



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

Steinbeck's Representation of Dialect in *The Grapes of Wrath* and its Translations into Spanish: A Comparison

verfasst von / submitted by

Grad. Helena López Besora

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2023 / Vienna 2023

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

UA 066 870

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. ao. Univ.-Prof. i.R. Dr. Norbert Bachleitner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	6
II. LANGUAGE VARIATION	7
2.1. SOCIOLINGUISTICS	8
2.2. DIALECTOLOGY	12
2.3. VERNACULAR ENGLISH.....	14
2.4. SPANISH DIALECTS IN SPAIN.....	18
2.5. VERNACULAR LANGUAGE IN LITERATURE	23
III. TRANSLATING NON-STANDARD LANGUAGE IN LITERATURE	30
3.1. TRANSLATION STRATEGIES	31
3.2. LOST IN TRANSLATION	35
IV. JOHN STEINBECK'S <i>THE GRAPES OF WRATH</i>	38
4.1. JOHN STEINBECK.....	38
4.2. <i>THE GRAPES OF WRATH</i>	42
4.3. STEINBECK'S LANGUAGE	47
V. <i>LAS UVAS DE LA IRA</i>	50
5.1. STEINBECK IN SPANISH.....	50
5.2. THE TRANSLATION BY HERNÁN GUERRA CANÉVARO	52
5.3. THE TRANSLATION BY MARÍA COY GIRÓN	53
5.4. THE TRANSLATION BY PILAR VÁZQUEZ ÁLVAREZ.....	55
VI. METHODOLOGY	58
VII. COMPARING THE THREE SPANISH TRANSLATIONS.....	60
7.1. ANALYSIS OF PASSAGE I	60
7.2. COMPARISON I	67
7.3. ANALYSIS OF PASSAGE II.....	69
7.4. COMPARISON II.....	79
7.5. ANALYSIS OF PASSAGE III	80
7.6. COMPARISON III.....	91
7.7. ANALYSIS OF PASSAGE IV	93
7.8. COMPARISON IV	105
7.9. RESULTS.....	107
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	108
IX. CITED WORKS	111
9.1. PRIMARY LITERATURE	111
9.2. SECONDARY LITERATURE	111
X. ABSTRACT.....	115
XI. ZUSAMMENFASSUNG.....	116

I. INTRODUCTION

Language reflects the variability of the human condition, and every language is shaped by a great number of factors. These can be classified, among others, according to the form of transmission, either oral or written; the different registers, formal, informal, slang, and vulgar (or frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate if using Joos classification developed in his book *The Five Clocks*); and its dialects, which can be divided in two great groups –social and geographical–, with many subdivisions within. The way we speak one tongue is the result of the sum of these and many other factors.

The reality of spoken language hasn't always been represented in written literature, especially in Spanish. However, there are some earlier works in English, for example by Sir Walter Scott or Charles Dickens, that do portray a more faithful representation of the oral speech. John Steinbeck was one of these authors who wanted to keep his characters and stories as real and natural as possible by means of the use of the vernacular in the figures' speeches.

In this thesis, I attempt to analyse Steinbeck's language, that is, how the Southern White Vernacular is used every time a character speaks. Even though we can see this usage of language in other works by Steinbeck, such as in *Of Mice and Men*, I will be taking *The Grapes of Wrath*, first published in 1939, as the object of study. This dialect will be analysed in comparison to Standard English –usually connected to the written standard form–, and General American –better related to the spoken language in USA, with markers that differentiate it from General English, associated with British English. The focus of my research will be the analysis of three translations of *The Grapes of Wrath* into Spanish, that is *Las uvas de la ira*, to assess how the three translators attempted (or not) to reflect the sociolect in their translations, and if they succeeded. In order to better analyse the resulting works of the Spanish translators, I will also reflect on what are common problems in the translation of dialects.

With this research, I will attempt to answer if the portrayal of spoken dialects is more common, accepted, and widespread in the English language than in Spanish. As mentioned, I will focus my research exclusively on the Southern White Vernacular English spoken in Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath*, characterised by its non-standard forms, and, to some extent, its incorrect use of grammar. To better illustrate my point, I will include some earlier examples. My hypothesis is that such non-standard forms, which are usually

markers of a dialect or a sociolect, are not so commonly represented in the written form in Spanish as they are in English.

Along the way, I will also ponder in the question of what the best approach to the translation of dialects is. Should the translator attempt to replace the variations of the original language with a dialect that represents a similar social value into the target language? Or is it better to avoid the use of dialect to reflect the social class of the characters and choose the standard language as a neutral solution?

In the Methodology chapter, I will offer a detailed explanation of what the steps for this research have been followed. Partly influenced by Tagliamonte's methodology, I will select four passages of *The Grapes of Wrath* with the highest presence of dialogues to narrow my research and to be able to provide a detailed analysis of the language variation, that is, the markers and features that allow us to identify the dialect. Taking the same four passages of the three translations, I will examine how the non-standard forms and the markers of the vernacular dialect have been conveyed into Spanish by each translator. Through the ensuing comparison, I will be able to recognise the differences in each translation and to reflect on their different approaches to translation.

To truly understand the nature of Steinbeck's language, I will frame the theoretical aspects of sociolinguistics and dialectology. I will start by diving into the basics: What is sociolinguistics? What are the differences between dialects, sociolects, or even registers? The following chapter will try to shed some light into these questions that will serve to better grasp the subtleties of a dialect so negatively regarded, stereotypically associated with low-class, poorly educated speakers. It will also give us an insight on Steinbeck's reasons to use the vernacular.

1.1. List of Abbreviations

Throughout the thesis, I will sporadically make use of some abbreviations to make the reading and understanding of certain aspects more agile and visual. Following the wording in Gramley (2020), I use the following abbreviations:

StE = Standard English

AAVE = African American Vernacular English

GenAm = General American

SWVE = Southern White Vernacular English

NStE = Nonstandard English

NStAmE = Nonstandard American English

AmE = American English

SAE = Southern American English

ST = Source Text

SL = Source Language

TT = Target Text

TL = Target Language

NSC = National Steinbeck Center

II. LANGUAGE VARIATION

This chapter will focus on the theoretical framework surrounding the branch of the science that studies language variation. I will start by offering an insight of the umbrella term under which dialectology is to be found: sociolinguistics. Next, I will examine what a dialect is and how it is to be differentiated from a sociolect, which will be followed by an examination of the different language variations in American English and in Castilian Spanish. I will give special attention to the Southern White Vernacular English, the variation that appears in Steinbeck's novel and one of the central objects of this study. It is important to note that the insights on sociolinguistics and dialectology are just a very broad and general overview of these fields of study, so there will be no mention of more detailed concepts such as isoglosses, diglossia, or dialect continuum because these are not essential for the framing of this study.

Before diving into the field of sociolinguistics, it is essential to recognise that language is never homogenous: it is constantly evolving, thus subject to language variation. In her article about the translation of linguistic variation, Rosa beautifully associates *language* with *place*:

At any given moment, language, therefore, is place, both physical and social. It expresses and creates, reinforces or changes the speaker's place, that portion of space allocated to or occupied by such a speaker, one's geographical and social place, socio- cultural allegiance, position, social station, function or role. (Rosa 2012: 77)

With this explanation, the understanding of language as an ever-evolving system is made clearer and more palpable. To visually accompany Rosa's explanation, we can find the concepts organised in the following table:

LINGUISTIC VARIABLES	CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES	TYPE OF VARIATION	LINGUISTIC VARIETIES
Phonetic and Phonological features (grouped in accents) Morphological, Syntactic, Semantic, and Lexical features (grouped in dialects)	TIME	DIACHRONIC VS. SYNCHRONIC	STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LANGUAGE
	PHYSICAL/GEOGRAPHICAL SPACE	REGIONAL	REGIONAL DIALECT or ACCENT
	SOCIAL SPACE	SOCIAL	SOCIAL DIALECT or ACCENT; SLANG; TECNOLECT
	INDIVIDUAL SPEAKER	INTERPERSONAL	IDIOLECT
	COMMUNICATIVE SITUATION	FUNCTIONAL	REGISTER

Figure 1. Linguistic Variation (Rosa 2012: 77)

2.1. Sociolinguistics

Let's start then, by clarifying what sociolinguistics is. As Spencer points out, "sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics which studies the ways in which language is integrated with human society". (Spencer 2010: vii) Differently to linguistics, which focuses on the study of language structure, sociolinguistics parts from the opposite assumption, that is, that language is not fundamentally homogenous, hence it should be studied within its social context. (Gordon 2013: 8) However, Labov argues that *sociolinguistics* is a redundant term, since linguistics and society are not independent from each other and that "language is a form of social behaviour". (Labov 1973: 183) According to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, it is "the study of the sociological aspects of language". ("Sociolinguistics") These sociological aspects can refer to a wide variety of factors, namely gender, social class, level of education, geographical area, ethnicity, and even social institutions, among others. Gramley associates language variation with group identity and adds that sociolinguistics also investigates "how variation in pronunciation, grammar, lexis, and pragmatics (communicative strategies, speech acts) correlates with membership in such groups and with the stance any given person is taking in the one or the other social situation." (Gramley, et al. 2020: 10-11) His words then show his correlation with the third wave of sociolinguistics, which I will discuss later.

