



Jan Kochanowski University Press

This is a contribution from *Token: A Journal of English Linguistics*
Volume 7/2018.

Edited by John G. Newman, Marina Dossena and Sylwester Łodej.

Special Editors for volume 7: Marina Dossena and Polina Shvanyukova.

© 2018 Jan Kochanowski University Press.

The method and practice of translational stylistics

John Douthwaite

Università degli Studi di Genova

ABSTRACT

This paper deals with how translation should be approached in the classroom and why. It argues in favour of a stylistic approach which allows for a full comprehension of a text and the devices by which meaning is conveyed in the text so that the 'best' equivalent translation may be found. In order to illustrate the process two Italian translations of a Joycean extract are examined to determine in certain instances what meanings the translators conveyed and how these compare to the meanings in the source text. Hypotheses are advanced as to why certain solutions were adopted in the light of translation theory.

Keywords: stylistics, translation, equivalence, meaning, complexity.

1. Translation theory

1.1 The complexity of human communication

Communication is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon, even with the simplest of utterances. Take this decontextualized example:

What on earth are you doing, boy!

Despite the absence of context, conjuring up viable interpretations presents no cognitive difficulty even to those not versed in linguistic theory. One of the most important linguistic indicators is the vocative "boy", as this immediately helps build context. Addressing another individual as "boy" presupposes that the speaker who has selected this linguistic form of address is an adult for it carries the social message of the speaker's 'superiority' with regard

to the condition of the hearer. The first important lesson to be drawn from this consideration is that there are many different types of meaning – “boy” employed as a vocative conveys social meaning which is far more important in this exchange than the conceptual meaning that it expresses, (i.e. ‘young male member of the species’), the latter constituting what the so-called man-in-the-street is generally believed to understand by the word “meaning”.

To make this distinction clear, let us examine the syntax of the utterance (U). The grammatical form is that of an interrogative, yet the communicative meaning the hearer infers from the U is not that of asking a question but of ordering, reprimanding, and perhaps even threatening. This interpretation is justified by the speaker-writer’s deployment of two further linguistic devices.

First, the use of an exclamation mark. This graphological mark performs three functions. Firstly, it denies the conceptual meaning that the U is a question, otherwise a question mark would have been employed. Secondly, it indicates the presence of an intonation pattern (in this case a falling tone rather than a rising tone), which again negates the function of the U as being that of a question. The function of this marked intonation pattern is to confirm the three functions, or illocutionary forces, identified above: ordering, reprimanding, threatening. Thirdly, it also supports the hypothesis that the U also expresses surprise and anger. In other words, after ideational and social meaning, we have uncovered a third dimension to “the meaning of meaning” (Ogden – Richards 1923): emotional, psychological meaning, or the conveyance of mental and emotional states and attitudes. We have at the same time discovered that Us can be (and usually are) multifunctional – they can bear more than one illocutionary force and more than one perlocutionary force concurrently. We have also ascertained that the ‘meanings’ identified so far are all non-literal, since the literal meaning, or locutionary force, would have been that of asking a question (that is to say, asking for information). Note also that Austin’s (1962) theory of speech acts, which draws a distinction between locutionary force (literal meaning), illocutionary force (speaker meaning) and perlocutionary force (the effect the speaker desires to produce in the hearer through the use of the specific U) widens further the horizon of “the meaning of meaning”.

The second linguistic device bolstering the interpretation of the U as conveying both conceptual meaning and emotional meaning is the use of the ‘polite’ expletive “on earth”. The ‘politeness’ of the expletive provides further social information as to the identity of the speaker and as to the nature of the interpersonal relationship between the two interactants.

Let us return to context. One hypothesis that immediately springs to mind (the implicature that has optimal relevance for the present writer, in Sperber – Wilson’s [1995] terms) is that the speaker is a teacher and the hearer a student who is doing something wrong, such as cheating during an examination. Hence what the teacher is saying, or, to be more precise, implying/conveying, (i.e. the explicature, in Sperber – Wilson’s terminology), is ‘You are a bad boy, you must stop copying, you will be punished if you don’t stop copying, I am surprised and angered by your bad behaviour’.

Two new aspects may now be identified. First, the U concurrently evaluates the behavioral act it attempts to stop (“bad boy”, or reprimand). Second, the evaluation is a social phenomenon, since the type of value judgment expressed depends on the speaker’s values, which are socially determined by the society s/he lives in (acquired through socialisation and maintained by internal and external restraints – conscience and the law). Language cannot thus be separated from the culture and social structure in which it is produced.

This latter point can be demonstrated quite simply by probing the social picture further. For a given speech act to be “felicitous”, (viz. successful), certain felicity conditions must be satisfied, otherwise the act is “null and void” (Austin 1962: 25). In the case of imparting an order, conditions such as the speaker’s right to give the order and the hearer’s duty to obey the order are crucial. This may be demonstrated by changing the contextual parameters. Were the speaker to be a fellow student, then the illocutionary forces would change to warning or advising and justifying his warning: “Stop copying – if the teacher sees you, you will be thrown out of the exam!” Stated differently, felicity conditions are determined by the nature of the speech act and of the context. The change of contextual parameters demonstrates the manifold interpretations that might be given to a U, and hence the ambiguity inherent in language.

So far we have talked about a single, decontextualized utterance (since in my interpretation the context was inferred). However, Us are interconnected and together they compose texts. The way they are connected and the structure of individual texts provide further meaning. Intratextuality and intertextuality are two aspects of such meaning. In Conrad’s novel *Nostromo*, in a flash forward which occurs at a relatively early stage in the novel, we are informed that the revolution described is a failure. This then enables the reader to judge in a critical light the words and actions of the characters that follow the flash-forward. Thus when they make their great speeches about liberty and justice, the reader knows these are hollow.

In this brief introduction, I have attempted to show that communication is extremely complex, that every U may convey numerous meanings, different types of meanings, and that Us have to be linked to the context of utterance and to co-texts if we are to 'extract' the 'full meaning' of a U, and a myriad of other factors such as intertextuality, social structure and to culture.

1.2 Translating and teaching translation

What we can take away from our discussion so far is that competent translation requires an awareness of as many intra-utterance and intra-textual meanings as possible. A translator must possess the analytical skills required to identify all the linguistic devices at work in a text and then calculate how they produce the effects (meanings) which the reader understands (or the author wishes the reader to understand). Consequently, the translator must also be able to account for the effect (or reaction) the author wishes to exert on the reader before he begins to attempt a translation.

Unsurprisingly, the translator has a difficult job to do. The daunting task described above is rendered impossible by the non-isomorphism of languages, since this latter phenomenon impedes the achievement of perfect equivalence. The target language does not possess exactly the same linguistic devices as the source language, and even where the two languages do possess nearly identical resources the effect those resources produce (the meanings they convey) may not necessarily be identical (linguistic relativity). Hence the need for compensatory strategies. The problem is exacerbated by differences being attributable not simply to linguistic relativity, but also to cultural relativity, another almost insurmountable obstacle to equivalence in many cases.

Turning to actual translation practices, some genres might prove a shade easier than others. Medical texts come to mind given their comparatively restricted language range, restricted concepts and restricted communicative functions or goals. However, technical, scientific texts where such criteria apply are only part of the translation universe. When we come to literary texts, advertising texts, legal texts, then the complexity is formidable.

Translation practice is also affected by market practice. Some publishing companies want a text which is readily digestible, where the complications of the target text are avoided. This is especially true of literary texts. Hence translators are 'encouraged' to domesticate.

This brings us to the problem of teaching translation. This is a universe in itself. The considerations offered below are 'direct consequences' of the

discussion of translational stylistics¹. They therefore need to be set within a full analytical framework of the teaching of translation, a venture which is well beyond the scope of this article. I direct readers' attention to Cortese (1995, 1996) who deals with such issues in some depth. I now return to the limited comments pertinent to my own investigation.

Given the complexity of meaning and the non-isomorphism of language, would-be translators need to be trained in interpreting texts and then rendering them in the target language with the greatest 'accuracy' possible, that is to say, with the highest level of equivalence possible. Though domestication will also be a target skill, foreignization will be the general skill aimed at. To do so, rich texts must be employed. This principle makes literary texts and advertising texts prime material for classroom use.

The following section will thus take the beginning of a short story from *Dubliners*, ("The Boarding House", in Joyce 1914), and examine how two of the many Italian translations available have dealt with the source text. An attempt will be made to identify not simply the losses and gains in translation, and to evaluate the results, but also to try to understand why the translator adopted the solution which s/he opted for.

