

(NON-DEICTIC, SOCIO-EXPRESSIVE)
T-/V-PRONOUN DISTINCTION IN
SPANISH/ENGLISH FORMAL
LOCUTIONARY ACTS*

LINGUISTS AND TRANSLATORS alike (and the latter term is a hyponym of the former) have deemed the perfect translation unattainable; but it is also true that there are many translations that fail to be accurate because of the translator's ignorance or flippancy. Richard of Bury denounced inaccurate translations back in the fourteenth century,¹ and as late as in 1976 Piquette proved that half the number of translations launched into the market were ambiguous and therefore flawed.² The statistics of translation amply illustrate what occurs when non-native speakers – in their efforts to express themselves in a foreign language either orally or in writing – are betrayed by linguistic interference caused by mother-tongue references. In fact, translation theoreticians have endeavoured to bridge the many linguistic gaps that separate languages and hinder non-native speakers/writers from mastering a foreign language. It is an accepted maxim that rhetorical sophistication makes it impossible to provide a perfect translation of any literary text; nonetheless, translation studies have pointed out the means to convert a non-literary text into its equivalent in a second language.³ Cultural difference has, for many years, been seen as the main obstacle for translators seeking to produce appropriate translations, and for non-native speakers to construct coherent speech; yet such a dreadful foe has been fought by the advocates of cultural awareness, from ethnographic semanticists and advocates of dynamic equivalence, like Casagrande, Nida and Taber, to those who proclaim the advantages of hermeneutics, like Steiner, Gadamer, and Bassnett-McGuire.⁴

After Vinay and Darbelnet's opposition to the *traduction littérale ou mot à mot*, i.e. *verbum pro verbo*,⁵ there is a general consensus on the word-for-word translation's being inappropriate in most – if not all – instances, for it leaves out most linguistic implicatures (i.e. the Gricean term used in present-day pragmatics to identify the loose kind of material implication that determines illocutionary force). This also concerns interpretation, and, generally speaking, any locutionary act uttered by non-native speakers, i.e. natural translation:⁶ most non-native speakers usually transform the meaning into the form of their mother tongue and then translate this first form into the equivalent form in the foreign language – which is a word-for-word translation. This linguistic mechanism favours interference, which is more accentuated whenever the speaker is more ignorant of cultural implicatures.⁷ José Ortega y Gasset deemed cultural implicatures essential in any act of utterance carried out by a non-native speaker: in an intriguing

allegory, Ortega y Gasset compares languages with countries and declares that in crossing a *frontier* a *traveller* always leaves behind a relevant part of their cultural baggage.⁸

Meaning in action is amenable to cultural contextualisation, and anyone translating, interpreting or simply speaking a foreign language must necessarily allow for cultural entailments (entailment being in sociolinguistics the material implications *sensu stricto*). Neglecting culturally-imposed denotations results in a lack of coherence that, depending on the context, can be rather significant. Politeness is one of the implicatures that are dependent on culturally-established conventions; and in order to express politeness the non-native speaker needs to be knowledgeable about the norms of politeness that govern the foreign language. John Lyons describes politeness as “[o]ne of the dimensions of cultural variation that regulate the use of the allegedly basic speech acts [...]. One must be careful [...] not to assume that generalizations made on the basis of one’s experience of one kind of society will be valid in respect of all human societies.”⁹ Indeed culture affects meaning and causes intelligibility to be conditional upon it.¹⁰ With regard to politeness, it is necessary to bear in mind that some universal functions in the act of utterance – such as asking questions and issuing commands – are addressed differently in different societies. In my case example of English and Spanish, the dissimilarities are indeed conspicuous, e.g. turn-taking is much more liberal in Spanish than it is in English,¹¹ and indirect speech-acts are less indirect in Spanish, e.g. where an English person would ask “could you tell me the time, please?” a Spaniard would simply say “¿tienes hora?” – which might be somewhat abrupt in English.¹² Generally speaking, Spaniards tend to speak in a much more informal manner than the British – and any other English-speaking people – as this essay argues. Many linguistic features are supportive and illustrative of this statement. In this essay I will discuss one difference which I believe particularly conspicuous – the T- versus V-pronoun distinction (T/V distinction) – although I shall also briefly refer to other disparities, such as the Spanish usage of personal pronouns to refer to a third person who is present in the conversation, or the use of indirect speech-acts. Politeness falls within the cultural gap between the Spanish and the English languages and is seldom translated – be it in written translation or in natural translation – by Spanish speakers who have not been exposed to British culture long enough to be fully aware of British social conventions. Not only does this result in inaccurate translations in films or television shows, but it is also liable to cause Spaniards to present themselves somewhat rudely in formal situations where formality is an unavoidable must. Likewise, the British may sound too formal in situations where Spaniards tend to adopt a very relaxed attitude.

