

Undergraduate Dissertation  
Trabajo Fin de Grado

How to Treat Implicatures in Translation:  
Comparative Analysis of English-Spanish  
Translations of *The Adventures of Huckleberry  
Finn*

Author

Jose Ramón Viguera Martínez

Supervisor

Ignacio Guillén Galve

FACULTY OF ARTS  
2020



## **Abstract**

Translation does not consist only on what words mean but also on what words imply. Implicatures show the intention a sender is transmitting behind the words used and that forms part of the message as well. The main purpose of this paper is the analysis of different examples of fragments from *Huckleberry Finn*. The focus of the analysis is on the translation of implicatures in idioms, slang, humour and other examples. The analysis suggests that older translations were too strict in terms of formality, explicitness is a difficult aspect in the translation of slang and literal translation is a useful strategy in the translation of Mark Twain's irony.

## **Resumen**

Traducir no se trata solo de traducir el significado de las palabras, pero también de lo que éstas sugieren. Las implicaturas muestran la intención detrás de las palabras del emisor y forman parte igualmente del mensaje. El objetivo de este Trabajo de Fin de Grado es el análisis de distintos ejemplos en fragmentos de *Las Aventuras de Huckleberry Finn*. El análisis se centra en la traducción de implicaturas en expresiones idiomáticas, la jerga, el humor y otros ejemplos. El análisis sugiere que las traducciones antiguas son más estrictas en cuanto a la formalidad de la traducción, que la explicitud es un aspecto difícil en la traducción de la jerga y que la traducción literal es una estrategia útil en la traducción de la ironía de Mark Twain.

## Index

1.- Introduction .....	5
2.- Theoretical Framework .....	7
2.1.- The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn .....	7
2.2 Translation theory .....	10
2.3 Pragmatics theory .....	12
3.- Methodology and analysis .....	14
4.- Conclusions.....	36
5.- References.....	38
6.- Appendix.....	40
6.1.- Source Text and Target Texts 1 .....	40
6.2.- Source Text and Target Texts 2 .....	42
6.3.- Source Text and Target Texts 3 .....	49
6.4.- Source Text and Target Texts 4 .....	57
6.5.- Source Text and Target Texts 5 .....	59
6.6.- Source Text and Target Texts 6 .....	61

## 1.- Introduction

Translation is the transfer of a message and its meaning from a text in a source language to an equivalent text in a target language. For decades, it was considered that translation was a mere transmission of information. This is, that only the transfer of the message information at a semantic level was relevant in whether to consider a translation successful or not. In last decades, many scholars have taken sociolinguistics as a key discipline to understand translation and how it works. This supposed the introduction of a new level of analysis, as if the perspective of sociolinguistics is taken, the intentions and effects behind words become as well a matter of consideration. Furthermore, the communicative situation is also influential in what a message transmits beyond its words. This is the reason why this dissertation undertakes an analysis on translation combining translation and pragmatics theories.

Concerning translation, some scholars have focused on the creation of effects and how translators have been able, or not, to create those effects on a target language. An example of these works is the research of Eugene Nida (1964) and the development of concepts such as formal and dynamic equivalence as well as equivalent effect, which although criticised by different scholars over time, marked the beginning of a new approach to translation theory centred on the reader. Moreover, he influenced other scholars in their research, as Peter Newmark. In his work, Newmark took the reader-centred perspective introduced by Nida and replaced his terminology with new terms such as communicative and semantic translation which resembles in great extent to dynamic and formal equivalence, respectively. Nevertheless, Newmark discards the concept of equivalent effect as it is not useful if source and target texts differ greatly in time and space.

In the field of pragmatics, the analysis of discourse is of particular importance. Halliday's systemic functional model is the most influential model of discourse analysis. One of the most important aspects in this model is the register which consists in field, tenor and mode. SFL has been criticised because of its excessive complexity, but it has served as discourse analysis model for several scholars such as Mona Baker or Basil Hatim & Ian Mason. Baker used the model in her work as well as introducing pragmatic concepts such as implicature or Grice maxim's whereas Hatim & Mason established a continuum of stable or dynamic elements of text depending on translator's availability of possible techniques when translating an element.

The research has tended to focus on the development of theories and concepts such as the previously mentioned, rather than on the analysis of how these concepts are applied in the translation of different text typologies. It would thus be of interest to take any of these scholar-developed concepts and analyse how it has been translated in a text. This is objective of this dissertation: the analysis of implicatures translation in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*.

This novel, published in 1884 in the United Kingdom and 1885 in the United States of America, is one of the main works of Mark Twain with its prequel *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*. It narrates the story of the escape of a child and a black slave, Huck and Jim, down the Mississippi river. It is characterised by the use of vernacular language and Twain's use of irony, a technique he masterfully used to criticise society's values and problems.

Hence, this novel, being used partly as a satire and with Twain's irony, can be a great source of implicatures, or intention conveyed in a message beyond word level, and so, a suitable choice in order to analyse it. This dissertation intends to developed a critical analysis of implicatures in this work, discerning what was Twain's implicature,

examining how translators have translated this implicature in order to classify the translations as a successful example, or not, of implicature translation. After this, and based on this analysis I will provide a translation proposal of my own creation.

## 2.- Theoretical Framework

### 2.1.- The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn

*The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is a novel by Samuel Clemens, better known by his pen name Mark Twain, published in 1884 in the United Kingdom and in 1885 in the United States of America. A sequel of *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, it is considered among the greatest American novels. Twain was considered the greatest humourist of his age because of the constant and great use of irony and satire throughout his works, and American writer and Nobel Prize laureate William Faulkner claimed he was the father of American literature. Twain was born in Hannibal, Missouri and worked as a riverboat pilot, giving setting to *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* and *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. These two novels are his most notable works.

In this fiction, Huckleberry Finn, the main protagonist, is a child who is kidnapped by his drunken father and while escaping from him encounters Jim, the other protagonist, a black slave who has escaped from Miss Watson's (Huck's adoptive aunt) household. Together, they escape down the Mississippi river, a key element of the setting in a Southern antebellum society. The language and style employed are acclaimed by its originality as it is one of the first American literary works written in Vernacular English. Huck renders the southern speech of a partially educated young boy in the 1830s: a natural everyday voice, natural and colloquial. Not only Huck's language but also black speech, in Jim, and Southern speeches of different areas down the Mississippi can be found.

The story is told by a first-person narrator, Huckleberry Finn, who is an apparently innocent and inexpressive narrator. His voice is consistent and sustained throughout the work, with a constant use of humour, used by Twain in order to voice his criticism through irony and satire. The novel displays a mix of genres such as adventure, all of Huck and Jim's events through their getaway; coming of age, as Huck undergoes a learning process and two moral crises, and thus becomes an independent individual, acquiring as well the realisation that adults may not always be right; satire, criticising and showing the problems of a society so that this society can notice them; and picaresque. There is as well a tone of nostalgia in the novel as it shows life before the war, the Old South where hospitality and humour were very popular.

The most important theme and the one that has created more controversy throughout the years is that of race and whether the novel is racist or anti-racist. At present, the presence of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* in United States public school system is questioned for its supposed racism and the presence of the word 'nigger'. Opinions of the former side are based on strong reactions against the use of the word 'nigger'; derogatory term directed at black people, specially African-American, with slavery connotations and considered a very racist word nowadays. The stereotypical description of Jim and slaves has been controversial as well. Concerning this, the historical context is essential, as the novel is set at a time before the Civil War, in which the use of this term was widespread, especially in the antebellum South, whose economy was centred around slave work in order to labour the plantations. In order to consider the novel as anti-racist, readership must analyse what are the implications of the message transmitted by the text, as the implied author may be transmitting a radically different message, typical of irony, which Twain mastered. Thus, the decision to analyse



implications which this dissertation undertakes could be also useful to discard the views of a racist novel.

Three different translations have been analysed in this dissertation. Two of them are significantly recent as the version translated by J.A. de Larrinaga was published in 2016 and even more María José Martín Pinto's version, which was published in 2019. However, the version translated by Francisco Elías was published more than 20 years before, in 1993. The age of a translation can be an important factor in its analysis and in Elías' translation, features such as excessive formality in how Jim uses the Spanish second person form of 'usted', considering that Jim, as a black slave in the 1830s is uneducated, can be found. There are other problematic aspects such as Jim's use of 'amito' referring to Huck and 'Salmón' instead of 'Salomón' considering the racist controversy that has surrounded this work throughout its history. 'Amito', meaning little owner, does not appear in the original version, and 'Salmón' is a translation of 'Sollermun', but Twain only renders black speech and does not suggest any confusion with another word or a low intelligence level on Jim. Thus, this older translation is excessively formal and analysing it from a 2020 perspective, it can be excessively racist in some representations.

Regarding the intended audience, it should be taken into account that Twain wrote the novel to an adult readership, which can be seen in the language and style used. However, now it is considered to be best suited for young adults and it is not difficult to find websites and book shops in which this work is recommended for children still in primary school. Thus, it is normal that translations use a slightly mild language compared to the original and that Twain work can be considered more explicit.

## 2.2 Translation theory

Translation of books written in English has always been significant in Spain, since it represented in 1998 “some 30-35% of all published works” (Zaro & Truman, 1998, p. 110). Literary translation is considered frequently as the freest form of translation, which is generally true, especially for poetry, plays and novels. Nevertheless, literary translation presents some particular and specific problems. Zaro & Truman (1998) signal that the main of these problems is the lack of a defined *skopos* as other types of translation (p. 110). Veermer’s concept of *skopos* can be explained as “a technical term for the purpose of a translation and of the action of translating” (Munday, 2008, p. 126). Sender’s intention in a literary text is to engage with receiver’s interest for different aims and this can vary according to each translator’s interpretation. The novel is the genre most frequently translated as it is probably the most popular literary genre. Translators often adapt or modify novels trying to make them more accessible to the reader, notably with mass target-oriented products.