As a field of study, sociolinguistics it was created in the 1960s, a beginning starkly marked by a conference on sociolinguistics at UCLA in 1964, where Labov attended while he was a PhD student, and a series of publications during the decade that proved the rise of interest in this 'new' discipline. (Gordon 2013: 11)

The existence of language variations can only be tied to the existence of a so-called standard form. Standard English (which I will also refer to as StE) is, technically speaking, a dialect, and is associated with a higher level of education and with a certain social status and correctness –also known as *linguistic prestige*. The StE is, then, correlated to the printed word, the language used in news broadcasts and taught in schools. (Gramley, et al. 2020: 7) Any deviation from this 'official' language, is said to be a variation and analysed as such. As we can see then, this form fits –or is designed to fit– a certain group in society, that is, a white, educated, middle- and upper-class pool of speakers. That is why people speaking and using a language that differs from the standard form are traditionally (and

mistakenly) thought to be from a lower class and to have a lower level of education –or even considered uncultured. Hence, language variations are negatively regarded and are highly stigmatised. In other words, this means that Standard English (or the standard form of the majority of languages, including Spanish) is starkly associated with power, “be it social, economic, institutional, or personal” (2020: 179) And this is the English we are taught to think of as the ‘correct English’. However, it is important to note that the StE is not connected to the differentiation of register, this means that it is not a static dialect, but also presents formal and colloquial forms.

Besides the Standard English, it is also worth mentioning the existence of General English. (which I will also refer to as GenE) General English is an umbrella term for different varieties of the language, including Standard English. This concept is used to refer to a “wide spectrum of varieties which are *widely used and understood*.¹ [...] If within the framework of GenE a speaker chooses a nonstandard variant, we can assume that they will be understood by other speakers of GenE” (2020: 8) Gramley also mentions how the choice of non-standard forms within the GenE –that is, NSGenE– could be regarded as a way of approaching or solidarizing with a certain group in society. (2020: 8)

Sociolinguistics owes a great deal to William Labov, an American linguist born in 1927, who has led the research of modern sociolinguistics and remains, nowadays, as the most quoted sociolinguist. He graduated from Harvard University in English and Philosophy and completed his master’s degree and PhD at Columbia University. (Gordon 2013: 5) He has dedicated great part of his work to the research of vernaculars –which is the central topic concerned in this study– and one of his biggest contributions to the field is the *Atlas of North American English*, which concluded that, against all odds, dialect diversity is increasing instead of decreasing. (Labov 2010: xxiv)

Sociolinguistics has also come to be called *variation study*. This is the term used by Penelope Eckert, a professor of linguistics at Stanford University and Labov’s former student, who identifies three waves in the development of this discipline. As already mentioned, Labov is the pioneer in the field, so it only makes sense that the first wave of sociolinguistics, or variation study, started with his study of the *Social Stratification of English in New York City* of 1966. This is not to say, however, that prior to Labov the study of language in its social context was non-existent. As Gordon reminds us, there were earlier

¹ Italics by me to emphasise the importance of this fragment. As Gramley states, the only two English variants that would fall out of the category of GenE would be the traditional dialects of the British Isles, and the English creoles, since they might not be understood by other speakers. (Gramley, et al. 2020: 8)

examples that already hinted in this direction, such as Antoine Meillet, William Dwight Whiney, Hugo Schuchardt, or Edward Sapir. (Gordon 2013: 9) However, these authors won't be discussed in this thesis, since we are parting from the conclusions by Labov. Going back to Eckert's article, she explains that Labov's study concluded that there was a higher presence of nonstandard forms –that is, expressions and language usage that were not part of the Standard English– among speakers with lower income and from lower social classes than among speakers of middle and upper classes. (Eckert 2012: 88) According to Labov, the use of the vernacular was automatic, intuitive, and dependant on class. In 1972, he defined it as “each speaker's first acquired and most automatic, hence maximally systematic, linguistic production, [...] untouched by the reflexivity of *human agency*.”² (2012: 88) In other words, the vernacular is defined, influenced, and shaped by social class, with no choice nor agency from the speaker to use a given dialect or switch between certain language variations. Here I want to highlight the aspect of “human agency”, since the lack of it is one of the main features of the first wave and what also distinguishes it from the two following waves. Another very important aspect to consider as one of the main markers of the first wave is the placement of the speakers into categories considered static and immobile, wrongly assuming there is no evolution in the way people speak. Other studies within the frame of the first wave also investigated gender as a factor of language variation, with the conclusion that women tend to lead in sound and language variation in comparison to men. (2012: 90) Eckert accurately summarises the first wave as follows:

The perspective of the first wave on meaning was based in the socioeconomic hierarchy: Variables were taken to mark socioeconomic status, and stylistic and gender dynamics were seen as resulting from the effects of these categories on speakers' orientation to their assigned place in that hierarchy. (2012: 90)

The second wave addressed the problem of the rigidity and lack of dynamism of the categories defining language variation and presented “the vernacular as an expression of local or class identity”. (2012: 91) This wave started with a study conducted by Lesley Milroy in Belfast, 1980, which wanted to prove the connection between the vernacular and the belonging in different social groups—that is, the correlation between the vernacular and personal identity. Simply put, the vernacular also came to be considered as a tool of identity

² Italics added by me in order to draw the attention to this specific feature, which is highly relevant in the context of this study.

and studied as such. And using it or not, a choice of belonging and membership in one social network. In another ethnographic study conducted by Eckert (2000), she found that:

[P]atterns of variation are not set in childhood but serve as resources in the construction of identity later in life. This finding indicates that broader class correlations are not simply the fallout of education, occupation, and income, but rather reflect local dynamics rooted in practices and ideologies that shape, and are in turn shaped by, class. (2012: 92)

This last sentence reflects the second wave in a nutshell. Again, the second wave fights the idea of fix and static categories (such as social class) as factors influencing the use of vernacular, and rather assigns language varieties according to the social environment, that is, as a way to align with a certain social group. In this sense, there is more dynamism in the development and adoption of certain usage of language by a speaker. At the same time, it acknowledges the correlation and relationships between the aspects mentioned in the first wave—social class and gender—and ideology and identity.

Finally, the third wave of sociolinguistics, or variation study, includes the stylistic aspect in the equation. The fact that differentiates the first two waves from the third is, as Eckert explains, the focus on “apparently static categories of speakers and equated identity with category affiliation.” (2012: 94) However, in the third wave, the different social identities, the membership in different categories, and the ability to fluctuate between them is what causes variation in language, which is in turn expressed through stylistic practice. Eckert concludes that “the emphasis on stylistic practice in the third wave places speakers not as passive and stable carriers of dialect, but as stylistic agents, tailoring linguistic styles in ongoing and lifelong projects of self-construction and differentiation”. (2012: 97-98) That is, linguistic variation is based on the principle of mutability and, just as important, agency.

Throughout the evolution of the different waves of sociolinguistics, we can see that more and more aspects came into play, meaning it slowly became an intersectional discipline. From merely having the social class into account when analysing the language of a pool of speakers; gender and social network came to be considered in the second wave. And later, in the third wave of sociolinguistics, the speaker’s identity, ideology, style, and, most importantly, the speaker’s agency came to be as important as (or more important than) the features studied in the first waves. One of the main points of this last wave is that “it would be erroneous to draw conclusions about a speaker’s supposed identity – male, female, gay, upper class, working class, and so on – based on their sex, education, or any

other major social variable.” (Gramley, et al. 2020: 182) In other words, sociolinguistics is now a field of study which can only be regarded as an intersectional discipline, where many factors influence and shape the way people speak.

2.2. Dialectology

Dialectology is a field of study that counts as a subcategory of sociolinguistics which focuses on the study of dialects. A dialect is one of the varieties of a language with distinctive expressions, pronunciation and grammatical forms that deviates from the so-called standard form. It differs from the category of *language* due to the mutual intelligibility criteria, which implies that the speakers of different dialects of the same language will most likely understand each other. Opposed to speakers of different languages who usually don't understand each other. (Yule 2010: 241) However, it is important to also refer to the way reality is perceived as a speaker of a certain language or dialect. As López García mentions, “junto a la realidad empírica y su idealización científica, existe la *conciencia de la realidad* interiorizada por los hablantes de la lengua, la cual no es continua ni exactamente discreta, se presenta más bien como una *compartimentación borrosa*.”³ (2019: 33) A good example for that are the Moldovan and Romanian languages which, according to philology, are the same language, but they are not perceived as such by the speakers. Here is where identity, society and politics play a major role. But philology must be aware and respect the awareness of reality of the speakers of a language and all its variations. The linguist Wayne O'Neil also points out that the mutual intelligibility criteria not always makes sense, and he takes the cases of the Finnish and Danish languages as an example, which are considered as two different languages, but its speakers can understand and communicate with each other. (qtd. in Lanehart 2001: ix) The same would be true for the Croatian, Serbian and Bosnian languages. Nonetheless, this criterion continues to be useful when trying to classify and categorise language varieties.