The T/V distinction in Spanish causes Spaniards who speak English to produce a particular speech which may sound decidedly rude in formal

situations.¹³ The question regarding Spanish personal pronouns parallels that of its adverbs: where English has only “here” and “there”, Spanish has “aquí”, “ahí” and “allí” (beside “acá” and “allá”). Spanish speakers who learn English are taught that both “ahí” and “allí” are translated as “there”; yet English speakers who learn Spanish must be taught the differences between “ahí” and “allí”, for such differentiation does not exist in their mother tongue. The T/V distinction is much more obscure: in (Peninsular) Spanish¹⁴ “tú”, second-person singular pronoun, is employed in informal situations, whereas “usted”, also second-person singular pronoun, is reserved for formal situations.¹⁵ English-speaking students of Spanish as a foreign language learn that “tú” is to be used in informal situations, and “usted” in formal ones. Conversely, most Spaniards are taught in their classes of English that both “tú” and “usted” must be translated as “you” because there is not a T/V distinction in English. This is only partially true: it is true that in the English language the original distinction between “thou” and “you” no longer exists.¹⁶ However, it is also true that depending on the formality of the situation there are two ways to refer to addressees. The extinction of “thou” in standard English somehow responds to the principle of polysemy that, in Stephen Ullmann’s words, “is without any doubt a semantic universal inherent in the fundamental structure of language”.¹⁷

Generally speaking, however, the reasons for a number of societies to prioritise the T pronoun are predominantly historical. Brown and Gilman point out that: “A historical study of the pronouns of address reveals a set of semantic and social psychological correspondence. The non-reciprocal power semantic is associated with a relatively static society in which power is distributed by birthright and is not subject to much redistribution.”¹⁸ Brown and Gilman further explain that “The static social structure was accompanied by the Church’s teaching that each man had his properly appointed place and ought not to wish to rise above it.”¹⁹ Therefore, linguistic changes were triggered off by social revolutions. In revolutionary France, the Committee for Public Safety decided that the V pronoun was a feudal remnant, and thus condemned it alongside all other privileges of the aristocracy. Likewise, Russian novels written after the Russian Revolution also show how the use of the V pronoun was dramatically restricted for social and political reasons during that period. Nonetheless, there has been a tendency in the west throughout the twentieth century to retain the V pronoun, although its usage has decayed gradually through to the 1980s and 1990s as social movements increased the sense of egalitarianism. This, as Brown and Gilman imply, results from the new social mobility that did not exist in former periods, and has increased steadily in the last five or six decades, e.g. with the rise in the number of university graduates, particularly in the 1970s and 1980s, and through the creation of many universities in all European countries. Nowadays, Bernard Spolsky

points out, "The choice of second-person pronoun and the related phenomenon of terms of address in Western European languages in particular shows the formalization of politeness and status in a language."²⁰ Indeed, terms of address, alongside greetings,²¹ index politeness; however, as Spolsky suggests, second-person pronouns likewise connote the speaker's social positioning, as understood by themselves, and the degree of social respect the speaker confers upon the addressee.²² This is to say that choosing the wrong second-person pronoun is liable to offend the addressee. In the particular case of formal locutionary acts, such offence may jeopardise any agreements that may need to be made.

