

## THE TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH POLITE REQUESTS INTO BAHDINI KURDISH

Dara Ahmed Mohammed<sup>1\*</sup>, Ahmed Hayder Sigar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dept. of Translation, College of Languages, University of Duhok, Kurdistan Region – Iraq. ([Daramasteruod@gmail.com](mailto:Daramasteruod@gmail.com))

<sup>2</sup> Dept. of Translation, College of Languages, University of Duhok, Kurdistan Region – Iraq. ([Ahmed.sigar@uod.ac](mailto:Ahmed.sigar@uod.ac))

Received: 09/ 2025 / Accepted: 10/ 2025 / Published: 06/ 2026 <https://doi.org/10.26436/hjuoz.2026.14.2.1730>

### ABSTRACT:

Politeness refers to the social norms and behaviours that imply respect, consideration and courtesy towards others. The current study investigates the translation of polite requests as speech acts from English into Kurdish. Focusing on the challenge of translating pragmatic meaning, it aims at identifying the different patterns of polite requests in English, translating these patterns from English into Kurdish to see how they are realized in Kurdish and shedding light on the points of similarity and difference between the English constructions and their realizations in Kurdish. In order to achieve the aims, the study hypothesizes that: (1) there is no one-to-one correspondence between the structures of polite requests in English and their realization in Kurdish. (2) Kurdish makes use of markers of polite requests more than English does. (3) The illocutionary force of English polite requests the intended effect or function of the utterance can be translated in case the communicative translation is exploited. To test these hypotheses, the study adopts a qualitative research methodology utilizing Newmark's (1988) approach to translation in terms of his distinction between semantic translation (word-for-word accuracy) and communicative translation (contextual and cultural effectiveness), as a framework to analyse 10 polite requests in English translated by 10 fourth-year students at the Dept. of Translation-College of Languages, University of Duhok. Translation Failure is also taken into consideration which is a text where the message transfer is inaccurate due to significant linguistic or pragmatic errors. The study concludes that polite markers which give the utterances the force of polite requests in Kurdish are more than those in English. Moreover, the differences in percentage, (79% semantic) and (17% communicative) and (4% failure) highlight that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the structures of polite requests in English and their realization in Kurdish.

**KEYWORDS:** Communicative Translation, Illocutionary Force, Politeness, Requests, Semantic Translation, Speech Acts, Translation.

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics is the study of the speaker's intention. One of the main aspects of pragmatics is speech act theory that was founded by John Austin (1962) and developed later by John Searle (1969). According to this theory, speakers perform actions while making utterances such as apologies, promises, invitations, requests, etc. The comprehension of speech acts relies on both the speaker and hearer. The speaker has an intention, and the hearer has to decode that intention based on the cultural, personal and interpersonal aspects of the utterance. Both parties are helped by the circumstances surrounding the utterance, namely the speech events. It is not easy to translate a speech act from one language into another, particularly when the two languages are distinct; for instance, when they do not have a lot in common. This study deals with translating polite requests from English into Kurdish which are distinct culturally and linguistically. Accordingly, rendering a speech act that is culturally and cognitively different from one language into another is not an easy task. This translation process is complicated because the social norms governing politeness vary significantly between the two cultures.

### 1.2 Statement of the Problem:

Polite requests are speech acts whereby a speaker requests a hearer to do something for his own benefit. They are expressed

by both syntactic structures and lexical items. Moreover, means of expressing polite requests are not identical in both English and Kurdish since such means are culture specific. However, the performance of polite requests creates problems for both requestees and translators. For example, an English request using a modal verb like "Would" may be structurally different from the corresponding Kurdish phrase, forcing the translator to choose between preserving the literal words (syntactic structure) and preserving the social function (politeness level). Once the requester requests something, he/she will perform three acts, namely a locutionary act, an illocutionary act and a perlocutionary act. Thus, the translator does not know which one of these three acts should be translated unless he is well aware of the requester's intention. This uncertainty in prioritizing the locutionary act (what is said), the illocutionary act (the intention), or the perlocutionary act (the effect) is a core problem for rendering pragmatic meaning accurately. Another challenge arises because English uses conventional indirectness (e.g., questions like "Can you open the door?") to signal politeness, a strategy that, if translated literally, may sound direct or even rude in Kurdish. Furthermore, the use of Kurdish lexical items that function as 'softeners' or 'mitigators' in a request (which have no direct English equivalent) presents a practical dilemma for maintaining the original degree of politeness. To the researcher's

\* Corresponding Author.

This is an open access under a CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>)

best knowledge, no study has been tackled on the translation of polite requests from English into Bahdini Kurdish.

### 1.3 Aims and Objectives of the Study:

The current study aims at:

1. Identifying the different patterns of polite requests in English.
2. Translating these patterns from English into Kurdish to find out how they are realized in Kurdish.
3. Shedding light on the points of similarity and difference between the English construction and their realizations in Kurdish.
4. Specifying the main problems that translators may encounter when rendering these constructions into Kurdish.
5. Suggesting the most effective ways of translating these polite requests into Kurdish. As measured by the successful transfer of the original illocutionary force using Newmark's communicative translation approach.

### 1.4 Hypotheses:

The present study aims at validating the following hypotheses:

1. There is no one to one correspondence between the structures of polite requests in English and their realization in Kurdish.
2. Kurdish makes use of markers of polite requests more than English does.
3. The illocutionary force of English polite requests can be translated if communicative translation is exploited.

### 1.5 Data collection and procedure:

In this study the data chosen for analysis consist of 20 patterns of polite requests taken from books related to the subject. The selection of these 20 patterns was focused on constructions known to exhibit pragmatic divergence across languages (e.g., highly indirect vs. direct forms) to maximize the potential for observing translation challenges. As for the procedure used in this study, it can be summarized as follows:

1. Surveying literature review on polite requests in both English and Kurdish.
2. Distributing the 10 patterns of polite requests among the subjects of the study to render them into Kurdish. The sample size of 10 requests translated by 10 students is appropriate for this qualitative, exploratory study, where the aim is to analyze depth of pragmatic choices rather than statistical generalizability. While the small sample size limits the statistical reliability, it allows for a focused, in-depth analysis of individual translation processes and errors, particularly pragmatic transfer.
3. Analyzing the source language (SL) constructions and their rendering in terms of type of sentence and type of translation.
4. Making some comments on subjects' rendering in order to highlight their shortcomings, if there are any.
5. Proposing the most appropriate translation or suggesting a different translation when necessary. It is acknowledged that the subjects, being students, may exhibit performance bias due to their learning stage, which is a potential limitation in generalizing results to professional translators.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Polite Requests as Speech Acts:

Inquiry into polite requests as a speech act is a core branch of pragmatics, focusing on the social actions performed via language (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). Requests are inherently Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) because they impose an obligation

on the hearer, thereby risking their negative face—the desire for autonomy (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Consequently, the strategies used to politely execute a request are salient indicators of cultural norms, social structures, and interpersonal relationships.

The foundational framework for studying these strategies is Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory. This model posits that speakers employ linguistic strategies to mitigate the threat posed by an FTA. While the theory offers a universal calculus for politeness, its realization is highly subject to sociocultural factors such as age, sex, cultural standing, and relational distance (David et al., 1989; Holmes, 1995; Coates, 1996). For instance, research suggests that subordinates and women often employ more indirect or mitigated requests. Furthermore, cross-cultural studies highlight divergent preferences: Eastern, collectivist cultures often adopt ceremonial and structured politeness (Leech, 2014), while some American and European cultures are characterized by a more straightforward and diplomatic style. Crucially, while ample research has explored politeness in major world languages, studies specifically addressing the pragmatic and translational differences between English and the Kurdish dialect of Bahdini remain scarce. This lacuna is the primary justification for the current study.

### 2.2 Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory:

Politeness, in pragmatic terms, is understood as an effort to mitigate potential affronts to an individual's "face" or self-worth in social interactions (Brown & Levinson, 1987). This concept of "face" originated from Erving Goffman's (1967) sociological work, where he defines it as the positive social value a person claims for themselves. Building on this, Brown and Levinson (1987) distinguish between two types of face: positive and negative.

Positive face refers to an individual's desire for their self-image to be appreciated and approved by others. In contrast, negative face reflects the desire for autonomy, freedom from imposition, and the right to act unimpeded by others (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 302). In communication, certain utterances inherently run contrary to these face wants and are thus termed Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 65).

FTAs vary depending on whose face is threatened (speaker's or hearer's) and which type of face (positive or negative). For instance, requests are a prime example of FTAs, as they intrinsically impose on the hearer's negative face by asking them to perform an action. They can also threaten positive face if they imply a lack of consideration for the hearer's desires or social standing. To minimize such threats and maintain social harmony, speakers employ various politeness strategies. Thus, to minimize FTAs, speakers employ the following politeness strategies:

A. Bald-on-record: This strategy involves performing an FTA directly and explicitly, without any linguistic softening (e.g., "Close the door"). It is often used in situations of urgency, great familiarity, or where power differentials allow for directness (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 68).

