

Palacký University in Olomouc

Faculty of Education

Institute of Foreign Languages



Bachelor Thesis

Vojtěch Doupovec

Politeness in Czech and English Language

Olomouc 2022

Supervisor: Mgr. Josef Nevařil Ph.D.

I hereby proclaim to have worked on this bachelor's Thesis independently and with the use of sources listed in the Bibliography

V Olomouci dne 20. 4. 2022

podpis

Acknowledgment

I want to thank my supervisor Mgr. Josef Nevařil, Ph.D. for his valuable lessons and helpful advice. Furthermore, I would like to thank my parents for being patient with me and providing me with never-ending support. Lastly, I would like to thank my friends who have given me emotional support through the entire writing process.

Table of contents

Acknowledgment.....	3
Table of contents	4
Abstract.....	6
Introduction	7
THEORETICAL PART	9
1. Politeness – English, and Czech	9
1.1 Face.....	12
1.1.1 Rationality	14
1.2 Face threatening acts	15
1.2.1 Threats to negative face and positive face	15
1.2.2 Threats to negative face.....	16
1.2.3 Threats to the positive face.....	17
1.3 Impoliteness.....	19
2. Type situations.....	21
2.1 Greetings.....	21
2.2 Addressing	21
2.3 Giving opinions and/or evaluation	23
2.3.1 Applying a conditional	23
2.3.2 Modal verbs or so-called hedges.....	23
2.3.3 Use of negation	24
3. Summary.....	24
Analytical part	25
4. The media chosen for analysis.....	25
4.1 About the author	25
4.2 Plot summary of To Sleep in a Sea of Stars	26

4.3	Analysis of the excerpts of To Sleep in a Sea of Stars	26
4.3.1	First conversation from To Sleep in a Sea of Stars.....	26
4.3.2	Analysis of the First conversation from To Sleep in a Sea of Stars	28
4.3.3	Second conversation from To Sleep in a Sea of Stars.....	29
4.3.4	Analysis of the second conversation from To Sleep in a Sea of Stars.....	31
5.	Analysis of conversations from How I met your mother	32
5.1	First conversation from How I met your mother between Barney and Ted.....	32
5.2	Analysis of the First Conversation from How I met your mother.....	34
5.3	Second Conversation from How I met your mother between Ted, Barney, and Lily	35
5.4	Analysis of the second conversation from How I met your mother.....	36
6.	Summary.....	37
	Conclusion.....	38
	Bibliography	39
	Primary Sources.....	39
	Secondary Sources.....	39
	Online Sources.....	40
	Resumé	42
	Annotation	43

Abstract

This thesis aims to analyse the differences and similarities in English and Czech views of politeness with the use of modern forms of media, specifically science fiction and situational comedy or sitcom. The theoretical part is used to present some views of politeness in both languages and some ways politeness might not be adhered to in conversation. The analytical part focuses on the analysis of short English and Czech excerpts from the different media and how and if they somehow differ in their presentation of politeness given by the theoretical part

Introduction

Politeness is something most people come in contact with daily and oftentimes without even realizing or thinking about it. People use learned phrases which to most people come naturally and are taught to us since we are born. Politeness strategies are used toward colleagues, co-workers, friends, parents, and even strangers.

This was the ultimate motivation behind choosing this topic, in short, wanting to learn more about something that most people generally do not give much thought to.

This thesis is divided into two parts, firstly the theoretical part in which a general look into politeness theories of both Czech and English authors is given, furthermore, there is a description of what is a face and what are face-threatening acts which are divided into negative and positive face-threatening acts. Next, there is a short chapter that talks about the opposite that being impoliteness and again how do Czech and English authors view it. Lastly, there is a chapter on type situations of politeness such as addressing others and similar situations, these will be further used in the analytical part of the thesis.

The second part of the thesis is an analytical part in which I will have a look at several different popular media and their English and official Czech variations. The media in question shall be the book *To Sleep in a Sea of Stars* by American author Christopher Paolini and its Czech translation *Spát v Moři hvězd*. A short description of the book is also provided in the analytical part. The second popular media is the American TV show *How I met your mother* and its Czech translation *Jak jsem poznal vaši matku*. The reason behind choosing two different media TV show and literary work is to have a wider grasp of translation styles and be able to measure how much does translation change certain aspects of politeness and if the changes are similar or different for each media.

Research questions for this thesis are as follows:

- (1) What commonalities are there between Czech and English views of politeness?
- (2) What differences are there in type situations between Czech and English?
- (3) What changes occur during the translation of typical situations?

The first question is to determine whether or not English and Czech have common or similar definitions and work on the same principles. The second question focuses on how these two languages differ in daily situations. Both of these questions are answered within the theoretical

part of the thesis. The third question will be answered within the analytical part of the thesis and its main aim is to analyse what changes occur when translating these two languages and how they affect the perception of politeness.

THEORETICAL PART

In this part, there is a general look at the politeness of both languages and in what ways they have different or similar views and definitions which is done by combining Czech and English authors and their opinions on this topic. Also, a list of typical situations is presented which will be further used in the analytical part. Lastly, the answers to the first two questions of this thesis are present in this part.

1. Politeness – English, and Czech

According to Watts (2003), it is quite difficult to truly describe politeness and thus it seems that most people tend to find comfort in broad descriptions of the word or avoid description altogether and rather talk about the behaviours, gestures, or words they would consider to be polite. Watts (2003) further argues that these problems with the general inability to define politeness are much wider and present themselves even in much more specific cases where polite or impolite behaviour cannot be generalized and determined without the context for the entire situation.

Čermák (2001, p. 298) defines politeness as a social stance that exists within certain societal conventions and at the same time shows respect to the other person or people. Furthermore, it must be behaviour that is acceptable to others and does not in any way provoke conflict. Čermák (2001) further states that politeness must be somehow communicated by language, but that communication can have different forms. This definition shows that politeness is strongly associated with what a certain society perceives as polite and that through different conventions different words and actions might be considered polite. Another important point is that according to this definition, politeness is a tool that we can use in our lives to avoid confrontation and conflict and enhance or maintain good relationships with other people. These are, of course, some of the more basic sentiments with regards to politeness and its usage, but since these stand at the core of politeness, it is useful to point them out as well. (Čermák, 2001)

Hirschová (2013, p. 228) describes politeness as a “feature of communication.” In her view, it is a useful tool to help the flow of information within a conversation and it is also useful a way to influence others’ opinion of the speaker, thus helping with interpersonal relationships and how they evolve over time.

Interestingly, Hirschová (2013) further states that politeness can be also used as a way to not only evolve relationships but to also assert dominance onto others and thus be the leading force in a relationship. This is an interesting point about politeness which is not talked about quite often as it is more often than not connected with being nice and cooperative, rather than malicious and controlling. Nonetheless, it is a good thing to point out and offer a different perspective.

Interestingly, Czech authors seem to have much more of a pragmatic style when describing politeness and see it as more of a tool while the English authors seem more focused on the emotional side of the participants. This is, in my opinion, an interesting difference between these two languages.