The analysis of these translations is taken from the perspective of sociolinguistics, the branch of linguistics interested in the uses of language and the values connected with this language. Eugene Nida (1995) explains that sociolinguistics analyses “levels or registers of language, competition between dialects and between languages, the growth and death of languages, the roles of jargons, slang, and verbal innovations, gender differences, and the abuse of language”. This view on the values transmitted by language has been key in understanding the nature of translation. Even so, Nida points out “two serious errors” that interfere in the comprehension of how languages work such as “the naive idea that languages consist merely of words and grammar” and “the distorted view that the primary, or even the only, role of language is to communicate information.” (p. 44). This second notion is significantly important regarding literary translation, since the

writer of a novel is supposed to have no interest in transmitting information but in creating an effect on the readers and create an engagement with them, among others.

Nida's work has also been relevant in the field of translation as he performed a key role in the introduction of a new direction in translation theory focused on the reader by introducing his concepts of formal and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence is often used in legal environments and focused on the source text structure, it seeks for precision. Most relevant for this dissertation is dynamic equivalence, based on what Nida names as 'the principle of equivalent effect', where 'the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message' (Nida 1964a: 159). The message is designed considering the receptor's linguistic needs and the objective of dynamic equivalence is find 'the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message' (Nida 1964a: 166).

The concept of equivalent effect has been criticized by many critics but Nida's work has influenced many others. One of them is Peter Newmark, who starts from the same receptor-oriented line but decides to replace Nida's terms by those of semantic and communicative translation. Focusing on communicative translation, Newmark (1981) explain its objective as "to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original." (p. 39). Thus, this attempt to create an effect on the target text reader is similar to Nida's dynamic equivalence, but Newmark discards the principle of equivalent effect as it is "inoperant if the text is out of TL space and time" (1981, p. 69). Thus, it is not possible for any translator to create the same effect on current target readership as the effect created by Twain in 1885 with the publication of a novel full of satire on values of American society of that time. So, Newmark communicative translation is focused on the target text reader, adapted to a specific language and culture and thus, it transfers into the target language culture those elements of the source

language. It values precision on the communication rather than in the message and in this manner, it is the more appropriate for a translation such as *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*.

### 2.3 Pragmatics theory

Regarding pragmatics, discourse analysis is a key element in understanding how language conveys meaning, social and power relations. The most influential discourse analysis model is Michael Halliday's systemic functional model, based on what he calls systemic functional linguistics. By the use of an exhaustive grammar, Halliday systematically establish the relationship between writer's linguistic choices to the text's function in a wider sociocultural framework. The creation of an accurate grammatical terminology is the important aspect of systemic functional grammar. It is important to note that in this model, Halliday relates the linguistic choices, the objectives of the communication and the sociocultural framework. Each level is influenced by the previous higher level, so the influence is top down from the context of culture to 'lexicogrammar'. Thus, the context of culture conditions the genre, "understood in SFL as the conventional text type that is associated with a specific communicative function" (Munday, 2008, p. 143).

Correspondingly, genre affects register, which in SFL consists of three elements: field, tenor and mode. Halliday defines field as "what is happening, to the nature of the social interaction that is taking place", tenor as "who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their statuses and roles" and mode as "what part the language is playing, what are participants expecting the language to do" (Halliday, 1985). Thus, defining the register in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, field can be established as the events that occur to a child and a black slave through their getaway along the Mississippi river. As each different fragment will present an individual different field it will be explained in

each different situation in the analysis. For establishing the tenor, it is important to consider both the writer and his audience. Twain's work was written to "be sold, bought, and read by his nineteenth-century readers" as he "reached readers all across America and abroad through subscription sales and the periodical press" (McParland. 2014). Regarding his readers, evidence show that they "brought a set of experiences to their reading through which Twain's works were interpreted". As for the mode, being a novel, it can be established as written to be read to oneself or aloud to others.

Several important works on translation have employed this model. In her work, Mona Baker examines equivalence at different levels such as word, grammar, thematic structure, cohesion and pragmatic levels. Of special interest in this dissertation is how she incorporates the pragmatic level of language in use. Baker defines pragmatics as "the study of meaning, not as generated by the linguistics system but as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation." (Baker 2011, p. 230). Baker pays special attention to the concept of implicature, an element which is going to be analysed in the original text and different translations in this dissertation. Implicature, a concept developed by philosopher of language Paul Grice, is a form of pragmatic inference. Baker (2011) explains it as "what the speaker means or implies rather than what s/he says" (p. 223). Thus, there is a meaning that goes beyond what the words used by the speaker say by themselves.

Apart from implicature, Grice also described a set of 'maxims' that operate in normal co-operative conversation (Grice, 1975). These are the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance and manner. Quantity refers to communicating only the amount of information necessary, nor more nor less; Quality, telling only what is true and can be supported; relevance, saying only what is relevant to the conversation and manner, using a manner that is appropriate to the message the speaker intend to send and which probably

will be understood by the receiver. Any participant in a conversation will assume that the person whom they are interacting with is trying to be cooperative by following these maxims. Yet, these maxims can be intentionally flouted for different reasons, like the creation of humour as will be later discussed in connection with Source Text 2 and its translations.

When analysing a translation, Basil Hatim and Ian Mason present in their work different proposals that can be taken into account. Particularly, they introduce a continuum of “dynamic” and “stable” elements that can be found in a text linked to translation strategies. More “stable” source texts can need a “fairly literal approach”, whereas concerning more dynamic source texts, “the translator is faced with more interesting challenges and literal translation may no longer be an option” (Hatim & Mason, 1997, pp: 23-26). and this is particularly relevant to the translation of these texts, since all the fragments chosen to analyse in this dissertation can be considered as dynamic as in all of them translators differ in the translation strategy used.

### 3.- Methodology and analysis

For the analysis of implicatures translation, data have been selected from six different fragments which I have translated. As mentioned above, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is a novel published in 1884 in the United Kingdom and in 1885 in the United States of America. It narrates the story of a child named Huckleberry Finn and a black slave named Jim and the events that occur to them along their escape down the Mississippi river. All the fragments are characterised by the presence of humour and irony, which Twain mastered.

These original fragments have been analysed as well as three different translations. Thus, in the appendix at the end of this dissertation; the six original fragments (each one accompanied by its three different translations analysed and a translation of my own creation) are included. Regarding the fragments, they are ordered chronologically, as they appear in the novel. For the fragments themselves, they appear in the next manner: firstly, Twain's original version labelled as Source Text (ST); followed by the three translations in chronological order of publication; this is: Francisco Elías' translation (1993), classified as Target Text 1 (TT1); followed by J.A. de Larrinaga's translation (2016), as Target Text 2 (TT2) and María José Martín Pinto's translation, as Target Text 3 (TT3). Lastly, the translation of my own creation appears labelled as Target Text 4 (TT4). Thus, inside the analysis of an expression which belongs to the first fragment, each text will appear as ST1, TT1.1, TT2.1, TT3.1 and TT4.1, respectively.

The expression or words included in the analysis have been selected for the presence of an implicature; this is, as explained before "what the speaker means or implies rather than what s/he says" (Baker, 2011, p. 223); which have supposed a challenge to the translators. According to Hatim and Mason continuum, all of the examples analysed are dynamic elements since translators have differed in the use of translation strategies and in none of the examples the three of them have been able to use literal translation.

Questions posed in this dissertation which have led the choice of examples as well as the analysis are the following: what is the implicature behind Twain's choice of words? Which strategies did the different translators use in order to translate this implicature from English, source language (SL), to Spanish, target language (TL)? And, finally, are these implicatures translated in a successful manner? Thus, the analysis has been systematically carried out in the next manner.

Firstly, examples have been divided in four different categories which are: (i) idioms, fixed phrases whose meaning cannot be deduced for the sole meaning of its words; (ii) slang, language characterised by significant informality and colloquiality, used instead of standard terms; (iii) humour, examples in which Twain's intention of creating a humorous effect is key on its interpretation; and (iv) mistranslation of implicatures, a general category in which implicatures have not been translated in the best manner by any of the translators. Within each category examples will appear chronologically except for (ii) slang, in which how the different translations of 'blame' change will be analysed altogether, with examples of different STs.

Concerning the analysis itself; when necessary, the usual meaning, the most common meaning of the word or expression in everyday speech, has been provided in order to establish a contrast; as well as the real meaning, or the proper meaning in the example, using dictionary definitions. Next, the implicature behind these words or expressions has been explained to then proceed to analyse each translation. For this, translation strategies used have been identified. After this, a critical evaluation of each translation in terms of successfulness has been made; mainly based on what has been labelled in this dissertation as pragmatically correct or successful, this is, a correct translation of the implicature, transmitting to the reader the intention and message behind the word or expression analysed (explained previously when establishing the implicature). Semantics has also been taken into account in the analysis, especially useful when establishing which translation is considered better, as there can be examples with more than one translation pragmatically correct, in which one of them is more accurate or respectful with the ST in terms of meaning. Eventually, based on the analysis of the different translations, an alternative translation of my own is explained and justified.



**(i) Idioms**

Example 1:

Field of Source Text 1	Huck narrates widow Douglas attempts to civilise him by introducing him in Christianity.
Source Text 1	<i>I don't take no stock in dead people.</i>
Target Text 1.1	<i>no me gusta hacer inventario de la gente muerta.</i>
Target Text 2.1	<i>los muertos me importan un comino.</i>
Target Text 3.1	<i>no me importan nada los muertos.</i>
Target Text 4.1	<i>a mí los muertos me importan un pimiento.</i>

‘Take stock’ is an idiom which usually means “to make an itemized list or record of the resources or goods available”, but since it is referred to somebody (‘dead people’) it takes another meaning: “to make an appraisal, estimation, or assessment of something” (Farlex Dictionary of Idioms, 2015). Thus, the implicature can be established as that Huck thinks dead people are not important and thus, he does not care about Moses. Analysing the translations, it can be appreciated how the three translators have taken three different translation strategies. In TT1.1, Elías uses literal translation: precise equivalences in terms of structure and meaning from moneme to moneme. This way, Elías translation is not successful and can be considered as pragmatically incorrect since it uses the usual meaning previously explained and not the real meaning used by Twain and consequently there is no sign of Huck’s lack of interest in dead people.