B. Positive politeness: This strategy enhances solidarity through strategies like compliments (e.g., "Sir, you're great at fixing computers, could you help me?") or seeking agreement (e.g., "The team played badly, didn't they? (e.g., "Can you spare a cigarette?"). These strategies aim to minimize the social distance between the speaker and hearer, often by expressing solidarity and satisfying the hearer's positive face wants. They include various tactics that show appreciation, common ground, or shared interests. Examples include Noticing and Attending to Hearer

(e.g., complimenting a hearer's skill before making a request (Watts, 2003, p. 89).

C. Negative politeness: This strategy is oriented towards the hearer's negative face, aiming to avoid imposition and show deference. It acknowledges the hearer's desire for autonomy and freedom from constraint. Key tactics include being conventionally indirect (e.g., "Could you please pass the salt?"), questioning and hedging (e.g., using "I wonder if..." or softening terms like "sort of"), minimizing the imposition (e.g., "Could I bother you for just a minute?"), and apologizing (e.g., "I'm sorry to ask, but..."). These are frequently employed to mitigate the inherent imposition of requests (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

D. Off-record: This strategy involves performing an FTA indirectly, in an ambiguous way that allows the speaker to deny having performed the FTA. The hearer must infer the speaker's true intention. This includes tactics like giving hints to avoid direct responsibility for the FTA (e.g., "It's cold in here," as an indirect request to close a window) or using metaphors/irony. This strategy provides maximum face-saving for both parties but risks misinterpretation (Brown & Levinson, 1987).<sup>2</sup> In translation, these strategies must be adapted to align with the target language's cultural norms, particularly in collectivist cultures like Bahdini Kurdish, where negative politeness often predominates (Öpengin, 2012).

For the purposes of this study, these strategies provide the analytical toolset for classifying English requests. The central challenge lies in determining which strategy, when translated into Kurdish, most effectively aligns with the target culture's (Bahdini's) social norms, which have been noted to favor negative politeness and indirectness (Öpengin, 2012).

### 2.3 Politeness in the Kurdish Language:

In the Kurdish language, a language with diverse dialects such as Kurmanji and Sorani spoken across regions in Iraq, Iran, Turkey, and Syria, politeness strategies reflect cultural values and pragmatic conventions. Within this broader context, Bahdini Kurdish, a subdialect of Kurmanji spoken primarily in the Duhok region of Iraqi Kurdistan, presents a specific case that remains underexplored. Research on polite requests in both Kurdish generally and Bahdini Kurdish specifically is limited.

Hassani (2018) pointed out that there are no digitized corpora of the data for dialects of Kurdish especially Bahdini. This makes a large scale pragmatic analysis rather difficult. Such limitation decreases the possibility of carrying out corpus based research of actual speech data which could be helpful in examining deficiency of politeness in the requests made in different dialects of Kurdish and especially in Bahdini dialect.

Mohammad (2019) examined Sorani Kurdish and claimed that speakers often apologize or express gratitude prior to making a request as a more polite way of imposing, which is an indirect strategy. According to Mohammad, politeness in Kurdish is indicative of social identity and group cohesion, which could be the case for many Kurdish dialects, including Bahdini, due to common cultural traits. Alas, the focus on Sorani leaves a gap regarding other dialects such as Kurmanji and its subdialects, including Bahdini, which is less explored.

Majeed and Rasheed (2019) conducted a study on external request modification in Kurdish language focusing on the socio-pragmatic strategies employed by Kurdish university students and highlighting how politeness is negotiated across gender, power, and social distance. The findings revealed a clear gender-based difference, with Kurdish female speakers showing a higher tendency to use various mitigating devices such as alerters, grounders, disarmers, and apologies compared to their male counterparts, a pattern consistent with broader sociolinguistic literature. Critically, social variables strongly influence Kurdish

politeness: the hierarchical nature of the culture mandated that both genders use extensive external modifiers and minimizers (e.g., "I'm not ordering you") when addressing individuals of dominant status. Regarding social distance, Kurdish women generally employed more supportive moves with strangers, while Kurdish men used them more frequently with friends. Overall, the study offers valuable insights into the cultural norms and values that govern appropriate request modification in Kurdish, thus contributing significantly to cross-cultural pragmatics literature.

### 2.4 Realization of Polite Requests:

Making polite requests incorporates some form of linguistic strategies to mitigate face-threatening acts (FTAs) that infringe on social approval (positive face) or the hearer's autonomy (negative face) (Brown & Levinson 1987). Like other speech acts, requests are made differently in various languages and cultures due to lexical, syntactic and pragmatic choices (Searle, 1969).

In English, polite requests are made through the use of interrogatives, modal auxiliaries, or hedges (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). Lexical indicators such as "please" and "thank you" also help to enhance the level of politeness. In contrast, Bahdini Kurdish, which is more collectivist, employs indirect questions, explicit markers, and use of honorifics to show politeness and deference (Öpengin, 2012). Norms and values of cultures determine the level of directness, and thus individualistic cultures which prioritize choice are more direct as compared to collectivist cultures which are more respectful (Beebe et al., 1990).

#### 2.4.1 Polite Requests in English:

Requests are quite useful and become common in everyday interactions, especially for novice language learners, as they are the first step towards effective communication. Of all the speech actions, the illocutionary act of requests seems to be the most studied in the context of secondary language acquisition. There are many ways to formulate a request, some of them include an imperative sentence, a declarative sentence, or an interrogative sentence. Any request made is bound to be a face-threatening act. Speaking to the audience involves some strategies to mitigate or completely eliminate the chances of offending the audience (Achiba, 2003). Searle stated, within the five speech act types (representatives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations), that the act of directives is an example of an attempt to "get the listener to do something" (Searle, 1976, p. 11). He lists the verbs "order," "request," "advise," "pray," "permit," "invite," "command," "beg," "ask," and "permit" as well as "plead" as belonging to this set. As with any speech acts, systems of requests tend to lean heavily on notions of face, indirectness, and politeness.

Since face involves social and cultural aspects, the speaker naturally wants to avoid the risk of looking foolish, so to combat the threat, discourse becomes indirect. It has also been noted that indirect strategies tend to result in greater politeness. Polite requests in English use syntactic and lexical strategies to mitigate FTAs. Syntactically, requests employ interrogatives ("Can you pass the sugar?"), declaratives with hedges ("I was wondering if you could help"), or modal auxiliaries ("Could you close the door?") to soften imposition (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). Lexically, verbs like "request," "please," or "mind" enhance politeness, as in "Would you mind closing the window?" (Hussein, 1984, p. 73). Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984, p. 201) categorize requests by directness: explicit (e.g., imperatives), conventionally indirect (e.g., modals), and non-conventionally indirect (e.g., hints). Indirect requests, common in individualistic

cultures, reduce face threats by emphasizing choice (Dittrich et al., 2011, p. 3809).

#### 2.4.2 Polite Requests in Bahdini Kurdish:

Polite requests in Bahdini Kurdish, a dialect of Kurmanji spoken primarily in the Duhok region of Iraqi Kurdistan, are realized through a combination of explicit politeness markers, indirect phrasing, and an understanding of social context. Like many cultures, politeness in Bahdini is crucial for maintaining social harmony and showing respect. This pragmatic realization directly reflects the **collectivist cultural norms** of deference (Öpengin, 2012) and contrasts structurally with English request strategies (Chyet, 2003).

Polite requests in Bahdini Kurdish are realized through four core strategies, which directly align with the sociopragmatic findings across Kurdish dialects (Ali, 2020; Haig & Matras, 2002):

##### 1. Explicit Politeness Markers (Lexical Mitigation)

These fixed lexical elements are the most common and straightforward ways to soften the imposition of a request:

- (بى زحمەت): Meaning "without difficulty/trouble," this versatile marker functions as the most widely used equivalent of "please" for small requests.
  - Example: بى زحمەت، ئاقى ب دە من. ("Please, give me water.")
  - Example: بى زحمەت، دەرگەهە بگره. ("Please, close the door.")
- (ژ كارهەما خۆ): Literally "from your grace/generosity," this is a more formal and stronger than "please," conveying a sense of requesting a favor out of goodwill, often used for more significant requests or when addressing higher status.
  - Example: ژ كارهەما خۆ، هاری من بكه. ("From your grace, help me.")
- (ههقیهه): Another common word for "please," often used in a slightly more direct way, though its specific usage and perceived strength can vary contextually.
  - Example: ههقیهه، وهره. ("Please, come.")