Kádár (2017) states that politeness is a type of behaviour through which people show that they, both linguistically and non-linguistically, bear in mind how others might feel at any given moment and adjust their behaviour accordingly. He then continues with the fact that politeness starts appearing after evaluation of a situation of participants in e.g., a conversation, and that it is a necessary phenomenon for creating and maintaining relationships between people. It is almost mandatory for a person trying to behave politely to be able to recognize nuanced behavioural patterns within others and react to them according to the given situation, which when compared to the definition given by Watts is in fact very similar and although Kadar's' description is more thorough and tries to rely less on generalization and more on hard facts, it still takes into account the persons interacting and their nuances. In this context, both authors seem to mostly agree on what politeness is. (Kádár, 2017)

Hirschová (2013) goes even further and claims that it is essentially impossible to not influence others while communicating. This is because of the fact that people try to reach certain goals while communicating and it is hard not to exert influence when trying to gain something for yourself. This influence can have many different forms and can be hidden or open. The open influence on other people can be quite dangerous as it might lead to the manipulation of others. (Hirschová, 2013)

Politeness itself, however, cannot exist in a vacuum, and therefore with it come so-called "evaluative moments" (Kádár, 2017). These can be described as moments in which the person on a receiving end of a polite gesture considers whether the gesture itself was truly sincere and should be treated as such or if it was simply pretended to receive a better response. These

evaluative moments are especially important in situations where the producer and receiver of utterance do not stand on common ground (Kádár, 2017).

A perfect example of this situation would be a conversation between two people who are not of the same culture and some gestures or sentences could be perceived as offensive, even though no offense was meant. In this case, it would be necessary for the person on the receiving end to recognize that no offense was meant and the person producing the offense made a mistake based on their ignorance of cultural differences. (Brown and Lewinson, 1987)

Hirschová (2013) goes on to say that politeness is strongly associated with not only society as a whole, which is certainly true, but even by smaller units within any given society. Each of these units has its own set of rules according to which one should act. Interestingly, Hirschová provides different examples and states that politeness within certain groups is mandatory, for example in the army or in diplomatic protocol, there are given sets of rules that must not be breached, or a person will suffer consequences. This provides an interesting contrast towards politeness in society as a whole, where people might get offended or react poorly to impolite behaviours, but rarely will anyone receive negative consequences.

These kinds of interactions between people are to this day probably best described by Brown and Lewinson (1987) and their assumption of the face. See below in chapter 1.1 titled Face.

In this context, politeness can be quite often confused with etiquette because of the fact that etiquette can be to a certain extent viewed as something similar. Etiquette is, however, much more focused on how a person acts, rather than how a person communicates. Nonetheless, so-called speech etiquette does exist, and it relates to correct greetings and farewells in specific situations such as business meetings. There is also a special territory within etiquette that is reserved for phone calls and specialized greetings during them. (Hirschová, 2013)

1.1 Face

Brown and Lewinson (1987, p.61) assumed that “all members of adult society have (and know each other to have)

- i) “face” or the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself, consisting of two related aspects:
 - a) Negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition
 - b) Positive face: the positive consistent self-image or personality (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants
- ii) Certain rational capacities, in particular, consistent modes of reasoning from ends to the means that will achieve those ends.” (Brown and Lewinson, 1987)

They thought of “face” as described by Goffman (1967) that it is something that can be lost in the sense of a phrase losing face. Which would in turn mean, that face can not only be lost but also gained and can get better or worse in time or can be otherwise affected by social interactions (Brown and Lewinson, 1987) and because of this most people generally want to cooperate in maintaining their faces, since if one was to endanger the face of others, they could, in turn, become subject to such danger themselves which is rarely what anyone wishes. Simply put, one does not want to be harmed and therefore will do no harm. (Brown and Lewinson, 1987)

Interestingly enough, most cultures will differ in what face means and uphold for them (different personal values and differences on what is socially acceptable) and even though this is the case it can still be assumed to a certain extent that this public face or the need to maintain public face is rather universal. (Brown and Lewinson, 1987)

Furthermore, Brown and Lewinson (1987) add that the face is not simply what we would attribute as norms in society but also something we can describe as basic wants that not the only member of society wants but is also aware that every other member wants as well. It is, therefore, in everyone’s best interest to satisfy, at least partially, these societal needs. It is important to remind that these needs are not in any sense of the word rights and can be sometimes entirely ignored without any fears of true repercussions.) With

these facts in mind, we can then define the previously mentioned negative and positive face as:

“Negative face: the want of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others

Positive face: the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others” (Brown and Lewinson, p. 62, 1987)

In this context, the negative face and with it associated negative politeness would be something that we imagine under the “standard politeness” or rather the notion of politeness itself. To give an example this would be one person asking another to make them coffee but rather than asking directly it would be posed as a request towards the kindness of the person making the coffee. This is also further proven by the fact that a lot of the time, negative politeness is oftentimes presented as a request or a question. Another important distinction between these two faces and how people use them is the fact that the negative face is something used towards everyone while the positive one is something, that is mostly reserved for groups of which people want to be members of, or at least get some sort of gratification from them. This would be one of the main distinctions between negative and positive faces. (Kamlasi, 2017)

Positive face and positive politeness are, however, not as obvious, easily imagined, and deserve a deeper discussion and it is more specific than the aforementioned negative. (Brown and Lewinson, 1987)

Yule (1996) describes positive face and by extension positive politeness as a need to be accepted and liked by other people, but more specifically to be viewed as a member of certain groups to which each person wants to belong to. In this manner, Yule (1996) agreed with Brown and Lewinson (1987) on the matter that positive politeness is more used within certain groups and that for example, we would be more gratified by a fellow computer geek complementing our custom-built PC than by a person who does not understand computers in the slightest and only wanted to sound friendly on the surface. (Yule, 1996)

Therefore, it can be expected of a person using positive politeness to try and reach a common goal and be friendly within a conversation. This can however lead to communicative issues as overfamiliarity can cause others to withdraw and for this reason, positive politeness can be seen as riskier, than negative. (Yule, p. 64, 1996)

Brown and Lewinson (1987) further state that the positive face oftentimes comes with certain assumptions about other people. As in the abovementioned example of a fellow computer geek complimenting a custom-built PC, this person would have to assume that we would want to be complimented and must risk the fact, that this is not something we would want and could potentially cause offense. It is because of this that a positive face is, for the majority of the time, confined from broader society. (Brown and Lewinson, 1987)

1.1.1 Rationality

For their needs in their theory of politeness, Brown and Lewinson (1987) defined rationality as a specific mode of reasoning described by Aristotle (1969) as “practical reasoning.” This sort of logical reasoning argues that people tend to arrive at certain conclusions by firstly creating a goal or ends and then inferencing ways to achieve these goals. (Brown and Lewinson, 1987)

The next aspect of rationality appears to be the human capability of weighing different means to an end and being able to discern which means would be the most suitable for a given situation and given goals. This also means that people are intrinsically capable of eliminating dangerous or irrational thoughts as they would not be worth the risk. (Brown and Lewinson, 1987)

Brown and Lewinson (1987) arrive at similar conclusions, saying that there is a certain notion of intuitiveness to their definition of rationality. They describe this notion as “minimum-cost assessment.” They further describe this as people choosing the path of least resistance when picking the means for their ends. (Brown and Lewinson, 1987)