In TT3.1, Martín Pinto opts for the use of modulation, defined by Vázquez-Ayora (1977) as a “change in the conceptual basis within a clause, without altering the meaning of the latter” (p. 291), as ‘no me importan nada’ is used to show no interest in Spanish. In TT2.1, Larrinaga takes an approach similar to Martín Pinto but slightly more different

as he uses an equivalence, “conveying the same situation in different modes, especially idiomatic ones” (Vázquez-Ayora, 1977, p. 322). This technique refers mainly to the substitution of a SL idiom by an equivalent TL idiom, in this case ‘me importa un comino’, which also means to have no interest in Spanish. Evaluating TT2.1 and TT3.1, both can be considered as successful translations since their translations render the implicature already defined. Nevertheless, TT2.1 is a better translation because of Larrinaga’s use of equivalence, which creates on TL readership an effect as close as possible to the effect created on SL readership, being this a perfect example of Newmark’s communicative translation. As a result, in TT4.1 I have used the same technique of equivalence with the difference of choosing another TL idiom with the same meaning as TT2.1 expression, but which I considered fits better to a child such as Huck.

Example 2:

Field of Source Text 2	Huck and Jim talk about Judgement of Solomon’s bible story. Jim is only able to interpret the story as literal and Huck tries to explain its figurative meaning
Source Text 2	But <i>hang it</i> , Jim
Target Text 1.2	No has comprendido de lo que se trata, Jim.
Target Text 2.2	¡ <i>Qué rayos</i> , Jim!
Target Text 3.2	Pero, <i>espera</i> , Jim.
Target Text 4.2	¡ <i>Cállate</i> , Jim!

‘Hang it’ is explained as a “phrase used when one is annoyed or irritated.” (Farlex Dictionary of Idioms, 2015). Hence, the implicature is drawn as Huck’s annoyance with Jim’ inability to interpret the Judgement of Solomon as a story used to transmit a message

as well as the fact the Huck does not comprehend Jim's lack of education as a result of his condition of black slave. In TT1, Elías straightforwardly omits the idiom. Observing TT2.2 and TT3.2, both translators use modulation, but with different results. Martín Pinto's 'espera' shows no evidence of annoyance or irritation as it is a term quite neutral in comparison which only means to wait. Thus, both TT1.2 and TT3.2 are unsuccessful translations: Elías for omitting the idiom and Martín Pinto for not rendering any of implicature's annoyance or irritation. Conversely, TT3.2 is a successful translation as 'Qué rayos' shows annoyance and although Larrinaga's translation could be considered slightly mild in comparison; as explained above, the intended audience in the present time is significantly younger than the one Twain had in mind when writing the novel. Taking this aspect into account, in TT4.2 my proposal is the use of modulation as Larrinaga, but using the verbal form 'Cállate', which shows annoyance in a franker way as well as using exclamations, but it is still appropriate for younger readers.

Example 3:

Field of Source Text 3	Huck tries to explain Jim why it is normal that French people do not speak English, while Jim explains his vision on why French people should talk in English.
Source Text 3	<i>Shucks</i>
Target Text 1.3	¡Bobo!
Target Text 2.3	<i>Pero</i>
Target Text 3.3	<i>Cáscaras</i>
Target Text 4.3	¡Bobo!

In this example, the presence of ‘Shucks’ pose a challenge to the translator, as its usual meaning, when considered as a noun, is a “ husk, pod, or shell of a seed, nut, or fruit” whereas when it is a interjection, as in ST3, it uses as a “exclamation of anger, annoyance, regret, or disgust about something” (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 2011). Being used as an interjection, the implicature of ‘Shucks’ is that Huck is annoyed because Jim does not understand the existence of more languages apart from English. In TT1.3, Elías uses modulation as he uses a soft insult such as ‘Bobo’ that renders perfectly the implicature, so it is a successful translation. However, neither Larrinaga or Martín Pinto accomplish this. In TT3.3, Martín Pinto uses literal translation and this way she is using a expression that even though it is a known expression of surprise in TL (Cáscaras), it has no relation with the annoyance of Huck with Jim. Therefore, it cannot be considered a successful translation. Even worse is Larrinaga’s translation, since in TT2.3 he uses transposition, this is ‘to express an idea in one language or the other in different categories’ (Zaro & Truman, 1998), into the adversative conjunction ‘Pero’, a quite neutral term which does not show any emotion and is the

reason why this is not a successful translation. In TT4.3, as I have considered Elías took a great decision, I have used the same technique and translation: modulation in ‘¡Bobo!’.

**(ii) Slang**

Example 4

Field of Source Text 2	Huck and Jim talk about Judgement of Solomon’s bible story. Jim is only able to interpret the story as literal and Huck tries to explain its figurative meaning
Source Text 2	<i>I wouldn’t give a dern</i> for a million un um
Target Text 1.2	<i>Yo no daría ni un centavo</i> por un millón de medios niños.
Target Text 2.2	<i>Yo no daría una higa</i> por un millón de medios críos
Target Text 3.2	<i>Ni un bledo me importarían</i> a mí un millón de ellos
Target Text 4.2	<i>A mí me importarían un carajo</i> un millón de medios niños.

Searching for ‘not give a damn’ in a dictionary, it is classified as slang and rude language with the meaning of “to not care in the slightest (about something or someone)” (Farlex Dictionary of Idioms, 2015). Knowing that Jim is assuming Solomon story as literal, the implicature is that, for Jim, to cut a child in two pieces does not make any sense. Examining the translations, it can be observed that all three different translators have opted for the same technique, equivalence, and even though they have chosen three different expressions, all of them carry the meaning of not caring. Thus, by using these informal and colloquial expressions, they have been partially successful, but not completely because they have not been able to add the special characteristic of rudeness of the SL expression. For achieving this, I have used equivalence as well, but by using another TL expression with the same meaning, such as ‘a mí me importarían un carajo’,

which is a ruder idiom, not very extreme so it can be read by the intended audience, I have achieved to add the sense of rudeness to the informality and colloquiality achieved by the translators before.

Example 5:

Field of Source Text 2	Huck and Jim talk about Judgement of Solomon's bible story. Jim is only able to interpret the story as literal and Huck tries to explain its figurative meaning
Source Text 2	<i>blame it</i> , you've missed it a thousand mile.
Target Text 1.2	Es otra cuestión... Estás lejos de comprenderlo
Target Text 2.2	Se te ha escapado por un millar de millas
Target Text 3.2	<i>maldita sea</i> , estás a mil millas de distancia
Target Text 4.2	<i>¡leches!</i> , te has quedado lejísimo de entenderlo

From now on, the analysis in this category is going to focus on how 'blame' is differently translated depending on the environment of the sentence where it appears. In this case, 'blame', without modifiers, presents the meaning of "blast; damn (used as a mild curse)" (Random House Kernerman Webster's College Dictionary, 2010). It shows Huck's exasperation with Jim for not interpreting the Judgement of Solomon as a story. Both in TT1.2 and TT2.2, the translation of 'blame' is omitted and this is the reason both of them are not successful as no sign of exasperation can be found on Huck's words. Regarding Martín Pinto's translation, we observe in TT3.2 how she has used modulation using an expression similar to ST2 ('maldita sea'). It is as well a mild curse like 'blame it', so Martín Pinto's translation is successful. In a similar manner, in TT4.2 I have

proposed as well the use of modulation, with another mild curse which is more emphatic accompanied by exclamations (¡leches!).

Example 6:

Field of Source Text 3	Huck tries to explain Jim why it is normal that French people do not speak English, while Jim explains his vision on why French people should talk in English.
Source Text 3	‘Well, den! <i>Dad blame it</i> , why doan’ he talk like a man?’
Target Text 1.3	Bien, ¿y?... <i>Maldito sea</i> , ¿por qué no habla como un hombre?
Target Text 2.3	¡Pues entonces! ¡ <i>Qué rayos!</i> ¿Por qué no habla como un hombre?
Target Text 3.3	¡Pues, entonces! <i>Maldita sea</i> , ¿por qué no hablan como los hombres?
Target Text 4.3	¡Pues entonces! ¿Por qué <i>demonios</i> no hablan como humanos?

When ‘blame’ occurs along with dad (‘dad blame it’), it means “a mild oath; a euphemism for god-damn” (Green’s Dictionary of Slang, 2020), so it is more powerful than ‘blame’ alone. In this case is Jim who is annoyed with French people for not talking as what Jim understands all humans talk, English, and this is the implicature. In TT1.3 and TT3.3 both Elías and Martín Pinto modulates ‘Dad blame it’ into almost identical expressions such as ‘Maldito sea’ and ‘Maldita sea’. In TT2.3, Larrinaga uses an equivalence he has used before for the translation of ‘hang it’ (¡Qué rayos!). In this case, all translations are not completely succesful because they have not rendered how ‘dad

blame it’ is more emphatic than ‘blame it’ and whereas in the previous case Martín Pinto does accomplish with the translation of the implicature, using the same expression does not fully accomplish with it in this case. In order to successfully translate the implicature, my proposal in TT4.3 is the use of transposition, transforming the verbal form ‘blame’ into the noun ‘demonios’. This way, it is rendered correctly how ‘dad blame it’ is more emphatic than ‘blame it’, as ‘demonios’ is more powerful than ‘¡leches!’.