2. Translation practice

2.1 The preparatory stylistic analysis

First students are invited to analyse the passage and then translate it before the lesson. Translation forces them to re-examine their interpretation as well as acquire training in finding the best possible equivalences. Next, in class a preliminary stylistic analysis is made of points which the teacher deems essential to interpretation. The two major aims of this operation are to ensure 'correct' (tenable) and profound interpretations are being advanced together with the identification of the linguistic devices supporting those interpretations, and, of especial importance, to make those points that might well not emerge from a sentence-by-sentence translation come to the surface, with particular attention being devoted to issues related to culture and society, specifically when the teacher suspects student knowledge in that domain might be insufficient or not activated spontaneously. The words highlighted in the source text below, (the first paragraph of "The Boarding

¹ On stylistics see Douthwaite (2000); Jeffries – McIntyre (2010); and Short (1996).

House" by James Joyce), have been specifically selected with this purpose in mind. An exhaustive analysis is not undertaken since this would lead to duplication when dealing with the two target translations and the students' own solutions, with a consequent loss in motivation and attention.

One final point concerns the selection of the source text. One cogent reason for choosing *Dubliners* is that the stories and the language appear to be simplicity itself. Joyce, like many great writers, is deceptively simple. Great care needs to be taken when dealing with such a writer, again justifying the need for exhaustive stylistic analysis of the text, as illustrated below, when teaching translation so as to make students aware that much more is happening in the text than would first appear.

[1] **MRS. MOONEY** WAS a butcher's **daughter**. [2] **She** was a **woman** who was quite able to keep things to herself: a determined **woman**. [3] **She** had married her father's foreman and opened a butcher's shop near Spring Gardens. [4] **But** as soon as his father-in-law was dead **Mr. Mooney** began to go to the devil. [5] **He** drank, plundered the till, ran headlong into debt. [6] **It** was no use making **him** take the pledge: **he** was sure to break out again a few days after. [7] By fighting **his wife** in the presence of customers and by buying bad meat **he** ruined **his** business. [8] One night **he** went for his **wife** with the cleaver and **she** had to sleep at a neighbour's house.

First of all, it will be noted that the first part of the passage is 'dominated' by the wife (signaled in bold type). In the three sentences which constitute this sub-section, the wife is the theme of the U in all three cases and occupies the end focus slot in two Us out of three. Significantly, Mrs Mooney is introduced and identified by her functional role: wife. This immediately introduces the central main theme of the text, gender relations. Since introducing a character by title and surname is standard practice, then missing this point is extremely easy. This example thus provides a first demonstration of the importance of stylistic analysis prior to translating any text. By contrast, the husband is mentioned only once, significantly not by name but by occupational status and by 'possession' ("her father's foreman), and performing the role of goal of the (metaphorical) material process, the result of being 'owned' by the father. Such signals as these indicate Mooney's 'inferiority' in the story, thus beginning to build the readerly position with regard to the characters.

The fourth sentence begins with contrastive "but", signaling the beginning of the second section, with the husband (signaled in bold italics) taking over the role of agent (and grammatical subject) in all the sentences

bar U6, where the grammatical subject is realized by impersonal “it” and Mr Mooney plays the role of goal. However, this syntactic-pragmatic exception is no exception when one considers that all the Us connote Mooney negatively and that “it” is actually a dummy subject hiding the ‘real’ subject (Mrs Mooney being implicitly referred to and so ‘repressed’). Indeed, Mooney is introduced as “Mr Mooney” in U4 to parallel “Mrs Mooney” in U1, hence setting up the contrast between the two characters. Mrs Mooney regains the role of grammatical subject and functional theme (Halliday – Matthiessen: 2004) in the final clause in the paragraph – the third, albeit brief, section. Significantly, as we shall see, this is a clause conjoined by the coordinating conjunction with the previous clause where the husband still occupies thematic position “and”, thereby putting the two people on an equal footing, syntactically speaking, while the illocutionary force of the conjunction is to introduce the effect of the cause described in the preceding clause. This interpretation is borne out by the use of the modal “had to”.

The preceding analysis involves two crucial points: co-text and (cultural) context. First of all, the opening paragraph exhibits a three-part movement. In the first part, Mrs Mooney dominates, in the second part Mr Mooney dominates, as the emphasized constituents immediately bring to our attention. Highly significant is the brusque change from Mrs Mooney as theme in the first three Us to Mr Mooney, brusque because U4 appears to break the Gricean maxim of relation (Grice 1989). The logical, thematic (ie. conceptual) link between U3 and U4 is not immediately transparent. In order to read between the lines, we need to identify the cultural framework which provides the background information necessary to draw the implications the text contains. Ireland was a patriarchal, Catholic society. Hence we find the initiative is taken originally by Mrs Mooney, who has the power because she is the daughter of the owner of the business and which power she exerts by selecting a husband.

However, the presence of strong contrastive “but” in sentence-initial position in U4 begins to explain that she can exert this power only by dint of being the daughter of the owner, for, as the first clause explains, as soon as her father dies, power is transferred to the *pater familias*. Two crucial linguistic phenomena support this reading. First, Mooney becomes theme and agent of the following Us. Second, verb tenses and the time marker in U4: “as soon as” “was dead” and “began”. Standard tenses following temporal “as soon as” would be past perfect plus past simple, a *consecutio temporum* which ‘separates’ or distances the two actions. Instead, the deployment of exactly the same tense – past simple – together with the specific temporal expression employed creates an effect virtually of simultaneity. This subtle

play creates the implications that while Mrs Mooney chose her husband, the future Mr Mooney bowed down to power, deliberately biding his time, because he knew that, (culturally speaking), once the old man had gone, he would be the boss. Hence the linguistic features that have just been listed and the negativity expressed by all the sentences in the second section: Mr Mooney is being evaluated extremely negatively as an opportunist, and rightly so, since he will ruin his family through squandering the money his opportunism brings him. Evoking such a strongly negative reaction in the reader is of paramount importance for when we read the rest of the story and discover Mrs Mooney's grievous faults (for the time), (namely, arranging her daughter to marry Doran by allowing her to have sexual intercourse with him outside the bond of marriage and then forcing him into a shotgun wedding), given the family situation and given the historical fact that the male is the breadwinner and the local or contextual fact that Mary is not like her mother and will be incapable of looking after herself as can her mother, we readers do not condemn Mrs Mooney so much as the society which produces such people, which I hypothesise is one of Joyce's major goals.

Through this analysis, we have established the importance of co-text, context and culture. This analysis is confirmed by the final clause in the paragraph (section three). Here, as we have said, Mrs Mooney begins to take back the power she had lost. In this clause she merely reacts defensively by abandoning the house. But this already constitutes (socio-cultural) rebellion, the assertion of the (female) self. Again co-text will provide confirmation, for in the next paragraph she will go to the priest and obtain a "divorce" – a highly radical act challenging traditional male hegemony. Stated differently, we immediately interpret the story as one of gender relations and power in the Irish society of the time and Joyce's critique of such a society, and not as the personal history of a handful of individuals. Without prior stylistic analysis, many of these points might well be missed in translating sentence by sentence. The result could be mis-translation. Furthermore, as will be shown immediately in the analysis of U1, when a literal or near-literal or apparently near-literal translation is available, the reader/translator is less likely to stop and think about possible implications, especially so in the case of the translator who has a job to complete in a limited time span. But such implications are important for they may well, and usually do, affect the remaining co-text².

² One cogent example which will be dealt with occurs in U8 when translating "a neighbour's house".

The interpretation also brings to light a central problem that will be encountered in translation. As Italian is a pro-drop language, then Joyce's play on gender achieved through the use of lexis and syntax (thematic position, end focus, agent-patient, pronoun and possessive adjectives) is threatened and what will be lost because of the difference between the two languages must be compensated for³.

Returning to classroom practice, attention must initially be drawn to style, which is informal, conversational, since before starting a translation, the translator must decide the type of translation s/he is going to produce, and then ensure all her/his linguistic selections conform to her/his selected solution, unless, of course, the style changes in the ST.

2.2 The stylistic analysis of the two translations.

At this stage we proceed by examining the target translations sentence by sentence followed by asking students if they can equal or improve on two highly reputable translations, the first by Attilio Brilli (1998), the second by Daniele Benati (2013). In the Us that follow, E = English source text, I = Italian target text.

- (1) U1
 E MRS. MOONEY WAS a butcher's daughter.
 I1 Mrs Mooney era figlia di un macellaio.
 I2 Mrs Mooney era la figlia di un macellaio.