It is important to mention that this grasp of rationality in their theory is critiqued by other authors. Culpeper (2011b) describes some problems, but his main point concerning their theory of politeness is a critique of people in the matter of rationality and the human inability to be guided by it. Anderson (2000, p. 173) further points out that we as humans do not excel at weighing our odds as much as we should and that “we systematically violate just about every logical implication of decision theory.” Anderson (2000) also further states that this notion of rationality had been rigorously disproven yet is still used to this day. (Culpeper, 2011b)

Culpeper (2011b) also states people will oftentimes go to great lengths to cooperate on certain social issues even if it might conflict with their self-interest, which would conflict with the notion of rationality stated by Brown and Lewinson as they have mentioned that people tend to go for decisions with minimum cost. Culpeper further argues that people of course are more

than capable of making sensible choices about goals that would benefit them. These rational decisions are, however, not made in nothingness and rather operate within certain societal norms. Therefore, Culpeper (2011b) adds, something that might be seen as rational, or irrational is largely dependent on the society in which individual lives and might be seen in a different light had the person making certain decisions done so in a different society than what they are used to. (Culpeper, 2011b)

Culpeper (2011b) then links irrationality to impoliteness; this is further discussed in chapter 1.4 called Impoliteness

For the needs of this thesis, the criticism of the theory of rationality, presented by Brown and Lewinson (1987), given by Culpeper, Anderson, and other authors, is highly valued and there is a lot of merit in what they have said and written. Nonetheless, this thesis will keep working with their version of the theory of rationality as it is the kind of theory they have chosen and much of their other further work is based around it. It is the kind of theory of the human mind that is hard to both prove and disprove with final certainty and therefore it is important to take it into account but at the same time not simply accept it.

1.2 Face threatening acts

With all the previously mentioned theories, it is inevitable that in the matter of conversation, threats to a face will arise. Both negative and positive. These acts are “those acts that by their nature run contrary to the face wats of the addressee and/or of the speaker.” (Brown and Lewinson, p. 65, 1987). Acts mean the accomplishments done by verbal and non-verbal communication.

1.2.1 Threats to negative face and positive face

According to the theory proposed by Brown and Lewinson (1987), there are two main distinctions when talking about face-threatening acts. The first distinction is interested in whether the FTA insulted or rather threatened our positive or our negative face. The second distinction is primarily focused on whether the FTAs are mostly focused on the face of the addressee or the face of the hearer and for this distinction it is not as important whether these are mostly aimed at the positive or negative face. These distinctions are then further subdivided

into other smaller categories for each of which several given examples help the reader establish what exactly is meant by each category. (Brown and Lewinson, 1987)

The fact that these categories were provided by Brown and Lewinson (1987) in their construction of the theory of politeness was a great way to familiarize the reader with the meaning behind the terms positive and negative face and in what way they differ. because without them it would sometimes be quite easy for readers who are not yet accustomed to the theories of politeness and the terms associated with them, to get confused by certain meanings of words, and for that reason, they were an excellent addition.

1.2.2 Threats to negative face

Brown and Lewinson (1987) make a list of acts that threaten the addressee's negative face by showing that the speaker might impede the addressees' freedom of action. These acts are as follows:

- i) Acts that establish a base for a future act of the addressee which in turn puts pressure onto the addressee to commit (or stops them from committing) the act.
 - a. "Orders and requests
 - b. Suggestions, advice
 - c. Reminders
 - d. Threats, warnings, dares"
- ii) Acts that establish future positive acts of the speaker toward the addressee which in turn push them to accept or reject such acts.
 - a. "Offers
 - b. Promises"
- iii) Acts that establish speakers' wants toward the addressee or their goods which in turn gives the addressee a reason to presume that they will have to take action to defend the object of the speakers' want
 - a. "Compliments, expressions of envy or admiration
 - b. Expressions of strong (negative) emotions toward the addressee – e.g., hatred, anger, lust" (Brown and Lewinson, p. 66, 1987)

These acts were simplified for this thesis; however, they do serve as a basis for the reader what should be imagined under the term FTA and how they operate within the parameters of the theory of politeness. Acts that threaten positive face are discussed next.

Such acts might indicate that the addressees' feelings and wants might not be considered by the speaker.

- i) Acts that implicate that the speaker has a negative opinion of some aspect of the addressees' positive face.
 - a. "Expressions of disapproval, criticism, contempt or ridicule, complaints or reprimands, accusations, insults
 - b. Contradictions or disagreements, challenges"
- ii) Acts that communicate that the speaker does not have care toward the addressees' positive face
 - a. "Expressions of violent emotions
 - b. Irreverence, mention of taboo topics
 - c. Bringing of bad news about the addressee
 - d. Raising dangerously emotional or divisive topics such as politics, race, or religion
 - e. Blatant non-cooperation in an activity
 - f. Use of address terms and other status-marked identifications in initial encounters." (Brown and Levinson, p. 67, 1987)

1.2.3 Threats to the positive face

The other way of division given by Brown and Levinson (1987) of FTAs primarily focuses on the threats which threaten the speakers' faces both negative and positive. In order to understand this distinction, it needs to be added that these responses below work with the presumption that the speaker is responding to a previous FTA committed by the addressee.

- i) Offending the speakers' negative face:
 - a. "Expressing thanks
 - b. Acceptance of addressees' thanks or their apology
 - c. Excuses

- d. Acceptance of offers
 - e. Responses to addressees' faux pas
 - a. Unwilling promises and offers" (Brown and Levinson, p. 67, 1987)
- ii) Offending the speakers' positive face:
- a. "Apologies
 - b. Acceptance of a compliment
 - c. Breakdown of physical control over body
 - d. Self-humiliation, shuffling or cowering
 - e. Confessions, admissions of guilt or responsibility – e.g. for having done or not done an act
 - f. Emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears." (Brown and Levinson, p. 68, 1987)

These distinctions were the main framework within which Brown and Levinson (1987) established their theory and in which they further provided examples of strategies for both committing and defending from certain FTAs. It is also through this framework they tried to create a universal concept of politeness across many different cultures and ways of speaking. Because of this, their concept of the face becomes rather static and unchanging throughout different parts of the world. This, of course, makes perfect sense when trying to create a universal worldwide framework upon which others can build but it is still hardly correspondent with reality because as is written in the examples above, it creates almost a constant feeling that everyone is threatening everyone during a conversation through basically anything they say ranging from apologies to advise. It is also next to impossible to give a universal framework for the whole world since some cultures might recognize certain elements of the western worldview as offensive and vice versa. (Culpeper, 2011b)

While such a way of thinking works well for theory, considering the fact that it has been in use for the past three decades, it lacks a certain perspective of other cultures and feels strongly influenced by the era and place in which the authors lived and through which they viewed the world. (Culpeper, 2011b)

The way Brown and Levinson (1987) described the face also turns away from the original concept of the face presented by Goffman (1967) who argued that the face is not constant but rather an ever-changing self-value and more importantly that it is a dynamic social construct

which changes depending on the situation and the context of any given conversation and it is, again, depending on the context, attributed, and negotiated between the speakers. (Goffman, 1967)

These are not the only critiques Brown and Levinson faced and face to this day, but these are further summarized in the conclusion of this thesis and also in the further chapters when the need for it arises.