Example 7:

Field of Source Text 2	Huck and Jim talk about Judgement of Solomon’s bible story. Jim is only able to interpret the story as literal and Huck tries to explain its figurative meaning
Source Text 2	A chile er two, mo’ er less, earn’t no consekens to Sollermun, <i>dad fetch him!</i>
Target Text 1.2	y un niño o dos menos no le importaban ni tenían consecuencias para Salmón.
Target Text 2.2	Un crío o dos de más o de menos no tenían importancia para Salomón, <i>¡maldito sea!</i>
Target Text 3.2	Un niño o dos, de más o de menos, no tenían la más mínima importancia para Salomón, <i>maldito sea</i>
Target Text 4.2	Perder un niño o dos le daba igual al <i>despreciable</i> Salomón

In this case, the occurrence is ‘dad fetch’, which is a synonym of ‘dad blame’ according to Green’s Dictionary of Slang. The implication is that Jim is annoyed with Solomon because from his point of view Solomon does not appreciate the value of children because he has an excessive amount of them. In TT3.2, Martín Pinto opts once



again for the use of modulation into ‘maldito sea’ which is the exact same technique and translation used in TT2.2 by Larrinaga. Once again, this translation cannot be considered as successful for the lack of implications as ‘dad fetch him’ should be more emphatic than ‘blame it’. For TT1.2, Elías decides to omit the expression which makes this translation worse than Larrinaga’s and Martín Pinto’s as the connotations are straightforwardly omitted. It is noticeable how being ‘dad fetch’ a synonym of ‘dad blame’ it has been translated differently from the previous example. In order to translate the implicature correctly, my proposal in T4.2 consists in the use of transposition into the adjective ‘despreciable’, a strong negative view on a person that renders Jim’s annoyance.

Example 8:

Field of Source Text 2	Huck and Jim talk about Judgement of Solomon’s bible story. Jim is only able to interpret the story as literal and Huck tries to explain its figurative meaning
Source Text 2	<i>Blame de pint!</i>
Target Text 1.2	<i>maldita cuestión</i>
Target Text 2.2	<i>¡Vete al cuerno con el quid!</i>
Target Text 3.2	<i>Al diablo con el significado</i>
Target Text 4.2	<i>¡Que le den por saco a lo que quiere decir!</i>

Now, the occurrence of ‘blame’ modifying another word (‘Blame de pint!’) does appear to move the translators to a more emphatic translation. The implicature is Huck’s anger with Huck trying to explain him the point of Solomon story as he sees in a clear manner the reason under Solomon’s attitude. In TT1.2, Elías uses modulation, but once again the expression chosen does not render the sense of mild curse of ‘blame’ and since

the translation is quite neutral compared to ST2, it is not a successful translation. It can be observed the use of modulation as well in TT 2.2, but in this case Larrinaga's choice is a more emphatic one (¡Vete al cuerno con el quid!) that, this time, does fit perfectly with the implicature and it is a successful translation. Martín Pinto as well translates successfully this example in TT3.2 by the use of a transposition into prepositional phrase 'Al diablo con el significado', another emphatic expression. Both TT2.2 and TT3.2 show in this example more powerful translations than in previous cases. For my translation, in TT4.2, I have proposed the use of modulation with another emphatic expression such as 'Que le den por saco'.

**(iii) Humour**

Example 9:

Field of Source Text 2	Huck and Jim talk about Judgement of Solomon's bible story. Jim is only able to interpret the story as literal and Huck tries to explain its figurative meaning
Source Text 2	Bofe un you claims it. What does I do? Does I shin aroun' mongs' de neighbours en fine out which un you de bill do b'long to, en han' it over to de right one, all safe en soun', de way dat anybody dat had any gumption would? No – I take en whack de bill in <i>two</i> , en give half un it to you, en de yuther half to de yuther woman.
Target Text 1.2	Cada mujer dice que el niño es suyo. ¿Qué he de hacer yo? Pues irme a la vecindad y preguntar. Así sabré de quién es y entonces se lo podré dar a la madre. Pero no me pasará por la cabeza cortar el billete en dos, porque medio billete no sirve de nada.
Target Text 2.2	Las dos aseguráis que es vuestro. ¿Qué hago yo? ¿Me pongo a indagar por entre los vecinos para asegurarme a quién de vosotros le pertenece el billete de verdad, y se lo entrego a su dueña sano y salvo, como haría cualquier persona que tuviese sentido común? No, señor; voy y lo parto en dos y te doy a ti la mitad y la otra mitad a la otra mujer.
Target Text 3.2	Las dos lo reclamáis. ¿Y qué hago yo? ¿Me voy a preguntarles a los vecinos para averiguar a cuál de las dos

	<p>pertenece el billete y se lo doy a la mujer correcta sano y salvo, como haría cualquiera que tuviera dos dedos de frente? No; yo cojo y parto el billete en <i>dos</i> y te doy a ti una mitad, y la otra mitad se la doy a la otra mujer.</p>
Target Text 4.2	<p>Las dos decís que es vuestro. ¿Yo qué hago? ¿Le pregunto a los vecinos de quién es el billete y se lo doy a la mujer correcta sano y salvo, como cualquiera que tenga un poco de cabeza? No, voy y parto el billete en dos, y te doy una mitad a ti y la otra a la otra madre</p>

In order to achieve humoristic effects, Jim is breaking one of Grice's maxims. Jim flouts the maxim of manner, which supposes that one tries to be as clear, as brief, and as orderly as one can in what one says, and where one avoids obscurity and ambiguity, by presenting what he thinks is the sensible option in an unexpected manner. What is very interesting is that at the same time, he is flouting in an involuntary manner the maxim of quality, which supposes that one tries to be truthful, and does not give information that is false or that is not supported by evidence. This is because of Jim's inability to see that Salomon story is not real and it does not pretend more than spreading a lesson or moral because of his condition of slave and his consequent lack of education. Thus, audience knows that Salomon story is not real, and Jim by making fun of it in such a so vehement way shows that he is wrong. This excerpt shows how Twain tried to show to the audience that Jim, a slave, possesses a strong sense of morality but slave's absence of education renders them vulnerable. Hence, the implicature in this example is that Jim ridicules Solomon decision by presenting the cut the baby decision as the sensible option and asking the neighbours as a crazy idea.

Elías uses modulation in TT1.2 as he presents directly what would be the sensible option as, indeed, the sensible option as it was a normal situation. This is an example of an unsuccessful translation, since there is no irony, key element in this novel and in Twain's work. Elías renders the message Jim tries to explain of what would be a sensible decision and that Solomon's is not, but it does not provide any sense of humour. Both Larrinaga and Martín Pinto in TT2.2 and TT3.2 use literal translation, a technique that may be dangerous if the appearance of false friends occurs. Nonetheless, it is rendered without flaw in these cases as they are faithful to the source text while providing the reader with the same humorous effect in the form of irony as well as being pragmatically correct and this way, successfully translating the implicature. Consequently, stylistic changes aside, in TT4.2 I have opted for literal translation as well in order to maintain Twain's mastery of irony and its humorous effects.

Example 10:

Field of Source Text 5	Huck is describing the church to which both the Grangerfords and Sepherdsons attend even though they have been in a bloody feud for 30 years
Source Text 5	If you notice, most folks don't go to church only when they've got to; but a hog is different.
Target Text 1.5	fui a la iglesia, que estaba desierta, excepto un par de lechones que suelen entrar allí, en verano, porque se está más fresco. Además, la puerta no se cierra nunca.
Target Text 2.5	Si os fijáis, la mayoría de la gente solo va a la iglesia cuando tiene la obligación de hacerlo, pero en el caso de los cerdos es distinto.
Target Text 3.5	Si te das cuenta, la mayoría de las personas no van a la iglesia más que cuando tienen que hacerlo; pero los cerdos son diferentes.
Target Text 4.5	Si te fijas, la mayoría de la gente solo va a la iglesia por obligación, pero los cerdos son diferentes.

With this example of irony, Huck underscores the hypocrisy of the families, who only go to church because they have to, for appearances, while the pigs, considered as dirty animals, go to the church because they like it, although only its floor, but they are definitely more truthful. In both TT2.5 and TT3.5, translators opt for translate literally the sentence, maintaining the irony and message of hypocrisy intended by Twain and this way achieving a successful translation. However, in TT1.5 Elías straightforwardly decides to omit the joke and therefore, it results in an unsuccessful translation. This can

be a result of TT1.5 being the older translation (1993), a time in which Christianity was more extended in Spain than in recent years. Thus, Elías may have feared to disturb the readership and decided to omit this joke about hypocrite Christians. Regarding TT4.5, I have used as well literal translation and only stylistic changes have been made.

Example 11:

Field of Source Text 6	The King and the Duke, two impostors, are following each other deception and Jim and Huck are being deceived.
Source Text 6	Looky here, Bilgewater
Target Text 1.6	Oiga, <b>Bridgewater</b>
Target Text 2.6	Mire, <b>Bilgewater</b> ,[4] [4]: Juego de palabras: Bridgewater significa «agua del puente» y Bilgewater, «agua de sentina». (N. del T.)
Target Text 3.6	Mira, <b>Bilgewater</b> <sup>43</sup> 43. <i>Bilgewater</i> . El agua pestilente y nociva que se acumula en el fondo del pantoque o casco de un barco. H. L. Mencken en <i>The American Language</i> (1963) definió «bilge» como ‘sandeces’.
Target Text 4.6	Mire, <b>Bilgewater</b> <sup>n</sup> N. Juego de palabras: <i>Bridgewater</i> significa «agua de puente», <i>Bilgewater</i> , «agua hedionda estancada en la parte inferior de una nave» y <i>bilge</i> , “sin sentido”.

In this fragment, The King makes a word play with the Duke’s supposed name because he knows the Duke is only pretending while Huck and Jim are oblivious to this. This word play consists in the change of the name Bridgewater for Bilgewater. If ‘bilge’ is searched in a dictionary, it is defined as “(Nautical Terms) the lowest inner part of a ship's hull.”, as well as “the dirty water that collects in a vessel's, also called bilgewater”. Moreover, ‘bilge’ presents the informal meaning of “silly rubbish; nonsense” (Collins English Dictionary, 2014). Thus, the wordplay consists in the use of these three meaning



and the phonetic similarity between 'bilge' and 'bridge'. Elías in TT1.6 uses generalization, this is the use of a more general or neutral term, as he decides not to use the word play and keep the original name of 'Bridgewater'. Observing TT2.6 and TT3.6, Larrinaga and Martín Pinto use borrowing, "word taken from a SL without translating and that acknowledges a lexical gap in TL" (López Güix & Minett Wilkinson, 1997), 'Bilgewater' and explain its meaning and the wordplay's meaning by the introduction of a note at the end of the page, Thus, TT1.6 can be classified as a not successful translations since there is no sign of humour or irony, key aspect in Twain's works. Regarding Larrinaga and Martín Pinto's, both of them are successful, since by the use of a note they explain the word play, but TT3.6 is better in the sense than TT2.6 only explains one of the word plays and it is not clearly explained since 'sentina' is not a common word in Spanish. For TT4.6, my proposed translation is the same as Larrinaga and Martín Pinto, adding a note with the three definitions that form the word play.

