BELOVED, BREATHING LESSON, THE RUSSIA HOUSE, RABBIT AT REST, NO GREATER LOVE, AND RISING SUN TRANSLATED INTO PORTUGUESE

*Diva Cardoso de Camargo**

ABSTRACT: From the viewpoint of the translational act, the literary text is seen as emphasising aesthetic-stylistic aspects, so that the importance of the author's language is comparable to that of the text content. By applying Aubert's model (1984, 1997, 1998) to six American novels (published during the years 1987-1994) and their respective translations into Portuguese, it was possible to carry out a comparative analysis of the linguistic, stylistic and cultural similarities and differences between the source texts and the target texts. From two different levels of data analysis, we observed how literary translation demands an increased use of modulation (590 lexical items = 20.0%, i.e., 1/5 of the entire corpus) in order to convey the source language writers' themes and choice of words within the stylistic possibilities of the target language. On the other hand, the percentage of literal translation (1048 lexical items = 34.9%) and transposition (875 lexical items = 29.2%) is significantly higher. In spite of Vinay's statement (1976, p. 168) that literal translation may lead to mistakes arising from false cognates and also the belief held by some theoreticians (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1958; Nida, 1964) that adaptation is widely used in translation, mainly in literary translation, the fact is that more than half (64.1%) of the translated texts in the corpus are literal translations (whether in the strict sense, i.e., "word-for-word", or in the wider sense, i.e., transposition). Thus, one may suppose that these two translation modalities are predominant in the English → Portuguese translation direction, and may be appropriately used also in literary translation.

* IBILCE/UNESP.

RESUMO: *Do ponto de vista do ato tradutório, considera-se o texto literário como valorizando os aspectos estético-estilísticos, de modo que a importância dada à linguagem do autor é comparável com o conteúdo do texto. Por meio da aplicação do modelo Aubert (1984, 1997, 1998) em seis romances norte-americanos (publicados durante os anos de 1987 a 1994) e as respectivas traduções para o português, realizou-se uma análise das semelhanças e diferenças lingüísticas, estilísticas e culturais entre os textos de partida e os textos de chegada. Com base em dois diferentes níveis de análise, pôde-se observar que a tradução literária solicita um aumento no uso da modulação (590 itens lexicais = 20,0%, ou seja, correspondendo a 1/5 do total do córpus) a fim de dar conta dos campos temático e léxico abarcados pelos autores na língua inglesa e das características estilísticas possibilitadas pela língua portuguesa. Por outro lado, é mais elevada a freqüência da tradução literal (1048 itens lexicais = 34.9%) e da transposição (875 itens lexicais = 29.2%). Ainda que Vinay (1968) alegue que se deva evitar a tradução literal devido aos riscos de falsos cognatos bem como as considerações de alguns teóricos (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1958; Nida, 1964) de que as adaptações sejam muito empregadas na tradução, sobretudo na de textos literários, os dados da pesquisa mostram que mais da metade (64,1%) dos textos analisados valeram-se da tradução literal, quer em sentido estrito ("palavra por palavra"), quer em sentido lato, ou seja, da transposição. Com base nos resultados obtidos, poder-se-ia supor que essas duas modalidades são predominantes na direção inglês→português e que podem ser empregadas adequadamente também na tradução de textos literários.*

UNITERMOS: *tradução; tradução literária; análise contrastiva; tipologia textual; estudos tradutológicos baseados em córpus.*

Introduction

Economic globalisation has improved communications systems, and technological advances have considerably changed the natural world and the ways in which people interact. More often than not, people with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds have to establish social, professional, or business connections. In addition, the languages and literary systems of developing countries have been increasingly exposed to the languages and literature of the major developed countries. Within this world panorama, translation has become an indispensable tool for modern man and in the relations between nations, and the translator's role can be viewed as that of a subjective agent in cultural interchanges. In the light of these developments, more systematic research is needed to enable translation theory to provide us with a better knowledge of the divergences and convergences between the Source Language (SL) and the Target Language (TL), a broader understanding of the possibilities and limitations of the linguistic and cultural exchanges occurring in the translation process, as well as a greater awareness of the translator's influence in the translational act.

Translation Studies has yet to develop an approach that might contribute to a typology of interlingual translation. From the viewpoint of the translational act, the aesthetic-stylistic aspect of literary text is always emphasised, so that the importance of the author's language is comparable to that of the text content. As the literary text presents discursive features which distinguish it from other text types, literary translation makes it possible to carry out a comparative analysis of the linguistic, stylistic and cultural similarities and differences between two products: the source text (ST) and the target text (TT). With this perspective in mind, the aim of this article is to sketch out some correlations between a higher or lower level of fluctuation in the frequency of the translation modalities in order to detect which are the most used strategies in literary translation.