According to Biber, the two main areas studied in dialectology can be divided in geographic dialects and social dialects. The first group, geographic or regional dialects, as its name indicates, studies the language variation “associated with speakers living in a particular location”. (Biber 2009: 1) The term *location* can range from a village or a city,

³ The translation of the Spanish fragment is as follows: “together with the empirical reality and its scientific idealization, there is the *awareness of reality* interiorized by the speakers of a language, which is neither continuous nor exactly discreet, but rather a *blurred partitioning*”. Translated by myself.

to a whole region in a country or a whole island, as Labov's study of Martha's Vineyard⁴ shows. Regional dialects are often associated with very distinct pronunciation and are a source of jokes among people living in different areas. (Yule 2010: 242) The second group, the social dialects, are commonly known as *sociolects* and refer to the varieties of "a given demographic group" (Biber 2009: 1), i.e., social class, social network, gender, among others. However, it is important to note that the boundaries between geographic and social dialects are not always clear cut. As Labov mentions, not all factors influence language change in the same degree, with class and gender having a heavier weight than neighbourhood, ethnicity, or social network, for example. (2010: 3)

Chambers and Trudgill (1998) split the definition of *dialect* in three different (mis)conceptions:

- I. As "a substandard, low-status, often rustic form of language, generally associated with the peasantry, the working class, or other groups lacking in prestige" (1998: 3); that is, the stigmatisation of a way of speaking that differs from the one considered as the standard, linked to a lack of education.
- II. As "forms of language, particularly those spoken in more isolated parts of the world, which have no written form" (1998: 3); as a way of undermining its importance and somehow its right to exist in a lasting and permanent way.
- III. As "some kind of (often erroneous) deviation from a norm – as aberrations of a correct or standard form of language". (1998: 3) Again, this misconception is the result of the power structures that defined –and still decide on– the rules of what makes the standard and 'correct' language, and how all variations are deemed incorrect.

As we can see, social class is a recurrent factor mentioned in the definition of *dialect* from different linguists and academics. Other than Labov, this factor has been studied by linguists like Cedergren, Trudgill, or Weinberg, among others. (Labov 2010: 190) What is, then, a sociolect?

A sociolect can be described as a dialect encompassing language variations that are related to, and caused by, societal factors. In other words, the variations in the standard language are "the effects of linguistic interaction among members of specific social groups." (Labov 2010: 4) The best example being the already mentioned social class. As

⁴ This study was conducted by William Labov in 1962 on the island of Martha's Vineyard, in Massachusetts, where he found that the local fishermen's diphthongs were different from the way the other people living on the island spoke. (Gramley, et al. 2020: 179)

Labov writes, “[t]he characteristics that define speakers as belonging to such a social class group are not given by their interaction with each other, but by their similarity on general measures of power, status, wealth and symbolic capital”. (2010: 190) This means, in other words, that certain language markers are common in people belonging to a specific stratum of society with a similar place in the social structure and differ from the standard language.

Also part of sociolects is the sense of belonging, that is, identity. In this scenario, the speaker is able to consciously adopt the vocabulary, expressions and even the pronunciation of a certain sociolect in order to be part of a desired group or to fit in a certain situation. In this case, we see how agency comes into play. According to Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, “[t]he individual creates his systems of verbal behavior so as to resemble those common to the group or groups with which he wishes from time to time to be identified.” (qtd. in Labov 2010: 193) This also proves a high degree of self-awareness by the speaker. As an example, we can refer to a specific passage of *The Grapes of Wrath*, when the Joads bury Grandpa. At this point, we see the characters’ struggle to produce and write something to honour the old man “that’s real nice”. (Steinbeck 2017: 167) Which, of course, it also implies a switch to the standard language and a higher register. They finally achieve it by copying a passage of the Bible.

2.3. Vernacular English

Now that we have seen the two *main* English variations, namely Standard English and General English, I am going to narrow the scope to the different language variations that can be found in the United States of America, with a special focus on the South. For that, I will be referring to American English (AmE) as the standard dialect of the United States, and to General American (GenAm) as the spoken variation understood by all speakers of the different dialects. I will also introduce the concept of the *vernacular* which will be necessary to understand the complexity of the dialects in the US.

First of all, I will start by highlighting the amount of different English variations in the United States in all different levels, that is syntax, phonetics, phonology, and morphology. (Gramley, et al. 2020: 240) This means, that there are not only differences in the vocabulary level, but also in the pronunciation. As Gramley states, the wide variety of forms has its roots in the internal migration between different parts of the United States. (2020: 240)

In this map, Gramley shows only some of the richness of dialects to be found in the United States, focusing on the varieties of the southern states.



Figure 2. Map of the dialect regions of the Southern United States. (Gramley 2020: 240)

Let's start then with the meaning of *vernacular*. According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, the etymology of the word brings us back to the Latin *vernāculus*, which means indigenous, “belonging to the household, domestic, native”. (“Vernacular”) This term is not exclusively used in the field of linguistics, which means it can be applied to different fields. For instance, it is common to see this term followed by the noun *architecture*. In this case, *vernacular architecture* refers to a specific type of building native to a certain region, which normally involves local resources and was probably build without the supervision of a professional architect. When applying this concept to the field of linguistics, we can infer that it refers to the natural language native from a certain region, and which is spoken without many regards to a “correct” grammar. In other words, the mode of expression and the ordinary speech spoken by a group or community native to a certain region. But where does the difference between *vernacular* and *dialect* lie? As with the distinction between dialect and language, it is not possible to find an objective definition on which everyone (or at least the academic community) agrees. As the linguist Wayne O’Neil said, “languages are defined politically, not scientifically”. (qtd. in Lanehart 2001: ix) But let’s have a look at the description of what a vernacular is according to Yule:

The term “vernacular” has been used since the Middle Ages, first to describe local European languages (low prestige) in contrast to Latin (high prestige), then to characterize any non-standard spoken version of a language used by lower status groups. So, the vernacular is a general expression for a kind of social dialect, typically spoken by a lower-status group, which is treated as “non-standard” because of marked differences from the “standard” language. (2010: 261)

As we can see, then, vernaculars have a direct connection with social class, that is, they are a distinct type of sociolect spoken by a speech community with a low status.

The English variation which has probably received most attention and has been most extensively studied is the African American English (also called Black English or Ebonics), with special emphasis on the African American Vernacular English (which I will also refer to as AAVE). As its name indicates, this variation is usually spoken by African American people, but not exclusively. It has been studied as having the roots in the former slave community of the United States, which has evolved into a variety of English with a set of features shared by many African Americans. However, this doesn't mean that all African American people use this vernacular, and at the same time, it also doesn't mean that AAVE is only used by this community of speakers. As with many dialects, AAVE has also been pointed out and stigmatised as a marker of lower status and low education, due to the pronunciation and the grammatical variations that characterise it, and it has even been referred to as "bad" English. Nonetheless, it is being increasingly recognised and is gaining appreciation among its speakers, especially among the young ones who see it as a powerful marker of identity and belonging, giving it a covert prestige. (Yule 2010: 260)

African American Vernacular English has been often compared to Southern American English varieties, such as the Southern White Vernacular English (SWVE). The South in the United States is not a clear-cut region. The concept is often used as a way to refer to the way of living and the culture of the people in the southern states, very often based on stereotypes, or the historically slave states. (Gramley 2020: 240) But this delineation can also be more or less perceived through language which, as mentioned, shares some features with the AAVE. The same happens with the English variation known as Southern. As John Algeo mentions, "Southern American English is not a thing with clearly defined boundaries, but is instead a generalized pattern of a large number of personal abstract mental systems and associated behavior that are ill defined and ever changing." (qtd. in Nagle 2003: 8)

Even though the relationship between the two vernaculars, that is AAVE and SWVE, is not completely clear, there are several theories around it. One of them, as Bailey points out, explains the similarities between these two English varieties as "a consequence of 'decreolization' of AAVE, that is, the movement of AAVE towards 'standard English' over time". (qtd. in Cukor-Avila 2003: 83) And he later draws attention to a rather important point: the African American speech community (mainly speakers of AAVE) "have exerted influence on the dialects of southern whites where they lived". (2003: 85) However, as Cukor-Avila reminds us, one of the recurrent problems when analysing the vernaculars, was their comparison to an undefined "standard English".