1.3 Impoliteness

While this thesis' primary focus is on the theory of politeness in Czech and English and their respective defining features, it would be incorrect to not include its opposite. This is also true because of the fact that some authors liken impoliteness to face-threatening acts which are mentioned in the previous chapter and its omission would severely undervalue the previous chapter and would also leave it without accompanying context.

Interestingly enough, the authors do not have a clear idea of what impoliteness actually is. There are many different definitions of it and agreement is rather sparse. Beebe (1995, p. 159) describes impoliteness as an FTA or part of an FTA that somehow breaks the social norm. Lakoff (1989, p. 103) says that impoliteness is when a person does not use politeness strategies that would be expected in a given situation which ultimately results in rude behaviour, or rather something that could be seen as such. Culpeper et al. (2003, p. 1546) say that impoliteness is, similarly to politeness, a strategy of communication that is used in order to attack face which in turn causes social turmoil.

Hirschová (2013) describes impoliteness not necessarily as a communicative strategy in itself but rather as a complete, or partial failure to be polite. Furthermore, impoliteness can also be seen as being overly polite or merely pretending to be polite and also being polite but in an overtly ironic way towards others who are not in the immediate friend circle of a given person and might not necessarily understand the impoliteness was merely a joke.

In this context, Hirschová (2013) and Lakoff (1989) seem to agree as they both say that impoliteness is simply a lack of politeness but not a politeness strategy or the opposite of thereof.

As we can see above the definitions differ and vary, while some authors worked them into the framework of FTAs, others have not mentioned it at all and used what could be described

as simple logic to deduce what can be considered impolite. One thing these definitions do have in common, however, is the fact that they all agree that in order to be impolite, one has to say or do something that breaks certain social conventions and at the same time, and maybe even more importantly, it has to be perceived as rude or impolite. Without this perception from the other party, there can be no impoliteness.

Culpeper (2011b) agrees with this statement and adds that it indeed is quite hard to easily define impoliteness. Simply because, as mentioned above, some behaviours could be seen as impolite in one place but entirely acceptable in another one. Culpeper (2011) then adds that for behaviour to be seen as impolite, two things must be involved. Firstly, the participant in a conversation must hold a certain set of beliefs about certain behaviours in a social context and see these behaviours as negative in such context. Secondly, these beliefs must be activated in the contexts in which the participants find themselves and this activation must be accompanied by a negative attitude towards what is being said or done. (Culpeper, 2011b)

These statements are quite interesting because they shift focus from the speaker to the addressee in terms of impolite behaviour since the addressee is the one who has to comprehend the language being spoken and has to determine, whether the language is impolite. This also means that the speaker might not in fact want to cause offense, but his behaviour and language cause the offense themselves by being spoken or done in a certain way.

Hirschová (2013) seems to agree with Culpeper (2011b) in that regard as she also states that impolite behaviour must be accepted as such by the addressee. If an addressee finds themselves in a situation where they face impoliteness there are several strategies that they can employ. The first of these strategies will be to simply ignore the rudeness, or the impoliteness end pretend that nothing happened, this is of course the simplest strategy to avoid conflict. If the addressee feels confident or is in a situation where they are higher in the social hierarchy, they can ignore the impoliteness entirely or they can rebuke the impoliteness which can result in the restoration of the communication back to a cooperative way. The last strategy would be to accept the conflict and be impolite back however this is not always possible there are situations in which impoliteness is presumed and cannot be targeted back for example in the army. (Hirschová, 2010)

This further implies that the understanding of impoliteness is fairly similar to English authors because, in order to be impolite, the other communicant must evaluate the situation

as something that should cause offense, and in the case that they do not come to such a conclusion, no offense could have been given and therefore no impoliteness committed.

2. Type situations

There exists an axis of “politeness-impoliteness” on which certain communicative interactions lie. (Hirschová, 2013, p. 246)

2.1 Greetings

Most greetings in Czech are neutral and remain fairly stable throughout time with some rare exceptions coming from other languages mainly within the interactions of younger generations who are on average more proficient with said languages. It does happen that some greetings become archaic, and people stop using them (Má úcta, Uctivý služebník)¹. Greetings further differ according to different times of day, different relationships between people, and so on. There are also greetings that signify one’s affiliation with a certain group, be it religion or political party, or a sports organization. With these neutral greetings having nearly no meaning by themselves it is important to add to their characterization by changing the way people say them and what gestures they add while speaking. (Hirschová, 2013)

English language greetings work in a similar way, with most of them being rather neutral and some becoming archaic and falling out of use. Examples of such are How fares or saying well met when greeting someone. (Crystal and Crystal, 2020)

Similarly, to greetings, goodbyes are usually also fairly standardized and follow the same rules.

2.2 Addressing

Addressing a person can become an unenviable task since there are many different variations and possibilities to address someone, depending on their social status, profession, or any other potential markings. Furthermore, the wording depends on how close we are in relation to the other person and through what ways do we know each other. There are different occasions during which an impolite address might occur, and they all have different scales

¹ My respects, Humble servant

of repercussions that might happen. When someone expects to be addressed in a formal way but is instead addressed informally, it is considered impolite, but rarely does anything other than the other person thinking less of them happens. However, this changes when speaking within the military, or diplomatic setting, where using the wrong address to a superior person might result in a demotion or an international faux pas. (Hirschová, 2013)

An address might also serve as an indicator for certain professions or affiliation with certain organizations. Another part of a formal address might be titles or the name of the specific job, for example, president or director. (Hirschová, 2013)

An important distinction in Czech in comparison with English is the different use of words and distinction when addressing people formally and informally. This is called *tykání* (second person singular) when talking informally and *vykání* (second person plural) when talking formally. This is something that does not exist in English and makes recognizing the tone of a conversation much harder. It is also a big distinction when addressing someone in a formal setting as Czech tends to use *vykání* much more in a formal setting and *tykání* in an informal setting between friends. This is not a simple axis where a person would use one or the other, but combinations of these two variations exist and are combined in situations with unknown people or with people one might not care about offending. (Hirschová, 2013)

There are some interesting differences between addressing others in Czech and English, mostly the fact that Czech is much more comfortable with combining different styles of addressing. E.g., it is perfectly acceptable to say *Vážený pane doktore Novotný* (Dear Mr. Doctor Novotný), though it is not entirely common it is still a very polite way of speaking to others. This is not something that the English would do as they would leave out the Mr.

One other specialty of combining *tykání* and *vykání* exists as Pečený (2011, p. 283) says that you can combine the use of the first name with *vykání*. This could be used between a teacher and a student or a doctor and a nurse.

One last special example is addressing unknown children. Since there really is no indication other than the gender of the child, it can be difficult to use the correct wording, and using diminutives only works to a certain age group. In this situation, it would be best to simply use the word please at the start of the sentence and continue without addressing the child directly. (Hirschová, 2013)

2.3 Giving opinions and/or evaluation

There are several ways to give opinions or evaluate others politely. These are the use of conditional, modal verbs, and negation.