Second-person pronouns thus concern formality; and the appropriate degree of formality to be kept in different situations results, in many instances, from the social history of a particular country. For example, Claire Kramsch has noted how the US is a more egalitarian society than many European countries. Spaniards have lived, in the past twenty or thirty years, through a social period that differs significantly from those experienced by most European nations, i.e. the change from a conservative dictatorial regime to a democratic society, or, in Spanish, the so-called *transición*. During the 1970s and 1980s, Spaniards envisaged the possibility of changing their social status much more than during the previous decades. Yet the change in use of "tú" in Spain was not solely the responsibility of politicians. I would suggest that this was a process initiated in the 1960s, which was accentuated during the transition from dictatorship to democracy, but has continued to be modified up to the present, and will go on evolving. The first historical antecedent of this process is to be found in the pre-war period, when political leader José Antonio Primo de Rivera established that members of his party, Falange Española, should address each other with "tú" rather than "usted" in order to express their fraternal commitment to the same political cause.²³ Although Falange Española (after the Civil War, Falange Española Tradicionalista de las JONS) was the only political party in Spain during the Francoist period, the prevalence of "tú" decayed after the war. José Antonio Primo de Rivera was sentenced to death and shot during the war; and during the 1940s and 1950s, the Church played a dramatic role in the governing of Spanish society. Whilst through their revolutions societies like the French had neglected the static society proclaimed by the Church hierarchy and moved toward an egalitarian society, Spain was, in the 1940s and 1950s, governed by the morals which the Church dictated. Nonetheless, during the 1960s, and after the economic miseries inherited from the war were overcome, Franco lightened the severity of his regime. Spain then became a more liberal society and the Church began to lose much of the influence it exerted on Spaniards. Spanish academic Fernando Lázaro Carreter has declared that he was taken by surprise when his students began to address him with "tú" in the 1960s. But the change in the choice of "tú"

versus “usted” in the academic world developed particularly in the 1980s and 1990s. Professor Juan José Garrido told me that when he was lecturing at the University of Salamanca in the 1960s, although he was in his mid-twenties at the time, all his students used to address him with “usted” and even stood up when he entered the classroom or when he walked past in the corridors. Conversely, although he is almost sixty now, his students address him with “tú”. In the academic world, the reasons for this change must be found in the internal structures of the universities. I would suggest that most students address their lecturers and professors with “usted” and do so until the addressee encourages them to call them “tú”. And encouraging the students to address the teaching staff with “tú” results from the new university policies that confer upon the students the right to be represented and to vote in the senate, the council and the departments. Therefore, the teaching staff – especially those who do not hold tenure – seem to be much more interested in pleasing the students now than they were some thirty or forty years ago.

“Tú” is now used in situations where other countries would demand the most strict formality, e.g. when addressing members of the Royal Family. I remember watching the King on the news, visiting a primary school and being addressed as “tú” by the children. Very recently, on 29 January 2000, film director Pedro Almodóvar addressed the Prince of Asturias at an awards ceremony. Almodóvar was speaking from the stage and wished the Prince, who was sitting among the audience, a happy birthday. Almodóvar emphasised a “usted” at the end of his first sentence and added: “No sé cómo llamarte”. Subsequently, Almodóvar continued to address the Prince with both “usted” and “tú”. Newspapers omitted the sentences with “tú”; yet the episode was broadcast uncut on television news. This anecdote proves that informality can now be found in any situation in Spanish society, even if it involves a famous artist addressing the heir to the throne at a public event.

From the viewpoint of linguistics, the question when translating both demonstrative and second-person personal pronouns relates to deixis²⁴ as a kind of reference. Deictic context implies a hierarchy of sortal categories (i.e. the class of object being denoted). In the case of “you”, this hierarchy is necessary in order to denote politeness. John Lyons argues that, in English, “you”, as well as “I”, is a deictic term “because it refers to the locutionary addressee without conveying any additional information about them”.²⁵ Accordingly, the English language has developed a number of formulae to establish a distinction between the second-person pronoun in informal situations and in formal situations, i.e. “you” or “you, [e.g.] John” versus “you, sir” or “you, [e.g.] Mr. Smith” respectively.²⁶ Therefore, whilst “you” may be considered deictic, it can also be regarded as non-deictic depending on whether it is accompanied by a first name, a “Mr”, or a “sir”, for it then conveys additional information – the relation between speaker and addressee imposed by the situation.