However, there is a number of phonetic features distinct of the Southern American which are easily recognisable. Some of the most important ones are the Pin-Pen merger, the Southern Shift –to which the monophthongization of the diphthong /aɪ/ to /a:/ belongs–, and the form of address as *y'all* for the second person plural pronoun. (Gramley, et al. 2020: 242) As we can see, the pronunciation plays an important role in the characterization of the SAE, or the SWVE for that matter, and as Gramley points out, “[p]ronunciation is decidedly more a marker of group-preferential patterns than grammar.” (2020: 256) Now I will try to enlighten the mentioned phenomena with examples:

- Pin-Pen merger. This is the merger of /ɛ/ and /ɪ/ before nasals, where the word *pen* is pronounced as [pɪn], and *Wednesday* is pronounced as [wɪnzdi]. In other words, this feature is the one that gives name to the nearly equal pronunciation of /ɪ/ and /ɛ/ as [ɪ] before nasals, this means that *pin* and *pen* are pronounced practically identically, the example the gives name to the feature. This merger can be found not only in the Southern states, but also in California as a result of the migration to the West of great parts of the population in the South, as well as in the regions where AAVE is spoken. As we will later see, this is exactly the case of the Joad family (and thousand others) in Steinbeck’s *The Grapes of Wrath*.
- The Southern Shift. This feature also receives the name of Southern Vowel Shift (SVS), and it involves the gliding of 6 elements, namely the vowels /i/, /ɪ/, /e/, /ɛ/, /æ/, and /ai/. Getting into more detail, these are the monophthongisation of the /ai/ diphthong, resulting in [a:] rather than [ai] and the centralisation of the /e/ nucleus. (Dodsworth, Benton 2019: 42) As well as the “lowering/retraction of /e/ (day → [dæ>ɪ]; weigh → [wæ>ɪ]), and the lowering/fronting of /o/ (know → [nəʊ]; boat → [brɒt])”. (Bailey 2001: 77) Another maker of the SVS is the prolongation in duration of the aforementioned vowels. (Dodsworth, Benton 2019: 42)

As Bailey explains, there are many more features that are exclusive for the SWVE, with the exception of AAVE with which it shares a good number of markers. Some of the phonetic features are illustrated in the following list with examples directly extracted from a much-detailed table procured by Bailey (2001: 76-77):

- Loss of /r/ after consonants (after /θ/ and in unstressed syllables): throw → [θou], professor → [pəfəsə]
- Front stressing of initial syllables: police → [pou’lis], Detroit → [di’trɔɪt]
- Fricative stopping before nasals: isn’t → [ɪdn]; wasn’t → [wʌdn]

- Glide reduction of /ai/ [aɪ>a] before voiced obstruents and finally: tied → [ta: d]; tie → [ta:]
- Glide reduction of /ɔɪ/ [ɔɪ>ɔə] before /l/: oil → [ɔəl]; boil → [bɔəl]
- Merger of /ɔr/ and /or/: horse → [hɔəs]; morning → [mɔənɪn]
- Merger of /er/ and /ɛr/: Mary → [mɛəɪ]; Carey → [kɛəɪ]
- Glide shortening of /ai/ before voiceless obstruents: night → [na:t]; white → [hwa:t]
- Merger of /ɔ/ and /ɑ/: caught → [kat]; lost → [last]
- Merger of /ær/ and /ɛr/: marry → [mɛəɪ]; merry → [mæəɪ]
- Merger of /ɪ/ and /æ/ before /ŋk/ (think = thank)

There are other distinctive features of the SWVE⁵—but not exclusively and can be found in other variations of Nonstandard American English (NSAmE)—which don't fall in the category of phonetics. Some of them are the plural marker and demonstrative *them* (as in *Give me them books*); the multiple or pleonastic negation (as in *I ain't got no time for nothin'*); the use of double modal (as in *I might could help you*); *don't* in the third person singular in present tense (as in *She don't eat pizza*); or *was* with a plural subject (*We was happy to see you*). (Gramely, et al. 2020: 257) Additionally, one can also hear the expression *y'all* for the second person plural. (2020: 242) We will later see how Steinbeck manages to illustrate some of these features transposed in a written form during the characters' dialogues.

We see then, that the AmE can't (and shouldn't) be regarded as a homogenous English variety, as no language is homogenous. This variation of the English language (namely GenAm) can be divided and categorised in many different sociolects and vernaculars, and we would do well to remember that they are all valid and should never be undermined nor stigmatised and devalued in favour of a “standard” form of the language.

2.4. Spanish Dialects in Spain

Much of what has been reflected about until now regarding sociolinguistics and dialectology is obviously not only valid for the English language and its variations, but for the vast majority of languages currently alive. Of course, this is also the case for Spanish.

⁵ I do not attempt to include all the features and distinctive markers of the SWVE, but I aim to provide a list with the most common and studied features mentioned in the secondary literature used for this paper.

In this chapter, I will be focusing on the Spanish from Spain, since this is the Spanish variety of the three chosen translations of *The Grapes of Wrath*. However, I will also make reference to the vastness of dialects of the Spanish language, also in Latin America.

As with (nearly) every other language,⁶ the presence of different dialects and variations accounts for the existence of a standard version of the language. This standard variation is not always connected with the place of origin of such a language, but rather where the centre of power is. A good example for this is French: even though it doesn't have its origin in the region of Paris, the French spoken in the capital is the one considered the standard variation. (López García 2019: 36) In the case of the Spanish language, the variation considered Standard in Castilian Spanish, or the one preferred, is the one spoken in Madrid—even though its origin lies in the old Kingdom of Castilla, with its centre in Burgos. As López García explains, even though the Spanish from Madrid (*madrileño*) and the Spanish from Sevilla (*sevillano*) are both strictly speaking dialects, Spanish speakers will only recognise the second one as such. One of the reasons behind it is the stigmatisation of the absence of the /θ/ sound, which is one of the most obvious markers of *sevillano* or, for the same matter, of a great part of Andalusian dialect. This absence receives the name of *seseo*. However, the *laísmo*—a marker of the *madrileño* variant considered grammatically incorrect that describes the use of the personal pronoun *la* or *las* as indirect object instead of *le* and *les*—is not deemed incorrect by the average speaker. (2019: 37)

The institution dedicated to the unification and regulation of the Standard version of the Spanish language in every Spanish-speaking country in the world is the *Real Academia Española*, which strives to maintain “una norma panhispánica”⁷. (Hualde 2013: 21) Each country has associated academies of the *Real Academia Española* which look to standardise Spanish orthography, while respecting specific features and/or vocabulary of the standard variation of the country where it is settled, be it Mexican, Colombian, Argentinian, or Castilian Spanish. (Lebsanft et al. 2012: 8) These specific features are what usually identify the standard variation in said country, that is why Spanish is considered a pluricentric language. As Hualde explains, “cada país hispanohablante tiene su propia norma nacional, generalmente basada en el uso lingüístico de la clase media-alta de la capital, lo que se conoce como ‘la norma culta’ de la capital del país.”⁸ (Hualde 2013: 22)

⁶ There might be languages I am not aware of without a Standard variation.

⁷ “A pan-Hispanic norm”. Translated by me.

⁸ Translation of the Spanish passage by me: “Every Spanish-speaking country has its own national norm, generally based on the language used by the middle-upper class of the capital, what is known as the ‘educated norm’ of the country’s capital.”

Here, again, it is necessary to bring attention to the political and sociological factors that lead to choosing the language variation of the powerful capital as the standard form of such variation. We must not forget, however, how the StEs from Spain has often been regarded as a superior variant than the Spanish variations spoken in Latin America. Amado Alonso, a Spanish philologist who spent many years of his life in Buenos Aires, referred to the *norma panhispánica* as *lengua general*. According to him,

la lengua general se levanta por sobre todas las variedades locales como un medio y como un producto de cultura superior, en cuya elaboración han participado y están participando las personas mejor dotadas de todas las regiones. [...] hay localismos en Madrid, en París, en Berlín como en Buenos Aires. Pero hay un sistema de modos de expresarse generalmente admitidos y prestigiados que conviven en cada sitio con otros modos de circulación y prestigio confinados en la región.⁹ (qtd. in Zamora Salamanca 2012: 232)

Here we can see his defense for a unified language, and even though his mention of a *cultura superior*—i.e., a superior culture—can sound classist, he acknowledges the equal presence of dialect markers—what he calls *localismos*, that is “localisms”—in every spoken language and reflects on their prestige.

If we focus on the Spanish dialects in the Iberian Peninsula, we see they are classified according to the region in which they are spoken. They then receive more precise names that usually involve the name of the biggest city where they can be found, e.g. going back to our previous examples, *madrileño* as a representative of *español occidental* (occidental Spanish), or *sevillano* as a representative of *español meridional* (meridional Spanish) or, more precisely, *andaluz occidental* (occidental Andalusian). (Fernández-Ordóñez 2016: 388-398) Fernández-Ordóñez also differentiates the main areas in which Spanish dialects are divided. (2016: 388-395):

- *Español occidental* (western Spanish) is the variant spoken in the central and north-western part of the Iberian Peninsula. It includes the areas of Cantabria, Asturias, great part of Castilla y León, Madrid and part of Castilla La Mancha. In *español occidental* there is a very specific feature that involves the distinction of countable and uncountable entities through the pronouns and adjectives following the substantive, as in *La buena leche fresco*. The substantive *leche* (milk) is

⁹ What follows is my translation of the Spanish segment: “General language rises above all local varieties as a means and as a product of a superior culture, in the elaboration of which the most gifted people of all regions have participated and are participating. [...] There are localisms in Madrid, in Paris, in Berlin, and in Buenos Aires. But there is a system of generally accepted and prestigious modes of expression that coexist in each place with other modes of circulation and prestige confined to the region.”

uncountable and feminine, and is marked as such, by means of the masculine flexion of the adjective following in *fresco* (fresh).