**(iv) Mistranslation of implicatures.**

Example 12:

Field of Source Text 2	Huck and Jim talk about Judgement of Solomon's bible story. Jim is only able to interpret the story as literal and Huck tries to explain its figurative meaning
Source Text 2	Warn' dat de beatenes' notion in de worl'?
Target Text 1.2	Eso demuestra que era un salvaje
Target Text 2.2	¿No era esa la idea más estúpida del mundo?
Target Text 3.2	¿No fue esa la idea más extraña del mundo?
Target Text 4.2	¿No fue esa la idea más extraña del mundo?

The implicature in ST2.1 In which shows Jim's evaluation of Salomon's decision to cut the child in two pieces as crazy and bizarre. Both Larrinaga and Martín Pinto in TT2.2 and TT3.2 opt for the use of modulation, each with a different point of view since the use of stupid in Larrinaga is more powerful than Martín Pinto's use of odd. Thus, both are successful translations but TT2.2 is better as it renders better the sense of the implicature.

Similarly, Elías uses modulation in TT1.2, although fairly extreme in this case. This translation is very disruptive with the source text and, although, the message and intention transmitted is not wrong, they can be interpreted along the whole Jim's intervention explaining how he sees Salomon's decision as he assumes Solomon story is real, incapable of interpret it as a Bible story used to transmit a message or moral. Consequently, it does not provide more relevant information. Hence, it is a not successful translation, since successful translations in this case are more respectful with the source text and they add a new message. Regarding TT4.2, I have opted to use the exact same

translation as Martín Pinto, this is modulation into ‘¿No fue esa la idea más extraña del mundo?’.

Example 13:

Field of Source Text 4	Huck reflects about which is more worthwhile: doing right or doing wrong.
Source Text 4	but after this always do <i>whichever comes handiest at the time</i>
Target Text 1.4	Decidí, pues, no preocuparme y hacer siempre <i>lo que tuviera más a mano</i>
Target Text 2.4	De modo que decidí no preocuparme más de ello y en adelante hacer <i>lo que fuera más sencillo cuando se presentara el caso.</i>
Target Text 3.4	después de esto, siempre haría lo que mejor me viniera en cada momento
Target Text 4.4	Así que decidí no volver a preocuparme por eso y hacer siempre <i>lo que me convenga en cada momento</i>

If ‘handy’ is browsed in a dictionary, it can be found a definition such as “easily or effectively used; convenient or useful” as well as “readily accessible or convenient in location” (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 2011). Nevertheless, this is not what is implied, since the implicature does not focus on the easiness or convenience but in that Huck decides that in the future he will not do what is easiest, only because it is easy, but what is best for him not taking into account what is morally right or not without need to analyse the action in religious and moral terms. Thus, in TT1.4 by the use of literal translation Elías does not achieve a successful translation since ‘lo que tuviera más a mano’ places the focus on convenience. Similarly, Larrinaga uses modulation in TT2.4, but as ‘lo que fuera más sencillo’ places the focus on easiness, it is

another unsuccessful translation. However, in TT3.4 by the use of another modulation does achieve a successful translation because of how 'lo que mejor me viniera' renders the sense of morally free and carelessness of the implicature. This way, in TT4.4 my proposal consists in the use of a similar modulation (lo que mejor me convenga), which is better in the sense does while being shorter, it still renders the same implicature meaning.

#### 4.- Conclusions

The novel taken as object of discussion, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, can be considered a perfect example of the difficulty in the translation of implicatures. Especially, in a work characterised by the use of irony and whose writer, Mark Twain, was hugely famous for its skill in the use of it. As irony is “an expression or utterance marked by a deliberate contrast between apparent and intended meaning” (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 2011), it is vital in the render of implicatures.

After the analysis performed, some conclusions can be drawn of each translation: Elías translation's (TTs1) can be considered as the worse of the three because: regarding idioms, it is not especially accurate; concerning slang it only achieves partial successful translations of implicatures, characterised by its lack of explicitness; and in regard to humour, all three translations are considered as not successful. It is not a surprising a result taken into account it is the oldest translation of the three and with a time difference of 23 years with Larrinaga's translation and 26 years with Martín Pinto's. This may be the main reason why this translation is less explicit as well as excessively formal.

Larrinaga's (TTs2) and Martín Pinto's (TTs3) translations are significantly similar in terms of successfulness in the translation of implicatures. While Larrinaga is more successful concerning the translation of implicatures in idioms and Martín Pinto is more

successful concerning slang, both stand out in humour and mistranslation of implicatures. Very similar in age and recent both of them, they do not show a ‘formality barrier’ as Elías in their translations. With different perspectives, which explains why one is more proficient in idioms and the other in slang, both perform a very correct translation of implicatures.

Examining the categories, it can be observed that the implicatures in idioms provide more unsuccessful translations than successful ones. The difficulties in the translations of idioms may reside in the difficulty of finding an equivalent idiom in TL that could create the same effect on target readership. Slang category is characterised by the lack of explicitness in translations which result is most of them being not completely successful translations of implicatures. About humour category it can be noted how literal translations performs a great work in translating Twain’s irony.

In fairness, it must be noted that short deadlines are characteristic of literary translation, what adds more difficulty to a work already vast and complicated. As discussed in this dissertation, a translator does not only have to take into account what the words say, but what it is saying the author behind those words as well as the effect he attempts to create on the reader. For my translation proposal, I have analysed thoroughly three different translations of the work as well as the source text as well as looking up the meaning and implications of different words and idioms in different dictionaries (Farlex, Collins, American Heritage). Conditions that in literary translation are impossible because of the shortage of time imposed in translators to do their work correctly and that if Elías, Larrinaga and Martín Pinto would have had them, they could have done a better work.

## 5.- References

- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London; New York: Routledge.
- bilge. (n.d.) *Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition 2014*. (1991, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2014). Retrieved from <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/bilge>
- blame. (n.d.) *Random House Kernerman Webster's College Dictionary*. (2010). Retrieved from <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/blame>
- dad-burn (n.d.) *Green's Dictionary of Slang*. (2020). Retrieved from <https://greensdictofslang.com/entry/krzm2oa>
- García Yebra, V. (1997). *Teoría y Práctica de la Traducción*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
- handy. (n.d.) *American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition*. (2011). Retrieved from <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/handy>
- hang it. (n.d.) *Farlex Dictionary of Idioms*. (2015). Retrieved from <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/hang+it>
- Halliday, M. A., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Deakin University Press.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.
- irony. (n.d.) *American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition*. (2011). Retrieved from <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/irony>
- López Guix, J. G., & Minett Wilkinson, J. (1997). *Manual de Traducción Inglés-Castellano: Teoría y Práctica*. Gedisa.
- McParland, R. (2014). *Mark Twain's Audience: A Critical Analysis of Reader Responses to the Writings of Mark Twain*. Lexington Books.
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford and New York: Pergamon.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1964a). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nida, E. A. (1995). Sociolinguistics as a crucial factor in translating and interpreting. In R. Martín-Gaitero (Ed.), *Encuentros Complutenses En Torno A La Traducción* (pp. 43-50). Madrid: Editorial Complutense.

- not give a damn. (n.d.) *Farlex Dictionary of Idioms*. (2015). Retrieved from <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/not+give+a+damn>
- shucks. (n.d.) *American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition*. (2011). Retrieved from <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/shucks>
- take stock. (n.d.) *Farlex Dictionary of Idioms*. (2015). Retrieved from <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/take+stock>
- Twain, M. (1986). *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Harmondsworth: Puffin Books.
- Twain, M. (1993). *Las Aventuras de Huckleberry Finn; Introducción de Carlos Rojas*. (F. Elías, Trans.) Barcelona: Planeta.
- Twain, M. (2016). *Las Aventuras de Huckleberry Finn*. (J. de Larrinaga, Trans.) Titivillus.
- Twain, M. (2019). *Huckleberry Finn: Edición Anotada: Aventuras de Huckleberry Finn (El Mejor Amigo de Tom Sawyer); Edición con Introducción, Notas y Bibliografía de Michael Patrick Hearn; Ilustrado por E.W. Kemble*. (M. J. Martín Pinto, Trans.) Madrid: Akal.
- Vázquez-Ayora, G. (1977). *Introducción a la Traductología: Curso Básico de Traducción*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Zaro, J. J., & Truman, M. (1998). *Manual de Traducción. A Manual of Translation*. Madrid: SGEL.

## 6.- Appendix

### 6.1.- Source Text and Target Texts 1

#### **Source Text 1**

*The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Chapter 1, p. 12.

After supper she got out her book and learned me about Moses and the Bulrushers; and I was in a sweat to find out all about him; but y-and-by she let it out that Moses had been dread a considerable long time; so then I didn't care no more about him; because I don't take no stock in dead people.

#### **Target Text 1.1**

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn; introducción de Carlos Rojas; traducción de F. Elías*. Chapter I, p. 6.

Después de cenar iba a buscar su libro y me leía algo sobre Moisés y los juncos del río. Yo sudaba para seguir la historia, pero un día se le escapó decir que Moisés había muerto hacía mucho tiempo. Desde entonces no me preocupé por él, pues no me gusta hacer inventario de la gente muerta.

#### **Target Text 2.1**

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn*. (J.A. de Larrinaga, Trans.) Chapter I, p. 45.

Después de cenar sacó un libro y me leyó lo de Moisés y los juncos y me entraron grandes ganas de saber cuánto podía saberse de él. Pero, luego, se le escapó que Moisés había muerto hacía tiempo; por eso ya no me interesó, porque los muertos me importan un comino.