Non-deictics are either descriptive (i.e. propositional) or socio-expressive.²⁷ “You” is socio-expressive and, on its own, does not entail politeness. Translating “usted” as “you” is but a word-for-word translation and, therefore, a bad translation for it does not provide the closest equivalent. The socio-expressiveness of the second-person pronoun places “you” in the semantic category that Nida and Taber named *abstraction* (as opposed to *object*, *event* and *relation*),²⁸ which designates notions of quality, quantity and degree, because it can designate the quality and degree (or rank) of the addressee. Hence, “you” conveys socio-expressive implicatures of quality and degree. From the viewpoint of Gricean grammarians,²⁹ “you” conveys semantic conversational implicatures, i.e. implicatures that regulate formality in locutionary acts.³⁰ Paul Grice’s theory that all language-activities are rational social interactions conditioned by the principle of co-operation concerns a formal/informal distinction in the use of “you”. The principle of co-operation encompasses four subprinciples – quantity, quality, relation and manner – and, according to Nida and Taber’s terminology, the socio-expressiveness of “you” places it within the subprinciple of quality that regulates the norms of politeness established by society and culture.³¹

Conversational socio-expressive implicatures make the translation of the Spanish T/V distinction a serious matter, to be approached very carefully. Indeed, the translation of “¿le apetece (a usted) una taza de té?” cannot be “would you like a cup of tea?” in all instances, as more formal situations (e.g. a waiter serving a client) would require “would you like a cup of tea, sir?” or “would you like a cup of tea, Mr Smith?”.³² English speakers of Spanish as a foreign language can associate “tú” with informal situations and “usted” with formal situations; however, Spaniards attempting to speak English often assume that both “tú” and “usted” can be put into English as “you”; or that “tú/usted = you”. Nonetheless, the dynamic equivalence of the T/V distinction between English and Spanish is:

Table 1

	SPANISH	ENGLISH
FORMAL SITUATION	Usted	You + sir You + Mr + last name
INFORMAL SITUATION	Tú	You You + first name

The vast majority of Spanish speakers of English as a foreign language fail to translate “tú” and “usted” according to the above table. This is noticeable simply by watching an American/British film dubbed into Spanish: Spanish dubbers always combine “usted” with first names although the

use of first names rather than the formula “Mister+last name” denotes informality. This becomes a dramatic difference when Spaniards in formal situations translate word by word from Spanish into English and refuse to endow their “you”s with the socio-expressive implicatures of formality.

The above table is not at all valid without further consideration, since meaning in action is amenable to cultural contextualisation. Present-day Spanish is quite a bizarre example of a language conveying the T/V distinction, because in the past two decades the use of the formal “usted” has diminished dramatically, and most Spaniards – especially young Spaniards – seldom use it. This opens further room for discussion. In the 1980s, Spanish translation theoretician Valentín García Yebra noticed that formality cannot be translated word-for-word from French into Spanish, notwithstanding the fact that the two languages bear the T/V distinction.³³ Formality is, indeed, a cross-cultural phenomenon that varies from one society to another, thus becoming the province of ethnolinguistics as much as of semantics.³⁴ Translating T- and V-pronouns from Spanish into any of its cognate languages is also subject to context. I take Portuguese as an example.

Portuguese is one of Spanish’s most cognate languages and also bears a T/V distinction; yet one cannot assume that “você = usted” and “tu = tú”, because the use of “tu” in Portuguese is restricted to very close friends and family. While a Spaniard would greet his neighbour “Buenos días Antonio ¿qué tal estás?”, a Portuguese person would always say “Bom dia, senhor António, tudo bem?”.³⁵ Therefore, while the Portuguese refer to all addressees (including most friends, colleagues, neighbours, etc.) except family and close friends by their titles, e.g. “senhor”, “senhor doutor”,³⁶ “senhor professor”, etc., Spaniards seldom use “señor” and “usted”. (There is in fact a third way of expressing “you” in Portuguese: “o senhor/a senhora”, the most courteous of all.) In a conversation between a Spaniard and a Portuguese person where both have a weak command of the other’s language (or none at all, as communication is feasible in many instances between such cognate languages), the Spaniard would not call his addressee “usted” or “você” because it would denote not only extreme formality but also his assuming an inferior role. Conversely, the Portuguese might take offence when being referred to as “tu/tú” by someone who is far from being one of his circle of intimates.