- *Español oriental* (eastern Spanish) is the language variant spoken in the West side of Spain. This area includes the regions of Aragón, Navarra, La Rioja, Soria in Castilla y León, and the regions of Guadalajara, Cuenca, Albacete in Castilla La Mancha (that is, Toledo and Ciudad Real). A distinctive feature of *español oriental* is the plural mark in the infinitive form of enclitic verbs, as in *Mis padres acaban de irsen*.
- *Español septentrional* (northern Spanish) is the variant spoken in the North of Spain, also in coexistence with Basque and Galician. More precisely, the communities with a predominance of *español septentrional* are Cantabria, Basque Country, Navarra, La Rioja and the northern parts of Castilla y León (mostly Burgos and Palencia). One of the most common features of this variant, which is the result of its contact with the Basque language, is the use of the constructions with “would” (that is, *condicional simple*), as in *Le gustaría que yo comería más*, instead of the imperfect of subjunctive, as in *Le gustaría que yo comiera más*.
- *Español meridional* (southern Spanish) has influence over nearly the whole southern half of Spain, right south of Madrid, and spreading all the way down to Andalusia, stretching, as well, to all the regions from West to East of Spain, and including the Canary Islands. One of the most recognizable features of this variant is the loss of the intervocalic /d/, especially in terminations like /ada/, /ado/, /ido/, (mainly in participles and adjectives) which results in words like *helado* (ice) to be pronounced like [e'laɔ], *embarazada* (pregnant) as [embara'θa], or *barrido* (swept) as [ba'rio].¹⁰

Nonetheless, there is still another distinction in the regions that is worth mentioning, that is:

- *Andaluz occidental y canario* (Spanish from Andalusia and Canary Islands) is the variation to be found in the most southern part of the Iberian Peninsula, more precisely in Huelva, Sevilla, Cádiz, Málaga, Córdoba, and Granada (where *seseo* and *ceceo* coexist); and in the Canary Islands. This variant deserves a separate category due to its marked features, the most common and noticeable one being the

¹⁰ More examples can be found in Fernández-Ordóñez *Dialectos del español peninsular*, from where these examples were also extracted.

already mentioned *seseo*, the substitution of the /θ/ sound for the /s/, but also its combination with *ceceo*, the opposite feature to *seseo*, which translates into the inability to differentiate between the sounds /s/ and /θ/.

These dialectological areas are, as usually happens with linguistic borders, not clear cut. There are many areas where several variants coexist as for example happens in Navarra, where the northern Spanish variant coexist with the western Spanish one. Needless to say, each of these areas has different Spanish variations, some of which receive the name of the biggest or most important city where they are spoken. A good example would be *sevillano*, a more specific variant of the *andaluz occidental* spoken, as the name clearly indicates, in Sevilla.

Besides the mentioned dialectological areas, it is also worth drawing attention to the three more languages spoken in the Spanish territory, that is Catalan, Euskera, and Galician, as well as Portuguese in Portugal, sharing a long stretch of border with Spain. This means that the contact between these languages leads to influences among them, which, in turn, result in certain variations that are also interesting to consider (even if they aren't dialects per se).

As mentioned before, the Spanish in Latin America is also richly varied. As Oesterreicher explains, there are three clear regional Standard variations in America: the one spoken in Mexico and its surroundings, the one spoken in Argentina and the countries along Río de la Plata (River Plate), and the countries along the Andes. According to him, the variations spoken in Chile, the Caribbean, the northern part of Latin America, and the United States are not easily categorised. (qtd. in Lebsanft et al. 2012: 9) Oesterreicher's classification is not the only one. The *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas*—the dictionary designed to answer some of the most frequently asked questions regarding the Spanish language—groups the countries in a different way: Antilles; Mexico and Central America; United States; Venezuela and Colombia; Ecuador, Perú, and Bolivia; Chile and Argentina; and Uruguay and Paraguay. (2012: 9) In the case of Latin America, the best valued, or preferred, variants of Spanish are the ones spoken in Mexico City and Bogotá. (Hualde 2013: 23)

Nonetheless, as already mentioned in the first part of the chapter, the variants and dialects which are not popularly (and academically) accepted as the standard form of the language spoken in the region are considered uneducated and are mistakenly associated with lower-income speakers. In the case of the Castilian Spanish, some the most stigmatised

features are mostly part of the Andalusian dialect, that is, the already mentioned *seseo* and *ceceo*, or the elision of the intervocalic /d/. Nonetheless, some features of the Spanish spoken in the North are also made fun of, such as the dialect in Asturias, which ends masculine adjectives in *-u* instead of *-o*, as in *El libro era muy cortu*. (Fernández-Ordóñez 2016: 388) However, this stigmatisation is not perceived by everyone. As an example, I'd like to quote María T. Sánchez when she declares that "it is clear that regional and social accents have played a much more important part in England than in Spain, [...] where language differences have been regional but not social". (Sánchez 2009: 229) While I agree with the first part of her statement, I also think it is important to bring attention to the fact that the different varieties are also rooted in their social conception, on top of the regional aspect. For example, Andalusian dialect has also been used to portray people with a lower degree of education, which, following the same line of misconceptions, are associated with people from a lower social class.

In this section we have seen a very small portion of the vastness and heterogeneity of the Spanish language. As mentioned, it was not my intention to explore each and every one of the varieties and dialects of the Spanish language, but merely to offer a broad overview of its richness only in the Iberian Peninsula and how the features of some of the dialects carry a distinct social stigma.

2.5. Vernacular Language in Literature

This section is going to reflect the use of dialects and vernacular language in literature. Throughout history, many authors have used dialects in their works, normally when representing direct speech of certain characters, as a way of adding a point of naturalness, credibility, and adequacy to the story, and as an identity and characterization marker for the figures. It is implied, then, that the standard form—the recognised norm—is the language variety used during the narrated parts and substituted for dialect in direct speech. As Sánchez mentions, the use of the non-standard language has served different purposes—some of which I mentioned above—which not only limit themselves "to regional and social origin, but are also related to ethnicity and cultural differences", such as Black English in American novels, especially in the second half of the nineteenth century. (Sánchez 2009: 198) Lane-Mercier also comments on the uses of the dialect in literature. According to her, it "reveals 'power structures, relations of hierarchy and exclusion', and

‘cultural representation of the Other’” which, she argues, is the domestic Other. (qtd. in Yu 2017: 55)

Nonetheless, even if the author strives for a representation of the dialect as loyal as possible, it is also his or her job to make it understandable and not overwhelming, making sure the reader will be able to both recognise the dialect and to understand it. In Ives words:

Nearly all examples of literary dialect are deliberately incomplete; the author is an artist, not a linguist or a sociologist, and his purpose is literary rather than scientific. [...] Each author has made his own decisions as to how many of the peculiarities in his character’s speech he can profitably represent; consequently, examples of literary dialect vary considerably in the extent to which they are “dialectal”. (qtd. in Sánchez 2009: 198)

This means, the author will consciously alter the dialect (which is normally very well-known to him or her, or a lot of research has been done so as to reach a native knowledge of it) for the benefit of the artistic effect on the reader. Sánchez also comments on the use of visual features to mark dialects, so it will be totally clear to the reader that the upcoming fragment is indeed meant to be and to feel different. This is what she refers to as “eye dialect” (2009: 199), and is marked by contractions, elisions, and misspellings.

Some of the most popular examples for dialect use in English-language literature, to name a few, are Mark Twain’s *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, George Bernard Shaw’s *Pygmalion*, Charles Dickens’s *Great Expectations*, or *To Kill a Mockingbird* by Harper Lee. I am going to briefly analyse Twain’s and Shaw’s examples in regard to their use of the non-standard language. In the next chapter, I will comment on how the translational problem of dialects has been solved and approached by different translators in different languages.

All these said authors, and many more which won’t be mentioned in this study, have used the written word throughout the centuries to represent a certain group of the society, usually the poorest, least educated, and least favoured as a way to portray their struggles, their ideology, their identity, and the hierarchy among classes represented by certain characters. In order to reflect this, they have attempted (and mostly succeeded) to imitate the spoken language in their works, that is, to write in a way that deviates from the standard form of the novel’s language by adding markers belonging to certain dialects and different registers. As Yu explains, “the value of a linguistic variety is not intrinsic, or neutral, but varies in relation to the variety it is contrasted with”. (2017: 62) This means that the choice of using a non-standard form of a language must always be analysed in relation to the

standard variety of that language. In Mukařovský's words, "even in cases where dialect predominates, the standard language norm is always the background against which dialect is projected, and in regard to which it is perceived as a distortion in relation to the other language varieties present in the text". (qtd. in Yu 2017: 56) However, as Yu reminds us, there are some misconceptions according to which "standard language is a unified single register, [and] all varieties of the standard language carry the same socio-cultural meaning concerning the identity of the characters." (2017: 55) That is, the standard form of a language is not homogenous and presents a series of alterations according to factors such as the register.

I will start by briefly commenting on probably the most recognised example of dialect use in literature: Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. This novel, published in 1884, tells the story of Huck, a white boy who fakes his death to escape from home, and Jim, a runaway black slave, and together they travel down the Mississippi river and become good friends. (Rodríguez Herrera 2014: 279) In Twain's novel, a variety of dialects can be distinguished, the most obvious one being the African American Vernacular assigned to Jim, the black slave. However, Twain didn't limit himself with this one dialect. Instead, he embarked on the great challenge of including different dialects in his novel, assigning each one to the different characters according to their position in society. This task proved to be a Herculean effort which was later responded, as he already expected, by critics regarding the use of "bad language". That is why he decided to add an introductory note in the novel to explain the different dialects that the reader can find in the text:

In this book a number of dialects are used, to wit: the Missouri Negro dialect; the extremest form of the backwoods South-Western dialect; the ordinary 'Pike-County' dialect; and four modified varieties of this last. The shadings have not been done in a haphazard fashion, or by guesswork; but painstakingly, and with the trustworthy guidance and support of personal familiarity with these several forms of speech. (qtd. in Rodríguez Herrera 2015: 281)

As we can see, he was already wary of the reception his text would have and he was aware that he needed to cover his shoulders with this explanation. He had to let everyone know how much work it had meant to reflect the dialectal variations in his text and how they were not the result of uninformed guessing, but rather of vast research and immense effort.