### **Target Text 3.1**

*Huckleberry Finn: edición anotada.* (M. J. Martín Pinto, Trans.) Chapter I, p. 14.

Después de la cena, ella sacaba su libro y me enseñaba cosas de Moisés y los juncos y yo estaba muy preocupado por saberlo todo sobre él. Pero enseguida soltó que Moisés llevaba muchísimo tiempo muerto, así que ya dejó de interesarme porque no me importan nada los muertos.

### **Target Text 4.1**

Own translation

Después de cenar sacaba su libro y me leía sobre Moisés y los juncos, y yo estaba ansioso por conocerlo todo sobre él. Pero pronto, se le escapó que Moisés llevaba muerto muchísimo tiempo, y me dejó de interesar porque a mí los muertos me importan un pimiento.

## 6.2.- Source Text and Target Texts 2

### Source Text 2

*The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Chapter 14, pp. 82-83

‘...Does you know ‘bout dat chile dat he ‘uz gwyne to chop in two?’

‘Yes, the widow told me all about it’

‘*Well*, den! Warn’ dat de beatenes’ notion in de worl’? You jes’ take en look at it a minute.

Dah’s de stump, dah – dat’s one er de women; heah’s you – dat’s de yuther one; I’s

Sollermun; en dish-yer dollar bill’s de chile. Bofe un you claims it. What does I do? Does

I shin aroun’ mongs’ de neighbours en fine out which un you de bill *do* b’long to, en han’

it over to de right one, all safe en soun’, de way dat anybody dat had any gumption would?

No – I take en whack de bill in *two*, en give half un it to you, en de yuther half to de yuther

woman. Dat’s de way Sollermun was gwyne to do wid de chile. Now I want to ast you:

what’s de use er dat half a bill? – can’t buy noth’n wid it. En what use is a half a chile? I

wouldn’t give a dern for a million un um.’

‘But hang it, Jim, you’ve clean missed the point – blame it, you’ve missed it a a thousand mile.’

‘Who? Me? Go ‘long. Doan’ talk to *me* ‘bout yo’ pints. I reck’n I knows sense when I

sees it; en dey ain’ no sense in sich doin’s as dat. De ‘spute was ‘bout a whole chile wid

a half a chile, doan’ know enough to come in out’n de rain. Doan’ talk to me ‘bout

Sollermun, Huck. I knows him by de back.’

‘But I tell you you don’t get the point.’

‘Blame de pint! I reck’n I knows what I knows. En mine you, de *real* pint is down furder

– it’s down deeper. It lays in de way Sollermun was raised. You take a man dat’s got on

‘y one er two chillen; is dat man gwyne to be waseful o’chillen? No, he ain’t; he can’t

‘ford it. *He* know how to value ‘em, But you take a man dat’s got ‘bout five million chillen

runnin' roun' de house, en it's diffunt. *He* as soon chop a chile in two as a cat. Dey's plenty mo'. A chile er two, mo' er less, earn't no consekens to Sollermun, dad fetch him!' I never see such a nigger. If he got a notion in his head once, there warn't no getting it out again. He was the most down on Salomon of any nigger I ever see.

### **Target Text 1.2**

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn; introducción de Carlos Rojas; traducción de F. Elías. Chapter XIV, pp. 98-99*

“...¿Conoce la historia del niño al cual quería partir en dos?

- Sí, la viuda me lo contó todo.
- Bien, ¿y pues?... Eso demuestra que era un salvaje... Fíjese un momento... Eso es un tronco... una mujer. Aquí esta usted, amito. Es otra mujer. Yo soy Salmón y este dólar de papel es el niño. Cada mujer dice que el niño es suyo. ¿Qué he de hacer yo? Pues irme a la vecindad y preguntar. Así sabré de quién es y entonces se lo podré dar a la madre. Pero no me pasará por la cabeza cortar el billete en dos, porque medio billete no sirve de nada. No se puede comprar nada con medio billete. Y de qué sirve medio niño. Yo no daría ni un centavo por un millón de medios niños.
- No has comprendido de lo que se trata, Jim... Es otra cuestión... Estás lejos de comprenderlo.
- ¿Quién? ¿Yo?... ¡Vamos a dejarlo!... No me hable de cuestiones... Creo que sé ver qué es lo de sentido común, cuando lo veo. Y le digo que lo que hizo Salmón no es de sentido común. La disputa no era por medio niño, sino por un niño entero, y el hombre que cree que puede resolver una disputa sobre un niño entero por

medio de la mitad de un niño, no es un hombre con sentido común... No me hable de Salmón, que ya me lo sé de memoria...

- Pero si es que no comprendes la cuestión...
- ¡Maldita cuestión! Creo que sé lo que es. Usted quiere decir que la cuestión está más allá, más honda. Y es verdad. La cuestión está en la manera cómo fue educado Salmón. Tome un hombre que tenga uno o dos hijos: no se dedicará a partirlos por la mitad. Sabe lo que valen. Pero tome un hombre que tiene unos cinco millones de chicos corriendo por la casa, y éste le partirá un niño más fácilmente que un gato. Estaba cargado de niños, y un niño o dos menos no le importaban ni tenían consecuencias para Salmón.

Nunca he visto un negro como Jim. Si se le mete una idea en la cabeza, no hay manera de quitársela. Tenía más odio a Salomón que ningún otro negro que yo conozca.

## Target Text 2.2

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn.* (J.A. de Larrinaga, Trans.) Chapter XIV, pp. 134-135

¿Has oído hablar de ese crío al que iba a partir en dos pedazos?

—Sí, la viuda me lo contó.

—¡Pues entonces! ¿No era esa la idea más estúpida del mundo? Párate un poco a mirarlo. Ahí tienes ese tocón... es una de las mujeres; ahí estás tú... eres la otra. Yo soy Salomón. Y este billete de un dólar es el crío. Las dos aseguráis que es vuestro. ¿Qué hago yo? ¿Me pongo a indagar por entre los vecinos para asegurarme a quién de vosotros le pertenece el billete de verdad, y se lo entrego a su dueña sano y salvo, como haría cualquier persona que tuviese sentido común? No, señor; voy y lo parto en dos y te doy a ti la mitad y la otra mitad a la otra mujer. Eso es lo que quería hacer Salomón con el crío. Y ahora, dime:

¿de qué sirve la mitad de un billete? No se puede comprar nada con él. ¿Y de qué sirve medio crío? Yo no daría una higa por un millón de medios críos.

—¿Qué rayos, Jim! ¡No has visto el quid de la cosa! Se te ha escapado por un millar de millas.

—¿A quién? ¿A mí? ¡Vamos, anda! A mí no me hables de quids.

Creo ver el sentido común donde lo hay, y el obrar así no tiene ni pizca de sentido común. No se pleiteaba por medio crío, se pleiteaba por un crío entero. Y el hombre que, cuando se discute la propiedad de un crío entero, ve la solución satisfactoria con medio crío, no sabe lo bastante para meterse bajo techado cuando está lloviendo. No me hables a mí de Salomón, Huck, le conozco de sobra.

—Te digo que no has visto el quid de la cosa.

—¡Vete al cuerno con el quid! Yo sé lo que sé. Y entiéndelo bien: el quid, el verdadero fundamento del asunto, viene de algo más hondo. Viene de la manera como fue criado Salomón. Toma un hombre que solo tiene uno o dos críos, ¿va ese hombre a derrochar críos? No, señor; no puede permitirse ese lujo. Él sabe darles todo su valor. Pero toma un hombre que tiene unos cinco millones de críos por casa y ya cambia la cosa. A él le cuesta poco trabajo cortar a un crío en dos, como hacerlo con un gato. Le quedan para dar y regalar. Un crío o dos de más o de menos no tenían importancia para Salomón, ¡maldito sea!

En mi vida vi un negro igual. Como se le metiera una idea en la cabeza, no había quien se la sacara ya. Le tenía más inquina a Salomón que ningún otro negro que yo haya conocido.

### Target Text 3.2

*Huckleberry Finn: edición anotada.* (M. J. Martín Pinto, Trans.) Chapter XIV, pp. 155-156

- ¿Sabes lo del niño ese que él iba a cortar por la mitad?

- Sí, la viuda me lo contó todo.

- ¡Pues entonces! ¿No fue esa la idea más extraña del mundo? Sólo mira esto un minuto. El tocón ese<sup>11</sup>, ese, pues esa es una de las mujeres; y aquí tú, tú eres la otra; y yo soy Salomón; y este billete de dólar de aquí es el niño. Las dos lo reclamáis. ¿Y qué hago yo? ¿Me voy a preguntarles a los vecinos para averiguar a cuál de las dos pertenece el billete y se lo doy a la mujer correcta sano y salvo, como haría cualquiera que tuviera dos dedos de frente? No; yo cojo y parto el billete en *dos* y te doy a ti una mitad, y la otra mitad se la doy a la otra mujer. Eso es lo que Salomón iba a hacer con el niño. Ahora, te pregunto: ¿para qué sirve ese medio billete? No puedes comprar nada con él. ¿Y para qué sirve medio niño? Ni un bledo me importarían a mí un millón de ellos.

- Pero, espera, Jim; se te ha escapado el significado completamente; maldita sea, estás a mil millas de distancia.

- ¿Quién? ¿Yo? Venga ya. No me vengas con tus significados. Creo que sé reconocer cuando algo tiene sentido; y no tiene ningún sentido hacer algo así. La discusión no era por medio niño; la discusión era por un niño entero. Y el hombre que piense que puede resolver una disputa sobre un niño entero con medio niño es que es tonto de remate. No me hables de Salomón, Huck, que me lo conozco muy bien.

- Pero te estoy diciendo que se te escapa el significado.