2.3.1 Applying a conditional

It is generally viewed as much more polite when the speaker uses a question with a conditional rather than an imperative sentence ordering someone to do something. Conditional can be further used as a mitigation of an order or request by a person of higher ranking or an employer towards an employee. (Hirschová, 2013)

2.3.2 Modal verbs or so-called hedges

Above, there is the mentioned use of conditional to soften a request or an order. Further stacking of softening in Czech would be adding more negation or as this chapter describes using modal verbs. Most often used modal verbs in Czech are equivalents to English “may” “want” and “can/could”. These are not any precise translations, and some variations of these words might appear but are simply used here to give an idea of the modal verbs in Czech. (Hirschová, 2013)

These aforementioned modal verbs are used in what are called hedges (Clemen, 1997). Hedging is used in order to, again, soften sentences and reduced their confrontational power and it is one of the most basic strategies in polite communication. (Hirschová, 2013)

Hedging is also often used in academic writing to soften the impact of certain sentences when we are writing something, and we do not want to presume something with absolute certainty. This is very similar to their use in conversation in politeness where we simply want to negate, or at least slightly mitigate the impact of a request, or in the case of academic writing the impact of a statement that cannot be entirely proven beyond a shadow of reasonable doubt. (Swales and Feak, 2004, p. 156-164)

Hedges are mostly used in English in which sentences without them might be oftentimes seen as too direct and through this directness might be viewed as trying to assert the dominance

of the speaker or the speaker's own opinion which in English is considered very impolite. (Hirschová, 2013)

2.3.3 Use of negation

Negation is mostly used in exploratory questions. In these types of questions in Czech, it does not matter whether they are asked in a positive or a negative way. That is because they serve the same purpose. It is however much more common to see the negative way being used because it is seen as more polite because it suggests to the addressee that the person asking the question does not necessarily expect a positive answer or that whatever request they had will be granted. This might put the recipient of the question at the ease of mind because he is not necessarily expected to give a positive answer and might therefore feel better when giving a negative answer or refusing to comply with the request (Hirschová, 2013)

However, negation might sometimes be used in a rather negative way, especially when using it to do or relay irony. This might be used for example in cases where the participants of the conversation know each other very well and it cannot, therefore, be always seen as an impolite question. (Hirschová, 2013)

In English, the use of negation is much more restrictive since you can only use a single negative about every thought. Using more than one would lead to the use of double negative which is not the correct grammar.

This is not the case in Czech in which you can say a sentence such as *Nikdy by mě nenapadlo, že nepřijde* (I would never think that he would not come). Such a sentence is acceptable and does not present problems in Czech.

3. Summary

In this part of the thesis, there is an overview of how politeness is viewed and characterized in the English and Czech languages. There is also a look at the main politeness theory presented by Brown and Levinson which is the theory this thesis works with and uses the most. It also includes their definitions of face-threatening acts. Furthermore, there is a short chapter on impoliteness and lastly the typical situations in a conversation that might occur.

Analytical part

4. The media chosen for analysis

In this part of the thesis, I make a comparison of an original and translated text of several media, with most of the focus being on conversations as they can be best used to illustrate the typical situations presented in the theoretical part above. The works selected are *To Sleep in a Sea of Stars* by Christopher Paolini. (*Spát v moři hvězd*, translated by Zdík Dušek, 2020) and several selected episodes of the American sitcom *How I met your mother*. As a part of this chapter, there is a short overview of the content of the book and information about the author.

As for the sitcom *How I met your mother*, the original creators are Carter Bays and Craig Thomas. All transcriptions of the scenes from the TV show both in English and Czech are done by me.

In this part, there is also the answer to the third and final research question.

It is also important to stress the fact that this is not an analysis of the quality of the translation but rather the analysis of the way the languages handle similar situations. For that reason, I will not be commenting on the translation of names or titles, unless necessary for context.

4.1 About the author

Christopher Paolini grew up in Montana, USA, where he was home-schooled by his parents. He used to write short stories and poems since he was a child and much of his ideas were influenced by the Middle Ages in Europe. His first book, *Eragon*, was not originally meant to be published and was simply a personal project which he thought he would personally enjoy reading. This story was based on his personal experiences of living and camping in the mountains at home. The book was written when Christopher was only 15 years old and he gave it to his parents to read, after which they decided that they would self-publish. This took many years and rewrites and promotion until the book was noticed by Alfred A. Knopf Books for Young Readers who would later go on to become Paolini's publisher. The Book would end up becoming New York Times Best Seller and throughout the following decade, Paolini would end up writing another three books to finish the series and received a Guinness World Record prize for being the "youngest author of a bestselling book series. Finally, after an almost decade-

long hiatus, he would end up writing his first science fiction novel *To Sleep in a Sea of Stars*. (Paolini International, 2022)

4.2 Plot summary of *To Sleep in a Sea of Stars*

The plot is set in the year 2257 and revolves around a woman called Kira Navárez who is employed as a xenobiologist in search of a suitable colony for humans. On the day of their supposed departure, Kira is sent to investigate a crashed drone as a last-minute mission. She, however, encounters an alien entity known as Soft Blade and this meeting would result in disastrous consequences for the entirety of the human race as it is thrust into a conflict that threatens to wipe out humanity on a cosmic scale.

4.3 Analysis of the excerpts of *To Sleep in a Sea of Stars*

The excerpts chosen here, have been chosen on purpose as they contain emotionally charged moments of both politeness and impoliteness and stressful situations. They have also been repurposed in order to contain mostly the dialogue between characters so as not to pointlessly inflate the character limits. All these corrections were done by the authors of this thesis.

4.3.1 First conversation from *To Sleep in a Sea of Stars*

This is the conversation between Alan and Kira (A and K from now). For context, this is a scene where Alan asks Kira to marry him.

K: "What do you mean?"

A: "I mean, let's not do this bouncing around anymore. I can't take it either."

K: "What would—"

A: "Let's apply for berths on the Shakti-Uma-Sati."

K: "As colonists."

A: "As colonists. Company employees are pretty much guaranteed slots, and Adra is going to need all the xenobiologists and geologists they can get."

K: "You're serious."

A: "Serious as a pressure breach."

K: "That's just the drink talking."

A: "No, Kira. It's not. I know this would be a huge change, for both of us, but I also know you're sick of jetting around from one rock to another, and I don't want to wait another six months to see you. I really don't."

K: "I don't want that either."

A: "So then let's not."

K: "I don't think the odds are as good as you say. Colonies only really want pair-bonded couples. You know that."

A: "Yes, I do,"

A: "Kira Navárez ... you asked me once what I saw among the stars. I told you I saw questions. Now, I see you. I see us."

A: "Kira, will you do me the honor of joining your life with mine? Will you be my wife, as I will be your husband?"

A: Will—"

K: "Yes. Yes, Alan J. Barnes. Yes, I'll marry you. Yes. A thousand times yes." (Paolini, 2020, p. 19-20)

Now the Czech translation.

K: "Jak to myslíš?"

A: "Můžeme s tím věčným harcováním přestat. Taky už to nemůžu vydržet"

K: "Co tím...?"

A: "Přihlašme se na Šakti-Uma-Sati."

K: "Jako kolonisté?"

A: "Jako kolonisté. Zaměstnanci společnosti mají místa víceméně zaručená a Adra bude potřebovat všechny xenobiology a geology, které dokáže sehnat."

K: "Myslíš to vážně."

A: “Jsem tak vážný, jako narušení hermetičnosti stanice.”

K: “Nemluví z tebe jen pítí?”