The difficulties in translating T- and V-pronouns from Spanish into such a close cognate language and culture as Portuguese (and vice versa) highlights the difficulties that arise when the cultural gap expands beyond the limits of romance language dominions. Not only does this difficulty concern semantics, as I have pointed out above, but sociology is also involved. I suggest that, in addition to Table 1, which deals with the semantics of the T/V distinction, the discussion should be completed with a sociolinguistic analysis that allows for socio-expressive denotations. In approaching the

social side of the T/V distinction in Spanish, I propose to borrow one of semanticists' chief analytical procedures: componential analysis. Yet instead of dissecting the lexeme into its component parts, I shall study the terms with regard to the situations in which they are employed. This is, therefore, a situational or contextual analysis rather than lexical decomposition. I furthermore believe componential analysis can be most helpful to this discussion as it has served translation theoreticians such as Nida, Taber and García Yebra as well as semanticists such as Greimas, Pottier, and Dowty.³⁷ In Table 2, I have selected a number of formal situations to observe which second-person personal pronoun is preferred in both Spanish and English.³⁸

Table 2

	SPANISH	ENGLISH
Policeman to a citizen	Tú/Usted	You + sir
Department store assistant to a client	Tú/Usted	You + sir
Shop assistant to a client	Tú	You + sir
Children to their teacher	Tú/Usted	You/You + sir
Businessman dealing with a businessman	Tú	You
Work colleagues from the same institution	Tú	You
Middle-class worker to his superior	Tú	You

It is also noteworthy that young people tend to avoid formality in both languages, e.g. if the shop assistants are in their late teens or early twenties and so is the customer, both are likely to use "tú" and "you" alone. On the other hand, senior citizens will be addressed as "usted" in Spanish.³⁹ Social status and education is another factor to be considered. Overall, all tables in this essay work with a middle-aged middle-class population as reference.⁴⁰ Generally speaking, I would again suggest that the choice of the second-person pronoun depends, firstly, on both the speaker and the addressee: age difference is an important determinant; and so are the speaker's own education and manners, and the clothes the addressee is wearing. Secondly, the scenario is also a relevant determinant. In Spain, assistants at department stores usually call their clients "tú", with some exceptions, e.g. El Corte Inglés, generally regarded the best department store. However, I have noticed that whereas in the Badajoz El Corte Inglés the assistants at the clothes departments address me with "usted", those at the restaurant or the music department prefer "tú", whereas in the Madrid El Corte Inglés I am addressed as "usted" in all departments. (I would suggest that now that Marks & Spencer has opened stores in Spain, an

observation should be carried out to determine to what extent Spanish Marks & Spencer assistants address their Spanish clients differently from the manner in which British Marks & Spencer assistants address British customers.)

Table 2 includes formal situations, but a chart containing addressees in non-professional activities reveals that Spaniards seldom use different forms of address in formal and informal situations whereas the British may do:

Table 3

	SPANISH	ENGLISH
Addressing a relative	Tü	You
Addressing a friend	Tü	You
Addressing a neighbour	Tü	You
Addressing a stranger (not an assistant) in a public place, e.g. a shop or a department store	Tü	You/You + sir
Addressing a stranger (not an assistant) in a public place, e.g. a pub	Tü	You

Although not as rigidly as the table might suggest (owing to its general nature), the English language is, in the examples provided in Table 3, less casual than the Spanish. Anthropologists might want to argue about the many differences between the British and Spaniards in the way they behave with strangers. Literature evinces that whereas in eighteenth-century England it was indiscreet to invite strangers to one's house, it was common in sixteenth-century Spain;⁴¹ and although social norms have, obviously, changed and are still changing, Britain still remains a more formal culture than Spain as far as politeness in speech is concerned.

I would conclude that translating T- and V-pronouns from Spanish into English properly is certainly a *tour de force*, not solely because English does not have a T/V distinction but also because the socially-imposed formulae of politeness differ from one society to the other. This affects translators and interpreters as well as foreign speakers who have not mastered the conversational implicatures imposed by the socio-expressive constituent of non-deictics, and therefore first convert the meaning into the form in their mother tongue only to translate word-for-word into the foreign language. In the particular case of politeness in formal situations, semantic analysis alone will never suffice and always calls for the viewpoint of sociolinguistics.