- ¡Al diablo con el significado! Creo que sé lo que sé. Y para que lo sepas, el *auténtico* significado va aún más lejos, es todavía más profundo. Está en la forma en que criaron a Salomón. Tú coges a un hombre que tiene sólo un hijo o dos, ¿ese hombre va a malgastar

a sus hijos? No, no puede permitírselo. *Él* sabe valorarlos. Pero ahora tú coges a un hombre que tiene unos cinco millones de hijos correteando por la casa, y es distinto. Lo mismo le da partir un niño en dos que a un gato. Tiene muchos más. Un niño o dos, de más o de menos, no tenían la más mínima importancia para Salomón, maldito sea.

No he visto nunca un negro igual. Una vez que se mete algo en la cabeza, no había manera de sacársela. Era el negro al que menos le gustaba Salomón que he visto nunca.

11. *El tocón ese*. En el original, «*Dah's de stump*», refiriéndose a 'las dificultades'. [N. de la T.: los tocones ocultos bajo el agua representaban un peligro para la navegación.]

## Target Text 4.2

Own translation

- ¿Sabes lo de ese niño al que iba a partir por la mitad?
- Sí, me lo contó todo la viuda.
- ¿Entonces qué? ¿No era esa la idea más extraña y estúpida del mundo? Piénsalo un minuto. Ese tronco de ahí, es una de las mujeres; y tú que estás aquí, la otra. Yo soy Salomón, y este billete de un dólar es el bebé. Las dos decís que es vuestro. ¿Yo qué hago? ¿Le pregunto a los vecinos de quién es el billete y se lo doy a la mujer correcta sano y salvo, como cualquiera que tenga un poco de cabeza? No, voy y parto el billete en dos, y te doy una mitad a ti y la otra a la otra madre. Eso es lo que quería hacer Salomón con el niño. Y ahora dime, ¿de qué sirve medio billete si no puedes comprar nada con él? ¿Y de qué sirve medio niño? A mí me importarían un carajo un millón de medios niños.
- ¡Cállate, Jim! No has entendido lo que quiere decir; ¡leches!, te has quedado lejísimo de entenderlo.

- ¿Quién? ¿Yo? Vete por ahí... No me hables de lo que quiere decir. Sé ver el sentido común cuando lo hay, y no hay ninguno en hacer eso. El juicio era por un niño entero, no por medio niño. Hay que ser tonto de remate para querer resolver con medio niño un juicio por un niño entero. No me hables de Salomón, Huck, que me lo conozco muy bien.
- Pero que te digo que no entiendes lo que quiere decir.
- ¡Que le den por saco a lo que quiere decir! Yo sé lo que sé. Y que lo sepas, lo que de verdad quiere decir va más allá, es más profundo. Viene de cómo educaron a Salomón. Coge a un hombre que solo tiene un hijo o dos, ¿tú crees que va a desperdiciarlos? No, porque no se lo puede permitir y sabe lo que valen. Pero coge a un hombre que tenga como cinco millones de niños correteando por la casa y ya no es lo mismo. Lo mismo le da partir en dos un niño que un gato, que tiene muchos más. Perder un niño o dos le daba igual al despreciable Salomón.

Nunca he visto un negro igual. Como se le metiera una idea en la cabeza no había forma de sacársela. Detestaba más a Salomón que cualquier negro que haya conocido.



### 6.3.- Source Text and Target Texts 3

#### Source Text 3

*The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Chapter 14, pp. 83-84

‘Why, Huck, doan’ de French people talk de same way we does?’

‘No, Jim; you couldn’t understand a word they said – not a single word.’

‘Well, now, I be ding-busted! How do dat come?’

‘I don’t know; but it’s so. I got some of their jabber out of a book. S’pose a man was to come to you and say *Polly-voo-franz y* – what would you think?’

‘I wouldn’t think nuff’n; I’d take en bust him over de head. Dat is, if he warn’t white. I wouldn’t ‘low no nigger to call me dat.’

‘Shucks, it ain’t calling you anything. It’s only saying do you know how to talk French.’

‘Well, den, why couldn’t he *say* it?’

‘Why, he *is* a-saying it. That’s a Frenchman’s *way* of saying it.’

‘Well, it’s a blame’ ridicklous way, en I doan’ want to hear no mo’ ‘bout it. Dey ain’ no sense in it.’

‘Looky here, Jim; does a cat talk like we do?’

‘No, a cat don’t’

‘Well, does a cow?’

‘No, a cow don’t, nuther’

‘Does a cat talk like a cow, or a cow talk like a cat?’

‘No, dey don’t’

‘It’s natural and right for ‘em to talk different from each other, ain’t it?’

‘‘Course’

‘And ain’t it natural and right for a cat and a cow to talk different from *us*?’

‘Why, mos’ sholy it is.’

‘Well, then, why ain’t it natural and right for a *Frenchman* to talk different from us? You answer me that.’

‘Is a cat a man, Huck?’

‘No.’

‘Well, den, dey ain’t no sense in a cat talkin’ like a man. Is a cow a man? – er is a cow a cat?’

‘No, she ain’t either of them’

‘Well, den, she ain’t got no business to talk like either one er the yuther of’em. Is a Frenchman a man?’

‘Yes.’

‘*Well*, den! Dad blame it, why doan’ he *talk* like a man? You answer me *dat*!’

I see it warn’t no use wasting words – you can’t learn a nigger to argue. So I quit.

### Target Text 1.3

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn; introducción de Carlos Rojas; traducción de F. Elías. Chapter XIV, pp. 99-100*

- ¿Cómo? ¿Es que los franceses no hablan lo mismo que nosotros?
- No, Jim; no se puede entender ni una palabra de lo que dicen, ni una sola.
- ¡Eso sí que me extraña! ¿Cómo es eso?
- No lo sé, pero es así. En un libro aprendí algo de su jergonza [(farfullar)]. Supón que un hombre se te acerca y te dice: *Parlé vu francé*? ¿Qué pensarías que quiere decir?
- No pensaría nada; le contestaría a puñetazos. Y eso si no era blanco, porque supongo que solamente un negro podría llamarle una cosa así.
- ¡Bobo! No te llamaría nada; te preguntaría simplemente si sabías hablar francés.

- Pero, ¿por qué no lo podía decir?
- Si es que estaría diciéndotelo. Es la manera francesa de decirlo.
- Pues es una manera diabólicamente ridícula y no quiero saber nada más de ella.  
No tiene sentido.
- Fíjate, Jim: ¿un gato habla igual que nosotros?
- No.
- ¿Y una vaca habla como nosotros?
- Tampoco.
- ¿Hablan los gatos igual que las vacas o las vacas igual que los gatos?
- No.
- Sin embargo, es natural que hablen de distinta manera, ¿no es verdad?
- Por supuesto.
- ¿Y no es natural que un gato o una vaca hablen diferente que nosotros?
- Claro que sí.
- Bien, entonces, ¿por qué no es natural y lógico que un francés hable distinto que nosotros?
- Oiga, amito: ¿un hombre es un gato?
- No.
- Luego no tendría sentido que un gato hablara igual que un hombre. Bueno... ¿Y una vaca es un hombre o un gato?
- No, no es ni un gato ni un hombre.
- Entonces no tiene nada de particular que no hable como ninguno de los dos.
- Claro.
- ¿Y un francés es un hombre?
- Sí.

- Bien, ¿y?... Maldito sea, ¿por qué no habla como un hombre? Contésteme a *esto*.

Comprendía que era inútil malgastar palabras. Es imposible enseñar a un negro a que razone. Y por eso le dejé.

### Target Text 2.3

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn*. (J.A. de Larrinaga, Trans.) Chapter I, pp. 135-137

—Pero, Huck, ¿no hablan los franceses de la misma manera que nosotros?

—No, Jim; no entenderías ni una palabra de lo que dicen... ni una sola palabra.

—¡Hombre! ¡Ahora sí que me has matado! ¿Cómo es eso?

—Yo no lo sé, pero es así. Saqué de un libro algo de su jerigonza. Suponte que se te acerca un hombre y te dice «Palebufransé»... ¿qué pensarías tú?

—No pensaría nada. Le daría de lleno en la coronilla. Es decir, si no fuera un blanco.

A ningún negro le consentiría que me llamara eso.

—Pero ¡si eso no es llamarte nada! Solo es preguntarte.

—Pues entonces, ¿por qué no podía decirlo?

—Pero ¡si lo dice! Esa es la manera francesa de decirlo.

—Pues me parece una manera absurda y no quiero oír hablar más de ella. No tiene sentido común.

—Escucha, Jim: ¿habla un gato como nosotros?

—No; un gato, no.

—Bueno, ¿y una vaca?

—No; una vaca, tampoco.

—¿Habla un gato como una vaca o una vaca como un gato?

—No, señor.

—Es natural y está bien que hablen diferente uno de otro, ¿verdad?

—Claro.

—¿Y no es natural y no está bien que un gato y una vaca hablen de distinta manera a la nuestra?

—Pues claro que sí, naturalmente.

—Pues entonces, ¿por qué no es natural y no está bien que un francés hable de diferente manera que nosotros? Contéstame a eso.

—¿Es un gato un hombre, Huck?

—No.

—Pues entonces, no es de sentido común que un gato hable como un hombre. ¿Es una vaca un hombre?... ¿O es una vaca un gato?

—No; ninguna de las dos cosas.

—Pues entonces, tampoco tiene derecho a hablar como ninguno de los dos. ¿Es un francés un hombre?

—Sí.

—¡Pues entonces! ¡Qué rayos! ¿Por qué no habla como un hombre? ¡Contéstame tú a eso!

Comprendí que gastarían la saliva en vano. Es inútil querer enseñar a un negro a discutir.

De modo que me di por vencido.

### Target Text 3.3

*Huckleberry Finn: edición anotada.* (M. J. Martín Pinto, Trans.) Chapter XIV, pp. 156-

158

- ¿Y eso? ¿Es que los franceses no hablan igual que nosotros?
- No, Jim. No entenderías ni una palabra de lo que dijeran; ni una sola palabra.
- ¡Pero, bueno, que me cuelguen! ¿Y cómo es eso?