The sentence is seemingly transparent and straightforward thanks to its brevity, its linguistic construction and its lack of complex conceptual content. Furthermore, the syntactic structure available in the target language appears to be so close to that of the source language that little deep thought seems to be required to produce an 'equivalent' in the target language. There seems to be nothing to reflect on.

This impression is instantly belied by the sole difference between the two translations, the presence in I2 of the definite article "la" ("the") and its absence in I1. This should immediately alert us to implicatures. The question that should be asked is the (Gricean) relevance of U1 to the text. Why is the protagonist introduced/presented as wife and as the daughter of a butcher, that is to say by categorial features, (the functional category of butcher and

³ The example "a neighbour's house" is again pertinent – see fn. 2 above.

the relational categories of wife and daughter – Van Leeuwen 1966), and not by individual human features? The reader thus immediately retrieves his knowledge of the world about butchers from long-term memory, conjuring up the image of a butcher – prototypically a big, strong, purposeful man. The implicature (or relevance) of U1 is that Mrs Mooney possesses some of the ‘salient’ characteristics of her father, the butcher. As we will learn shortly, (co-text), the main feature she shares with her father, since it will determine Mrs Mooney’s behaviour throughout the story, is that of a strong, active, resolute character, one which is more ‘properly’ associated with the male than with the female in the society of the time. In other terms, the story starts with a social portrait of a female non-conformist. A second feature, which we will pick up later in U3, is the association of protectiveness with ‘big’ and ‘strong’.

In I2, one viable interpretation of the inclusion of the definite article “la” is that it renders the portrait that of a specific human individual. A further ambiguity that the inclusion of the article in Italian gives rise to is that it has the potential to imply that that particular person (the butcher) had more than one child and that Mrs Mooney was his only daughter. In contrast, the suppression of the definite article in I1 renders the picture a purely categorial one, as in the source text (ST), without any implications as to any other possible member of the family.

What is crucial here is not so much that I2 is ambiguous, but that that ambiguity goes against the much deeper implications my interpretation of the ST gives rise to, since my basic contention is that the theme of the story is not the psychological portrait of a single individual, but the social issue of gender and power in the family (and in the wider society) in Ireland in Joyce’s time. If this contention is correct, then the version without the article is to be preferred to guide the reader more steadfastly towards the social interpretation of the story. Such implicatures, I repeat, are all too easy to miss if a prior stylistic analysis is not carried out. The final lesson to be drawn from this example that I wish to stress is that the extreme complexity and subtlety of language use is instantly attested to by the ‘mere’ presence or absence of an article, one of the ‘humblest’ constituents of the language system.

(2) U2

E She was a woman who was quite able to keep things to herself: a determined woman.

I1 Era una donna che sapeva il fatto suo, una donna senza dubbio risoluta.

I2 Abile a tener per sé le proprie faccende, era una donna determinata.

With this second U the translator's life becomes immediately much more difficult. We note two radically different translations, both of which differ noticeably from the ST. The first point to observe concerns graphology. Joyce is extremely punctilious in his use of this symbolising device, creating subtle nuances of meaning through its deployment. In the case at hand Joyce's use of the colon is surprisingly discarded by both translators. The colon in the ST starkly divides the sentence into two parts. The first part is long. The second part is short, hence foregrounded by its brevity, which in turn is rendered even more perceptually salient by the colon, hence signalled as important information. Significantly, the information regards Mrs Mooney's character, for "determined" implies a strong character, as hypothesised above with reference to U1. Hence U2 represents a 'logical' continuation of the conceptual theme introduced by U1, and a confirmation of the interpretation offered of U1. Turning to the specific content of U2, the illocutionary force of the first clause is that of describing a specific feature of Mrs Mooney's character. The illocutionary force of the second clause is that of making a higher-level generalisation about Mrs Mooney's character which is confirmed by the specific instantiation predicated by the preceding clause.

The lack of a colon in the target texts alters the pragmatic relationship between the two clauses. Turning exclusively to syntax, I1 and the ST are almost equivalent, since they both consist of two main clauses, the second of which is syntactically imperfect thanks to the ellipsis of subject and verb (with the subject having been 'dropped' in the Italian translation). However, in I1, due to the suppression of the colon, replaced by a comma, the second clause pragmatically constitutes a continuation of the first clause: the addition of a second and therefore independent character trait. The hierarchy between the two clauses of the ST and the relationship of illustration-generalisation of the ST are thus lost. Consequently, the force of "determined" – that key character trait which keeps Mrs Mooney going in the face of the great adversity recounted in the story – is considerably diminished.

However, I1 attempts to recover the lost force through the use of two compensatory strategies. The first is the exploitation of Italian syntax which enables the translator to place "risoluta" in strong end focus position. The second is the addition of the prepositional "senza dubbio". As well as its semantic function as intensifier, the prepositional phrase also plays on alliteration to draw attention to the concept. However, as we shall see five paragraphs below, this second point is not really a gain at all.

The syntactic structure of I2 differs radically from the ST, since it is realised by a verbless subordinate clause followed by a perfectly-formed main

clause – the opposite construction of the Joycean U. Thus, the information in the first clause is flagged by the grammar as being less important than that in the main clause, which is not true of the ST, where the information in both clauses is signalled as very important. I2 attempts to mimic the structure of the source by employing ellipsis, as in the original, though shifting this syntactic feature to the first clause. As with I1, the resulting pragmatic effect appears to be more one of addition.

The pro-drop feature of Italian immediately emerges with great force. The ST begins with “she” in graphologically first and functionally thematic position, as well as realising the grammatical function of subject of the sentence. The lexeme “woman” appears in end focus, and is thereby signalled as important information. We also find “woman” as the fourth word in the sentence. It is redundant, or repetitive, since U1 contains the items “Mrs Mooney” and “daughter” and U2 begins with “she”, leaving no doubt as to gender identity. Hence, had Joyce wished to respect the canons laid down by the classic style manuals, he could have varied quite simply by replacing the lexical item “woman” with the lexeme “person”. Redundancy is also important with regard to the second, brief, clause, for Joyce could have opted for something like “she was determined”. He could even have reduced the two clauses to one, as in: ‘she was a determined woman who was quite able to keep things to herself’, eliminating one instantiation of “woman”. In addition to confirming the importance of the gender factor conveyed by the repetition of the gender markers, brevity, redundancy and graphological foregrounding also mean that “a” and “woman” constitute given information. Indeed, the only new information in the second clause is the premodifier “determined”. This again constitutes foregrounding (Douthwaite 2000) for, by dint of constituting new information, the premodifier in the noun phrase becomes more important than the head of that phrase, the head normatively constituting the most important constituent of a phrase. By such linguistic devices Joyce is able to have his cake and eat it. He manages to stress both concepts: “woman” – gender – and “determined” – the socially ‘inappropriate’ character-feature. Clearly, the loss of the subject in Italian weakens this effect.

Instead, in I2, the deployment of ellipsis of the verb “era” enables the translator to place “abile” in thematic position. Since it constitutes a marked theme and is graphologically salient, the concept receives great emphasis. Thus, placing “abile” in thematic position and “risoluto” in end focus constitute compensatory strategies in which the two terms receive equal stress. I2 would thus seem to recover more of the ‘original meaning’ of the source text. However, the structure used eliminates one instance of “donna”.

From syntax we turn to lexis. The English lexeme “quite” can mean anything from ‘hardly’ (almost nil) to ‘extremely’ (almost all), depending on intonation, volume, pitch, collocation, co-text, context. Thus, depending on the way the linguistic devices are deployed in context, a teacher handing back an essay to a student and accompanying the action with the words and appropriate intonational pattern ‘That’s quite good’ might mean anything from ‘that’s not very good at all’, to ‘it’s alright’, to ‘it’s very good indeed’. In the target text, “quite” represents a very strong intensifier. Italian does not possess a satisfactory equivalent and we see the two translators struggling with the problem.

In I1 the translator has employed “senza dubbio”, but he has also moved the item from the first clause to the second. It thus appears to act as a compensatory strategy employed to reinforce the gender references lost in Italian due to the absence of the subject pronoun occupying informationally strong thematic position in the Joycean text. This hypothesis is bolstered by a second compensatory mechanism, the intensive play on alliteration: initial letter “d” in “donna”, “donna”, “dubbio”; and the “s” sound in “sapeva”, “suo” “senza”, “risoluta”. One imagines this device was opted for since alliteration is a foregrounding mechanism heavily deployed by Joyce to a variety of communicative ends, hence a ‘Joycean style’ is maintained.