Their particular culturally- and subconsciously-imposed T/V distinction causes Spanish speakers of English as a foreign language to miss formality

in formal situations – and vice versa. Nonetheless, interpreting second-person pronouns is but an example of the cultural gap between Spanish and English with regard to politeness. Special attention must be conferred upon the usage of third-person pronouns when the third person is present, and also upon indirect speech-acts. In formal situations, it is impolite in English to use a personal pronoun to refer to a third person who is partaking of the locutionary act, whereas in Spanish this is perfectly acceptable. In any situation – both formal and informal – any Spaniard would say: “Cuéntale lo que ocurrió ayer”. A word-for-word translation (“Tell him what happened yesterday”) would be impolite in formal situations, for in well-mannered English such usage of third-person pronouns is deemed rude, and nouns or names are preferred. The many possible polite formulae would include “Tell John what happened yesterday”, “Tell Professor Ardila what happened yesterday”, etc. Indirect speech-acts in English are in all instances – familiar as well as formal scenarios – much more formal than in Spanish. Spaniards tend to use commands, affirmative sentences or simple questions at all times, e.g. “Préstame el bolígrafo”, “Oyes, te cojo el bolígrafo”, or “¿Me prestas el bolígrafo?” The third sentence would be considered rather polite, and interrogative intonation in any of the three would suffice to denote politeness. The word-for-word translation would provide blunt sentences in English: “Lend me your pen”, “I’m taking your pen”, and “Can I borrow your pen?” The hints of formality in English conditional tenses are not shared by the Spanish language; thus while an English speaker would say “May I borrow your pen?”, “Could I (possibly) borrow your pen?” or “Would you lend me your pen?”, “¿Puedo pedirte el bolígrafo?” or “¿Podría pedirte el bolígrafo?” would in Spanish denote irony or facetiousness. Moreover, the use of “please” and “thank you” is more general than that of “por favor” and “gracias”. A Spaniard would rarely add a “por favor” unless he/she explicitly tries to sound very polite. Once the Spaniard has the pen, they could thank the borrower with a “gracias”, but this is only necessary in formal situations and when addressing a stranger, whereas English speakers always use “please” and “thank you” – or in more casual situations, “cheers” or “ta” in British English – to which they will be answered “you’re welcome” – or, more casually, “that’s alright”, in both British and American English, and “m-hm” or “no problem” in American English.

J. A. G. ARDILA

*Facultad de Formación del Profesorado
Universidad de Extremadura
10071 Cáceres
Spain*

NOTES

* To my son John Ardila-Neville, on his birth.

¹ Richard of Bury, *Philobiblon* [*Philobiblon*] (Paris, 1856), quoted in Valentín García Yebra, *En torno a la traducción* (Madrid, 1989), p. 77.

² Quoted in J. F. Kess & R. A. Hoppe, "On Psycholinguistic Experiments in Ambiguity", *Lingua* 45 (1978), 125–48 (p. 131).

³ The differences between literary and non-literary translations have been proclaimed by many linguists such as Julius Wilhelm ("Zum Problem der literarischen Uebersetzung", *Filología Moderna* 63–4 [1978], 343–92 [p. 344]), who argued that literary translation (or *Uebersetzung*) and non-literary translation (or *Uebertragung*) should be regarded as two disparate linguistic disciplines; likewise J. C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics* (Oxford, 1965), p. 25.

⁴ J. B. Casagrande, "The Ends of Translation", *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 20 (1954), 335–40 (p. 338); E. A. Nida, *Towards a Science of Translating, with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating* (Leiden, 1964), p. 166; E. A. Nida, "Semantic Components in Translating Theory", in: *Application of Linguistics: Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics*, ed. G. E. Perron & J. L. M. Trim (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 342–51 (p. 347); E. A. Nida & C. R. Taber, *Theory and Practice of Translating* (Leiden, 1969), p. 1; G. Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (London, 1975); H.-G. Gadamer, *Verdad y método* (Salamanca, 1977); S. Bassnett-McGuire, *Translation Studies*, 2nd edn (London & New York, 1991), pp. 1, 80.