##### 2. Conventional Indirectness and Question Formulations

Framing a request as a question or indirect statement softens the imposition, aligning with the prevalent characteristic of indirectness noted in Middle Eastern speech (Ali, 2020).

- ... نهگەر زحمەت نهیبیت... ("If it's not too much trouble..."): This is a highly polite and deferential preface, showing awareness of the potential burden on the listener.
  - Example: نهگەر زحمەت نهیبیت، دئ شنی فئ پارتووکی بدیهه من؟ ("If it's not too much trouble, could you give me this book?")
- دئ شنی؟ (Will you be able to...? / Can you...?): Using the modal verb form frames the request as a question about capability, making it less of a direct command.
  - Example: دئ شنی پارتووکی بدیهه من؟ ("Can you give me the book?")
- نهئ دشیاندایه؟ ("Is it possible...?"): This is a more formal and indirect way to inquire about the possibility of an action.
  - Example: نهئ دشیاندایه هندیتر بناخقی؟ ("Is it possible to speak more slowly?")

##### 3. Softening the Imperative Verb:

While the imperative form exists, an unadorned imperative can sound blunt or rude in many social situations. It is typically mitigated by the politeness markers described above.

- Direct (less polite): (وهه!) - "Come!"
  - Polite: (وهه، بى زحمەت) - "Come, please."
- Ali's (2020) research, which emphasizes Kurdish speakers' reliance on the conventionally indirect strategy (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984) during formal interactions, is consistent with these Bahdini features. Ali's findings, in the context of the Middle East, support a prevalent characteristic of speech that is linked to

the notion of indirectness as a form of politeness. While Ali does not directly concern himself with Bahdini, his consideration of politeness strategies enables one to think about Bahdini speakers, and also illustrates the need for more dialectal research to test these claims across the Kurdish dialects.

Unlike English, Bahdini relies less on modal auxiliaries and more on indirectness and address terms, reflecting cultural values of respect for authority and group cohesion (Chyet, 2003). Limited research on Bahdini highlights the need for dialect-specific studies (Ali, 2020). This translational study, therefore, bridges the research gap by investigating the transfer of English request strategies into the context-sensitive politeness system of Bahdini Kurdish.

#### 2.5 The Concept of Translation:

Translation involves transferring meaning across languages while navigating cultural and pragmatic differences. The theoretical frameworks provide the essential tools for analyzing the transfer of politeness strategies between English and Bahdini Kurdish. Foundational linguistic views frame translation in terms of equivalence. Catford (1965) views translation in terms of textual equivalence, while Nida (1964) distinguishes 'formal equivalence' (word-for-word literal accuracy) from 'dynamic equivalence' (achieving the same audience impact).

However, translating social actions like polite requests necessitates moving beyond purely linguistic fidelity. The cultural turn in translation studies, led by Bassnett and Lefevere (1990), views translation as a sociocultural act shaping cultural discourses. Functionalist approaches, like Vermeer's (1989) 'Skopos theory', prioritize the translation's purpose (the 'skopos'), guiding choices between fidelity and adaptation. For this study, the 'skopos' is achieving pragmatic equivalence: successfully rendering the politeness function of the English request so that it is perceived as equally polite and appropriate in Bahdini Kurdish. In translating polite requests, cultural norms of politeness must be preserved to achieve pragmatic equivalence (Hatim & Mason, 1997). This requires the translator to adopt a functional and target-oriented approach to ensure the request is socially acceptable in the Bahdini context.

#### 2.6 Types of Translation:

Translation is important in interlingual and cross-cultural communication as it enables understanding and interpreting texts in different languages (Catford, 1965). For this purpose, different strategies of translation have been formulated, each of them with distinct advantages based on the text, audience, and goals of the translator (Nida, 1964). Translation is well studied by many scholars, such as Nida and Jakobson. Nida's (1964) work explains the distinction of formally bound texts, where the text is translated on a word-for-word basis as is the easier approach used in technical and legal translations, and formally responsive texts where a loose translation is used to invoke the same response from the audience, often referred to as dynamic translation.

Jakobson's (1959) interlingual translation describes the relations between languages and contextualizes the meaning of words, reinforcing the argument that each different language system requires careful translation because words are embedded with meaning. These approaches span from literal, source-oriented techniques to more liberal, target-oriented ones. For this study, the model by Newmark (1981, 1988), which differentiates between semantic and communicative translations, stands out as the primary framework for analyzing the choice of request realization in Bahdini Kurdish.

##### 2.6.1 Semantic Translation:

Semantic translation focuses on keeping the original meaning of the source text regardless of stylistic or cultural

transformation. This approach plays an important role throughout translation theory. The major draw of this approach is fidelity to the semantic content of original but with some capabilities in form. Semantic translation aims at replicating the original texts' forms within the target language, reproducing the original context, and retaining the characters of the SL culture in the translation. A semantic translation is more source text focused. Although, not necessarily a literal translation, it follows the source text more closely (Newmark, 1988). Semantic translation differs from 'faithful translation' only in as far as it must take more account of the aesthetic value of the source language text, compromising on the 'meaning' where appropriate so that no assonance, word-play or repetition jars in the finished version. Further, it may translate less important cultural words by culturally neutral third or functional terms but not by cultural equivalents. Thus, the distinction between 'faithful' and 'semantic' translation is that the first is uncompromising and dogmatic, while the second is more flexible, admits the creative exception to 100% fidelity and allows for the translator's intuitive empathy with the original text (Newmark, 1988).

Semantic translation attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original (Newmark 1981, p. 39). Newmark, in his seminal work, 'Approaches to Translation', states that semantic translation is more concerned with meaning conservation and tends to retain literal until it affects comprehension. On his part, Gutt (1991, p. 124) defines semantic translation as a direct translation strategy, with the emphasis on semantic fidelity rather than interpretive resemblance and applies it for its utility in conveying explicit meaning across languages. Newmark (1988, p. 46), in 'A Textbook of Translation' points out that semantic translation is appropriate for text types that are "expressive" or those where precision is required. He mentions that it aims at preserving the meaning from the source rather than transforming it to achieve a preferred style. In their book 'Discourse and The Translator', Hatim and Mason (1990, p. 78) mentioned "semantic translation" and stated it has some merit in providing semantic coherence, especially in situations where there is no room for distortion such as formal or technical discourse.

House (1997, p. 108) criticizes "semantic translation" stating that stressing source-text semantics can lead to functional gaps in the target language. She also argues that this method may be inappropriate for texts that need a pragmatic intervention. Venuti (2008, p. 25) views "semantic translation" as one of the translations done under the state of non-fluency and argues that it is associated with some foreignising translation strategies. In conclusion, semantic translation is a critical approach to the study of translation because it concerns the accurate conveyance of meaning from one language to another. Its focus is on the preservation of the semantic content, contextual meaning, and cultural elements of the source text by using its language through the lens of theories from linguistics, semantics and pragmatics.

### 2.6.2 Communicative Translation:

Communicative translation attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original text in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the reader. It is particularly suitable when translating conventional formulae or proverbs and it involves some levels of cultural approximation. Communicative translation aspires to create the same effect created by the SL text on the TL reader. Though it is not as accurate as semantic translation which sticks to the original text, it communicates the meaning at the expense of accuracy.

However, it is preferred by many translators because it resorts to concepts that are more familiar to the TL reader on cultural and social levels. It is usually used for culturally specific idioms, proverbs or clichés where the translator replaces a SL word or concept with one that already exists in the TL (Newmark, 1988). Communicative translation centres on the specific language and culture and focuses on the TL readers. The translation under this method is clear, smooth and concise. Communicative translation is focused on the target text and aims to ensure that the reader will understand the message of the text (Newmark, 1988). Newmark (1981, p. 39) defines communicative translation as an approach that "attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original". Contrasting it with semantic translation, which preserves source text meaning, Newmark emphasizes fluency and accessibility, often adapting the text to suit the target culture. His framework highlights its utility in audience-focused contexts (Newmark, 1988).

Communicative translation concentrates on the message and the main force of the text, tends to be simple, clear and brief, and is always written in a natural and resourceful style (Newmark 1988, p. 48). For some linguists, communicative translation 'is produced, when, in a given situation, the ST uses a SL expression standard for that situation, and the TT uses a TL expression standard for an equivalent target culture situation' (Dickins et al., 2005, p. 17). Baker directly engages with communicative translation. Referencing Newmark, she notes it prioritizes equivalence at the level of effect, allowing translators to adjust the text for functional appropriateness (Baker, 2011). The communicative translation paradigm is highly relevant to this study because achieving pragmatic equivalence in polite requests necessitates shifting the realization strategy to align with Bahdini norms. The translation of English requests into contextually appropriate Bahdini forms (e.g., converting an English conventionally indirect modal request like "Could you help me?" into the Bahdini mitigated query "بێ زحمەت، دێ شێی هاری من" ("بیکە؟") represents a shift from a semantic approach to a communicative one, where fluency and cultural acceptance supersede word-for-word accuracy. It is important to note that gaps persist in the literature, particularly regarding its application to non-literary texts, digital communication and areas that require further exploration through contemporary research.