However, moving the prepositional phrase “senza dubbio” to the second clause leaves the adjective phrase “abile” (“capable”) without its intensifying premodifier. Thus ellipsis to place “abile” in marked theme position may be seen as a strategy compensating the loss of the intensifier, weakening the subordinate clause and strengthening the main clause.

I2 ‘solves’ the problem of “quite” by simply ignoring its existence. However, Translator 2 also employs “donna determinata” thus exploiting both alliteration and end focus, though it is the adjective that is in end focus and not the head noun, given the syntax of Italian. Through the employment of such linguistic devices I2 manages to keep some of the strength of the original gender markers. However, this effect is weakened by the fact that I2 eliminates one of the instantiations of “donna”.

Before continuing, a word on loss and compensation. As the textbooks tell us, an attempt at getting across all the ‘meanings’ contained in a U by finding a perfect equivalent is generally impossible due to linguistic and cultural relativity. Hence the use of compensatory strategies. Given the complexity and multifunctionality of utterances, translation will naturally entail gains and losses. Since language is not a mathematical system, no objective weighting can be given to the constituent meaning components

of any given U in context in order to calculate in an 'objective', 'mechanical' or 'automatic' fashion which is the 'best' solution. Were this possible, one could envisage the machine taking over from the human translator. The solution to be adopted is thus up to the translator, and will depend, in the first instance on his interpretation of the ST which will guide him in deciding which aspects are more important than others and which must therefore be retained in translation when weighing up the gains and losses. As the old saying goes, 'ye pays ye money and ye takes ye choice', and I would add, you hope the critics do not go for their guns. When teaching translation, mistakes must, of course, be pointed out, but when actually evaluating translations, the impossibility of equivalence and the nature of communication mean that it is infrequent to be able to openly and bluntly declare that certain expressions are 'right' or 'wrong', unless the translator is incompetent, for generally, there are so many factors involved that what is 'right' becomes at times a moot point, as the preceding discussion on "risoluta" and "determinata" illustrates. What is therefore important is not whether my comments/interpretations are right or wrong, but bringing to light the entire cognitive process of identifying the message in the ST and the linguistic means deployed to convey that message and the considerations/evaluations involved in the process of converting the message and means into the target language.

Returning to a discussion of the translations, I2 opts for "le proprie faccende" ("her own business/affairs") for "things". The original expression is the embodiment of vagueness, whereas the Italian translation is decidedly specific, limiting Mrs Mooney's ability of self-control to her own affairs. Now, one might argue that a) if you can exercise self-control over your own affairs, you can exercise control over all affairs, and b) to be able to control you own affairs you have to know everybody's affairs. While these two arguments might be conceded, what I believe Joyce is implying by the use of a generic term is that Mrs Mooney keeps her mouth well and truly shut (to again put the matter bluntly), in contrast to the gossip who reveals nothing about his own affairs but who shouts everything he thinks he knows (or invents) about others from the rooftops. Again, this might be considered quibbling. What is at stake, however, is effect in text and context. A person like Mrs Mooney who keeps all her knowledge secret is less likely to make enemies than the gossip, and more likely to build herself (or himself) a solid reputation of strength and reliability. This has direct practical consequences (in the text and in real life). For instance, when Doran goes down to discuss "reparation" with Mrs Mooney on the fateful Sunday morning, this inadequate being

just doesn't stand a snowball in hell's chance against this truly formidable woman, for her ability "to keep things to herself" is one of those character traits that renders her so daunting.

(3) U3

E She had married her father's foreman and opened a butcher's shop near Spring Gardens.

I1 Aveva sposato il garzone del padre e messo su una macelleria dalle parti di Spring Gardens.

I2 Aveva sposato il capo lavorante di suo padre e aperto una macelleria nei pressi di Spring Gardens.

U3 provides further evidence of the need for prior stylistic analysis. The lexical verb 'to marry' in English and its equivalent 'sposare' in Italian used 'normally' carry the meaning that 'A got married to B' without implying agency, that is to say, without implying A is deliberately and consciously acting upon the world, which is the meaning that a material process generally carries, as in the expression 'A kicked B', where B is the goal acted upon by A and does not have the power/opportunity to affect A's action, (otherwise he would presumably have avoided the kick). Instead, the various linguistic and non-linguistic factors listed in 2.1 above when discussing this U signify that in this specific case, Joyce intended the use of the material process exactly as carrying out its prototypical functions. That is to say, the implicature is that Mrs Mooney was the agent, it was she who chose her future spouse. The latter is reduced simply to role of goal of the material process.

Further evidence in support of the interpretation comes from alliteration ("father's foreman) indicating that she selected her father's top man, namely the best, most skillful worker. Note the parallelism that Mooney too is introduced not by personal identity but by categorial, functional identity. The further implication is quite simple: since it is the male who is the bread-winner, Mrs Mooney chose not the most handsome or charming male available (to her), but, in obedience to the cultural norms of the time, the man who, in theory, represented the best bet for making a good income producer to protect the family.

Confirmation of this hypothesis is furnished immediately, (exploitation of the Gricean manner maxim, sub-maxim: be orderly), by "opened a butcher's shop" (exploitation of the Gricean maxim of relation). Had the man been a clerk, then it seems improbable that the couple would have opened a butcher's shop. One might also note the subtle point that, although

at a superficial reading one might not apply the prototypical Hallidayan analysis of the material process to “had married”, this fact – together with deletion through ellipsis (viz. “and [she had] opened a butcher’s shop” and NOT [“they had] opened”) – hides the further facts that the subject of “opened” is Mrs Mooney, and that in this case the lexical verb exhibits all the prototypical features of the material process: first and foremost that Mrs Mooney is the agent, and a very active one since she is the one who decides to open the shop. However, from this we further infer that Mrs Mooney’s father is the one who supplied the cash to open that shop! Again money, (cf. the surname “Mooney”), power and gender are to the forefront – the social picture is primary. This hypothesis takes us back to U1 where I hypothesised that the lexeme “butcher” would trigger the retrieval of the image of a big, strong man, one who protects his kin, which is precisely what he does in providing the money for his daughter and son-in-law to open a business. The final point is that my interpretation of U3 is also bolstered by co-text. Namely, we apply the Gricean maxim of manner, sub-maxim be orderly to interpret “marry” as a prototypical material process because it follows immediately on from “determined woman” in the previous sentence. U3 exemplifies one of Mrs Mooney’s ‘acts of determination’, so to speak.

Now the translational issue that arises is that a literal translation – “aveva sposato” and “e aperto una macelleria” – produce ‘perfect equivalents’, hence a translator who has not performed a prior stylistic analysis might miss the interpretative points that have just been made. One might object that this does not matter since the translation is perfect. This objection can be easily parried, since this argument entails forgetting co-text and context and the macro-interpretation of the story and its relationship to the other stories in *Dubliners*. If one overlooks certain constituents of a text because a literal translation produces a viable equivalent, then one might overlook those same features when they occur again in the text. Of this fact we have already had cogent proof – the inclusion of the definite article in U1 of I2 undermined the social nature of the story.

Although the literal translation is possible for significant parts of the U, there are nevertheless some instructive observations to make. The most important concerns the translation of the noun phrase “her father’s foreman”. The most important aspect is the translation of the possessive adjective “her”. I2 translates this literally with “suo”. Instead I1 eschews a literal translation with the rendering “del padre”, which is made possible by the absence of the Saxon genitive in Italian. This form has a distancing effect which produces a negative evaluation. Since the U is written as narration (see the modes

of speech and thought presentation in Semino and Short 2004), then the evaluator must be the heterodiegetic narrator (the default interpretation). Now although it cannot be denied that Mooney is a hapless male, so far Joyce's text has performed no evaluation of him. Indeed, as we have seen, the next U begins with contrastive "But" and introduces a concentration of negative value judgments on his person. However, it does so when Mooney is the theme (both Hallidayan and conceptual) of that part of the text. Hence, by employing a distancing mechanism, the translator is introducing a feature not present in the ST. Indeed, the value judgement would be ill-placed because the first section (Us 1-3) shows Mrs Mooney planning her future and taking the required action for her 'dreams to come true'. At that point in story time and in text time Mrs Mooney is unaware of her future husband's 'true character' and the game he is playing. Including the value judgement would therefore undermine Mrs Mooney's hopes by implicitly negating them (through the negative evaluation) and would consequently undermine the three-part structure of the opening: i) Mrs Mooney acting to further her future as best she can, ii) her husband ruining the business, iii) Mrs Mooney reacting to save her family from total disaster. The importance of stylistic analysis prior to translation emerges most forcefully yet again.

