkeit*. Hamburg: Meiner.
- Pavlidou, Th. (1994). Contrasting German and Greek politeness and the consequences. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 21(5), 478-511.
- Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (1982). Προβλήματα σχετικά με τη σειρά των ορών στις ελληνικές προτάσεις. [Problems related to the word order in Greek Sentences]. *Γλωσσολογία*. 1, 99-107.
- Politis, P. (2002). Η γλώσσα του γεγονότος: Τροπικότητες στα πρωτοσελίδα εφημερίδων [The language of the event: Modalities in journals' coverage]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics*. 22, 543-554.
- Politis, P. (2014). *Η γλώσσα της τηλεοπτικής ενημέρωσης. Τα δελτία ειδήσεων της ελληνικής τηλεόρασης (1980–2010)*. [The Language of Televisual Information. The News Bulletins of the Greek Television (1980–2010)]. Thessaloniki: Institut of Modern Greek Studies.
- Schäffner, C. (2004). Political Discourse Analysis from the Point of View of the Translation Studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*. 3(1), 117-150. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.3.1.09sch>.
- Sidiropoulou, M. (1995). Headlining in Translation: English vs. Greek Press. *Target*. 7(2), 285-304. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.7.2.06sid>.
- Sidiropoulou, M. (2002). *Contrastive Linguistic Issues in the Theatre and Film Translation*. Athens: Typothito: George Dardanos.
- Sidiropoulou, M. (2003). *Options in Translation. Cognitive and Cultural Meaning in English-Greek Translation*. Athens: Sokolis Publishing.
- Sidiropoulou, M. (2004). *Linguistic Identities through Translation*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece: A Cross-cultural Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sifianou, M. (2001). *Discourse analysis. An introduction*. Athens: Leader Books.
- Sifianou, M. (2003). Εντοπισμένες μορφές της Αγγλικής: Οι ανακοινώσεις στο Μέτρο της Αθηνάς [Situated Forms of the English Language: Announcements in Athens Underground]. In D. Theophanopoulou-Kontou (Ed.). *Συγχρονές τάσεις στην Ελληνική Γλωσσολογία* [Current Trends in Greek Linguistics] (pp. 374-389). Athens: Editions Patakí.
- Sifianou, M. (2008). Parliamentary discourse and Politeness. In A. Moser, A. Bakakou-Orfanou and allii. *Γλώσσης χαρίν* [In favor of Language] (pp. 464-474). Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Sorning, K. (1989). Some remarks on Linguistic Strategies of Persuasion. In R. Wodak (Ed.). *Language Power and Ideology. Studies in Political Discourse* (pp.95-113). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Stephens, J. (1992). *Language and ideology in children's fiction*. London: Longman.
- Symeon, D. (2000). *Apologies in English and Greek*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Athens, School of Philosophy. Faculty of English.

- Theophanopoulou-Kontou, D. (1999). Τα μεσα αμεταβατα ρηματα της Νεας Ελληνικης και η μεσοπαθητικη καταληξη [Middle intransitive verbs of Modern Greek and medio-passive declination]. In A. Mozer. (Ed.). *Greek Linguistics '97: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics* (pp. 114-122). Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1985). Structures of News in the Press. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.). *Discourse and Communication* (pp. 69-93). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.) (1997a). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997b). What is Political Discourse Analysis? In J. Blommaert & Ch. Bulcaen (Eds.). *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*. 11, 11-52. <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/What%20is%20Political%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf>.
- Venuti, L. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Wang, H. (2008). A Tentative Analysis of «Face» in the Chinese Request. *Intercultural Communication Studies*. 17(1), 197-208.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.