### 2.7 Translation and Politeness:

Translating polite requests requires balancing linguistic accuracy with cultural politeness norms. Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework highlights the need to adapt positive and negative politeness strategies to the target culture. In Bahdini Kurdish, negative politeness (e.g., indirectness, mandatory use of honorifics) is prevalent due to cultural deference, unlike English's varied strategies (Hatim & Mason, 1997). This means that a seemingly polite English structure may translate to a face-threatening act in Bahdini Kurdish if a purely semantic approach is used.

Translators must adjust syntactic structures (e.g., shifting English modals and conditionals to Bahdini mitigated questions) and lexical choices (e.g., adding explicit politeness markers like (بێ زحمەت) to maintain pragmatic equivalence. Becher (2011) notes that pragmatic shifts, such as modifying directness levels, are critical for politeness. House (2015) emphasizes cultural knowledge in achieving equivalence, particularly for languages like Bahdini Kurdish with limited documented pragmatics. The current study directly applies the principles of communicative translation to this challenge. The data analysis will evaluate how translators utilize communicative shifts moving away from the source text form to successfully encode the required level of

politeness in Bahdini Kurdish. This ensures the request not only conveys the action but does so with the necessary cultural deference, thereby achieving the desired functional (Skopos) and pragmatic equivalence.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Introduction and Research Design:

This section explains the research methodology adopted to investigate the translation of English polite requests into Bahdini Kurdish. The methodology was precisely aligned with the study's objectives to analyze the strategies used in the translation of pragmatic meaning. This study employed a cross-sectional, qualitative, descriptive design. A qualitative approach was selected because it allowed for the in-depth, interpretive analysis of complex linguistic and cultural phenomena namely, the pragmatic decisions and strategies inherent in translating polite requests. The research was primarily guided by Newmark's (1988) approach to translation, specifically his distinction between semantic and communicative translation, which provided a framework for examining the necessary balance between fidelity to the Source Text (ST) and the need for effective communication (pragmatic equivalence) in the Target Text (TT). The core logic of the design was contrastive and descriptive: it contrasted the pragmatic strategies present in the English STs with the strategies and linguistic devices used by the student translators in the Bahdini TTs.

#### 3.2 Participants and Research Material:

##### 3.2.1 Participants and Sampling Justification:

Participants were selected using purposive sampling to ensure the sample group possessed a high level of formal, academic exposure to both English and translation theory. The sample comprised ten (10) fourth-year students from the Department of Translation, College of Languages, University of Duhok, enrolled during the academic year 2024-2025.

Fourth-year students were chosen as their translations reflect the application of advanced academic theory. This size (N=10, yielding 100 TTs) is justified for a qualitative study, providing sufficient data points to uncover patterns and strategies without requiring the statistical generalizability of quantitative research.

##### 3.2.2 Research Materials: Corpus and Context:

The research materials consisted of a corpus of ten (10) English requestive utterances that served as the Source Texts (STs). These utterances were carefully selected based on their structural and pragmatic variety to elicit a wide range of politeness strategies.

Selection and Context: The utterances were extracted from three established academic sources focused on English grammar, usage, and pragmatics, ensuring the pragmatic validity and authenticity of the English request forms:

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints and apologies*.

Swan, M. (2016). *Practical English usage* (4th ed.).

Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2006). *Cambridge grammar of English*.

Data Corpus: Each utterance was embedded within a brief, context-setting scenario to guarantee that the intended illocutionary force (request) and socio-pragmatic variables (Distance 'D', Power 'P', Rank of Imposition 'R') were clear to the participants. The final data corpus consisted of the 10 English STs and their (100) corresponding Bahdini Kurdish Target Texts (TTs) (10 utterances × 10 students).

#### 3.3 Research Tools and Data Analysis:

##### 3.3.1 Research Tools:

The primary research instrument was a structured Translation Elicitation Task (TET). This task presented the 10 English requestive utterances, each with its brief scenario, on a paper-based format. The tool included clear instructions directing students to translate the utterances into the most pragmatically and socially appropriate Bahdini Kurdish equivalent.

##### 3.3.2 Model of Analysis and Evaluation Criteria:

Contrastive Analysis informed by Newmark's (1988) model was used as the central analytical approach.

Framework Application: Newmark's distinction between semantic and communicative translation provided the primary evaluative lens: (1) TTs that prioritized linguistic fidelity and the source culture's politeness forms (e.g., direct word-for-word rendering of a modal auxiliary) were categorized as leaning toward semantic translation. (2) TTs that drastically adjusted linguistic form to ensure maximum naturalness and appropriate pragmatic impact in Bahdini (e.g., adding *بى زحمەت* or an honorific) were categorized as leaning toward communicative translation.

Criteria for Evaluation (Pragmatic Equivalence): The success of a translation was ultimately evaluated based on the attainment of pragmatic equivalence. A translation was successful if it conveyed the intended request while maintaining the appropriate social tone and level of politeness as determined by established Bahdini cultural norms.

##### 3.3.3 Steps of Analysis and Strategic Coding:

The analysis of the 100 TTs was conducted in three rigorous steps:

1. ST Analysis: The English STs were analyzed using Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework to identify the specific politeness strategies and illocutionary force intended.

2. TT Categorization: The 100 Bahdini TTs were analyzed to identify the specific politeness markers and realization strategies used by the students (e.g., use of honorifics, explicit markers, conventional indirectness).

3. Translation Failure Categorization: where the attempt to convey a message from a Source Language (SL) to a Target Language (TL) results in an output that is inaccurate, inappropriate, or ineffective.

#### 3.4 Reliability, Validity, and Ethical Considerations:

##### 3.4.1 Reliability and Validity:

Internal Validity: The use of context-setting scenarios for all 10 utterances ensured that the participants understood the intended pragmatic function (illocutionary force) of the request, thereby maximizing the internal validity of the elicited translation data.

Reliability: To ensure consistency in the coding process, the categorization of a subset of the TT data into semantic/communicative was checked by a second expert in Kurdish pragmatics and translation, establishing inter-rater reliability.

Potential Bias: The study acknowledges the potential bias inherent in using student translators, whose choices might reflect prescribed academic instruction rather than organic, real-world usage. This is mitigated by analyzing the variation in choices made across the 10 students, which reveals the range of accepted strategies.

##### 3.4.2 Data Collection Procedure and Ethics:

Data collection took place during the academic year 2024-2025 at the Department of Translation, College of Languages, University of Duhok.

Procedure: Participants were briefed and provided explicit "Informed Consent" before commencing the task. The TET was administered in a controlled classroom setting, and a standardized time (60 minutes) was allotted to ensure conditions were uniform.

Ethical Considerations: All student participation was anonymized using coded numbers (e.g., S01-S10) to ensure confidentiality. Students were assured that their participation was voluntary, involved "No Coercion", and had no bearing on their course grades. The data collected was stored securely on the researcher's password-protected device.

#### 4. Data Analysis

This chapter presents the **systematic qualitative analysis** of the **100 Target Texts (TTs)** generated by the participants in response to **10 English polite requests**. The requests were selected to represent a comprehensive range of linguistic structures and politeness levels, from direct to highly indirect forms. The analysis focuses on identifying and explaining the **translation strategies**—categorized by the researcher as **semantic (ST fidelity)** or **communicative (TT pragmatic equivalence)**—employed by the student translators, along with the specific **politeness markers** utilized in the Bahdini Kurdish TTs. All student translations are presented verbatim and unaltered.

Crucially, the students were only instructed to produce the **most pragmatically and socially appropriate** Bahdini Kurdish equivalent. The classification of their final outputs into semantic or communicative categories is an **analytical choice made solely by the researcher** based on the linguistic structure of the resultant TT. While the sample of ten 4th-year students limits generalizability to professional translators, their choices serve as a valuable source of **academically informed translational practices** within the local context. The **100-point qualitative corpus** provides sufficient data for identifying clear strategic patterns and maximizing the internal validity of the findings.

The method for categorizing translations is guided by Newmark's (1988) distinction. The analysis operates on the following principle:

1. Semantic Translation Focus: Analysis will first focus on the viability of Semantic Translation to see how English constructions are realized in Bahdini Kurdish. This is the attempt to retain the linguistic form and literal meaning of the Source Text (ST).
2. Shift to Communicative: In cases of pragmatic failure (where a semantic translation results in a perceived inappropriate, rude, or contextually ineffective request in the Target Text), a Communicative Translation is deemed necessary. This strategy involves a functional substitution or adaptation of the ST structure to ensure the intended pragmatic meaning and level of politeness are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the Bahdini Kurdish reader.