The translator of I1 exacerbates the situation by translating "foreman" with the term "garzone" ('butcher's boy'), which has two serious drawbacks. First, it downgrades Mooney's occupational status, demoting Mooney to the lowest of Mrs Mooney's father's workers, thereby vilifying both the man and the daughter. Second it eliminates the base 'man' in the ST lexeme "foreman", removing Joyce's subtle irony regarding Mooney's manliness. Instead, Joyce prefers Mooney to damn himself with his own hands in the second section, and for a very good reason, one which emerges forcefully, in *Dubliners*, the problem of drink (Douthwaite 2008; Lloyd 2000). Joyce highlights the problem by not 'contaminating' it with any other issue. This indicates just how serious he considers the problem to be, linked as it is to manhood (Valente 2004), personal independence and national independence, both political and economic, hence to Ireland's 'postcolonial' situation (Cheng 1995; Nolan 2000).

This tactic of demeaning the future Mr Mooney, and consequently Mrs Mooney too, is realised twice more in I1 through two informal lexical selections: "messo su" ('put up') for "opened" and "dalle parti di" for "near". Low (viz. informal) language equals low status (viz. a negative value judgement).

I2 avoids such negative evaluation by employing literal “aperto” for “opened” and the more formal expression “nei pressi di” for “near”. With regard to “foreman”, I2 employs “capo lavorante” (‘head worker’). While “capo” (‘head’, ‘boss’) does not diminish status, “lavorante” is a direct indicator of subordination which “foreman” has to a far lesser extent, since the root of the Italian lexeme (‘lavorare’) explicitly indicates that person works rather than just commanding. Instead, the main function of the ‘foreman’ is to oversee, to command.

This brings up a general translational point. If a foreignising strategy has been decided on, and the translation attempts to achieve the highest degree of equivalence possible, then this includes the reproduction of the rich implicational, indirect style deployed by Joyce. Hence, making explicit what is implicit in the ST is unacceptable.

And there is, of course, good reason to opt for respect of the ST. One of the functions of literature is social, namely developing the personality to the full by offering situations to the reader to which he must apply his critical faculties. The reader is invited to think, to think for himself and to evaluate. If, therefore, indirectness is of the essence to achieve this goal, then ‘normalising’, ‘domesticating’, ‘facilitating’, call it what you wish, goes against this function. It must therefore be avoided.

On a general level, both translations miss the alliteration (“father’s foreman”) (through no fault of their own) which together with the possessive adjective indirectly draws attention to the fact that the future husband is a subordinate, a possession of Mrs Mooney’s father, a condition which Mrs Mooney wishes to continue in the ways society permits, as is implied by Us 1-3. This again draws attention indirectly to the problem of subordination and more in general to postcolonialism⁴. The importance of intratextuality and culture again come to the fore.

One final point concerns the name of the area where the Mooneys open their new shop: “Spring Gardens”. In presumably an attempt at foreignising, both translators leave the name in the source language. Unfortunately, this does not help the Italian reader who does not know English or who simply believes the name has not been translated to give the impression of authenticity. Her/his expectations will lead him astray and s/he will investigate no further, a ‘mistake’ since both parts of the name are symbolic: “spring” symbolises birth or rebirth while “gardens” suggests flowering,

⁴ See, for instance, Farrington, another alcoholic, in “Counterparts” – Douthwaite (2008).

blooming, namely life reaching its culmination. Hence the name is, ironically again, one of hope for the life the newly-weds are about to embark on.

(4) U4

E But as soon as his father-in-law was dead Mr. Mooney began to go to the devil.

I1 Ma quando morì il suocero, Mr Mooney cominciò ad andare a rotoli.

I2 Ma subito dopo la morte del suocero, Mr Mooney aveva iniziato a prendere una cattiva piega.

Hope is instantly dashed by contrastive “but” which takes us into the second section of the extract, where Mooney dominates, in all his negativity. We have seen that the deployment of the subordinating conjunction “as soon as” together with the two lexical verbs both in the past simple are intended to indicate almost simultaneity. Such simultaneity conveys and underlines the concept that Mooney had consciously acquiesced to the marriage and bided his time knowing that when his wife’s father died he would take over command of the family and the money and would be able to do as he wished, namely get drunk every day without giving a thought to anyone else. Note that despite the mode of presentation being narration and the sentence constituting an ‘external’ description on the part of the narrator, what is actually being investigated is Mooney’s internal train of thought. This interpretation is bolstered by Joyce having employed not the material process verb ‘to die’ (‘died’) indicating an ‘action’, but the intensive relational process ‘be’ (‘x was a’, ‘father was dead’) indicating a state, hence the inability to act brought about by death.

It might be objected that dying is not exactly a material process in the full Hallidayan sense of the term, i.e. one controlled by the agent to bring about some effect on the world. That is semantically true. However, the choice of a relational process *in lieu* of a material process, the standard choice, has to be accounted for. Hence I posit the symbolic difference between material and relational processes to explicate Joyce’s foregrounded expression. Socially speaking, Mooney has reflected on, (a thought process), and is consequently acting on his knowledge that the father is no longer there to protect the daughter.

Both translations fail to give the impression of simultaneity. In I1 “quando” (‘when’) is extremely weak. I2 does somewhat better because of its inclusion of the time expression “subito” (‘immediately’). However, the

function this expression is supposed to perform is dampened somewhat by the preposition “dopo” (‘after’) which explicitly negates simultaneity.

Before turning to the next point a crucial observation on language use is in order. Now it cannot be denied that in ‘real life’ the two actions would be temporally sequential and not simultaneous. However, by presenting them linguistically as ‘simultaneous’, Joyce is creating the series of implications listed above – calculation, prediction, biding time, acting when the opportunity presents itself.

Returning to the discussion of the translational solutions adopted, worse still, temporally sequential action is underscored by the contrast in verb tenses: implicit past simple (“dopo la morte” – ‘after the death’) and past perfect (“aveva iniziato” – ‘had begun’). Furthermore, both translations insert a comma to divide the two clauses where Joyce uses none in an attempt to reinforce the impression of simultaneity through syntactic unity. Both translations domesticate. In so doing, they fail to provide linguistic signals which help the reader identify the implicatures and implications which Joyce has built into his text.

The other interesting point is the translation of the metaphor “go to the devil”. The literal translation ‘andare al diavolo’ means something totally different in Italian: the expletive ‘go to hell’. Now the ST metaphor clearly belongs to the realm of morality. In English culture the devil and drink have long been associated, conceptually and linguistically. And the Catholic Church was very strong at the time in Ireland. Hence the metaphor has profound socio-cultural resonances.

The I1 metaphor “andare a rotoli” (‘be ruined’) loses the moral domain of the ST metaphor completely since it is highly generic and can be applied to any situation whatsoever of deterioration, including those situations where no moral judgment is incurred or implied. The great weakness of this solution can presumably be explained by the intense use of alliteration for which it was chosen: “mori il suocero, Mr Mooney cominciò ad andare a rotoli”. However, such alliteration provides the reader with no clues, as does the Joycean text, as to how to reach the implications inferable from the ST. Hence the compensatory strategy seems to fail in this case. I2 also employs a very weak metaphor (compared to the ST) – “prendere una cattiva piega” (‘take a bad fold’). Though generic too, this metaphor has the partially-redeeming grace of containing the lexeme “cattiva” (‘bad’) which evokes the moral domain. However, the metaphor “piega” (‘fold’) is so weak that the moral lexical item cannot really redress the situation. Its weakness may be ascribed to two main factors. First, the adjective “cattiva”

acts as a premodifier to the head noun “piega”, hence is flagged by the syntax as less important information. Second, “cattivo” is generic, in that it has great meaning potential, including connotations which are not morally unsound, such as “cattiva sorte” (“come to a bad end”). A different type of consideration is at the textual level. In U7, Joyce employs the adjective “bad” in the noun phrase “bad meat”. As we shall see shortly, both translators avoid using the equivalent adjective in Italian. For translator 2, one reason might well be that he has just used the lexeme in this previous U. One choice in a text affects other choices, a very important general translational principle.

(5) U5

E He drank, plundered the till, ran headlong into debt.

I1 Beveva, sgraffignava i soldi dalla cassa e s'ingolfava sempre più nei debiti.