A: “Ne, Kiro. Nemluví. Víím, že to pro oba bude obrovská změna, ale taky víím, že máš dost těch přeletů z jednoho kusu skály na druhý, a nechci čekat půl roku, než tě zase uvidím. Vážně nechci.”

K: “Já taky ne.”

A: “Tak nečekejme.”

K: “Mám dojem, že naše šance nejsou tak dobré, jak říkáš. Kolonie chtějí jenom manželské páry. To přece víš.”

A: “Ano, víím.”

A: “Kiro Navárezová, kdysi ses mě zeptala, co vidím mezi hvězdami. Odpověděl jsem, že otázky. Ale teď vidím tebe. Nás. Kiro, prokážeš mi tu čest a spojíš svůj život s mým? Budeš mou ženou, jako já budu tvým mužem? Budeš...”

K: “Ano, ano, Alane J. Barnesi. Ano, vezmu si tě, Ano. Tisíckrát ano.” (Paolini, 2020, p.22-23, translation by Dušek)

4.3.2 Analysis of the First conversation from To Sleep in a Sea of Stars

In the second line, there is a shift in the Czech translation, whereas the original English opts for a negative question, the translation does not see this as optimal. This is a surprising way of the use of negation since it is far easier to use in Czech than in English. In the next sentence, the use of negation is left the way as it is in the original.

Very interesting to note is the line as colonists which in the original is poised as a statement but when translated it is changed to an exploratory question. This is rather strange as there was no need for this change in the translation and it does fairly nothing in a way of changing the feeling of the question, or a statement, being polite. This is even stranger when considering that in the next line when Kira states that Alan is truly serious and both versions are left as statements

and not changed to a question. This is yet again done in the next line where the statement is again changed to a question.

The way it is translated makes Kira in the English version feel more like she is sure of herself and does not have to reassure herself by questioning herself and Alan.

Another thing to note is the constant use of names throughout the excerpt, this is also to a point unexpected, since Czech oftentimes entirely omits names, and it is not seen as anything impolite because it is the way the language functions. This is especially strange in the last part where both the protagonists address each other by their full names, even with middle names and surnames, as that is something that rarely ever happens in Czech and to a point could even be seen as a satire between friends.

It would be much more expected of Kira to use *tykání* (second person singular) as this is a very close and intimate moment between the two protagonists and Czechs would not use their full names in such a setting.

When looking at the excerpt through the lens of Face-Threatening Acts we can see that in the English version there are several threats to the negative face of Kira, these include suggestions, offers, and promises. Namely, the suggestion that they move to the Shakti-Uma-Sati, the offer to marry, and the implication of a promise of a life together.

As for the threats to the positive face, there is an acceptance of his offer to marry Kira.

In the Czech version, these are the same and remain unchanged.

4.3.3 Second conversation from To Sleep in a Sea of Stars

The second excerpt is from when Kira is held prisoner by the army trying to figure out what had happened to her and what is the alien she found on the planet. She was nearly tortured by the army, and this led to an escalation between her and the security detail. This is a conversation between Kira and Doctor Carr who had been performing experiments on her. The last lines are said by security detail robots trying to apprehend Kira.

Dr. Carr: “Alright, Navárez. Enough of this. We—”

K: “Go away.”

Dr. Carr: “That’s not going to happen.”

K: "Well, I'm not going to help you until I get what I asked for. Simple as that."

Dr. Carr: "Get back into position, Navárez, or else—"

K: "Or else what?"

Dr. Carr: "Fine"

Robot: "Citizen Navárez. Turn around and put your hands on the wall."

K: "No."

Robot: "If you resist, we are authorized to use force. You have five seconds to comply. Turn around and put your hands on the wall."

K: "Go jump out an airlock." (Paolini, 2020, p. 84-85)

The Czech version is as follows:

Dr. Carr: "Dobře, Navárezová. Dost téhle komedie. Teď..."

K: "Jděte pryč."

Dr. Carr: "To se nestane."

K: "Já vám nebudu pomáhat, dokud nedostanu, oč jsem žádala. Jednoduché."

Dr. Carr: "Zaujměte pozici, Navárezová, jinak..."

K: "Jinak co?"

Dr. Carr: "Jak chcete."

Robot: "Občanko Navárezová. Otočte se a dejte ruce na stěnu."

K: "Ne."

Robot: "Budete-li odporovat, máme povolení použít sílu. Máte pět vteřin na uposlechnutí. Otočte se a dejte ruce na stěnu."

K: "Vyskočte z tlakové komory." (Paolini, 2020, p.90-92, translation by Dušek)

4.3.4 Analysis of the second conversation from To Sleep in a Sea of Stars

This second excerpt was specifically chosen because of the high-stakes situation which arises and the constant dialogue between two characters who have antagonized themselves through previous interactions, which then escalates into physical violence.

Right in the first line, we can see a great example of impoliteness when Dr. Carr uses *vykání* in an ironic way and without any hedging or the use of Ms. This can be considered offensive in both languages, especially with the threat attached right afterward.

A great example of a double negative in the Czech translation is in the fourth line where Kira uses it to accentuate her point of not doing anything for them without getting anything in return.

An interesting comparison is also in the fifth line where it seems more like an order in the English version rather than the plea in the Czech, although of course both are ended with an unfinished threat, therefore it is somewhat certain that both cases are orders meant as definitive orders rather than polite requests.

Finally, the exchanges where the robot is speaking are interesting to analyse, since without the accompanying context these requests would almost seem polite, however in the sense that these are programmed robots and have no internal feeling, it is rather impossible to measure anything they do or say on the politeness-impoliteness scale. This is also true for the last line which would normally be seen as offensive and dangerous, but when coming from a robot it is a somewhat moot point.

Kiras' position in this part is weak and she seems to be simply stubbornly refusing whatever order she is given simply because it feels that it is the only obstruction she can really do.

When looking for any FTAs committed, there can be seen several. Threats to the negative face would include orders and requests by Dr. Carr towards Kira, furthermore, several threats toward her are made, though these are mostly left unspoken and used in unfinished sentences, except when said by the robots with the threat of violence. There are also the expressions of strong negative emotions by both sides. In fact, almost the entirety of this excerpt is going one negative face threat to another, there are cases of orders, threats, and warnings, expressions of negative emotions towards the addressee, non-cooperation in an activity, and also used of address terms

and other status-marked identifications by the robots, however again, here it is hard to decide whether or not this could be considered a face threat from the context of it being said by a robot and not a human being.

Interestingly enough, there are no threats to the positive face present in either the English original or the Czech translation.

Out of these two excerpts, there are not many obvious differences between the way English and Czech present FTAs and not many differences in any typical situations either. The biggest change from English to Czech is the occasional use of double negative, which cannot be used in English and therefore it is no surprise that such change sometimes occurs as it is natural for Czech speakers to use it.

Arguments could be made about the way people are addressed in the translated version and that some of those

5. Analysis of conversations from How I met your mother

For the purpose of this thesis, there will be conversations and their translation from the pilot episode of the sitcom and their translation into Czech. As mentioned before, the transcription of the English original is taken from the script, while the Czech translation is done by the author of this thesis.

5.1 First conversation from How I met your mother between Barney and Ted

The context for the scene here is that Teds' best friend Marshall is going to propose to his long-term girlfriend and Ted is unsure how will that affect their friendship and is therefore unsure about his own future, while his friend Barney is much more free-minded and wants Ted to not think about it and just spend the time together so that they could go to bars together.