Contributing towards a line of research (Aubert, 1997, 1998) that has been under development at the University of São Paulo since 1980, this particular investigation in the English→Portugue-

se direction deals with literary discourse with a partial total of 3,000 lexical items.

Theoretical basis

With reference to the *method*, Aubert's model (1984, 1997) was utilised because it provided for the possibility of measuring the degree of linguistic differentiation between the ST and the TT, whereby data can be organized and prepared for statistical treatment. This research method is based on Vinay & Darbelnet's descriptive model ([1958, 1977] 1995), which, in spite of its shortcomings, proposes a set of 'procedures' or *translation modalities* that take into consideration the complexity of the translational act. Among the main shortcomings of Vinay & Darbelnet's model concerning its application to the specific line of research which has been termed *translation modalities*, it can be pointed out that some categories (eg.: loan, calque, modulation and equivalence) lack a clearer definition so as to be employed in the classification process. Consequently, the model had to be adapted to the specific descriptive and com-parative purposes of the corpus analysis.

Both models conceive the modalities as set up on a scale ranging from a kind of 'zero degree' of translation (*transcription* in the new proposal) up to the most source-distant category (*adaptation*). Between these two extremes, there are two groups of modalities: direct translation and oblique translation. In *direct translation*, the passage of the SL into the TL is accomplished without much elaboration or form change, and no special stylistic processes occur. In the current version of the model, there are four basic modalities (with their respective code numbers for statistical treatment): [02] *transcription*, [03] *loan*, [04] *calque*, and [05] *literal translation*. In *oblique translation*, the formal changes of linguistic structures are related to content and style, thus suggesting that this is the kind of translation that really fulfils the translational act. The new model establishes five modalities: [06] *transposition*, [07] *explicitation/implicitation*, [08] *modulation*, [09] *adaptation*, and [10] *intersemiotic translation*. The reformulation proposal also takes into account four other modalities: [01]

omission, [11] *addition*, [12] *mistranslation*, and [13] *correction*, besides the co-occurrence of several categories.

For the sake of brevity, only those modalities analysed in: *2. Results and Discussion* will be defined here:[1] [05] *literal translation* occurs when the words or translation sequences are in a strict lexical correspondence and have exactly the same structure, that is, the same classes of speech and the same order; e.g.: [05.09] ... *that he was forced to neglect his "wife" and ...* → *... que ele era forçado a negligenciar sua "esposa" e ...* In [06] *transposition* there are classes of word change, blending or extension, or a combination of these alterations; however, neither meaning nor style change; e.g.: [06.03] ... *Mostly it was (trucks) ...* → *... A maioria era de (caminhões) ...* Transpositions can be: [06a] obligatory, when imposed by the morphosyntactic structure of the TL; or [06b] optional, at the discretion of the translator. [08] *Modulation* occurs when a given text segment is translated in such a manner as to impose an evident shift in the semantic surface structure, albeit retaining the same overall meaning effect in the specific context and co-text; e.g.: [08.03] ... *(his) trade so busily ...* → *... (a) profissão com tamanho afinco ....* [68] *Transposition with modulation* happens when a modulated word or expression is placed in another position in the TL sentence; e.g.: [68.03] ... *(an) old-fashioned kind of (place)*, *...* → *... (um local) meio antiquado, ...* [09] In *adaptation*, the limits of translatability are reached, as only a global similarity remains between SL and TL situations; e.g.: [09.01] *Sheriff* → *Delegado*.

In order to avoid diachronic variations, the *sample selection* was made by choosing STs and corresponding TTs produced in a given period of less than ten years, since a longer interval might interfere in the translators' behaviour. The corpus thus includes the following six American novels published between 1987 and 1994, and their translations into Portuguese: (ST1) *Beloved* (1987), by Toni Morrison → (TT1) *Amada*,[2] translated by Evelyn Kay

---

[1]   For a complete definition and examples of the thirteen modalities and some possible co-occurences, see Aubert's model (1997 or 1998).

[2]   Even though the publishing date is not mentioned in two TTs corresponding to: ST(I): 1988, and ST(III): 1988, sample selection was taken between 1995 and 1996, that is, with a shorter-than-ten-year-interval between publication of the STs and the TTs.