⁵ J.-P. Vinay & J. Darbelnet, *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction* (Paris & Montreal, 1958).

⁶ Brian Harris and Bianca Sherwood define natural translation as: "The translating done in everyday circumstances by people who have no special training for it" (p. 155); see "Translating as an Innate Skill", in: *Language Interpretation and Communication*, ed. D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (New York & London, 1978), pp. 155–70. Henceforth, when using the verb "to translate" I shall imply both written and natural translation, which is, as the title of this essay indicates, my main concern.

⁷ See V. J. Rozencveijg, *O jazykovyx kontaktax* (Moscow, 1936), p. 64. For the particular case of Spanish-English, see, for instance, R. J. Alfaro, *Diccionario de anglicismos* (Madrid, 1970).

⁸ J. Ortega y Gasset, "Gracia y desgracia de la lengua francesa", in: *Obras completas*, Vol. 5 (Madrid, 1951), pp. 267–8.

⁹ J. Lyons, *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 252.

¹⁰ R. B. Kaplan, *The Anatomy of Rhetoric: Prolegomena to a Functional Theory of Rhetoric* (Philadelphia, 1972), p. 14; Y. Kachru, "Cultural Meaning and Rhetoric Styles: Toward a Framework for Contrastive Rhetoric", in: *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics*, ed. G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Oxford, 1997), pp. 171–84.

¹¹ Particularly intriguing and significant is the saying: "In a German meeting one person speaks and the rest listen; in an English meeting no-one speaks and everyone listens; and in a Spanish meeting everyone speaks and no-one listens."

¹² Cf. P. Brown, "How and Why Are Women More Polite: Some Evidence From A Mayan Community", in: *Women and Language in Literature and Society*, ed. S. McConnel-Ginet, R. Borker & N. Furman (New York, 1980), pp. 111–36 (p. 115): "If I walk past my neighbor on the street and pointedly fail to greet him, I offend his face; and if I barge into his house and demand to borrow his lawnmower with no hesitation or apology for intrusion (for example, 'Give me your lawnmower; I want it') I equally offend his face."

¹³ It is important to bear in mind that all speakers differentiate formal situations from informal situations. Research on behaviour being subject to a degree of formality has been carried out by E. Goffman in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Harmondsworth, 1969) who distinguishes "focused interaction" from "unfocused interaction", which occurs in the so-called "frontal regions".

¹⁴ Henceforth, the discussion will target Peninsular Spanish and British English.

¹⁵ Their forms in the plural, "vosotros" and "ustedes", are used (in Peninsular Spanish only) according to the very same criteria as the singular forms. Therefore, I shall always refer to the singular forms in my subsequent discussion.

¹⁶ R. Brown & A. Gilman, "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity", in: *Language and Social Context*, ed. P. P. Giglioli (Harmondsworth, 1972), p. 266.

¹⁷ S. Ullmann, "Semantic Universals", in: *Universals of Language*, ed. J. H. Greenberg (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), pp. 172–207 (p. 173).

¹⁸ Brown & Gilman, p. 266.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ B. Spolsky, *Sociolinguistics* (Oxford, 1998), p. 20.

²¹ For greetings and phatic communication, see E. Chaika, *Language: The Social Mirror* (New York, 1989), p. 44.

²² C. Kramsch, *Language and Culture* (Oxford, 1998), p. 41: "Markers of social deixis give indication not only of where the speaker stands in time and place [...] but also of his/her status within the social structure, and of the status the speaker gives the addressee."

²³ S. Payne, *Falange: Historia del fascismo español* (Madrid, 1985), p. 75: "En el camino de regreso a Madrid, José Antonio propuso que, en adelante, todos los falangistas adoptasen la fórmula familiar del tuteo para tratarse entre sí. El [sic] mismo era tratado frecuentemente por su patronímico de José Antonio y pronto fue conocido en todo el mundo político por su nombre de pila."

²⁴ For a full introduction to deixis, see the pioneering volume by R. J. Jarvella & W. Klein (eds), *Speech, Place and Action: Studies in Deixis and Related Topics* (New York, 1982).