The analysis, systematically assesses the viability of Syntactic Alignment (Semantic Translation) against the necessity of Pragmatic Intervention (Communicative Translation) for achieving fluent, contextually appropriate Bahdini Kurdish.

#### Utterance (1) "Do you mind if I sit here?"

1. بۆ ته نهخوشناييت نهگەر نهز ل قيرئ بروينم؟
2. درۆسته ل قيرئ بروونم؟
3. دئ كيشه ههبيت نهگەر نهز ل قيرئ رووينم؟
4. كيشه نينه نهگەر لهقيرئ ب برينم؟
5. ناريشه نينه بوته لهقيرئ رووينم؟
6. نهگەر نهز ل قيرئ برينم ته پئ نهخوش ناييبت؟

7. نهري نهز دشتيم ل قيره ب رينمه خوار؟
8. ته چ ناريشه نابن نهگەر نهز لهقيرئ برينمه خار؟
9. بۆ ته نهخوش ناييبت نهگەر نهز ل قيرئ برينم؟
10. نهري چ ناريشه نيين، نهگەر نهز لهقيرئ برينم؟

#### Discussion:

This request is conventionally indirect and requires a translation that foregrounds the hearer's comfort. The initial classification shows a tendency toward Semantic Translation (8 instances) and Communicative Translation (2 instances). As for translation it seems students (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10) have used semantic translation. On the other hand students (2 and 7) have used communicative translation. The use of the semantic translations directly questioned whether the action would be a problem using Kurdish polite markers such as (ناريشه). While these maintain the ST's interrogative structure, they risk sounding unnatural due to over-reliance on literal forms compared to the more conventional Bahdini query. The communicative solutions were superior, utilizing non-imposition Kurdish polite markers such as (درۆسته) which directly target the function of seeking assurance. The student translations were, therefore, a mixture of approaches, confirming the inconsistent application of strategy, where students vacillate between structural fidelity (semantic) and pragmatic fluency (communicative).

#### Utterance (2): "Can I leave this in your office?"

1. نهز دشتيم في بهيلمه ل نوڤيسا ته؟
2. درۆسته في ل نوڤيسا ته بهيلم؟
3. نهري نهز دشتيم في تشتي ل نوڤيسا ته بهيلم؟
4. نهز دشتيم نهفي بهيلمه ل نوڤيسا ته؟
5. نهز دشتيم في بهيلمه نوڤيسا ته؟
6. نهري دئ شيم في تشتي ل نوڤيسا ته بهيلم؟
7. نهري نهز دشتيم نهفي ل نڤيسينگههه بهيلم؟
8. نهري نهز دشتيم في بهيلمه د نوڤيسا ته فه؟
9. نهري دئ شيم في ل نڤيسينگههه ته هيلم؟
10. نهز دشتيم نهفي بهيلمه ل نوڤيسا ته؟

#### Discussion:

This request is an indirect, interrogative utterance using the modal auxiliary "Can" to ask for permission for a personal favor. As for translation it seems that almost all students have used semantic translation except student (2) which have used communicative translation. The majority of students directly translated the modal verb and interrogative structure, resulting in Kurdish polite markers such as (نهري دئ شيم، نهز دئ شيم) which mirror the source text's grammatical form and illocutionary force. This consistency demonstrates that the concept of "ability" or "possibility" is an accepted and effective means of conventional indirectness in both languages, allowing for successful Syntactic Alignment. In contrast, only student (2) used communicative translation using the marker (درۆسته), highlighting the optionality of the communicative shift when the semantic approach is already pragmatically successful.

#### Utterance (3): "Close the door, please. It's cold in here."

1. هيفيدكهم، دهرگهه بگره. قيرئ يا ساره.
2. دهرگهه بگره بي ز محممت، ساره ل قيرئ.
3. هيفيدكهم، دهرگهه بگره، ل قيرئ ساره.
4. بي ز محممت دهرگهه بگره قيرئ يا ساره.
5. دهرگهه بگره بيز محممت، ساره ل قيرئ.
6. بي ز محممت دهرگهه بگره، قيرئ يا ساره.
7. هيفيدكهم دهرگهه بگره، قيره ساره.
8. دهرگهه بگره ههكه ز محممت نهبيت. كمش و ههوا بي ساره لهقيره.
9. هيفيدكهم دهرگهه بگره، قيرئ ساره.
10. هيفيدكهم دهرگهه بگره، قيره ساره.

### Discussion:

The data for this direct request showed a 100% adherence to Semantic/Functional Translation. All students have directly translated the imperative verb 'close' and the politeness marker 'please' using high-frequency Bahdini Kurdish equivalents like (بێ زهحمەت, ههێشکەم, زهحمەت نهیهت, تکهیه). This high consistency highlights the direct correspondence between the English and Kurdish politeness markers for such a straightforward command, suggesting that the function of "please" is an almost exact lexical match in this context. The explanatory sentence ("It's cold in here") was also consistently included, indicating a complete preservation of the source text's proposition and pragmatic intent. No instances of pragmatic failure or unnaturalness were recorded, as the semantic rendering was functionally equivalent.

**Utterance (4): "I'd appreciate it if you'd help me just this once."**

١. نەز دێ سۆپاسداربم نەگەر تۆ فێ جارێ هاریکاریا من بکە.
٢. دێ گەلمەک کەیفە من هێت گەر چ نەیهت تۆ فێ جارێ هاری من بکە.
٣. دێ گەلمەک سۆپاسدار بێ نەگەر تە نەف جارە تێ هاریکاریا من کر.
٤. دێ بێ سۆپاسداربم نەگەر تۆ هاریکاریا من بکە بێ نەفێ جارێ.
٥. دێ سۆپاسدار بێ نەگەر بێتێ قێجارێ ژێ هاریکاریا من بکە.
٦. دێ بێخۆشحالیم نەگەر بێتێ تۆ فێ جارێ هاریکاریا من بکە.
٧. گەلمەک بێخۆش بێ نەگەر نەفجارە هاریکاریا من بکە.
٨. دێ سۆپاس داربم هەمە هاریکاریا من بکە قێجارێ بێتێ.
٩. نەز دێ یا سۆپاسداربم نەگەر تۆ بێس فێ جارێ هاریکاریا من بکە.
١٠. نەز دێ سۆپاسدار بێ نەگەر تێ نەف جارە هاریکاریا من بکە.

### Discussion:

This indirect request showed that almost all students have used semantic translation except student (2) which have used communicative translation. The initial discussion noted a split between students using direct gratitude in Kurdish such as (دێ بێ) and those using happiness/appreciation Kurdish polite (دێ گەلمەک کەیفە من هێت, نەز دێ بێ کەفخۆشیم). Both groups successfully conveyed the illocutionary force by shifting the request from a command into a conditional statement of the speaker's positive internal state (Positive Politeness). The distinction is subtle: the semantic group directly translated the lexis of "appreciate/grateful," while the communicative group translated the feeling into a more intense expression of happiness. Critically, none of three groups relied on the literal conditional structure of the English hint, confirming that Semantic Over-reliance on the structural form was avoided in favor of a functional declarative statement. The split indicates that both methods are acceptable for achieving pragmatic equivalence for this type of indirect request.

**Utterance (5): "May I interrupt for a moment?"**

١. دێ شێم چرکەیکێ تە بێرم؟
٢. دروسه ناخفتنا ههوه بێرم بپهههکێ؟
٣. نەز دێ شێم بۆ دهمەکێ کورت ناخفتنا تە بێرم؟
٤. دێ شێم بۆ خولەمەکێ ناخفتنا تە بێرم؟
٥. دێ شێم بۆ دهمەکێ ناخفتنا تە بێرم؟
٦. دێ شێم بۆ دهمەکێ ناخفتنا ههوه بێرم؟
٧. دێ شێم بۆ دهمەکێ ناخفتنا تە بێرم؟
٨. نەز دێ شێم خولەمەکێ ژ دهمێ تە بێرم؟
٩. نەز دێ شێم ناخفتنی بێرم بۆ چرکەکان؟
١٠. نەز دێ شێم ناخفتنا تە بێرم بۆ دهمەکێ؟

### Discussion:

This indirect request for permission, using "May," was dominated by 'Semantic Translation; (10 instances), relying on the Bahdini modal equivalent (نەز دێ شێم). This again confirms that, for permission requests, a direct modal transfer is considered an effective, polite, and fluent solution.. As for

translation it seems students (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10) have used semantic translation. On the other hand students (2 and 8) have used 'Communicative Translation' relying on the non-imposition markers (دروسه). Student (8)'s translation (ژ دهمێ تە بێرم؟) is a significant communicative shift, reframing the action of interrupting into the more general, less intrusive action of saying something. This demonstrates a subtle, successful strategy to minimize the face-threatening act.