I2 Bevendo e rubando soldi in cassa, era finito a capofitto in un mare di debiti.

This U again demonstrates the need for careful prior analysis. The most subtle play Joyce makes use of here is graphology. The sentence is realised by three main clauses, in which each successive clause is longer than the previous one by one word:

- (6) He drank,
plundered the till,
ran headlong into debt.

In other terms, the increasing length, the consequent increasing spreading out of the words over the page, (exploiting the Gricean quantity maxim), mimics the increasing danger and approach of disaster as Mooney increasingly wastes more money. (Note again Mooney-money. To save this linguistic play, the surname would have to be translated into something like ‘Soldai’, where ‘soldi’ in Italian means ‘money’, or ‘Soldini’, the diminutive of ‘soldi’.) Stated differently, the increasing length leads to a climax in the ST.

Mimicry and its effect is lost in both translations. In I1, the first clause consists of a single word and the next two clauses are realised by five and six words respectively, but if one examines total graphological length, then the third clause is longer than the second by a mere three letters. In other words, the difference in length, especially when reading, is imperceptible. I2 fares

even worse, for the first two clauses exhibit the same syntactic structure (parallelism) and are coordinated by the conjunction “and” (“e”), hence form a unit, while the third clause differs totally, hence forms an independent unit, thereby eliminating the effect of a climax. In addition, when one links this syntactic fact to the semantics, then the resulting illocutionary force is that of cause and effect. Yet Joyce does his writer’s best to avoid producing such a pragmatic link between the three parts of his sentence. Indeed, unlike I1, which employs the lexeme “e” (‘and’) in place of the comma after “till” in the ST, Joyce even avoids employing a conjunction which would be standard in English (and Italian) in order to make the three clauses exactly parallel and consequently avoid the cause-effect link. Thus the Italian normalises.

Now there is no doubting that in the ‘real world’ the link is indeed one of cause-effect, nay of two cause-effect chains: Mooney needs to drink; this constitutes the cause of his robbing money from the till; this in its turn is the cause of his running into debt. The fact that reality consists of two cause-effect links in no way negates the WAY Joyce expounds these links. He ‘hides’ them linguistically (just as Mooney hides the truth of his own doings – drink will lead to ruin) a) so that the reader has to work out the implicatures himself and b) in order to create a climax, because what is important is not so much the cause-effect chain, but the final result. Indeed, the final effect is conveyed in the final clause: the clause is realised by two metaphors “run into debt” and “headlong”, both of which are communicatively powerful, and “debt” occupies informationally strong end focus position.

This brings us to the metaphors employed. “Plundered the till” is extremely powerful, conjuring up the picture of pirates attacking a town or ship with extreme violence, killing, looting and raping. It also implies taking all the valuable possessions, leaving the assailed who have survived destitute, a perfect rendering of Mrs Mooney’s situation after her husband’s pillage.

I1 maintains a metaphor, “sgraffignava” (‘pinched’), but this reduces the action to the pettiness of a boy pinching a few pennies, which makes the subsequent clause totally unrealistic, as the stark contrast with “s’ingolfava ...” (‘got up to his ears in debt’), illustrates, despite the fact that it is not as strong as the ST metaphor. While Mooney’s behaviour is indeed infantile, what is crucial here is the devastating effects of his infantile behaviour on his family, for the issue is not simply that of money, but also of the example he sets his children as a father. Thus his daughter Polly turns out a weakling and sexually depraved, and his son is violent and tends to alcoholism. Such socio-cultural facts help explain why drink as debilitation is such a major theme in Joyce. The solution offered by I2 is explicitation, “rubando soldi

in cassa" ('stealing money from the till'), thereby totally negating Joyce's indirect style and its brilliant and forceful implications.

Turning to "ran headlong into debt", I1 again produces a weaker solution. "Ingolfarsi" is employed, for instance, to refer to the flooding of a carburettor. Collocations of this nature reduce the physical dimensions, hence the importance this symbolises, of the phenomenon referred to. Furthermore, the reflexive verb form is the equivalent in English of a passive form or a form in which the grammatical subject is not necessarily the agent of the process or is the agent of a material process in which the grammatical subject is also the goal ('lavarsi' = 'to wash [oneself]'). Such a form thus diminishes or removes responsibility from the actor, or limits the effects to the actor himself, in contrast to the ST where running headlong into debt underscores the deliberateness as well as the frenzy or vehemence of the agent's action, and does not preclude the extension of the effects of the agent's actions to others. I2 tends even more to imply the passiveness or diminished responsibility of the actor by employing the expression "era finito" ('had ended up'). Worse still, the denotation of the lexical verb together with the tense of the lexical verb (past perfect) propels us forward to the end of the action, constituting an interruption of the 'smooth', continual progression of the action and its accumulative effect, thereby defeating the climax Joyce has so skilfully designed. It should be noted that the same stricture applies to I1. Indeed, this explains why I1 includes the temporal expression "sempre più" ('always more', i.e. 'increasingly'). It compensates for the absence of this concept from the denotation of the lexical verb "ingolfarsi" and the cumulative progression of the three clauses of the ST.

However, I2 attempts to compensate by deploying the felicitous visual metaphor "un mare di debiti" ('a sea of debts'), conveying the extensiveness of the damage done. It also manages to retain the metaphorical effect of "headlong" through the use of the equivalent term "a capofitto".

(7) U6

E It was no use making him take the pledge: he was sure to break out again a few days after.

I1 Non serviva a niente ottenere promesse, dopo qualche giorno avrebbe ricominciato da capo.

I2 Inutile fargli promettere di non bere più: tanto nel giro di pochi giorni ricominciava daccapo.

The crucial role played by culture emerges here with great force: culture-specific meaning not available in the target culture and referring to highly

significant aspects of the texts, the loss of which diminishes greatly the 'meaning' of the ST render the translator's task an overwhelming one. This is illustrated perfectly by "take the pledge" since this is an idiomatic expression which goes back to the nineteenth century anti-drinking campaigns generally run by religious institutions (e.g. the Temperance Movement) where people were encouraged to sign a paper taking a formal vow to abstain from alcohol. As such it has no direct equivalent in Italian. Furthermore, the translator cannot afford to employ the thirty-seven words I employed in my 'summary' explanation!

"Ottenere promesse" ('obtaining promises') in I1 is clearly inadequate as it violates the Gricean maxim of manner, since the meaning is not transparent (promises of what?) in addition to losing all the cultural information of the original (the religious content). "Ottenere" is also too formal compared to the ST. I2 is successful in getting the essential conceptual content across, but it, too, loses completely the cultural content, which is of prime importance to the ST for it evokes a precise socio-cultural phenomenon tied to the problem of drinking, which we have seen repeatedly is a central issue in *Dubliners*.

Joyce breaks the sentence into two main parts. Both translations respect this division. However, I2 is more accurate since it maintains the colon of the ST. The colon helps the reader uncover the pragmatic link between the two parts as negative evaluation and the explanation of that evaluation. The comma replacing the colon in I1 weakens this link for it fails to reproduce the break represented by the colon in the ST and so makes the sentence appear to be conveying one basic idea while the ST conveys two basic ideas. In conveying two basic ideas, the reader is encouraged to reconsider his interpretation. This should lead to the discovery that the first clause in the ST also conveys frustration and anger (hence criticism) towards the concept expressed, a sensation which is greatly reduced by the use of the comma in I1. Instead, retaining the colon in I2 means retaining the force of the attitude expressed towards the content conveyed. However, the use of "tanto" in I2, which is an addition to the ST, communicates more a sense of resignation than frustration and anger. The ST emotional content is further weakened in both translations by having dislocated left the time expression ("dopo qualche giorno" and "nel giro di pochi giorni"). Indeed, the dislocation destroys the parallelism in the Joycean text: A was B ("it was no use" and "he was sure"). Parallelism serves to place the focus on the subject attribute ("no use" and "sure") since the subject in the first clause is a dummy subject and constitutes given information in the second clause and therefore conveys

virtually no information, as does the lexical verb since it is a copula. Hence “use” (strongly negated by “no” if the appropriate phonological pattern is employed) and “sure” (which can also be highlighted by phonology) come to be the focal points in their respective clauses despite being in the middle of the sentence and not in thematic position or in end focus, the standard locations where stress falls. Both translations lose all of this linguistic play.

