

https://dspace.org/

Albert Camus' Les justes: a descriptive approach to the analysis of a drama text in translation.

Hudson, Joanna L

2015-02-06
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/16904

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

in the reversed order: 'being ashamed for twenty years... I couldn't stand it'.

Foka's reply to this is again expanded in the TT into fuller and more explicit sentences. Lines 36 and 37 of the ST 'La honte? Quelle honte? Enfin, ce sont des idées de barine' are changed in lines 37 and 38 of the TT to 'what yer mean ashamed? That's just the sort of thing a gentleman like you would say'. The elocutionary shifts resulting in the lower class sociolect are due to corresponding shifts on the lexico-semantic, stylistic and graphic levels.

Foka's interlocutory question 'Que disais-tu ?' in line 39 of the ST is replaced by 'Only one?' in line 41 of the TT, for once introducing a repetition into the text which was not in the ST.

The Grand-dukes's name in line 40 of the ST has been omitted in line 42 of the TT.

Lines 43 and 44 of the TT are again a fuller and more explicit rendition of 'Voyez-vous ces barines! C'est grave, dis-moi?' in lines 41 and 42 of the ST.

The impersonal use of 'falloir' and the pronoun 'le' in line 43 of the ST, are, in line 45 of the TT, changed to an active construction with the introduction of the deictic 'I', and the noun phrase is again reproduced in full: 'but I had to do it'.

The phrase in lines 44 and 45 of the ST 'Une histoire de femme, non?' is reduced to the simple 'A woman, eh?' in line 46 of the TT. The

interlocutory 'Was that it' is added to the TT in line 46 to reinforce the strong presence of spoken language elements. The final sentence of the ST in Foka's speech, line 45, 'Bien fait comme tu l'es...' is changed in line 47 of the TT to the colloquial 'Yeh...a good-looking young lad like you...', thus making more explicit what was merely suggested in the ST. The elocutionary shifts are once again evident in the attempt to use a specific sociolect.

The seventh and final passage to be analysed (Appendix H) is taken from Act V, during the closing moments of the play; Voinov and Stepan have just returned with the news of Kaliayev's execution.

The two short sentences in line 1 of the ST have been reduced to one longer one in line 1 of the TT. The verb 'monter' has been expanded in the TT to 'climbed the steps'. In line 2 of the TT, the general but personal construction using 'you' has replaced the use of the impersonal 'on' in line 1 of the ST: this semantic shift is obligatory in terms of the norms of the target language. Lines 2 and 3 of the TT have been expanded slightly to clarify the sense of 'le bourreau l'a recouvert tout entier' in lines 2 and 3 of the ST.

The immediate succession of 'Et puis, et puis...' in line 4 of the ST has been syntactically shifted to form two distinct questions which are separated by pauses in line 4 of the TT. By changing the line into two separate questions, a reluctance to reply is implied on Stepan's side, which is not implied in this line in the ST.

Line 7 of the ST 'Ensuite, te dis-je' has been considerably expanded in lines 7 and 8 of the TT: 'Tell me what happened next!...go on...'. Stepan's reluctance is shown here by the parasyntactic use of the three points of suspension (...) to indicate pauses where Dora waits for a reply. The change from the imperative 'Parle' in line 7 of the ST to '*You* tell me' in line 8 of the TT is obligatory as 'Speak!' is not a usual command in the target language .

The addition of the points of suspension in line 10 of the TT 'A...a horrible thud' implies a hesitation in Voinov's speech which is not evident in line 9 of the ST.

In line 13 of the TT, the addition of 'our' causes Dora's line to refer directly to the group, whereas the use of the determiner 'la' in line 12 of the ST gives the line a more general application. Lines 13 and 14 of the ST have been lexico-semantically changed in lines 13 and 14 of the TT to 'the testimony of us revolutionaries'. In line 16 of the TT, the adjective 'horrible' has been omitted to lessen the repetition; this is a stylistic shift. The shift from the singular 'la joie' in line 17 of the ST to the plural 'joys' in line 17 of the TT is obligatory in terms of normal target language usage. The use of the auxiliary verb 'devoir' in lines 19 and 20 of the ST to indicate the probable truth of the statement, has been omitted in line 19 of the TT where the statement is made definite through the use of the present continuous tense of 'to laugh'. This definite statement is further supported by the addition of the deictic phrase 'I know he is' in line 20 of the ST which also adds a personal perspective not present at this point in the ST.