Regarding the dialects themselves, Twain used a variety close to the AAVE to mark Jim's speech –which he refers to as the *Missouri Negro dialect*–, while he kept the South-Western dialect (which is close to, if not the same as, the SWVE) for Huck, a poor white boy without a place in society. The characters representing the higher class of society in

the novel, such as the Judge and Aunt Polly, were assigned a “more correct” variety of the Pike-County dialect. This last dialect, the Pike-County, is what could generally be regarded as the Standard American, meaning that, in this case, “Standard language [...] becomes the most powerful sociolect in the linguistic hierarchy constructed by Twain”. (Yu 2017: 59)

As Rodríguez Herrera explains, the marked differences between Jim’s and Huck’s dialects owed Twain many critics, the title of “racist” among them. (2014: 280) He was accused of using the word “nigger” and was said to comically mimic “the dialect of black-faced minstrels”. (2014: 280) This was one of the reasons, among others, why the novel was widely censored in different regions of the United States. (2014: 280)

What follows is one example of Jim’s speech, where the extent of the dialect can be appreciated: “Sometimes you gwyne to git hurt, en sometimes you gwyne to git sick; but every time you’s gwyne to git well agin. Dey’s two gals flyin’ ’bout you in yo’ life. One uv ’em’s light en ‘tother one is dark”. (Twain 1985: 22) As we can see, elisions, contractions, and misspellings are widely featured, which also catches the reader’s attention due to the visual alterations (a great example of the “eye dialect” mentioned earlier). This is also how whenever Jim speaks, the reader is able to *see* the difference between him and Huck. As mentioned, Huck uses the South-Western dialect (or SWVE in today’s terminology), which means that it is the most predominant language variation in the novel, since he is the one narrating the story and he does it using his dialect:

He listened some more; then he come tip-toeing down and stood right between us; we could a touched him, nearly. Well, likely it was minutes and minutes that there warn’t a sound, and we all there so close together. There was a place on my ankle that got to itching; but I dasn’t scratch it; and then my ear begun to itch; and next my back, right between my shoulders. (Twain 1985: 7)

As we can see in this passage, the identifiable dialectic markers go quite unnoticed at first glance in comparison to Jim’s speech. However, when paying closer attention, we see that the narrative part is scattered with particles such as “warn’t”, “dasn’t”, or the substitution of *could have* for “could a”. It is also worth mentioning the use of the past participle “begun” instead of the past simple *began* that would have taken its place in a text written in Standard American English. We will see some of these characteristics reappearing during the analysis of the language variation in *The Grapes of Wrath*.

Another interesting point in Twain’s novel is the tone of the narration: it has a rather childish undertone, which perfectly accounts for an even better credibility of the narrator—who is supposed to be around 13 years old—as well as of the story itself, as Huck describes

the developing events and his opinions, thoughts, and doubts from the point of view of the rather young and inexperienced boy he is.

Again, the characters representing the higher range of society speak the language variation with a higher prestige from the three differentiated dialects in the novel. So, reasonably, even more contrast is perceived during the interventions of the Judge or Miss Watson in comparison to Huck and, especially, to Jim—the uncultured slave. This next quote belongs to the Judge Thatcher: “Why, my boy, you are all out of breath. Did you come for your interest?” (Twain 1985: 19) Only these two short sentences are able to give the reader a taste of a different register. The same is valid for Miss Watson or the Widow. In the next chapter, I will mention short examples of what techniques were used to translate these varieties of language variations by translators of different languages.

The next example of the use of dialect variations in literature is probably the most studied and well known by an Irish author: Bernard Shaw’s *Pygmalion*. The play was first staged in Vienna in 1913: it premiered first in German, following a translation by the Viennese Siegfried Trebitsch. (Connolly-Smith 2009: 127) The reason behind this decision was Shaw’s popularity in Germany and German speaking countries, which was much higher than the one he had in his own country. (2009: 130) This represents one of the rare occasions in which the translations are more successful than the original works. It wasn’t until 1914 when it premiered in London, after having done so in New York a month earlier and in many other cities with German-speaking communities. The play, which was later adapted to the musical *My Fair Lady*, tells the story about Eliza Doolittle, a girl who makes a living by selling flowers in the streets of London. She is mainly characterised by the way she speaks, that is, her use of the working-class dialect *par excellence* in London: the cockney speech. As Peterghella explains, “cockney is perceived as both sociolect and regionalect, spoken by lower classes in a specific urban area of London”. (2002: 47) Due to Eliza’s strongly marked cockney, a professor of phonetics, Professor Higgins, takes it as a challenge to turn her cockney speech into standard English and to make a duchess out of her. That is why Shaw put special care in the representation of the dialect and set the language itself at the center of the plot by portraying Eliza’s evolution towards the “socially accepted” language variation.

Taking a passage from the play also quoted by Sánchez (2009), it is clear that this representation of the cockney dialect has been taken to a point where it is nearly unintelligible for any person without a background in cockney dialect, not to mention the difficulties it presents to non-native speakers:

THE FLOWER GIRL: Ow, eez, ye-ooa san, is e? Wal, fewd dan y' d-ooty bawmz a mather should,eed now bettern to spawl a pore gel's flahrzn than ran awy athaht pyin. Will ye-oo py me f' them? [...]

THE DAUGHTER: Do nothing of the sort, mother. The idea! (Shaw 1976: 16)

In this case we can see that Bernard Shaw went even further than Twain when characterizing the dialect. Of course, we mustn't forget that dialect itself is the main pillar of the play, so the author made sure to come as close as possible to the oral language through the written form. In this passage, as well as in mostly every intervention of Eliza Doolittle before she transitions into Standard English, the reader will immediately see the dialect before starting to read, yet again another example of the so-called "eye dialect" mentioned by Sánchez. And what will call the audience's (and readership's) attention is the contrast of the two language variations, as we can see in the example above with Eliza's statement and Clara's (the daughter) answer.

Bernard Shaw added a note to this passage: "Here, with apologies, this desperate attempt to represent her dialect without a phonetic alphabet must be abandoned as unintelligible outside London" (1976: 16), drawing attention to the difficulty of portraying pronunciation without the use of phonetics. It appears to be a tendency, or a common habit of self-defence, for the authors to write a comment in regards of the presence of the non-standard language in certain passages of their works. In this comment, they either defend their attempt to be as accurate as possible to the variety spoken by the people –that is, raising awareness of the difficulty of the task and the research done to achieve a representation as faithful as possible to the spoken dialect; or they apologise for incongruences or the possible inability of the reader to understand the text. The first scenario would be the case of Steinbeck himself –as we will later see—and the case of Twain; while the second scenario can be attributed to Bernard Shaw, also as a sign of his frustration of making phonetics a main pillar of his play, but without allowing himself to use the phonetic alphabet.

Going back to *Pygmalion*, it is interesting to see how Shaw represents Eliza's evolution to the standard English, the corrections Professor Higgins of Eliza's pronunciation, and how she reaches the so-called 'perfection':

LIZA: [...] Aha! Now I know how to deal with you. What a fool I was not to think of it before! You can't take away the knowledge you gave me. You said I had a finer ear than

you. And I can be civil and kind to people, which is more than you can. Aha! That's done you, Henry Higgins, it has. (Shaw 1976: 138)

The contrast the reader or the audience can perceive is not only Eliza's language evolution, but also the contrast between the dialogues in the beginning of the play between Eliza and Professor Higgins –or for the matter, between her and any other of the characters from the high society, and the dialogues where Eliza already masters the standard language.

These two cases have been discussed with the aim of offering a better portrayal of what dialects in literature look like. They also help putting the problem of the translation of dialects in the spotlight and to raise awareness of the translator's nearly impossible job.

III. TRANSLATING NON-STANDARD LANGUAGE IN LITERATURE

It is quite safe to affirm that the translation of non-standard language, that is, the translation of dialect, poses one of the biggest –if not the biggest– challenge in literary translation. And, for that matter, of translation as a whole, since this phenomenon is only to be found in literature. From a more general perspective and in Venuti's words,

A translated text, whether prose or poetry, fiction or nonfiction, is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text –the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the 'original.' The illusion of transparency is an effect of a fluent translation strategy of the translator's effort to ensure readability by adhering to current usage, maintaining continuous syntax, fixing a precise meaning. (Venuti 2008: 1)

The invisibility of the translator that Venuti describes, so desired by the readership, proves itself almost impossible in the event of transposing the dialect of the source text into a fitting vernacular in the target text. Such attempts tend to end in artificial-sounding speeches that eliminate the credibility that the original writer achieved, which may thus result into a 'bad translation'. In other words, the translation of dialects is one of the biggest problems in translation. This is because, as mentioned before, dialects are not only a variation in syntax, grammar, and pronunciation from a language we have learned to call 'standard', but they also carry strong cultural, historical, and social connotations that fill it with meaning. And, obviously –and ideally–, all these nuances and added meaning must be considered during the process of translation.