**Utterance (6): "I was wondering if you would give me a hand."**

١. من پسیار کر کا نایا تۆ دشیی هاریکاریا من بکە.
٢. من هزر دکر کا دێ شیی هاری من کە یان نه.
٣. بۆ من مەرفه کا تۆ دێ هاریکاریا من کە.
٤. من هزر دکر کا نەز تۆ دێ هاریکاریا من کە.
٥. من هزر دکر کا دێ شیی هاری من کە؟
٦. من هزر دکر کا نایا تۆ دێ هاریکاریا من کە.
٧. من پسیار کر نەگەر شیا ی هاریکاریا من بکە؟
٨. من پسیار ژ خۆ دکر کا دێ هاریکاریا من کە.
٩. من پسیار دکر نەگەر تۆ هاریکاریا من بکە.
١٠. من هزر خۆ دکر کۆ دێ شیی هاریکاریا من کە.

### Discussion:

This indirect request aims to lower imposition by expressing the request as a thought process. The translation was highly split: 'Semantic' (8 instances) and 'Communicative' (2 instances). The semantic group (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10) focused on the literal meaning of "wondering" with phrases in Kurdish like 'من پسیار کر' and 'من هزر دکر'. This resulted in an 'unnatural or overly literal form', as it often loses the essential tentativeness of the ST. The Communicative group (3 and 6) focused on conveying the intent of the request by substituting the thought process with a statement of desire or curiosity (من هزر دکر). These communicative shifts are generally more successful as they transform the request into a fluent, mitigated statement, avoiding the awkwardness of the literal translation.

**Utterance (7): "Would you mind doing my shopping today? I've got so many other things to do."**

١. بۆ تە خوشه نەفرۆ بهیهه دگەل من فرۆشگهه؟ من گەلمەک تێتێن دێ هەنە کو بکەم.
٢. دێ شیی کر بێتێ من کەبێ نەفرۆ؟ من گەلمەک تێتێن دێ بێن هەبێ دقیت بکەم.
٣. نەز دێ کێشه هەبێت نەگەر تە نەفرۆ بازار کرنا من کر؟ من گەلمەک کارێن دێ بێن هەبێ بکەم.
٤. لدف تە چ کێشه نێه نەگەر ژ پێش من فە بچیه بازارێ؟ من گەلمەک کار بێن هەبێ.
٥. دێ شیی تێتێ ژ پێش من فە کر؟ من گەلمەک کارێ هەبێ کو دقیت بکەم.
٦. نەز دێ تە پێ ناخۆش نایبێ نەفرۆ ل جەهێ من بچیه کرینا تێتێ؟ من گەلمەک تێتێن دێ بێن هەبێ بکەم.
٧. نەخۆشه نەفرۆ کر بێنێ نەجەم بدم؟ من گەلمەک تێتێن دیتێ بێن هەبێ بکەم.
٨. نەز دێ تۆ بێ رازی من بیه بازارێ نەفرۆ؟ من گەلمەک تێتێن هەبێ یا پێدقیه نەز بکەم.
٩. نەز دێ بۆ تە نەخۆشه نەفرۆ بازار کرنا من بکە؟ من گەلمەک کارێن دێ هەنە کو بکەم.
١٠. نەز دێ بۆ تە نە ناریشه یه نەگەر نەفرۆ دگەل من بازارێ بکە، من گەلمەک کارێن دیتێ هەنە بکەم.

### Discussion:

This conventionally indirect, interrogative request focuses on the hearer's willingness to perform a substantial favor. The initial classification was largely semantic translation used by students (3, 4, 6 and 9) (relying on the modal/mind concept) with students using phrases like (ناریشه نێه) and (نەخۆشه). While students (2 and 5) were identified as using communicative translation, reframing the request to focus on the action itself using phrases such as (دێ شیی) and (ناساییه) and students (1, 7, 8 and 10) have failed conveying the correct message into Bahdini Kurdish. A critical analysis reveals that the

semantic translations (e.g., using *ناریشه* or *کیشه*) were functionally communicative in this context, as these phrases are conventionalized ways in Bahdini to ask for a favor while minimizing imposition. The primary pragmatic goal here is to address the high level of imposition by explicitly mentioning the potential inconvenience ("mind"). Therefore, the most successful translations (e.g., *دەف تە چ کیشه* or *نەری دێ شێی کرینت من کەمی نەفرۆ؟*, *نینه...*) are categorized as Communicative because they either: 1) use the direct Bahdini non-imposition formula, or 2) use the ability query (*دێ شێی*) with the second, explanatory sentence reinforcing the need for the favor, thereby fully preserving the source text's politeness level and pragmatic intent.

**Utterance (8): "I'd like two kilos of tomatoes, please."**

١. هێفیدکەم، من دوو کیلویین باجانان دێن.
٢. من دوو کیلویین تەماتێ دێن، بێ زحمەت.
٣. من دوو کیلو تەماتە دێن، هێفیدکەم.
٤. من دوو کیلو بین باجانان دێن، بێ زحمەت.
٥. من دوو کیلویت باجانا دێن، بێ زحمەت.
٦. بێ زحمەت، دوو کیلویین تەماتا بەدە من.
٧. من دوو کیلویین تەماتا دێن، هێفیدکەم.
٨. من دوو کیلوگرامین باجانان دێن، زحمەت نەبێت.
٩. من دوو کیلویین باجانان دێت، بێ زحمەت.
١٠. من دوو کیلویین باجانان دێن بێ زحمەت.

**Discussion:**

This indirect request utilizes the declarative form 'I'd like' softened by 'please.' As for translation it seems all students except student (6) have used semantic translation, directly rendering the speaker's desire using phrases like (*من دێن، من دێت*) combined with explicit politeness markers (*هێفیدکەم، بێ زحمەت*). This combination is highly effective, as the Semantic translation of the desire is mitigated by the 'Functional' translation of 'please.' The communicative translation used by student (6) reframed conventions, such as the direct imperative with mitigation (*بێ زحمەت، دوو کیلویین تەماتا بەدە من*). The high semantic alignment shows that expressing desire in Bahdini Kurdish is an accepted strategy for polite ordering, provided it is explicitly mitigated.

**Utterance (9): "Please stand over there."**

١. هێفیدکەم، لۆزێرێ رابووستە.
٢. بێ زحمەت لۆزێرێ رابووستە.
٣. هێفیدکەم، لۆزێرێ رابووستە.
٤. بێ زحمەت لۆزێرێ هەب رابووستە.
٥. هێفیدکەم، لۆزێرێ هەب رابووستە.
٦. بێ زحمەت لۆزێرێ رابووستە.
٧. ئەگەر زحمەت نەبێت لۆزێرێ رابووستە.
٨. زحمەت نەبێت، لۆزێرێ رابووستە.
٩. هێفیدکەم، لۆزێرێ رابووستە.

**5.1 The Strategic Dichotomy: Semantic Adequacy vs. Pragmatic Necessity:**

The primary finding is the existence of a clear strategic dichotomy that dictated translational success: students employed a high volume of Semantic Translation (ST) when structural

**Table 1**

Strategy	Percentage	Primary Function (Why Chosen)	Consequences of Failure
Semantic Translation (ST)	79%	Default choice for direct, conventionally structured requests (Modals, Mitigated Imperatives) where Syntactic Alignment preserves politeness.	Failure leads to unnatural literalism in highly indirect requests (e.g., "wondering").
Communicative Translation (CT)	17%	Mandatory Pragmatic Intervention for highly indirect/off-record requests where the ST structure has no	Failure leads to loss of politeness or unidiomatic TTs (TF).

١٠. هێفیدکەم لۆزێرێ هەب رابووستە.

**Discussion:**

The analysis for this direct request showed a 100% adherence to Semantic/Functional Translation, by directly rendering the imperative verb 'stand' and the Kurdish politeness marker 'please' using Bahdini Kurdish equivalents (*بێ زحمەت،* *هێفیدکەم*). This highlights the direct correspondence between the English and Kurdish politeness markers for such a straightforward command. The consistency of translation suggests this translational solution is highly standardized and widely accepted among the students.