- No lo sé, pero es así. Saqué de un libro algunas de las cosas que chapurrean. Imagínate que se te acerca un hombre y te dice «parlé-vú-fransé», ¿qué pensarías?
- Pues no pensaría nada; le daría un golpe en la cabeza si no fuera blanco, claro. No permitiría que ningún negro me llamara eso.
- Cáscaras, no te está llamando nada. Es para decir, ¿sabes hablar francés?
- Y entonces, ¿por qué no lo *dice*?
- Pero es que lo *está* diciendo. Esa es la *manera* de decirlo en francés.
- Pues es una manera completamente ridícula y no quiero oír hablar más de esto. No tiene ningún sentido.
- Mira, Jim. ¿Hablan los gatos como nosotros?
- No, los gatos no.
- ¿Y las vacas?
- No, las vacas tampoco.
- ¿Los gatos hablan como las vacas, o las vacas como los gatos?
- No.
- Es normal y natural que hablen de forma diferente unos de otros, ¿no?
- Por supuesto.
- ¿Y no es normal y natural que los gatos y las vacas hablen de forma diferente a *nosotros*?
- Pues, por supuesto que sí.
- Pues, entonces ¿por qué no es normal y natural que los *franceses* hablen de manera diferente a la nuestra? Contéstame a eso.
- ¿Los gatos son hombres, Huck?
- No.

- Pues, entonces, no tiene sentido que un gato hable como un hombre. ¿Las vacas som hombres?, y ¿son las vacas gatos?
- No, no lo son.
- Pues, entonces, no tienen por qué hablar ninguno de ellos como los otros. ¿Los franceses son hombres?
- Sí.
- ¡Pues, entonces! Maldita sea, ¿por qué no *hablan* como los hombres? ¡Contéstame *tú a eso!*

Vi que no tenía sentido malgastar más palabras; no se le puede enseñar a un negro a discutir. Así que lo dejé.

### Target Text 4.3

Own translation.

- ¿Y eso, Huck? ¿Los franceses no hablan igual que nosotros?
- No, Jim. No entenderías nada de lo que dijeran... ni una sola palabra.
- ¡Pero, bueno, que me cuelguen! ¿Y cómo puede ser?
- No lo sé, pero así es. Aprendí en un libro algo de lo que farfullan. Imagina que se te acerca un hombre y te dice «¿parlé-vú-fransé?», ¿qué pensarías?
- No pensaría nada, le metería un puñetazo. Si no fuera blanco, claro. No consentiría que ningún negro me llamara eso.
- ¡Bobo! No te estaría llamando nada, solo te pregunta si sabes hablar francés.
- Pues, ¿por qué no lo dice?
- Pero si lo está diciendo, es la manera francesa de decirlo.
- Pues es una manera absurdamente ridícula y no quiero oír más del tema. No tiene sentido.

- Mira, Jim. ¿Los gatos hablan como nosotros?
- No.
- Vale, ¿y las vacas?
- Tampoco.
- ¿Hablan los gatos como las vacas, o las vacas como los gatos?
- No.
- Es normal y está bien que hablen diferente unos de otros, ¿no?
- Claro.
- Y es normal y está bien que los gatos y las vacas hablen de forma diferente a nosotros. ¿A que sí?
- Por supuesto.
- Vale, entonces contéstame a esta pregunta: ¿por qué no es normal y está bien que los franceses hablen de forma diferente a nosotros?
- ¿Los gatos son humanos, Huck?
- No.
- Vale, entonces no tiene ningún sentido que los gatos hablen como los humanos. ¿Las vacas son humanas? ¿O las vacas, gatos?
- Ninguna de las dos.
- Vale, entonces no tiene sentido que hablen como ninguno de los dos. ¿Los franceses son humanos?
- Sí.
- ¡Pues entonces! ¿Por qué demonios no hablan como humanos? ¡Contéstame tú a eso!

Entendí que iba a ser inútil malgastar saliva; no puedes enseñar a un negro a debatir, así que lo dejé.



## 6.4.- Source Text and Target Texts 4

### Source Text 4

*The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Chapter 16, p. 95

Well, the, says I, what's the use you learning to do right, when it's troublesome to do right and ain't no trouble to do wrong, and the wages is just the same? I was stuck. I couldn't answer that. So I reckoned I wouldn't bother no more about it, but after this always do whichever comes handiest at the time.

### Target Text 1.4

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn; introducción de Carlos Rojas; traducción de F. Elías*. Chapter XVI, p. 114

Entonces ¿de qué sirve obrar bien, si obrar bien es desagradable y obrar mal no lo es, y si los resultados son los mismos?». Me quedé atónito. No podía contestar a esta pregunta. Decidí, pues, no preocuparme y hacer siempre lo que tuviera más a mano.

### Target Text 2.4

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn*. (J.A. de Larrinaga, Trans.) Chapter XVI, p. 152

¿para qué ha de servir aprender a obrar bien cuando el hacer bien es fastidioso y no cuesta ningún trabajo obrar mal y el premio es el mismo en los dos casos?». Encallé. No podía contestar a eso. De modo que decidí no preocuparme más de ello y en adelante hacer lo que fuera más sencillo cuando se presentara el caso.

### **Target Text 3.4**

*Huckleberry Finn: edición anotada.* (M. J. Martín Pinto, Trans.) Chapter XVI, p. 174

Bueno, pues entonces, me dije, ¿de qué sirve aprender a hacer lo correcto cuando es difícil hacer lo correcto y no cuesta nada hacer las cosas mal, y al final lo mismo te da? No tenía ni idea; no tenía respuesta para eso, así que decidí que no me iba a preocupar más por eso y que, después de esto, siempre haría lo que mejor me viniera en cada momento.

### **Target Text 4.4**

Own translation

¿Y para qué sirve aprender a hacer el bien, cuando es difícil hacerlo, no cuesta nada hacer el mal, y recibes lo mismo por ambas? Me quedé bloqueado y no podía contestar a eso. Así que decidí no volver a preocuparme por eso y hacer siempre lo que me convenga en cada momento.

## 6.5.- Source Text and Target Texts 5

### Source Text 5

*The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Chapter 18, p. 112

...there warn't anybody at the church, except maybe a hog or two, for there warn't any lock on the door, and hogs like a puncheon floor in summer-time because it's cool. If you notice, most folks don't go to church only when they've got to; but a hog is different.

### Target Text 1.5

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn; introducción de Carlos Rojas; traducción de F. Elías*. Chapter XVIII, p. 136

Me deslicé, pues, hasta la carretera y fui a la iglesia, que estaba desierta, excepto un par de lechones que suelen entrar allí, en verano, porque se está más fresco. Además, la puerta no se cierra nunca.

### Target Text 2.5

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn*. (J.A. de Larrinaga, Trans.) Chapter XVIII, p. 174

De modo que salí y marché carretera arriba, y no había nadie en la iglesia, como no fuera un cerdo o dos, porque la puerta estaba sin cerradura y a los cerdos les gusta el piso de madera en verano, porque está fresco. Si os fijáis, la mayoría de la gente solo va a la iglesia cuando tiene la obligación de hacerlo, pero en el caso de los cerdos es distinto.

### Target Text 3.5

*Huckleberry Finn: edición anotada*. (M. J. Martín Pinto, Trans.) Chapter XVIII, p. 210

No había nadie en la iglesia, menos un cerdo o quizá dos, porque la puerta no tenía cerradura, y a los cerdos les gustan los suelos de tablones de madera en verano porque

están frescos. Si te das cuenta, la mayoría de las personas no van a la iglesia más que cuando tienen que hacerlo; pero los cerdos son diferentes.

### **Target Text 4.5**

Own translation

No había nadie en la iglesia, salvo quizás un cerdo o dos, ya que la puerta no tenía cerradura y a los cerdos les gusta el suelo de madera en verano porque está fresco. Si te fijas, la mayoría de la gente solo va a la iglesia por obligación, pero los cerdos son diferentes.

## 6.6.- Source Text and Target Texts 6

### Source Text 6

*The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Chapter 19, p. 125

‘Looky here, Bilgewater,’ he says, ‘I’m nation sorry for you, but you ain’t the only person that’s had troubles like that.’

‘No?’

‘No, you ain’t. You ain’t the only that’s ben snaked down wrongfully out’n a high place.’

### Target Text 1.6

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn; introducción de Carlos Rojas; traducción de F. Elías*. Chapter XIX, p. 152

- Oiga, Bridgewater: lo siento por usted, pero no es la única persona a la cual han sucedido cosas como ésas...
- ¿No?
- No; no lo es. Usted no es la única persona que ha sido derribada de una alta condición.

### Target Text 2.6

*Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn*. (J.A. de Larrinaga, Trans.) Chapter XIX, p. 190

—Mire, Bilgewater,[4] le compadezco enormemente, pero no es usted la única persona que ha sufrido penalidades de esa índole.

—¿No?

—No, señor. No es usted la única persona a la que han derribado, rastrera e injustamente, de un puesto elevado.

[4]: Juego de palabras: Bridgewater significa «agua del puente» y Bilgewater, «agua de sentina». (N. del T.)

### Target Text 3.6

*Huckleberry Finn: edición anotada.* (M. J. Martín Pinto, Trans.) Chapter XIX, p. 232

- Mira, *Bilgewater*<sup>43</sup> -dice-. Lo siento muchísimo por ti, pero tú no eres la única persona que ha tenido ese tipo de problemas.
- ¿No?
- No. No eres la única persona al a que han arruinado privándola injustamente de una posición elevada.

43. *Bilgewater*. El agua pestilente y nociva que se acumula en el fondo del pantoque o casco de un barco. H. L. Mencken en *The American Language* (1963) definió «bilge» como ‘sandeces’.

### Target Text 4.6

Own translation

- Mire, *Bilgewater*<sup>n</sup> -dice-. Lo siento muchísimo, pero usted no es la única persona que ha tenido problemas de ese tipo.
- ¿No?
- No, señor. Usted no es el único al que han privado injustamente de una posición elevada.

N. Juego de palabras: *Bridgewater* significa «agua de puente», *Bilgewater*, «agua hedionda estancada en la parte inferior de una nave» y *bilge*, “sin sentido”.