By placing the question mark after 'Boria' in line 21 of the TT, the translator has emphasized the 'spoken language' component of this line. When Dora continues 'you are my brother' and then 'you'll help me', the implication is that she has received some non-verbal indication of agreement; the paralinguistic use of the three points of suspension (...) to indicate slight pauses also gives this impression. The reference in line 21 of the ST to an earlier conversation between Annenkov and Dora 'Tu as dit que' is omitted in line 22 of the TT. The tense has been changed in the TT to the future from the conditional tense used in the ST, and the sentence is a statement in the TT, and a question in the ST.

Annenkov's reply, a simple 'Oui' in line 23 of the ST, has been expanded in line 23 of the TT to become strongly affirmative: 'Yes of course I will'. All of the above are primarily stylistic shifts.

There is a lexico-semantic shift in line 24 of the TT, where line 24 of the ST, 'Donne-moi la bombe' has been changed to 'let me throw the bomb', thus making explicit Dora's aim.

The pronoun 'la' in line 25 of the ST has been replaced by the full noun phrase in lines 25 and 26 of the TT: 'I want to throw the bomb'. In the sentence immediately following, however, the pronoun has been preserved in the English.

Lines 27 and 28 of the ST have been greatly changed in the TT. The reminder that 'Tu sais bien que' is omitted, and the verb 'vouloir' has been changed to the more restrictive 'let' in the TT. The locative phrase 'au premier rang', meaning in 'the front line (of action)', has been changed in line 27 of the TT to a phrase of action: 'throw the bombs'.

The single imperative 'Accepte' in lines 30, 31 and 33 of the ST has been changed to 'Let her' in lines 29, 30 and 32 of the TT: this is a lexical shift.

The change in tense in line 31 of the TT from the imperfect, used in line 32 of the ST, to the present tense alters the implication. By using the past tense, Annenkov shows that he has already agreed to Dora's request, although he has not yet said so. This implication is not present in the TT due to the change of tense.

The lexical change made in line 24 of the TT is retained in line 34, where line 34 of the ST, 'Tu me la donneras, n'est-ce pas?', is altered to 'You will let me, won't you?'.

Annenkov's reply of 'Oui, Dora' in line 36 of the ST, is repositioned in the TT to follow immediately after Dora's question 'You will let me, won't you?' in line 34. The two lines which should come before Annenkov's 'Yes Dora' (line 35) are added to Dora's last lines. The use of the pronoun 'la' in line 34 of the ST is reproduced as the noun phrase which it stands for in line 36 of the TT: 'I shall throw the bomb'.

During this detailed analysis of these seven passages, 276 shifts were noted, of which only twenty one were obligatory in terms of the norms of target language usage (for example, the use of constructions with 'on' or 'falloir'). The majority of these shifts (33%) are stylistic, while 23% are lexico-semantic. Syntactic and deictic shifts each comprise 10%, and 7% of the shifts noted are purely semantic. Elocutionary and lexical shifts

make up 6% each, and the the remaining 5% are graphic, connotative and cultural shifts.

Certain recurring features became evident during this analysis. The use of a pronoun for a noun phrase referred to in a previous line is usually reproduced in full. Although many of the deictic shifts that were noted resulted from obligatory shifts, many were made for stylistic reasons, to increase or emphasize the personal aspect within a line for example. The majority of the shifts are lexico-semantic ones made for stylistic purposes, although there are also several elocutionary shifts in part of Act IV, where a sociolect has been introduced into the text. The translator seems to have made a conscious attempt to decrease specific references made to particularly Russian or Socialist elements. Some further examples will now be given, in order to see if the changes noted in this micro-structural analysis have been made consistently throughout the play.

Numerous changes were found in references made to the Socialist Revolutionary party. In Act I, Stepan states that:

> Le parti socialiste révolutionnaire a besoin d'une discipline. (ST: 16)

In the translation, however, this reference has been altered:

> The Socialist Revolution must have discipline. (TT: 124)

This change makes the statement more general in the TT, as the reference to the group's status as members of a particular political party is omitted.

There is another change in Act I:

ANNENKOV
Toute la Russie saura que le grand-duc Serge a été exécuté à la bombe par le groupe de combat du parti socialiste révolutionnaire pour hâter la libération du peuple russe. (ST: 17)

In the translation, 'le groupe de combat' which is the actual name of the group in the play is omitted:

ANNENKOV: All Russia shall know that the Socialist Revolutionary party has killed the Grand-duke Sergei to hasten the liberation of the Russian people. (TT: 124)

Although the 'party' reference has been included here, the omission of the group's name again generalises the statement and reduces the impact caused in the ST by the revelation of the group's particular function - political assassination.