**Utterance (10): "Will it be all right if I bring a friend?"**

١. دێ یا باش بێت ئەگەر هەفالمکی بێم؟
٢. درۆستە هەفالمکی خۆ بێم؟
٣. نەری دێ کیشه هەبێت ئەگەر من هەفالمک لگەل خۆ نینا؟
٤. چ کیشه نین ئەگەر نەز هەفالمکی بێم؟
٥. درۆستە نەز هەفالمکی خۆ بێم؟
٦. چ ناریشه نین ئەگەر نەز هەفالمکی بێم؟
٧. نەری درۆستە ئەگەر هەفالمکی خۆ بێم؟
٨. نەری دێ یا قەبیلکری بێت نەز هەفالمکی خۆ بێم؟
٩. نەری دێ یا ناسایی بێت ئەگەر نەز هەفالمکی دگەل خۆ بێم؟
١٠. نەری دێ یا درۆست بێت ئەگەر من هەفالمکی خۆ نینا؟

**Discussion**

This indirect request, seeks permission by asking about the appropriateness of an action, resulted in more preference for 'Communicative Translation' (6 instances) over Semantic (4 instances). It seems that students (2, 5, 7 and 10) have used semantic translation. On the other hand students (1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9). The initial discussion noted semantic attempts translating "all right" with phrases like (*درۆستە*). The most successful communicative strategies focused on the illocutionary force of the request, using non-imposition phrases like (*نەری، چ ناریشه نین*), or directly translating the concept of appropriateness (*دێ یا ناسایی بێت*). The high frequency of these non-imposition markers (*درۆستە، ناریشه نینه*) confirms the cultural priority of addressing the hearer's face when requesting permission.

**5. Findings**

This section synthesizes the analysis of 100 translations into the core findings regarding the strategic translation of English polite requests into Bahdini Kurdish. The evaluation moves beyond description to critically assess why certain strategies were chosen and their overall effectiveness in achieving pragmatic equivalence.

fidelity was pragmatically adequate, but were compelled to use Communicative Translation (CT) when literalism failed. Synthesis of Strategic Choice: The overall success rate was high, with 96% (96) of TTs achieving pragmatic equivalence. However, the distribution of successful strategies reveals a clear strategic function:

		fluent Bahdini parallel (e.g., complex non-imposition queries).	
Translation Failure	4%	No function	No Fuction

**5.2 Critical Evaluation of Politeness Structures:**

The analysis of the various request types highlights specific conditions under which each strategy was most effective, directly addressing the demand for critical evaluation of strategy effectiveness.

**A. High Success: Modal and Imperative Requests (Semantic Translation ‘ST’ Dominance)**

For direct requests employing Modal Verbs ("Can you...", "Could I...") and Mitigated Imperatives ("Close the door, please"), Semantic Translation was overwhelmingly dominant (up to 100% consistency in U3 and U9). Bahdini Kurdish modal (دئ / شئنی / دشئیم) and direct mitigation markers (بئ زحممت, هیفئدکم) show a near one-to-one pragmatic correspondence with English, making ‘ST’ the most efficient and conventional choice. This strategy successfully employs the politeness strategy of querying ability (e.g., U3) or explicitly marking mitigation (e.g., U9) to soften the command, achieving high pragmatic fluency without intervention.

**B. High Risk: Highly Indirect and Off-Record Requests (Communicative Translation ‘CT’ Necessity)**

Requests that rely on complex English formulations of the speaker's internal state (e.g., "I was wondering," "I'd appreciate it," "wouldn't mind") represented the highest translational risk. Over-reliance on Literal Forms: Unnatural literalism is strongly confirmed in Utterance 6. Direct Semantic transfer of "I was wondering" (من هزر دکر or من پسیارکر) often resulted in TTs that sounded like a statement of internal curiosity rather than a tentative request, failing to fully preserve the source text's pragmatic intent (e.g., U6). The successful translations demonstrated Pragmatic Intervention, shifting the illocutionary force to fluent Bahdini conventions: (1) Expressing Desire: Replacing "wondering" with من دئیا بزائم (I wanted to know). (2) Using Non-Imposition Markers: Replacing complex forms like "wouldn't mind" with direct, fluent markers such as چ ناریشه نین (there is no problem) or درۆسته (is it right).

**5.3 Synthesis of Politeness Markers and Translational Issues**

The following table is restructured to link the markers clearly to specific translation issues or effectiveness.

**Table 2**

Politeness Marker Category	Bahdini Kurdish Markers	Primary Translation	Strategy Effectiveness and Issue Link
Direct Mitigation	بئ زحممت, هیفئدکم, زحممت نهئیت	Mandatory Sematic Transltion (ST)	High Success. Direct functional equivalence; ST is mandatory.
Ability/Capability	دئ شئنی, دشئیم	Dominant Semantic Translation (ST)	High Success. Conventional polite frame; ST preserves politeness.
Permission/Discomfort	کئشه, ناریشه, نهخوش, درۆسته	High Communicative Translation (CT)	Dual Function. Fluent CT is used to query non-imposition; ST attempts using Kurdish Markers (کئشه, ناریشه, نهخوش, درۆسته) that risk unnatural literalism.
Speaker's Internal State	من دئیا بزائم, دئ سوپاسداریم	Mandatory Communicative Translation (CT)	Pragmatic Necessity. Used to replace complex English forms (e.g., "wondering"); ST of these forms leads to pragmatic failure.

**6. Conclusion**

This study investigated the translation of 10 English polite requests into Bahdini Kurdish by 10 student informants (100 total translations). The analysis provides a critical understanding of the strategic choices required to achieve pragmatic equivalence between the two languages.

**6.1 Synthesis of Findings and Hypothesis Verification:**

The data demonstrated a high overall rate of pragmatic success (96%), but this was achieved through a strategic negotiation between two translation methods: Semantic Translation (ST) and Communicative Translation (CT).

This strategic distribution verifies Hypothesis No. 1 (There is no one-to-one correspondence between the structures of polite requests in English and their realization in Kurdish). If a direct correspondence existed, the CT rate would be negligible, and the few ST attempts that led to unnatural literalism (e.g., in U6) would not have occurred. The necessity of using CT in nearly half the cases confirms that direct structural alignment often fails to produce a fluent, appropriate Bahdini equivalent.

Furthermore, the high success rate confirms that the illocutionary force of the English polite requests can be translated if the appropriate strategic choice is made, thereby validating Hypothesis No. 3 (The illocutionary force of English polite requests can be translated if communicative translation is

exploited). The reliance on CT was the mechanism that preserved the politeness level when ST proved structurally inadequate.

## 6.2 Theoretical and Practical Implications:

The findings carry significant implications for both translation theory and pedagogical practice in the Kurdish context.

**Theoretical Implication: The Necessity of Pragmatic Intervention**  
The study established clear parameters for when literalism fails. For highly indirect, off-record requests that rely on complex, internal-state English markers (e.g., "wondering," "mind"), Pragmatic Intervention (CT) becomes a mandatory requirement. This intervention primarily involves substituting the complex English structure with a simpler, culturally conventional non-imposition marker in Bahdini Kurdish (e.g., using instead of a literal rendering of "you wouldn't mind"). This suggests that Kurdish politeness conventions prioritize the *direct query* of the hearer's face over *convoluted structural softening*.

**Practical Implication: Pedagogical Focus**

For translation pedagogy, the study indicates that: (1) Semantic Translation should be taught as the default success strategy for formulaic requests involving modal auxiliaries and explicit mitigation markers ("please"). (2) Curricula must specifically address the pragmatic failure inherent in literally translating complex indirect requests, training students to decode the illocutionary force and switch to a fluent Communicative strategy based on TL conventions. This directly addresses the tendency toward unnatural literalism observed in the ST attempts for highly complex utterances.

## 6.3 Limitations of the Study:

Despite the robust data, this study acknowledges two main limitations:

1. **Sample Size and Context:** The reliance on 10 student informants limits the full generalizability of the findings to all Kurdish speakers. While the students function as expert informants within an academic context, further research involving professional translators and a wider sociolinguistic demographic is needed to confirm the universality of these strategic conventions.
2. This Study is confined to translation from English into Bahdini Kurdish, excluding other Kurdish dialects such as Sorani, thus limiting the generalizability.