Another point of major interest lies in syntax. The first clause in I2 is verbless, and so grammatically imperfect, while the ST employs a finite clause, hence a *bona fide* main clause. Through ellipsis of the verb, the Italian thematises “inutile” (‘useless’) thereby increasing its value as information. However, this gain in emphasis is minimal, since English standardly requires a subject and a verb. However, we have seen that “it” is a dummy subject and “was” is a copula, hence they convey virtually no information. Furthermore, Joyce could have written “no use making him take the pledge’. This form, both in English and Italian, would have rendered the sentence more conversational, whereas the Joycean text at this point, though informal, is pure narrative description (hence focalised through the narrator and/or society). Hence the form selected by I2 changes the style of the text. Since the text is complex and all signals, starting from humble punctuation and articles, are significant, the reader is obliged to try to account for the change in style.

Perhaps the most significant difference is the treatment of “break out”. This is yet another extremely powerful metaphor, on a par with “plundered the till” and perhaps also “ran headlong into debt”. What should also be noted is that in the second part of this extract, where Mooney is the theme and dominant actor, metaphors abound (“go to the devil”, “fighting”, “bad meat”). There is no sentence where a metaphor is not used, in contrast to the non-metaphorical style of the first and third parts where Mrs Mooney is the theme. The intensiveness together with the brilliance of the metaphors help account for the intensity of the second part, which naturally evokes a powerful (negative) reaction in the reader. Though the target language might not be able to provide equally effective metaphors as the original, employing direct language in place of metaphors is best avoided where possible. Thus the literal “ricominciava” (‘began again’) falls stone flat compared to the original metaphorical expression which oozes violence and uncontrollable behaviour, for what Joyce is trying to do through his rich implicational style is to describe, analyse and seek the cause of the behaviour described. All this is lost if some adequate metaphor is not found in the target text.

(8) U7

E By fighting his wife in the presence of customers and by buying bad meat he ruined his business.

I1 A furia di litigare con la moglie in presenza dei clienti e di vendere carne scadente, aveva finito per mandare il negozio in malora.

I2 A furia di litigare con la moglie in presenza dei clienti e di comprar carne di pessima qualità, aveva mandato in rovina il negozio.

What is interesting about U7 is that both translators add to the ST. Where Joyce opts for the 'simple' metaphor "fighting", the translators use an idiomatic metaphorical expression, ("a furia di", translatable as 'so much', but consisting of 'furiously' and 'repeatedly'), together with a lexical verb which expresses the concept literally, "litigare" ('quarrel'). The same analysis applies to "mandato in malora" ('sent to the dogs/to hell') and "mandato in rovina" (literally, 'sent to ruin'). Furthermore, I1 also exploits alliterative "m" and the moral sphere with "malora". One might hypothesise that having failed to reproduce the metaphorical power of the text in previous Us here the translators try to recoup. This strategy is, however, questionable, because Joyce here is relatively flat. The metaphor "fighting" rather than literal 'quarrelling' is a dead metaphor and is required by semantics in order to give the impression of violence, which the two translators upstage with the expression "a furia di".

Joyce also deploys style to imply violence in a highly indirect way. The importance of the formal expression "in the presence of" is to imply that the relationship between husband and wife is so bad that they also argued in public. (Note how Joyce heaps the blame on the husband by assigning him the role of theme and grammatical subject of the three clauses, with his wife performing the role of goal in the first clause.) This phenomenon was serious because it lost them their clientele, since customers do not wish to see the family proprietors quarrelling in the shop while being served. The formality of the context (business), conveyed by the formal expression "in the presence of", should have induced Mooney to more socially appropriate behaviour, but he was unable to control himself. Please note my use of the lexeme 'control', which I employed above to help explicate the metaphor "break out". Joyce's texts are tightly knit, full of intratextual 'references' and resonances. But indirect. Joyce's deployment of "buying" will seal the point.

While I2 translates literally ("comprar"), I1 uses the 'opposite' expression, "vendere". Now, it might be justifiably argued that it is the selling of a bad product that actually loses the customer. So the question becomes

why Joyce employed “buying”. The implication is that Mooney’s policy is both deliberate and systematic. While one might sell bad meat because it has gone bad, and the event is therefore occasional and unplanned, buying bad meat signifies that Mooney is out to make as much money as he can, as quickly as he can. In other words, the use of the lexical verb “buy” conveys the intensity and uncontrollability of his habit, as well as the intentionality of the act. These implications would not have been so forceful had Joyce employed the verb “sell”. Note however, that “buy” has none of the evocative, emotive power of the language (especially the metaphors), employed in the preceding Us. The sense of flatness is reinforced by the deployment of verb tenses. As in U4, (parallelism), Joyce deploys simultaneity of tenses (“by fighting ... he ruined” may be taken as the equivalent of ‘since he bought ... he ruined’). Again, both translators opt for a contrast in tenses, using the past perfect in the third clause (for the Italian too, uses a syntactic construction which is akin to the past simple). Thus the translations imply that gradually Mooney lost his customers as they became increasingly dissatisfied, while the ST provides an ‘instantaneous’ account of cause-effect. Indeed, I1 increases the sense of the passing of time by the use of “aveva finito per ...” (‘he had ended up ...’). Thus, it might be highly significant that neither of the translators reproduced the parallelism in the Joycean text, but normalised. Either it was not detected or it was deliberately ignored.

One might also note the play on the evaluative moral domain. Joyce uses the adjective “bad” with its explicitly moral overtones. Instead I1 employs the adjective “scadente”, which may be translated as ‘cheap’, poor’ or ‘bad’, hence a word with a wider range of semantic meanings and fewer moral connotations, and I2 employs a noun phrase (“di pessima qualità”) in which the evaluative adjective is the premodifier (hence less important than the head) and which can be translated as (‘awful’, ‘dreadful’, ‘foul’, ‘terrible’, as well as ‘bad’), and in which the head noun places the emphasis on business rather than on morality, thereby weakening the already weaker adjective, (weaker compared to the ST).

One final issue here is alliteration, which is abundant in this U: “f” in “fighting” and “wife”, the “s” sound in “his”, “presence”, “customers” and “business”. Alliteration performs its standard task of drawing readers’ attention to words which are connected in some significant, non-literal fashion and/or which play an important role in conveying the message conveyed by the U. Thus, Joyce repeats the preposition “by” in “by buying bad meat” to increase the intensity of alliteration of the letter “b”, (a harsh-sounding voiced plosive), in order to draw attention to the adjective “bad”

("meat" being, in one sense, given information, unless one goes to a butcher's to buy clothes, of course). I2 is fortunate because alliteration is maintained in part: "di comprar carne". I1 is doubly unfortunate, since in addition to obliterating the implications Joyce creates through the use of "buy", it also loses the play on alliteration. Alliteration, together with compensation, may also account for I2's deployment of the metaphor "mandare ... in malora".

(9) U8

E One night he went for his wife with the cleaver and she had to sleep at a neighbour's house.

I1 Una sera arrivò al punto di correre appresso alla moglie con una mannaia e lei dovette andare a dormire in casa dei vicini.

I2 Una sera l'aveva persino inseguita con una mannaia, e lei aveva dovuto passar la notte in casa di una vicina.

U8 offers further cogent illustrations of non-isomorphism making the translator's task at times thankless. The first is "went for his wife (with the cleaver)". The metaphor evokes a sudden lunge or run quickly forward in the act of aggression, with the features of the physical movement embodying the intensity of the extreme violence of the action, given the embodied intention to cause great harm. The concept is underscored by alliteration: "went" and "wife". Note that "wife" was also the object of alliteration in the preceding U.

Both translators attempt compensatory strategies. In I1 "arrivò al punto" ('went so far as to ...') is a relatively tame attempt to mimic the extremity of the action since it has no connotations of violence and speed, and "correre appresso" ('run after') is decidedly weak. The expression "arrivò al punto" is also formal, contrasting with the stark informality of "went for". The expression "arrivò al punto" also reiterates the feature of the passing of time which characterises the translations of Us 4, 6 and 7, where Joyce on the contrary focuses on 'simultaneity'. I2 employs "persino" ('even') to try to mimic the degree of violence, but with similar results to I1. The choice of the lexical verb, "inseguire" ('run after', 'chase') is, like "correre appresso", lifeless compared to the ST "went for", and it, too, is formal. "Inseguire" is also slightly different semantically from "went for". Indeed, the two Italian translations seem to evoke the scene in Vittorio De Sica's film *I Vitelloni* where the mother chases the wayward son round the table brandishing a carpet beater – more comedy than tragedy (culture and intertextuality). Significantly, neither translator opts for a verb denoting greater violence such as 'aggredire' or 'attaccare', both of which may be translated by 'attack'.