Massaro; (ST2) *Breathing lesson* (1988), by Anne Tyler → (TT2) *Lições de vida* (1989), translated by Wilma Freitas Ronald de Carvalho; (ST3) *The Russia house* (1988), by John le Carré → (TT3) *A casa da Rússia,* translated by Isabel Paquet de Araripe; (ST4) *Rabbit at rest* (1990), by John Updike → (TT4) *Coelho cai* (1992), translated by Paulo Henriques Britto; (ST5) *No greater love* (1991), by Danielle Steel → (TT5) *Amor sem igual* (1994), translated by Aulyde Soares Rodrigues; and (ST6) *Rising sun* (1992), by Michael Crichton → (TT6) *Sol nascente* (1993), translated by Aulyde Soares Rodrigues.

With regard to the *procedures,* the criterion of "Randomness and Random Sampling Numbers" (Kendall & Smith, 1972) was adopted in order to select pages/paragraphs, and up to 500 lexical items were obtained for each ST.[3] The resulting sample consists of six STs, each comprising 500 lexical items, which, in relation to the corresponding lexical items of each of the six translations, add up to 3,000 lexical items in the SL. From the total obtained for each modality, we calculated the proportion of the text of the SL that was translated into the TL.

For the purpose of *statistical analysis,* two levels of comparison were established in the corpus: – 1st. absolute and relative distribution among the modalities; and – 2nd. significant quantitative differences between modalities and STs/TTs.

Results and discussion

On the first level of data analysis, the *absolute and relative distribution among the modalities* (See *Table* below) reveals three highest frequency categories: literal translation, transposition, and modulation, besides the most recurrent hybrid procedure: transposition with modulation.

---

[3]   In AUBERT (1997, p. 12-13): "Most frequently, the model has been applied in describing continuous text segment samples (currently, 500 and 800 words per text selected for corpus sampling). This is the case of Alves (1983), Darin (1986), Silva (1992), Zanotto (1993), Camargo (1993; 1999), and Aubert (1984), as well as of" [...] Gehring (1998).

Classification	Code	MODALITIES	No.	%
		Table — Absolute and relative distribution among the modalities in the literary text (English→Portuguese)		
1st	(05)	Literal translation	1048	34.9
2nd	(06)	Transposition	875	29.2
3rd	(08)	Modulation	590	20.0
4th	(68)	Transposition with modulation	163	5.4
5th	(07)	Explicitation/implicitation	119	4.0
6th	(01)	Omission	78	2.6
7th	(03)	Loan	70	2.3
8th	(11)	Addition	45	1.5

Literal translation is the most frequent modality, with 34.9% in the general average of the six literary texts. This high incidence indicates that cultural adaptations are not so common as generally supposed in the translational act. In spite of Vinay's (1968, p. 168) statement that this modality may lead to mistakes arising from false cognates, data reveal that literal translation is a widely used category at word level.

Transposition is the second modality in frequency, with 29.2%. A subdivision was made so as to observe these occurrences in isolation: obligatory transposition corresponds to the second highest frequency in the sample with 25.0%; however, optional transposition registers a considerably lower incidence, with 4.2%. Thus, from the sum total of 3,000 lexical items, the basic categories in the literary texts are: literal translation and transposition, corresponding to more than half of the relative extension among translation modalities (1,923 lexical items = 64.1%).

In third place, we find *modulation*, with 20%. Because the corpus deals with literary discourse, it seems to have required a higher use of modulation, though less than that of literal translation and transposition. The increased use of modulation may be related to the more elaborate and less predictable language used in literary translation. Vinay (1968, p. 173) states that good free modulation tends to please critics due to the character of authenticity that this procedure lends the author's world view.

The most frequent hybrid modality and the fourth most recurrent in our study is *transposition with modulation*, with 5.4%,

and the same considerations made concerning modulation may be extended to this category.

In addition to the above predominant modalities, translators also seem to value *explicitation/implicitation* (4.0%), *omission* (2.6%), *loan* (2.3%), and *addition* (1.5%); the other categories in this investigation do not appear to be relevant enough for statistical processing.

As this study deals with literary language, a high frequency was expected concerning adaptation and transposition with adaptation (which occurs when an adapted word or sequence is placed in another position in the TL sentence). According to Vinay (1968, p. 176), adaptation is the most complex category, because it requires that the translator should have sound knowledge of both cultures, including habits, social patterns, philosophical concepts, and history. However, the data reveal an occurrence of only 0.1% in the modality of adaptation and none is registered in transposition with adaptation, thus indicating that traces of an idiosyncratic nature would be less frequent[4] than supposed, even when dealing with literary translation; also, their use would be less frequent than suggested by translation theorists, as Vinay & Darbelnet (1958, 1977), and Nida (1964). On the other hand, it may also be possible to attribute the absence of adaptations and transpositions with adaptation to the proximity between source and target cultural backgrounds.