Ted: You know what's weird? I just spent all day planning this romantic marriage proposal...and it's for someone else.

Barney: Oh, I see. Marshall gets engaged, and all of a sudden, your ovaries are shrinking. Have you forgotten what I said to you the night we met? We were sitting right over there... Ted, I'm gonna teach you how to live.

Ted: Barney. We met at the urinal.

Barney: Yeah, true.

Ted: Oh, right. Hi.

Barney: Lesson one, lose the goatee. Lesson two, never wear jeans to a strip club. You want a fabric that's light and * roomy.

Ted: Why? Oh.

Barney: Lesson three: don't even think about getting married till you're 30.

Ted: I'm not thinking about it. Just 'cuz my best friend's getting married doesn't mean I have to.

Barney: I thought I'm your best friend. Ted, say I'm your best friend.

Ted: You're my best friend, Barney.

Barney: Good. Then as your best friend, I suggest we play a little game I call, "Have Ya Met Ted?"

Ted: What? No, we're not playing "Have Ya Met Ted." (Bays and Thomas, 2005)

The Czech translation is as follows

Ted: Víš co je zvláštní, strávil jsem celý den plánováním romantického žádání o ruku... a je to pro někoho jiného.

Barney: Aha, chápu. Marshall se zasnoubí a zničehonic se ti smrsknou vaječníky. Copak jsi už zapomněl, co jsem ti řekl, tu noc co jsme se poznali? Seděli jsme přímo támhle... Tede, naučím tě žít.

Ted: Barney, potkali jsem se na záchodě.

Barney: Ah, jo vlastně.

Ted: Oh, čau.

Barney: Lekce číslo jedna, ohol si tu bradku. Lekce číslo dva, nikdy nenos džíny do strip klubu, budeš chtít lehký a prodyšný material.

Ted: Proč? Oh, aha.

Barney: Lekce tři, opovaž se vůbec přemýšlet and svatbou dokud ti nebude aspoň 30.

Ted: Neuvažuju and tím, jen protože se mi bude ženit nejlepší kamarád, neznamená, že já musím taky.

Barney: Myslel jsem si, že já jsem tvůj nejlepší kamarád, řekni mi že jsem tvůj nejlepší kamarád.

Ted: Jsi můj nejlepší kamarád.

Barney: Dobře, jakožto tvůj nejlepší kamarád navrhuji, abychom si zahráli takovou malou hru, které říkám “Už jsi poznala Teda”?

Ted: Co? Ne, nebudeme hrát “Už jsi poznala Teda.” (Translation by me)

5.2 Analysis of the First Conversation from How I met your mother

The reason for using this as the first excerpt is that it corresponds with the previous part of the thesis as in the fact that the previous excerpt from *To Sleep in a Sea of Stars* also dealt with a marriage proposal. There is a different take on this in the *How I met your mother* sitcom, where the marriage is played for laughs while in the previous part it was an important moment. This was done on purpose to present a certain juxtaposition between a serious tone and a more comedic one.

I believe this to be a great example of comedy and irony between friends where one can see that there is a certain history and without the context of them being friends, the language might appear incredibly insulting, e.g., when Barney insinuates that Ted has ovaries and is getting emotional.

As for typical situations, we can see here again how often the English original uses names which are as mentioned before something that the Czech translations do not use as often.

Also, quite interesting to note how incredibly straightforward in this exchange Barney is. When he first meets Ted, he does not even introduce himself and starts talking to him in a way as if they knew each other for several years. This is of course hardly something that can be seen on a daily basis and would be considered impolite

As for FTAs in this excerpt, there are several threats to negative face made by Barney where he offers unsolicited advice to Ted with regards to his style and fashion. This could also be seen as an expression of disapproval.

Also, another thing to notice is the fact that there are yet again no threats to the positive face.

Furthermore, it is important to notice that yet again, nearly nothing changed from the translation except for the removal of addressing by name.

5.3 Second Conversation from How I met your mother between Ted, Barney, and Lily

The context for this scene is that Ted is trying to get a new girlfriend and he and his friends just went to her apartment so that he could try and kiss her before she leaves for a work-related prolonged period of time and his friends are there to support him.

Barney: “Yeah. Hey, Ted, if you kiss her, can I watch? I love it when chicks make out.”

Ted:” Her lights are on. She’s home.”

Lily: “Ted, hang on! So, should we wait here? What if you, uh... “

Barney: “Get it on with the TV reporter? “This just in.”

Lily: “Please don’t leave us out here all night.”

Ted:” If it’s going well, I’ll call your cell phone and let it ring once. And you guys can take off.”

Lily:” Kiss her, Ted. Kiss her good.”

Ted:” Marshall, remember this night. When you’re the best man at our wedding, and you give a speech...you’re gonna tell this story.”

Barney: “Why does he get to be the best man?! I’m your best friend!” (Bays and Thomas, 2005)

Czech translation is as follows.

B: Jo. Hej, Tede, pokud ji políbíš, myslíš že se můžu dívat? Rád se dívám na holky, jak se líbají.

T: “Svítí se u ní, je doma.”

L: “Vydrž chvíli, měli bychom na tebe čekat? Co když se spolu...”

B: “Co když se vyspí s reportérkou? Nejnovější zprávy...”

L: “Jenom nás tady prosímtě nenechej čekat celou noc.”

T: “Pokud to půjde dobře, zavolám ti a nechám to jednou cinknout, pak můžete odjet.”

L: “Polib ji, pořádně ji polib.”

T: “Marshalle, tuto noc si zapamatuj. Až mi půjdeš za svědka a budeš mít proslov, chci abys řekl tenhle příběh.”

B: “Hej, proč by měl být on tvůj svědek, já jsem tvůj nejlepší kámoš!” (Translation by me)

5.4 Analysis of the second conversation from How I met your mother

Similarly, to the scene before this one, there is a sense of irony coming from Barney where he again expresses how he considers Ted a woman and this is a great example of something that would be considered impolite under different circumstances, where the two participants of a conversation do not know each other but this way it is a great example of a way of ignoring impoliteness presented by others and simply not responding to it.

Other than that, there are several examples of addressing by name which again does not happen all that often in Czech but in this translation, I felt these would be far more natural than in the previous cases and could very probably happen.

When looking at this excerpt from the point of FTAs there are again several threats to the negative face of the addressee. Namely, a request from Barney to watch the kiss, a request from Lily to not let them wait the whole night, and a suggestion again from Lily to kiss her good.

Interestingly enough, there is also an expression of envy coming from Barney when Ted says to Marshall that he is going to be his best man at his wedding when the time comes.

6. Summary

In the analytical part of this thesis, there is a look at several short text excerpts from the science fiction novel by Christopher Paolini and its Czech translation as well as several excerpts from the pilot episode of the American sitcom *How I met your mother* and its Czech version. Through these, there is an answer to the question posed in the introductory chapter as to what changes occur during translation. Full answers to all three research questions are below in the conclusion.