One of these changes is a connotative shift. Annenkov refers to 'le Comité Central' (ST: 18), but this is translated as 'Headquarters' (TT: 125). 'Central committee' is an accepted concept of communist party organisation, and in this play it therefore connotes revolution, a successful change from the czarist regime to a socialist system of government sometime in the future. By changing this to 'Headquarters' in the TT, the ST-specific connotation is lost, as 'Headquarters' has only the general connotation of 'higher authority' or 'central meeting place'.

The noun 'camarade' in the ST could be translated as 'friend' or as the more politically connotative 'comrade', which, given the Russian, socialist setting of this play, is appropriate. In the TT, however, the translator has selected 'friend'. In Act I, for example, Stepan asks:

Qui sont nos camarades? (ST: 18)

which is translated as:

> Who are our friends here? (TT: 125)

The reference to 'Saint-Pétersbourg' (ST: 23), also in Act I, has been changed to 'Petrograd' (TT: 126) in the translation. As St Petersburg only became known as Petrograd in 1914, and as at the beginning of the TT there is a line introducing the setting of the play: 'The action takes place in Moscow. The year - 1906' (TT: 122), this shift is difficult to explain.

In Act II, when the rest of the group decide that they too would have spared the children as Kaliayev did, Annenkov makes this an official order by referring to the Organization when he informs Stepan of the decision:

> L'Organisation décide que le meurtre de ces enfants est inutile. (ST: 67)

In the TT, however, the reference to the Organization has been omitted, and the deictic 'we' has been substituted, thus removing the official element and emphasizing the personal aspect of the decision:

> We've decided that slaughtering these children will serve no purpose. (TT: 144)

The treatment of 'frère' in various TT passages has already been noted in previous analysis. Several other examples were found. In Act I, when Kaliayev arrives, he welcomes Stepan with the words:

> Sois le bienvenu, frère. (ST: 25)

In the TT, however, 'frère' has been omitted and Stepan's name has been substituted:

> Welcome Stepan! (TT: 127)

In one of Kaliayev's speeches in Act I, he refers to his fellow members as 'frères', and this has been preserved in the TT:

> J'ai tout quitté pour l'Organisation. Comment supporter que mes frères détournent de moi? (ST: 35)
>
> I've sacrificed everything for the Organization and I couldn't bear it if my brothers turned away from me. (TT: 131)

In Act II, 'frère' is again used in the plural in the ST, but is omitted altogether in the TT:

> KALIAYEV
> Regardez-moi, frères, regarde-moi, Boria, je ne suis pas un lâche, je n'ai pas reculé. (ST: 55)
>
> KALIAYEV: Yes, look at me...go on, look at me!...but I'm no coward! I didn't falter, Boria! (TT: 138)

In Act IV, Kaliayev is explaining to Foka that one day they will be equal:

> Nous serons tous frères et la justice rendra nos coeurs transparents. (ST: 102)
>
> We'll all be brothers...and justice will make our hearts pure and innocent. (TT: 158)

A little later, however, he refers directly to Foka as 'frère', and this is omitted in the TT:

> Il ne faut pas dire cela, frère. Dieu ne peut rien. (ST: 102)
>
> No, it's not that!...God can do nothing! (TT: 158)

In the same scene, Foka, in the ST, refers to Kaliayev's use of the term 'frère' and this has been preserved in the TT:

> Parce que tu ne peux pas me parler comme un frère. C'est moi qui pends les condamnés. (ST: 105)
>
> Well, all this talk about you and me being brothers, isn't any use...I'm the hangman... (TT: 159)

The TT line in the above example has been altered to accord with the previous use of 'brothers' in the TT. Whereas the ST line 'tu ne peux pas me parler comme un frère' refers to the fact that Kaliayev addressed Foka as 'frère', this usage was omitted in the TT, so the line has been changed to refer to Kaliayev's account of how he and Foka would one day be equal 'we'll all be brothers', where 'brothers' *was* used in the TT.

The use of noun phrases in the TT where pronouns were used in the ST was found to be fairly consistent throughout the text. In Act I, for example, Stepan asks Dora how many bombs would be necessary to blow up Moscow; in the ST the pronoun 'en' is used, but the noun 'bombs' is repeated in the TT:

STEPAN
Combien en faudrait-il pour faire sauter Moscou? (ST: 20)

STEPAN: How many bombs would it take to blow up Moscow? (TT: 125)

In Act III, there is another example of repetition of a phrase in the TT, which in the ST was represented by a pronoun:

KALIAYEV
Je serais désespéré.