When taking each text in isolation, we may again observe a uniform predominance of the three most frequent categories. The fourth most used modality in the corpus, the transposition with modulation, can be observed in three texts: TT2 *Breathing lesson* (6.2%), TT4 *Rabbit at rest* (9.8%), TT5 *No greater love* (6.0%), and, as mentioned before, in the general average (5.4%). The three other texts present some deviation as we have the fourth most recurrent category with omission (5.8%) in TT1 *Beloved*, loan (2.8%) in TT3 *The Russia house*, and explicitation/implicitation (5.8%) in TT6 *Rising sun*, whereas, in spite of its small difference, transposition with modulation is in fifth place (respectively: 5.0%, 2.2% and 3.4%). Also, TT5 reveals internal fluctuation with a difference of only two

---

[4]   This evidence also finds support in Darin (1986), Silva (1992), Zanotto (1993), and Camargo (1993, 1996, 1999).

lexical items between the highest frequent modality, literal translation (152 occurrences: 30.4%), and transposition (150 occurrences: 30.0%). In this way, literary translation reveals a word-by-word translation predominance as well as a high tendency towards change in class of speech or in the word order in the TL textual sequence.

According to the nature of certain categories, transposition and explicitation/implicitation were grouped with other modalities, supporting the above results. The grouping of transposition plus hybrid modalities [06 + (62 + 63 + 65)] *transposition plus transposition with transcription plus transposition with loan plus transposition with literal translation* reveals an incidence of 30.2%. As was expected, it is the fusion of (06a + 05) *obligatory transposition plus literal translation* that is most common in the corpus: 59.9%. Based on these two groupings, it seems that translators often accomplish their complex task either by using TL options which are quite similar to SL forms, that is, by using literal translation adequately, or by making changes in word order, word class and grammatical features due to TL impositions.

On the other hand, the joining of [07 + (27 + 37 + 67)] *explicitation/implicitation plus transcription with explicitation plus loan with explicitation plus transposition with explicitation* only registers: 4.3%. In spite of the decrease in the use of paraphrase, footnotes, or implicitations condensed in this grouping, it may indicate some individuality of translators when dealing with literary texts.

However, more distinctive traces of literary translation may be seen in the fusion of (06b + 08) *optional transposition plus modulation*: 25.4%. Such distinction is even clearer in the grouping of (06b + 08 + 68) *optional transposition plus modulation plus transposition with modulation*: 29.6%. As modulation and transposition with modulation are beyond changes at the level of SL and TL formal structures and are geared to the semantic and stylistic levels, they are probably the modalities which typify literary translation.[5] The increase in these categories also suggests that, since there is a more active participation by translators in re-elaborating the literary text, consequently higher creativity is achieved.

---

[5]   As also pointed out in Alves (1983), Darin (1986), Silva (1992), Zanotto (1993), and Camargo (1993, 1996, 1998).

At the second level of data analysis, *significant quantitative differences between modalities and STs/TTs* were examined. The Khi Square test indicates that the fluctuation observed is significant (p. 0.05) in the following respects: a) literal translation and transposition are significantly more frequent in TT3, and also transposition with modulation in TT4; b) explicitation/ implicitation and modulation are significantly less frequent in TT3; c) loan has a homogeneous procedure in all TTs. Other modalities do not reach levels of occurrence sufficient to list statistical comparisons at this level. As TT3 may have presented a singular pattern when compared with the other five texts, further calculations seemed appropriate to find out whether this translation would be responsible for deviation. By excluding TT3, data show that: a) literal translation is significantly more frequent in TT2, and again transposition with modulation in TT4; b) modulation is significantly less frequent in TT2; c) loan, transposition and explicitation/implicitation have a uniform pattern in all TTs. When grouping transposition and explicitation/implicitation with other modalities, TT3 shows abnormal variation in all calculations; once TT3 is excluded, TT2 and TT4 are the deviant translations. Although some discrepancy is found in the corpus, the same translation hierarchy in all TTs is kept for the three major modalities: literal translation, transposition and modulation, in this order.

It may be interesting to point out that the high percentages of literal translation and transposition suggest that the major part of the translator's work takes place at the level of immediate translation possibilities, even though such behaviour is usually much criticised in literature concerning translation. In other words, overall literality seems to be the dominant professional conduct, as most of the translator's essential technical procedures consist of literal translations (equivalent to Catford's (1965) word-for-word translation) and transpositions (very near to Catford's definition of literal translation).

Furthermore, corresponding almost to 25.0% of the entire corpus, the high frequency of modulation seems to confirm that there is a correlation between modulation and literary text, that

is, a greater need for modulations may be said to be related to features commonly attached to the language of the novel. In order to convey the SL writer's creative associations in the area of meaning and the target language stylistic features, the literary translator is not limited to being a mere translating channel by the use of technical and stylistic resources contained in modulation and transposition with modulation.