Conclusion

To summarize the main points of the thesis and answer the research questions presented in the introduction. The main purpose of the thesis was to find what are the differences and/or similarities in English and Czech views of politeness and its theory. Furthermore, the idea of face attacks was presented and explained as well as how do these two languages differ in typical conversational and communicative situations such as addressing other people or the use of negation in a conversation. The research questions for the intention of this thesis were asked like this:

- (1) What commonalities are there between Czech and English views of politeness?
- (2) What differences are there in type situations between Czech and English?
- (3) What changes occur during the translation of typical situations?

The first and second questions are answered in the theoretical part, but to reiterate the points made. Czech authors oftentimes draw from the theory provided by English authors and therefore their views do not differ very much and mostly build upon these theories for the purposes of Czech language.

The answer to the second question is that Czech is capable of using double negation and often does so, even in translations as it is easy for Czech readers and speakers to understand, but it is incorrect in English and therefore cannot be used which is one of the main differences. Furthermore, the way these two languages address people with English being more open to using names in a conversation.

As for the third research question, I tried to find differences if any exist between English original works and their Czech translation and whether these differences correspond with the previously mentioned theory, and it would seem that this is indeed the case even though it cannot be said with absolute certainty, as some translations had surprisingly higher rates of translating and using names which is not something the theory entirely supports, although of course, the sample of texts for this thesis was not big enough to come to definitive conclusions and more research into this topic should be done.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

BROWN, Penelope a Stephen LEWINSON. Politeness: Some universals in language usage. 1987. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. ISBN 0-521-30862-3.

CULPEPER, Jonathan. Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. ISBN 978-0-521-86967-6.

HIRSCHOVÁ, Milada. Pragmatika v češtině. Vyd. 2., V Karolinu 1., dopl. V Praze: Karolinum, 2013. ISBN 978-80-246-2233-0.

Secondary Sources

BEEBE, Leslie. Polite fictions: Instrumental rudeness as pragmatic competence. ALATIS, James, Carolyn STRAEHLE, Brent GALLENBERGER a Maggie RONKINS. Georgetown University round table on language teachers: Ethnolinguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic aspects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press., 1995, s. 154-168. ISBN 0-87840-130-X.

ČERMÁK, František. Jazyk a Jazykověda. Praha: Karolinum, 2001. ISBN 80-246-0154-0.

ERVING, Goffman. Interactional Ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior. Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1967.

Fraser, B. “Hedged performatives”, in P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (eds.), Syntax and Semantics. Vol. 3. New York: Academic Press, 187–210. 1975

HIRSCHOVÁ, Milada. Nezdvořilost jako pragmalingvistický fenomén. Brno: Masarykova Univerzita, s. 273-285, 2010. ISBN 978-80-210-5250-5.

JOHN, Anderson et al. The Oxford handbook of Memory. Oxford: Oxford University Press p. 557–570, 2010.

LAKOFF, George a Mark TURNER. More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. ISBN 978-0-226-46812-9.

PAOLINI, Christopher. Spát v moři hvězd. Přeložil Zdik DUŠEK. V Praze: Fragment, 2020. ISBN 978-80-253-4935-9.

PAOLINI, Christopher. To Sleep in a Sea of Stars. New York: Tom Doherty Associates, 2020. ISBN 978-1-250-79050-7.

SWALES, John a Christine FEAK. Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills. Michigan: University of Michigan p. 156-164, 2004.

The Concept of Hedging. MARKKANEN, Raija. Hedging and Discourse: Approaches to the Analysis of a Pragmatic Phenomenon Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997, s. 235-248.

WATTS, Richard. Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. ISBN 0-521-79085-9.

YULE, George. Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. ISBN 0-194-37207-3.

Online Sources

BAYS, Carter a Craig THOMAS. How I Met Your Mother: Pilot [online]. 2005 [cit. 2022-04-20]. Dostupné z: https://www.dailyscript.com/scripts/How_I_Met_Your_Mother_-_Pilot.pdf

CRYSTAL, David a Ben CRYSTAL. SHAKESPEARE'S WORDS [online]. 2022 [cit. 2022-04-20]. Dostupné z: <https://www.shakespeareswords.com/Public/LanguageCompanion/ThemesAndTopics.aspx?TopicId=17>

CULPEPER, Jonathan et al. Impoliteness revisited: with special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. Journal of Pragmatics. 2003, 35, 1545-1579. Dostupné z doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00118-2

KÁDÁR, Dániel. Politeness in Pragmatics [online]. 2017 [cit. 2022-04-20]. Dostupné z: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.218>

KAMLASI, Immanuel. The Positive Politeness in Conversations Performed by the Students of English Study Program of Timor University. 2017. Dostupné také z:

<https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/207623-the-positive-politeness-in-conversations.pdf>

PAOLINI INTERNATIONAL LLC. Biography - Christopher Paolini [online]. 2022 [cit. 2022-04-20]. Dostupné z: <https://www.paolini.net/biographies/christopher-paolini-full/>

PEČENÝ, Pavel. Bohemica Olomucensia 2: Philologica Juvenilia [online]. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2011 [cit. 2022-04-20]. ISSN 1803-876X. Dostupné z: https://kb.upol.cz/fileadmin/userdata/FF/katedry/kbh/veda_a_vyzkum/bohemica_olomucensia/BO_2_2011.pdf

Resumé

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá zdvořilostí v anglickém a českém jazyce, primárně se pak zaměřuje na to, zda je teorie v anglickém a českém jazyce rozdílná, nebo zda spolu souhlasí. Dále se snaží zaměřit na typologické situace v konverzacích, jako jsou pozdravy a oslovování a jak se tyto od sebe liší v obou jazycích. V analytické části jsou pak tyto znalosti využity k porovnání anglického originálu s českým překladem a ke zjišťování, zda-li se v teorii nalezené rozdíly uplatňují i v praxi.

Annotation

Jméno a příjmení:	Vojtěch Doupovec
Katedra:	Ústav cizích jazyků, PdF UP, Olomouc
Vedoucí práce:	Mgr. Josef Nevařil, Ph. D.
Rok obhajoby:	2022
Název práce:	Zdvořilost v českém a anglickém jazyce
Název práce v angličtině:	Politeness in Czech and English
Anotace práce:	Cílem této práce je analyzovat rozdíly a podobnosti mezi anglickými a českými názory na zdvořilost za použití moderních médií, jmenovitě science fiction a sitcomy. Teoretická část se zabývá prezentací teorií zdvořilosti a názory na nich v obou dvou jazycích a různými způsoby, jak by bylo možné se chovat nezdvořile v průběhu konverzace. Analytická část se zabývá analýzou krátkých textů v jejich originálním znění a následném překladu do češtiny a tím, zda se v těchto překladech nějak mění vyznění zdvořilosti, popřípadě vyznění jistých typových situací.
Klíčová slova:	Zdvořilost, jazyk, nezdvořilost, obličej, útoky na obličej
Anotace v angličtině:	This thesis aims to analyse the differences and similarities in English and Czech views of politeness with the use of modern forms of media, specifically science fiction and situational comedy or sitcom. The theoretical part is used to present some views of politeness in both languages and some ways politeness might not be adhered to in conversation. The analytical part focuses on the analysis of short English and Czech excerpts from different media and how and if they somehow differ in their presentation of politeness given by the theoretical part.
Klíčová slova v angličtině:	Politeness, language, impoliteness, face, face threatening act
Rozsah práce:	43 stran
Jazyk práce:	Anglický