Assuming the translator has no problem in identifying and understanding the language variation from the source language (with all its connotations and layers of meaning), the big decision has to be taken. However, even if "in the native target language translators may be able to recognize varieties [of the source language], they might not be able to produce them". (Fawcett 1997: 77) Nonetheless, a series of essential questions arise: What is the best approach when it comes the translation of dialects? Is there a 'correct' or 'proper' way? Is it an act of violence towards the ST to even attempt it? And, most importantly, is it even possible to translate a dialect? As it often happens, these questions have no clear answer. Opinions are divided among theorists and translators who defend the need of representing the dialect of the source text (ST) into the target text (TT), or those

who affirm that it is better to omit it. The voices in favor of not transferring a dialect into the TT argue that it is not possible to transpose a cultural set of values of a language into another cultural background. Clifford Landers is of this opinion, and says that, even though this goal is a sign of dedication from the translator's side, "it is also an impossible one". (2001: 116) He goes on by discouraging translators to set in this task, saying that "dialect is always tied, geographically and culturally, to a milieu that does not exist in the target-language setting. Substitution on an 'equivalent' dialect is foredoomed to failure. The best advice about trying to translate dialect: don't." (Landers 2001: 117) Peter Fawcett also claimed that dialect "takes us to the point where translation becomes impossible". (qtd. in Sánchez 2009: 230) However, he does acknowledge that "the translator may want to reflect [a source text written in a regional language] in the translation." (Fawcett 1997: 76) Another reason given for the omission of the dialect is the risk to ridicule the language and to make it non-relatable to the readership of the TT, as Antoine Berman wrote: "le vernaculaire ne peut être traduit dans un autre vernaculaire. Seules les koinés, les langues "cultivées", peuvent s'entretraduire. Une telle exotisation [...] n'aboutit qu'à ridiculiser l'original."¹¹ (qtd. in Sánchez 2009: 231)

It is true, then, that the translation of a dialect is usually not very successful, at least into Spanish, where there isn't a stablished tradition of adding dialect and regional markers in literature. And even though it might work better in other languages, the existence of a dialect in the source language with an equivalent dialect in the target language is close to impossible. This is why dialects have been rendered as untranslatable. Of course, this doesn't mean that there haven't been attempts, more or less successful, to achieve this equivalence.

3.1. Translation strategies

Let's now take a look at the possible options a translator has when facing a source text with dialectal markers. There are mainly two ways a translator can approach a literary text, which correspond to the first decision that will have to be taken: that is, whether to attempt the representation of the dialect from the SL into the TL –be it through the use of register, the use of a dialect in the TL, or a reference added in the translation–; or completely omit

¹¹ What follows is my translation of the French passage: "The vernacular can't be translated into another vernacular. Only the koiné, the 'cultivated' languages, can be translated. Such exoticization [...] only results in making the original ridiculous".

any reference or mention of its presence whatsoever. These two strategies, which are all the same valid in the general field of literary translation and not only used in the presence of dialect, receive the name of *foreignization* and *domestication*. The first one, as the name indicates, entails bringing the receiving reader closer to the source text and the source culture, making the translation foreign to the receiving culture. In Friedrich Schleiermacher's words, it is when "the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible and brings the reader towards him", and it does so under an "ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad". (qtd. in Venuti 2008: 15) According to this strategy, and in the case of the translation of dialects, the translator would attempt to find an equivalent –or similar– dialect in the TL to be as close as possible to the author and to the SL, risking sacrificing credibility in the resulting translation.

On the other hand, the domestication strategy consists in the opposite process, thus, bringing the author of the ST closer to the reader of the receiving culture for the sake of credibility, naturalness, and readability. Again, Schleiermacher claims that, in this case, the translator "leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and brings the author to him", and describes the domesticating practice as "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home". (2008: 15) When considering the translation of dialects, it would probably result in the omission of the regional markers, since these translations are usually not that successful and don't sound as natural. It is important to note that Schleiermacher, or Venuti for the same matter, are aware that a 'total translation' is not achievable, an opinion they share with many other theorists and translators like Ortega y Gasset, Nabokov, or Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, who also express their frustration for the impossibility of translation.

However, it might be possible that a combination of the two methods just described, foreignization and domestication, is the best approach when translating literature. Nonetheless, Venuti reminds us that, even if some theorists do claim the importance of remaining close to the author,

an ethics that counters the domesticating effects of the inscription can only be formulated and practiced in *domestic* terms, in domestic dialects, registers, discourses, and styles. And this means that the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text can only be signalled indirectly, by their displacement in the translation, through a domestic difference introduced into values and institutions at home. [...] the domestic terms of the inscription become the focus of rewriting in the translation, discursive strategies where the hierarchies that rank the values in the domestic culture are disarranged to set going processes of

defamiliarization, canon reformation, ideological critique, and institutional change. (Venuti 2000: 469)

In other words, even if a translator chooses to foreignize the translation by bringing the cultural values closer to the ST, he or she can only achieve it by expressing the ideas of the ST in domestic terms in the TT.

Let's go back to Sánchez to inspect the possibilities a translator has when translating a text with non-standard language variations. She claims that there are three strategies among which the translator must choose:

to attempt some form of non-standard variety out of those which are to be found in the TL; to use standard language only, with occasional indicators of the type 'he/she said in his/her regional dialect'; to ignore completely the non-standard language and to stick to the standard norm in the TT. (Sánchez 2009: 202)

She goes on by adding that the common strategy among translators into Spanish is the omission of the dialectal markers, which means they tend to write everything into the standard variety of the country they are from, with the occasional change in the register by including some expressions from the colloquial or vulgar registers.

When the first strategy suggested by Sánchez –the use of another existing dialect in the TL–, is used, it tends to produce an unnatural translation and it is usually not well received by the readership of the TT. (2009: 205) And, as already mentioned above, it is nearly impossible to find a fitting dialect in the TL that carries many of the social and historical meaning –as well as its nuances– present in the dialect of the ST. The second strategy –the addition of cues in the dialogues indicating that the character is indeed speaking dialect–, is a helpful solution, but might overwhelm and annoy the reader if this sort of indications are added by the translator in every speech. This technique was applied by D. H. Lawrence in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. What is interesting in this case, as Sánchez writes, is that the indications were added by the writer himself, solving part of the problem for the translators. (2009: 211) However, the jokes about the difference in the two lovers' accents do get lost in translation, since no comment from the translator's side can't reach an equivalent or a satisfactory solution. Finally, the last of the strategies –just omitting the non-standard language varieties–, is the preferred among translators. Usually, it is not because they don't find it relevant, but because they are aware of the impossibility of the task and they rather produce a readable and natural translation, with which the readership

of the TT will be able to identify. In other words, the translator must make him or herself invisible, and attempt to produce a translation that it is not recognisable as such.

I could add another strategy that, in my opinion, could be included in Sánchez's list. Probably, the most successful¹² translations that haven't ignored the non-standard language variation of the ST, are those in which the translators have used a variety of registers to signal the language differences between characters, and between the dialogues and the narrative parts. This is usually the case when a translator decides to replace a dialect associated with a less-cultured layer of society, like the AAVE, with a colloquial register and even with vulgar expressions. It is important to bring attention to the word *associated* in the last sentence, since, as it has already been mentioned many times, there is no such thing as a 'second-class' language variation or one which is less valuable than another.

And yet another strategy for the translation of dialects and vernaculars should be considered. Some translators, like the Italian Francesco Saba Sardi, have used an invented dialect –which is usually the result of a combination of regional markers, expressions of different dialects and ungrammatical forms from the TL– in a translation to represent the non-standard variety of the ST. He used this method, for example, in his attempt to reproduce the cockney in Shaw's *Pygmalion*, where he produced “a mix of a fusion of dialects from across Northern Italy, the agricultural Po Valley area, and from the urban areas of Milan, because of their Latino-Celtic matrix, which makes them closer to the sonority of cockney.” (Perteghella 2002: 48) According to Perteghella, Saba Sardi found an ingenious and valid solution for the translation of the cockney variation and the slang in the play. (2002: 49) Interestingly, the dialect Saba Sardi created could have a similar effect on the audience as the cockney dialect regarding its unintelligibility outside Northern Italy for the translation, and outside London for the original. However, it is important to remember that, even in this case, the cultural, historical, and social background of the cockney dialect don't get transferred to the invented dialect in the TT. Lastly, it is also worth mentioning the special case of the theatre translation, since the performability of the text also needs to be considered. As Perteghella explains, translators should consult the dramatic tradition and literary canon of dialectical works within the receiving culture”. (2002: 49) In other words, not only the translator's preference has to be taken into account, but also the theatre tradition in the receiving culture. For example, if, hypothetically, the

¹² In this context, the adjective *successful* is meant to refer to the readability and naturalness of the TT, and the acceptance of the translation in the receiving culture and readership.

Andalusian dialect were the one used to portray people with a lower educational level, this could be the appropriate language variation to substitute the cockney dialect in *Pygmalion*.