## REFERENCES

- Achiba, M. (2003) *Learning to request in a second language: A study of child interlanguage pragmatics*. Multilingual Matters.
- Alabdali, T. (2019) 'Revisiting Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory: A Middle-Eastern Perspective', *Bulletin of Advanced English Studies*, 2(2), pp. 31-48.
- Ali, S. (2020) 'The speech act of request in Kurdish language according to the model (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain)', *Humanities Journal of University of Zakho*, 8(1), pp. 1-18. doi:10.26436/hjuoz.2020.8.1.570.
- Ali, S. A. (2021) 'Impoliteness and threat responses in an Iraqi-Kurdish EFL context', *Arab World English Journal*, 12(2), pp. 31-48.
- Ali, S. S. (2019) 'Compliment as a Politeness Strategy in Kurdish Language a Pragmatic Study', *Humanities Journal of University of Zakho*, 7(1), pp. 15-29.
- Alzebaree, R. S. & Yavuz, S. (2017) 'The realization of request and apology speech acts in Kurdish EFL learners', *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(26), pp. 1-13.
- Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Baker, M. (2011) *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. 2nd edn. Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. (1990) *Translation, history and culture*. Pinter Publishers.
- Becher, V. (2011) 'When and why do translators add connectives? A corpus-based study', *Target*, 23(1), pp. 25-47. doi:10.1075/target.23.1.02bec.
- Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T. & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990) 'Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals', in Scarcella, R. C., Andersen, E. S. & Krashen, S. D. (eds.) *Developing communicative competence in a second language*. Newbury House, pp. 55-73.
- Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1984) 'Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP)', *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), pp. 196-213. doi:10.1093/applin/5.3.196.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Catford, J. C. (1965) *A linguistic theory of translation*. Oxford University Press.
- Chyet, M. L. (2003) *Kurdish-English dictionary*. Yale University Press.
- Coates, J. (1996) *Women talk: Conversation between women friends*. Blackwell Publishers.
- David, M., Smith, J. & Johnson, R. (1989) 'Cross-cultural perspectives on politeness and requests', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 13(2), pp. 131-146. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(89)90001-6.
- Dickins, J., Herve, S. & Higgins, I. (2005) *Thinking Arabic translation: A course in translation method: Arabic to English*. Routledge.
- Dittrich, W., Johansen, T. & Kulbrandstad, L. A. (2011) *When children make polite requests: A cross-linguistic study*.
- Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Anchor Books.
- Gutt, E.-A. (1991) *Translation and relevance: Cognition and context*. Blackwell.
- Haig, G. & Matras, Y. (2002) 'Kurdish linguistics: A brief overview', *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung*, 55(1), pp. 3-14. doi:10.1524/stuf.2002.55.1.3.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990) *Discourse and the translator*. Longman.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997) *The translator as communicator*. Routledge.
- Holmes, J. (1995) *Women, men and politeness*. Longman.
- House, J. (1997) *Translation quality assessment: A model revisited*. Gunter Narr Verlag.
- House, J. (2015) *Translation as communication across languages and cultures*. Routledge.
- Hussein, A. (1984) 'Pragmatics of politeness in English and Arabic', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8(1), pp. 65-80. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(84)90003-2.
- Jakobson, R. (1959) 'On linguistic aspects of translation', in Brower, R. A. (ed.) *On translation*. Harvard University Press, pp. 232-239.
- Newmark, P. (1981) *Approaches to translation*. Pergamon Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988) *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1964) *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Brill.
- Öpengin, E. (2012) 'Sociolinguistic situation of Kurdish in Turkey: Sociopolitical factors and language use', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2012(217), pp. 151-170. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2012-0053.

- Searle, J. R. (1969) *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1976) 'A classification of illocutionary acts', *Language in Society*, 5(1), pp. 1-23. doi:10.1017/S0047404500006837.
- Venuti, L. (2008) *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. 2nd edn. Routledge.
- Watts, R. J. (2003) *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

### ترجمة الطلبات المهذبة بالإنجليزية إلى الكردية البيهيدنية

#### المخلص :

يشير الأدب إلى الأعراف والسلوكيات الاجتماعية التي تنطوي على الاحترام والمراعاة والكياسة تجاه الآخرين، وتتحرى هذه الدراسة ترجمة طلبات الأدب كأفعال كلامية من اللغة الإنجليزية إلى اللغة الكوردية، مركزة على تحدي ترجمة المعنى التداولي (الاستعمالي)، وتهدف إلى تحديد الأنماط المختلفة لطلبات التأدب الإنجليزية وترجمتها لمعرفة كيفية تحققها في اللغة الكوردية، وتسليط الضوء على نقاط التشابه والاختلاف، حيث تفترض الدراسة: (1) عدم وجود تطابق واحد لواحد بين تراكيب الطلبات في اللغتين، (2) استخدام اللغة الكوردية لعلامات التأدب أكثر من اللغة الإنجليزية، و(3) إمكانية ترجمة القوة الإنجازية (الأثر المقصود من المنطوق) عند استغلال الترجمة التواصلية (الفعالية السياقية والثقافية)، ولاختبار هذه الفرضيات، تنبئ الدراسة منهجية بحث نوعية باستخدام مقارنة نيومارك (1988) للتمييز بين الترجمة الدلالية (الدقة الحرفية) والترجمة التواصلية (الفعالية السياقية والثقافية)، كإطار لتحليل 10 طلبات مهذبة بالإنجليزية ترجمها 10 طلاب في السنة الرابعة بقسم الترجمة - كلية اللغات، جامعة دهوك، حيث تم أخذ فشل الترجمة في الاعتبار، وهو نص يكون فيه نقل الرسالة غير دقيق بسبب أخطاء لغوية أو تداولية كبيرة، تُخلص الدراسة إلى أن العلامات المهذبة التي تمنح الأقوال قوة الطلبات المهذبة في اللغة الكوردية أكثر من تلك الموجودة في اللغة الإنجليزية. علاوة على ذلك، تُظهر الفروقات في النسب المنوبة (79% دلالية) و(4% تواصلية) وفشل) أنه لا يوجد تطابق واحد لواحد بين هياكل الطلبات المهذبة في اللغة الإنجليزية وتحقيقها في اللغة الكوردية .

**الكلمات الدالة:** الترجمة التواصلية، القوة التأثيرية، الأدب، الطلبات، الترجمة الدلالية، أفعال الكلام، الترجمة

### وهرگیرانا داخازین ریزگرتنی بین زمانی نینگلیزی بو زمانی کوردی بههدینی

#### پوخته :

ریزگرتن ناماژه ب ریتسا و رهفتارین کومه لایمتی کو ریز و بایه خدان و بهخشدنیهی بهرامبهر کهمین دی نیشان دهمه. نهمف توژیژنهمه فمکولینتی ل وهرگیرانا داخازین ریزگرتنی وهرکردیمین ناخفتنی ژ زمانی نینگلیزی دا بو زمانی کوردی دکمت. نارمانجا فی توژیژنهمه برینیهی ژ دیاریکرنا شیوازی بین داخازین ریزگرتنی د زمانی نینگلیزی و وهرگیرانا فان شیوازا ژ زمانی نینگلیزی بو زمانی کوردی بو وی چمندهی کو بهینته زانین چهوا د زمانی کوردی دا جیبهجی دین و رووناکرنا خالین هاوبهش و جیاوازا دناقیهرا چاوانیا دروست بوونا وان د زمانی نینگلیزی و جیبهجیکرنا وان د زمانی کوردی دا بو جیهینانا نارمانجین سهری، توژیژنهمه گریمانی دکمت کو: (1) هیچ هاوتایهکا راستهوخو نینه دناقیهرا پیکهاتین داخازین ریزگرتنی د زمانی نینگلیزی دا و جیبهجیکرنا وان د زمانی کوردی دا.. (2) زمانی کوردی زیدهتر ژ زمانی نینگلیزی نیشانین داخازین ریزگرتنی بکار دینیت. (3) هیزا نیلوكیوشنهری یا داخازین ریزگرتنی د زمانی نینگلیزی دشنت بهینته وهرگیران نهگس وهرگیرانا پهیوهنیدار بهینته بکار نینان. بو تاقیکرنا گریمانین سهری، توژیژنهمه رینازا فمکولینا کوالینتی بکار هینایه کو رینازا نیومارکی (1988) بهکار هینایه د رووی جیاوازی د نافیهر وهرگیرانا واتابی (وردیایا پهیف ب پهیف) و وهرگیرانا پهیوهنیدار (کاریگهرا جفاکی و دهر برین)، وهرک چوار چنویهک بو شروفهکرنا (10) داخازین ریزگرتنی ب زمانی نینگلیزی کو ژ لای (10) خویندکارین قوناغا چوارم بهشی وهرگیران-کولیزا زمان، زانکویا دهوک هاتینه وهرگیران شکستنا وهرگیرانی ژی هاتیه بهرچاقرن، کو برینیهی ژ دههکی کو گوهاستنا پهیما، ژ نهجامی شاشین زور ل رهنهوی بان پراگماتی.. توژیژنهمه گههسته وی نهجامی کو نیشانین ریزگرتنی کو هیزا داخازین ریزگرتنی ددهتهف گوتنان د زمانی کوردی دا زیدهترن ژ زمانی نینگلیزی. هسروهه، جیاوازی ل ریزهیا سهری، (79% واتابی) و (17% پهیوهندی) و (4% شکستهینان) پشتگیریا فی چمندهی دکمت کو هیچ هاوتایهکا راستهوخو نینه دناقیهرا پیکهاتین داخازین ریزگرتنی د زمانی نینگلیزی دا و جیبهجیکرنا وان د زمانی کوردی دا.

**پهقیقین سهرهکی:** وهرگیرانا پهیوهنیدار، هیزا کار تیکرنتی، ریزگرتن، داخوازی، وهرگیرانا واتابی، کردارین ناخفتنی، وهرگیران