²⁵ Lyons, p. 307.

²⁶ "You, madam" and "you, Mrs/Miss Smith" for female addressees.

²⁷ Lyons, p. 309.

²⁸ Nida et al., pp. 34–5.

²⁹ See P. H. Grice, "Presupposition and Conversational Implicature", in: *Radical Pragmatics*, ed. P. Cole (New York, 1981), pp. 183–98.

³⁰ Manners are also regulated by paralinguistic features, i.e. prosody and body language. With regard to proxemic rules, see: E. T. Hall, *The Silent Language* (New York, 1959); R. D. Gross, *Psychology: The Science of Mind and Behaviour* (London, 1992), pp. 492–513; S. M. Jourard, "An Exploratory Study of Body Accessibility", *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 5 (1966), 221–31, and J. Nicholson, *Habits* (London, 1977). For the particular differences between cultures, see O. N. Watson & T. D. Graves, "Quantitative Research in Proxemic Behaviour", *American Anthropologist* 68 (1966), 971–85.

³¹ P. H. Grice, "Logic and Conversation", in: *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, ed. P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (New York & London, 1975), pp. 41–58 (pp. 45–6).

³² The foreign speaker must, of course, be aware of other informal formulae, such as "would you care for a cup of tea?" (in American English).

³³ V. García Yebra, *Teoría y práctica de la traducción*, Vol. 1 (Madrid, 1984), p. 408: "no se puede traducir oui, Monsieur o non, Monsieur, que en francés se usan formalmente por sí, señor, que en español sólo es para superiores."

³⁴ The external social context should not be ignored in the study of languages because context variation is always a source of information, claim linguists such as E. Tarone, *Variation in Interlanguage* (London, 1988); L. Dickerson, "The Learner's Interlanguage as a System of Variable Rules", *TESOL Quarterly* 9 (1975), 401–7; R. Ellis, *Understanding Second Language Acquisition* (Oxford, 1985), and R. Young, *Variation in Interlanguage Morphology* (New York, 1991). Cf. non-variationist theoreticians, e.g. L. White, *Universal Grammar and Second Language Acquisition* (Amsterdam, 1989); P. Gregg, "The Variable Competence Model for Second Language Acquisition and Why It Isn't", *Applied Linguistics* 11:3 (1990), 365–83, and "Taking Explanation Seriously: Or, Let a Couple of Flowers Bloom", *Applied Linguistics* 14:3 (1993), 276–94.

³⁵ In Brazilian Portuguese, the use of "tu" is almost extinguished, whereas "você" is employed even between close relatives.

³⁶ In Portugal, a Bachelor's degree entitles its holder to use the title of "doutor".

³⁷ A. J. Greimas, *Sémantique structurale: Recherche de méthode* (Paris, 1966); B. Pottier, *Linguistique générale: Théorie et description* (Paris, 1974); D. R. Dowty, *World Meaning and Montague Grammar* (Dordrecht, Boston & London, 1979); E. A. Nida, *Componential Analysis of Meaning* (The Hague, 1975).

³⁸ On the case of Spanish, my research has not found any conclusions drawn from actual surveys – and neither has that of the several colleagues I have consulted. The information provided has been obtained through my on-going observation in Extremadura and Kent, for the past two years, where I have resided alternately. As to the usage of address terms as "you" avoidance, see P. Brown & S. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 203.

³⁹ Cf. the impolite "usted abuelo" to senior citizens who are unknown to the speaker.

⁴⁰ For a division of social classes as perceived by sociolinguists, see J. K. Chambers, “Social Class and Sociolinguistic Sampling”, in: *Sociolinguistic Theory* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 36–41.

⁴¹ In Cervantes’ *Don Quixote* the main character is invited to the house of those he meets on the road. A comparison between Spanish and British literature is most illustrative for it evinces how the British would only walk into a stranger’s house if forced by danger or necessity, whereas Spaniards were very fond of visiting those they had just met and even to admit vendors without the slightest resistance – as Fernando de Rojas’ *Celestina* evinces. Cf. C. Lennox, *The Female Quixote*, ed. M. Dalziel (Oxford, 1989), p. 394, note 86.