Thus, in the light of the regularity registered on the level of the absolute and relative distribution of modalities, there seems to be a predominant order for the more frequent categories: literal translation, transposition and modulation in the English→ Portuguese direction. Consequently, it could be also said that there is a certain stability in translation praxis in relation to literary texts, which can be extended to a fourth modality: transposition with modulation.

References

ALVES, I. C. (1983) *Modalidades de tradução: uma avaliação do modelo proposto por Vinay e Darbelnet.* Unpublished MA thesis. São Paulo, PUC-SP.

AUBERT, F. H. et al. (1984) Descrição e quantificação de dados em Tradutologia. *Tradução e comunicação* 4. São Paulo, Álamo. p. 71-82.

AUBERT, F. H. (1997) Translation modalities – a descriptive model for quantitative studies in Translatology. *Romansk forum* 6. Oslo, University of Oslo. p. 3-28.

_____. (1998) Translation modalities – theory and pratical results. *TradTerm* 5(1). São Paulo, Humanitas. p. 129-157.

CAMARGO, D. C. (1993) *Contribuição para uma tipologia da tradução: as modalidades de tradução no texto literário.* Unpublished PhD dissertation. São Paulo, USP.

_____. (1996) As modalidades de tradução e o texto literário. *TradTerm* 3. São Paulo, CITRAT/USP. p. 27-33.

_____. (1999) *Padrões distributivos das modalidades de tradução inglês→português.* Unpublished Post-doctorate research. São Paulo, USP / UNESP.

CATFORD, J. C. (1965) *A linguistic theory of translation.* London, Oxford University Press. (3rd ed., Oxford University Press, 1969.)

DARIN, L. C. M. (1986) *Translation modalities in the comparison of English and Portuguese – analysis of excerpts taken from C. Castañeda's novel*

'The teachings of D. Juan' or 'A erva-do-diabo'. Unpublished MA thesis. Exeter: University of Exeter.

GEHRING, S. (1998) As modalidades de tradução inglês«português: correlações bidirecionais. Unpublished PhD dissertation. São Paulo: USP.

KENDALL, M. G.; SMITH, B. B. (1972) Randomness and random sampling numbers. In.: ARY, D. et al. Introduction to research in education. New York, Rinehart and Winston (3rd ed. 1985, 430-434).

SILVA, M. G. G. V. (1992) As modalidades de tradução aplicadas ao conto 'O cobrador': um estudo comparativo. Unpublished MA thesis. São Paulo, USP.

VINAY, J.-P. (1968) La traduction humaine. In: MARTINET, A. Le langage. Paris, Gallimard. (Span. trans.: La traducción humana. In: MARTINET, A. Tratado del lenguaje 4. Buenos Aires, Nueva Visión, 1976.)

VINAY, J.-P.; DARBELNET, J. (1958) Stylistique Comparée du Français e de l'Anglais. Paris, Didier, 2nd ed. 1977. (Engl. trans. by Juan Sager. Comparative Stylistics of French and English – a methodology for translation. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1995.)

ZANOTTO, P. (1993) Tipos de texto e modalidades de tradução. Unpublished PhD dissertation. São Paulo, USP.

Material used as corpus for analysis

(ST1) MORRISON, Toni (1987) Beloved. New York, Alfred Knopf. (TT1) trans.: Evelyn Kay Massaro. Amada. São Paulo, Nova Cultura/Best Seller, without date.

(ST2) TYLER, Anne (1988) Breathing lesson. New York, Alfred Knopf. (TT2) trans.: Wilma Freitas Ronald de Carvalho. Lições de vida. Rio de Janeiro, Imago, 1989.

(ST3) CARRÉ, John le (1988) The Russia house. New York, Alfred Knopf. (TT3) trans.: Isabel Paquet de Araripe. A casa da Rússia. Rio de Janeiro, Record, without date.

(ST4) UPDIKE, John (1990) Rabbit at rest. New York, Alfred Knopf. (TT4) trans.: Paulo Henriques Britto. Coelho cai. Companhia das Letras, 1992.

(ST5) STEEL, Danielle (1991) No greater love. New York, Delacorte Press. (TT5) trans.: Aulyde Soares Rodrigues. Amor sem igual. Rio de Janeiro, Record, 1994.

(ST6) CRICHTON, Michael (1992) Rising sun. New York, Alfred Knopf. (TT6) trans.: Aulyde Soares Rodrigues. Sol nascente. Rio de Janeiro, Rocco, 1993.