DORA
Et maintenant, ne l'es-tu pas? (ST: 82)

KALIAYEV: I'd be desperate.

DORA: *Aren't* you desperate? (TT: 150)

In Act IV, Skouratov informs Kaliayev that the Grand-duchess insists on seeing him; the pronoun used in Skouratov's line in the ST is expanded into a phrase in the TT:

KALIAYEV

Je ne veux pas la voir.

SKOURATOV

Je regrette, elle y tient. (ST: 115)

KALIAYEV: I refuse to see her!

SKOURATOV: I'm sorry, but she insists on seeing you. (TT: 163)

The following extract from Act I shows clearly how the introduction of deictics into the TT emphasizes the personal involvement of the group far more than is apparent from the ST, where the sentence constructions are impersonal. Although the changes from the use of 'falloir' are obligatory shifts in terms of the target language norms, the shifts from abstract nouns in the ST to finite verbs in the TT are optional:

KALIAYEV

Le grand-duc, ce n'est rien. Il faut frapper plus haut!

ANNENKOV

D'abord le grand-duc.

KALIAYEV

Et si c'est un échec, Boria? Vois-tu, il faudrait imiter les Japonais. (ST: 31)

KALIAYEV: But, of course, the Grand-duke is nothing...we must strike higher.

ANNENKOV: But we must start with the Grand-duke.

KALIAYEV: And suppose we fail, Boria...then we must do what the Japanese did. (TT: 129)

It would seem, from these individual examples, that the most common shifts identified in the analysis of the seven passages occur consistently throughout the text. Where the norms of the target language necessitated shifts in the TT, personal deictics such as 'I', 'we' and 'you' were used, thus emphasizing personal viewpoints and actions. The translator, when faced with the choice of a personal or impersonal construction, usually

selected the personal, which is less formal in English and hence more commonly found in informal speech situations such as those in the play. An attempt was made throughout the TT to clarify the sense of ST lines, so that relatively little ambiguity exists. A definite attempt to decrease and generalize socialist and communist references was noted. Finally it was discovered that 'frère' was only translated as 'brother' in the TT when it was used in an indirect manner. Whenever 'frère' was used in direct address in the ST, it was omitted or replaced with a proper name in the TT.

From this micro-structural data it can be seen that the majority of the shifts noted are either stylistic or lexico-semantic, and the lines of dialogue have not been rearranged or substantially altered in the translation. As was noted in the macro-structural analysis, the translator has attempted to clarify ambiguities, either by repeating noun phrases rather than using pronouns, or by expanding upon the ST lines where the sentence construction is peculiar to the French language or where ellipsis is used. A major shift, noted in Act IV, is the introduction of a lower class sociolect into Foka's speech. Although accents in speech are often more indicative of a specific sociolect in French, there is no indication in either the stage directions or the lines of dialogue of the ST that Foka uses a different accent or sociolect to Kaliayev. The translator evidently felt that it was a contradiction in terms for Foka, who was obviously of a lower social class than Kaliayev, to speak in the same grammatically correct and erudite manner, and therefore introduced specific lower class sociolectal elements into Foka's speech, once more making his own personal interpretation of the ST into specific directions in the TT. Although a large number of shifts were noted, none of them altered the content of the lines to any great extent, but rather changed the manner of ex-

pression in order to conform with conventional speech patterns in the target language. The language level in the TT was often found to be less formal than in the ST, but was still in keeping with the situations in the play. Therefore, although no major changes were made to the actual content and order of the lines of dialogue, the shifts did affect the manner of expression and various elements typical of spoken language were introduced. This indicates that the translator was aware of the possibility of the performance of the work, and thus approached it as a dramatic text.

CONCLUSION

Having completed the textual analysis of the play and its translation, the systemic context can now be considered. As previously stressed, the intertexual and intersystemic relations forming part of Lambert and Van Gorp's final section will not be discussed here as they go beyond the scope of this project. The data collected during the preliminary, macro- and micro-structural levels of analysis will now be reviewed and compared, in order to establish the approach taken by the translator, Henry Jones, in his translation of *Les Justes*.