Both translators entrust the brunt of the job of conveying violence to the instrument – “mannaia” (‘cleaver’) – compared to the greater violence communicated by the ST.

Joyce is again shorter than the two translations. He is pithy, flat in his style, but devastating in his implications. The translations are both longer, which together with the lower degree of violence denoted or connoted by lexical choice, weaken the translations.

With regard to flatness of style, it should further be noted that “arrivò al punto di” and “persino” express emotion; in this case we can hypothesise surprise at the action described. Hence, the translations add an evaluation, one which conveys narratorial attitude, both components which are missing from the Joycean original. This does not mean the Joycean U does not express a value judgment. The metaphor “went for his wife” should evoke a negative value judgment on the part of the reader. The origin of this value judgement is a cultural, moral one: one should not hit or try to kill one’s wife. Hence the Italian translations “correre appresso” and “inseguita” will evoke a similar reaction in the Italian public, since both cultures condemn violence to women. However, the two units not present in Joyce’s text – “arrivò al punto di” and “persino” – are linguistically marked as evaluators, and reinforce the implicit cultural value judgment expressed by the lexical verb.

It may be noted that I1 translates “his wife” with the definite article “la moglie”, creating a sense of distance and therefore an evaluation which the ST does not have, as occurred in U3. I2 fares even worse, since the lexeme “wife” is eliminated totally, transformed, as it is, into a pronoun, “la” (‘her’: “l’aveva ... inseguita”). Now one might plausibly argue that the translator is mimicking the husband’s intention to murder by suppressing the lexeme “wife”. If so, that is not Joyce’s intention. As we saw in the pre-translation stylistic analysis, Joyce is careful to include character/gender markers in order to underline the messages he is trying to convey with regard to the issues of the family, gender, money and power he is dealing with in this story. Hence I2 adds something which is not ‘present’ in the ST and in so doing manages to remove an essential component of the ST that was identified during the pre-translation analysis.

At this point, one might note the presence of the subject pronoun “lei” (‘she’) in both translations. One might be tempted to hypothesise that the translators have now employed the pronoun in order to respect Joyce’s play on gender. Unfortunately, this hypothesis cannot be sustained. Since Italian is a pro-drop language, if “lei” were not to be included here, then, by ellipsis, the subject of the second clause would have to be taken to be identical to that of the first clause, namely the husband! Since the subject pronoun

has become in this case a mandatory constituent, then it will be taken as 'normal', unmarked. Consequently, no special attention will be devoted to it when parsing the sentence. That is to say, it will not be taken as significant, as an example of foregrounding evoking the gender issue.

The second instantiation of non-isomorphism is illustrated by "A neighbour's house". Here the problem is that English does not mark gender differences as extensively as does Italian. Hence, while we have no way of knowing whether the neighbour is male or female from the syntax, Italian is obliged to make a choice (as in I2, which opts for a female neighbour), or, if neutrality is to be maintained, to opt for the plural, as in I1, since the form "dei vicini" covers both the masculine case and the gender neutral case. Now given the social reality of the time, it is unlikely that Mrs Mooney will have chosen to go to a male neighbour's house. The possible consequences are more than obvious. Equally obviously, female solidarity will have been at work. But Joyce never mentions, describes or refers to the socio-cultural context explicitly. The issues he is dealing with are all investigated in an indirect fashion, beneath the literal meaning of the language and of the unfolding of the story. Hence the lower degree of specificity of the English language in the identification of gender serves Joyce's purpose well. Which leaves the poor translator of a language like Italian in a quandary when it comes to finding an equivalent. Loss or gain there must be.

3. Conclusion

Even the simplest acts of communication are highly complex phenomena, with each utterance conveying a myriad of messages and these messages being linked to each other and to other texts in a given culture in a given period. Since the first stage in translation is comprehension of a ST, then an analytical method is required which enables the researcher to identify as many of the messages as possible ("full" comprehension not being humanly possible) and the linguistic means by which these messages are conveyed before he begins his translation. The best method to achieve this, I would argue, is stylistics. Learning consists of the acquisition of the analytical skills of the type identified in the course of this article and their application to the source and target languages. Hence getting students to first analyse the text to be translated, then critically examining translations already carried out to see how much equivalence has been achieved and by what means, and finally offering their own solutions (which they prepare beforehand, when they first analyse and then translate, before coming to the class discussion) so

that they also learn to apply the skills they are acquiring, may be suggested as representing an optimal approach to teaching/learning translation. It also helps to evaluate translations, identifying how the translator approached the specific text. Further analysis would, for instance, have revealed that I1 has a tendency to use language which is a shade more formal than the ST while I2 manifests the opposite tendency.

The text employed for illustrative purposes does not appear to be difficult, since despite the number of creative metaphors employed, the concepts are transparent, syntax is not complex and lexis falls within the realm of the 'average' speaker's knowledge store. Yet it illustrates complexity perfectly, showing how a text is embedded in the society of its time, thus making a vast knowledge base a mandatory requirement to comprehend it, the subtlety of the linguistic means deployed despite their surface simplicity and the complex processing required to unpack the text, all of which are prior requisites before attempting to produce a translation. The text also illustrates the dangers of 'literal' translation and how easy it is to miss important meanings and devices if one has not analysed the text prior to translating it. This, of course, has deep implications for translation teaching and practice. Perhaps the main lesson to be learnt, is that sectorial teaching, (teaching one specialised domain in order to produce 'experts' in that sector), might not be the best teaching strategy. Medical texts, to return to an initial example, do not usually exhibit the breadth and depth of the type of text examined here. Furthermore, to teach only one domain is based on the presupposition that the student will find employment in that sector, for the rest of his life. This not being the case, then the objective, as in all teaching, should be that of providing the student with transversal skills which can be applied to all domains. Since stylistics adopts all the approaches available (linguistic theories, literary theories, sociology, anthropology, psychology), depending on the text to be dealt with, it fits this bill perfectly.

REFERENCES

Sources

- Joyce, J.
1996 [1914] *Dubliners*. London: Penguin.
1998 [1914] *Gente di Dublino*. Translated by A. Brillì. Milan: Mondadori.
2013 [1914] *Gente di Dublino*. Translated by D. Benati. Milan: Feltrinelli.

Special studies

- Austin, J.L.
1962 *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cheng, V.
1995 *Joyce, Race and Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cortese, G.
1995 "English for translators and interpreters". In: G.C. Cecioni – C. Ceselka (eds.) *Proceedings of the symposium "The Teaching of Foreign languages in European Universities"*. Firenze: Centro Linguistico di Ateneo, 130-148.
1996 "L'intervento del traduttore, tra la realtà e le virtualità del testo". In: G. Cortese (ed.) *Tradurre i linguaggi settoriali*. Torino: Cortina, 237-263.
- Douthwaite, J.
2000 *Towards a Linguistic Theory of Foregrounding*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
2008 "Counterparts: Local or global?", *Globale e locale, Quaderni della Facoltà di Lingue e Letterature Straniere della Università degli Studi di Cagliari* 10, 49-70.
- Grice, P.
1989 *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. – C. Matthiessen
2004 *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Jeffries, L. – D. McIntyre
2010 *Stylistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lloyd, J.
2000 "'Counterparts': *Dubliners*, masculinity, and temperance nationalism". In: D. Attridge – M. Howes (eds.) *Semicolonial Joyce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 128-149.
- Nolan, E.
2000 "State of the art: Joyce and Postcolonialism". In: D. Attridge – M. Howes (eds.) *Semicolonial Joyce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 78-95.
- Ogden, C. – I. Richards
1923 *The Meaning of Meaning*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.
- Semino, E. – M. Short
2004 *Corpus Stylistics: Speech, Writing and Thought Presentation in a Corpus of English Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Short, M.
1996 *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London: Routledge.
- Sperber, D. – D. Wilson
1995 *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (2nd edn.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Valente, J.

- 2000 “Neither fish nor flesh”; or how ‘Cyclops’ stages the double-bind of Irish manhood”. In: D. Attridge – M. Howes (eds.) *Semicolonial Joyce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 96-127.

Van Leeuwen, T.

- 2006 “The representation of social actors”. In: C.R. Caldas-Coulthard – M. Coulthard (eds.) *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, 32-70.

Address: JOHN DOUTHWAITE, Dipartimento di Lingue e Culture Moderne, Università degli Studi di Genova. Piazza Santa Sabina 2, 16124 Genova (Italy).

ORCID code: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6750-2991>.