Before the analysis of the two texts was begun, it was hypothesized that the translation would have been approached as a literary text because of Camus' status as a respected literary figure, and that the successful performance of Jones' translation by PACT would have been due to Camus' style of writing. The preliminary data revealed that *The Just* was acknowledged as a translation, but that the preface and epigraph in the original had been omitted. Data was then collected on the macro-structural level, where it was established that the format of the TT, although different from that of the ST, conformed with the accepted conventions of script presentation in the target culture. The stage directions were also examined in detail in this section, using the semiotic component incorporated into Lambert and Van Gorp's scheme for this purpose. Analysis showed that a great many of the stage directions were altered, added or omitted in the TT, these representing an attempt by the translator to make explicit what he felt was implicit in the text. Where the content of the dialogue seemed to indicate a pause or a particular

action, this was often added to the TT as a specific stage direction. Similarly, the emphasis within a sentence which was unmarked in the ST was invariably shown in the TT by the use of italics, the translator again showing the way he felt a line should be said by the use of specific notation in the TT. The same applied to the use of the three points of suspension (...) to indicate brief pauses or hesitations. Where possible ambiguities were present in the stage directions of the ST (for example, the omission of certain 'exit' directions), the translator attempted to clarify them by incorporating additional directions into the TT. An interesting shift noted in this section was the translator's treatment of the stage property 'icon', which was replaced in the TT by 'prie-dieu'.

After the macro-structural level of analysis was completed, it was concluded that the translation of the stage directions had been approached as part of a text to be performed. Had Henry Jones approached the text as one only to be read, he would not have found it necessary to add to, clarify or alter the stage directions to the extent indicated by this level of analysis. It was therefore concluded that in his translation of the stage directions, Jones used the strategy constituting Bassnett-McGuire's third category, that is, he took into account the performance dimension of the text.

No major oppositions were found between the data collected on the macro- and micro-structural levels of analysis. On the micro-level, numerous passages from the play were selected and analysed, and the data collected was then compared to further examples taken from the remainder of the text. This analysis revealed certain consistent shifts made by the translator. As was also found at the macro-level, the translator attempted to remove possible ambiguities from the dialogue by reproducing ellipses

and pronouns in their full form in the TT. Repetition of phrases in the ST was avoided in the TT, or at least reduced. Short sentences in the ST were combined into longer sentences in the TT, and additional elements were included in short ST clauses; these shifts conform to standard target language usage, where very short sentences are unusual. Although not affecting the meaning of the original, elements typical of spoken language were often introduced into the TT by the translator. A major shift noted at this level was the addition of the lower class sociolect in Act IV. A study of the deictic shifts in the dialogue revealed that the translator, when confronted with passive or impersonal constructions in the source language , usually chose to translate these with personal constructions in the target language, thus markedly increasing the personal elements in the TT.

A very interesting shift made throughout the TT was the translator's treatment of specifically Russian or socialist references. As already noted in the macro-structural section, the typically Russian 'icon' was replaced by 'prie-dieu' in the TT. Study of the denotative and connotative shifts in the dialogue revealed several similar shifts: references to the Organization were often replaced by 'we', the reference to 'le groupe de combat' was omitted, Central Committee became 'Headquarters' and 'friend' was used in preference to 'comrade'. A possible reason for these shifts is the period during which the play was translated. Jones' translation was first published in 1965 in Great Britain, a time when the cold war was still a reality, and anti-Russian feeling was high due to the defection in 1963 of Kim Philby, the British spy, to the Soviet Union. The decreased number of communist references in the TT could therefore be due to a desire by the translator to give a more general context to the play so that it might be more readily accepted by British audiences. This

could explain the shift to 'Petrograd' in Act I as this is the least well-known of the three names given to this city[2]; it is therefore the least evocative of communist or soviet images. Further research into the target literary system and the situation of the target reader within this system would be necessary before a definite reason for these particular shifts could be given.

The increased number of stage directions in the TT, the attempt to clarify ambiguities and the increased number of personal references and elements typical of spoken language all indicate that the translator approached the text as a dramatic text to be performed. This view is supported by the addition of the lower class sociolect in Act IV; if the translator had approached the play as a literary work, this addition would have been unnecessary as the sense of the lines and hence the action of the play are not altered by the added sociolect.

The original hypothesis that the translator would have approached the play as a literary work has been disproved after detailed analysis of both the source and target texts. A clear attempt to treat the play as a dramatic work was discovered, and changes were found which altered and clarified actions and manners of speech and expression. No major changes were found to have been made to the order of the dialogue in the play nor to the action, perhaps out of respect here for Camus' literary status. It therefore seems that Jones approached *Les Justes* as a text to be performed, paying particular attention to the performance dimension of

---

[2] St Petersburg (1703-1914), Petrograd (1914-1924) and Leningrad (1924-).

Author Hudson Joanna
Name of thesis Albert Camus' Les Justes: A Descriptive Approach To The Analysis Of A Drama Text In Translation. 1988

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.