Whatever the method or strategy chosen by the translator, it is important to highlight that the process of translation can't take place without a certain degree of loss. As Venuti claimed, while it is not possible to eliminate the cultural and linguistic differences between the ST and the TT, "the violence wreaked by translation is partly inevitable". (qtd. in Sánchez 2009: 221)

3.2. Lost in translation

We have already seen that there is always some part of meaning that gets lost in translation, a process that has even been described, especially by Venuti, as an act of violence against the source text. Naturally, much more gets lost in translation when dealing with dialects, regional markers and even accents. In part, this is the result of what Toury called (already in 1995) 'the law of growing standardization', according to which "unusual source elements are being replaced with more common target language elements." (qtd. in Leppihalme 2000: 260) This, of course, applies to dialects, but is also valid for wordplays, fixed expressions and even metaphors. Interestingly, it goes hand in hand with the concept of *domestication*, already mentioned above. Venuti has a similar speech regarding the tendency towards a standard language in the receiving culture. According to him, this tendency has been growing in the Anglo-American literature during the last three hundred years, which results in a deprivation of the character and the voice of the original text. (2000: 261) In the face of the many sacrifices in the representation of the cultural and social background of the dialect of the ST, some translators try to compensate it, usually by means of a marked difference in registers to set two characters clearly apart, or with some additions like swear words or expletives. (2000: 263)

I will now jump back to the examples mentioned above (in section 2.5), that is Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn* and Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion*, and briefly mention what got lost in those translations and how some of the translators approached the problem of the non-standard language.

Let's start with the example of *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. As Rodríguez Herrera states from the very beginning, the common approach for the translation of Jim's dialect has been that of the standardisation. (2014: 278) His statement is, yet again, a corroboration of Toury's and Venuti's theories about the tendency of dialect

standardisation in translation, which we keep encountering along this study. In his comparison between the French, Italian, and Spanish translations, Rodríguez Herrera finds, with great disappointment, that Twain's introductory note regarding his use of the different dialects is missing and that no trace of the African American English is to be found in the translations. However, there is one Spanish translator, Cristina Cerezales, who tried to reproduce Jim's dialect in the TT by transposing it into Andalusian Spanish. (2014: 282) By doing so, she missed the whole historical and social background of Jim's language variety, which is very meaningfully charged and reminiscent of his and other black slaves' struggles. With this it is even more clear that, as Judith Lavoie comments about the French translation, "Black English represents an obstacle to the translator because (s)he is faced with 'the responsibility of inventing a language fit to convey the same cultural, social, political and ideological values inherent to Black English.'" (qtd. in Rodríguez Herrera 2014: 283) She implies, then, that the solution is to invent a dialect that fulfils the requirements and conveys the same meaning as the language of the ST. However, is it possible to make up a language variety with a social and historical meaning?

As mentioned earlier (in section 2.5), the aim of using dialect in *Huckleberry Finn*, mainly during Jim's interventions, is to characterize the runaway man and to make a distinction between the slave and the rest of the characters, especially from the white ones. In other words, the dialect carries the social, but also the historical meaning of the story. The non-standard variety helps setting the plot at a certain point in time and at a certain place, and makes it more realistic, relatable, and historically accurate.

In the case of *Pygmalion*, the omission on the representation of the dialect, in whatever way, means a complete loss on the essence, the character and the whole point of the play, since, as Leppihalme accurately points out, "the more important the feature, the more loss there is if the translation downplays it." (2000: 250) Nevertheless, even though it could be regarded as one of the most complex texts to translate, the translation of *Pygmalion* has been attempted many times, in many languages. Sánchez makes a comparison of three Spanish translations of the text to better illustrate her point:

Perhaps, the real problem posed by *Pygmalion* is that there is no possibility for the translator to get away from the fact that the whole play is about the mispronunciation of one of the main characters and her progressive improvement until perfection is eventually reached, and that the whole sociolinguistic background is not really transferable to a Spanish context. (Sánchez 2009: 211)

Needless to say, her comment applies in all other languages. In the three translations she analysed, there is only one who has achieved a closer approximation to the original, and that is the one by Floreal Mazía, who went for the representation of lexical and phonetical features of “dialectal variants from Andalusia, Canary Islands and South America” (2009: 206), besides adding footnotes for clarifications on the pronunciation. And as Sánchez comments, the other two translators, Julio Broutá and Juan Leita, naturalised Eliza’s cockney dialect transforming it into a very mild register of a Madrid’s accent, which has no connection whatsoever to a lower or less educated part of the society. (2009: 206) This means that, even if there has been an attempt to transform the dialect of the SL into a language variation in the TL (and it has only been partly achieved), the historical, social, and cultural background of the language variation does get lost in the resulting translation.

When it comes to the first German translation, completed by the Viennese translator Trebitsch in 1913, also chose the path of the standardization of the dialect, transposing “Eliza’s cockney accent [...] into impeccable standard German”. (Conolly-Smith 2009: 132) Interestingly, this translation was one of the few ones that were authorised by Shaw himself. However, this did not stop other translators to produce the text in their own languages. It is also worth mentioning that, even if he chose not to represent the language variation of the ST, Trebitsch sometimes tried to domesticate the text into the TL and culture by changing the locations mentioned in the play to make them more familiar to the German-speaking audience. The problem was that, even though he did set the play in England, he made the mistake of changing one location to one in Germany. (2009: 133) However, it is important to highlight that in the representations of the play, the actresses playing Eliza did try to adopt a dialect. As Rusu points out, the translator should be able to “competently make stylistic decisions that would render the play speakable, while conserving as much as possible of the speakability present in the ST”. (Rusu 2021: 108) Her statement puts the performability of the play in focus which, hand in hand with the language, will be decisive on the way the audience perceives the play in the target culture.

Here we have seen only two examples of the (mis)translation of the non-standard language variations in literature to get an idea of how complicated this task proves to be for translators. The tendency to standardise any dialect has resulted in many losses in meaning and style in the target texts. However, the challenge of finding a suitable replacement with similar nuances and similar historical and social background can’t be underestimated and is nothing less than a herculean effort.

IV. JOHN STEINBECK'S *THE GRAPES OF WRATH*

In this section, I will introduce the main object of the study: Steinbeck's novel *The Grapes of Wrath*. I will start with an introduction of the author, his biography and how it is linked to the recurrent topics of his novel. Next, I will look into the type of language he uses, vernacular and other non-standard variations. Finally, I will also briefly comment on the reception of his works. The next section will be focused on *The Grapes of Wrath*, where I will offer a context of the historical moment portrayed in the novel, and I will go deeper in the language specificities of the text and the ways the vernacular has been used. This will lead to the translational problems of the novel.

On September 2022 I had the chance to visit the National Steinbeck Center (NSC) in Salinas, California, the author's birthplace and scenery of many of his novels and stories. The museum, which was a great source of information and inspiration for writing this thesis, features an interactive exhibition focused on some of his most famous works, together with biographical components and historic context.

4.1. John Steinbeck

Even though John Steinbeck never moved to Paris, he could be regarded as a later member of the Lost Generation. Like Hemingway, Scott Fitzgerald, and John Dos Passos, among others, he also grew up in a post WWI era when moral and human values were in crisis, and he did, as well, live a bohemian life, with jazz, alcohol, and cigarettes, which would contribute to his premature death.

Steinbeck was born in 1902 in the small town of Salinas, in northern California, to John Ernst and Olive Steinbeck. He was the only son of the couple but had three sisters. His grandparents came from Ireland, Germany and America. The father 'withdrew' from his children's lives at an early age, a fact that would impact Steinbeck's shy character. (Parini 1994: 2) During his childhood and teenage years, he and his sisters vastly explored Salinas and the surroundings, getting to know and love the Valley which would later be the stage and scenery of many of his works, and whose people would influence his characters. After the years at school, Steinbeck published his first work at the Salinas High School yearbook, *El Gabilan*, and in the school newspaper, *The Flashlight*. (Steinbeck Family Artifacts, NSC 2022) On his last year of high school, in 1918, he got the Spanish flu, a disease which killed many, and deeply affected him, leaving him with traces for the rest of

his life. (Parini 1994: 33) When he recovered, he was able to finish high school. Afterwards, he intermittently attended Stanford, where he joined courses mainly in literature, English, and creative writing, but also applied to a course in the dissection of cadavers at the medical faculty due to his interest in biology and ‘people’. (Jones 2021: 14) During his time at university, he could concentrate on writing, thanks to the economic support of his parents. However, he dropped off and never completed a degree. Even though he later came to regret not having a university degree, those years at Stanford helped him develop as a writer. The summer jobs he got working at farms and ranches inspired him to write stories like *Of Mice and Men* and it’s also where his interest in Mexican people arose, from which he drew inspiration for *Tortilla Flat* and *Cannery Row*. (Parini 1994: 43-44) After moving to New York and working as a journalist in the newspaper *American*, he went through a highly creative and productive time, and in 1929 he published his first work *Cup of Gold*, a novel with some autobiographical influences that he finished writing while living at Lake Tahoe for a while. (1994: 91) Before its publication, in 1928, Steinbeck met his first future wife, Carol Henning, in San Francisco, whom she married in 1930. It was her who would later suggest the title of *The Grapes of Wrath*, taken from a Civil War anthem by Julia Ward Howe *Battle Hymn of the Republic*. (Section dedicated to *The Grapes of Wrath*, NSC 2022) She had also a big influence on Steinbeck’s work, besides retyping his manuscripts. After the publication of the short novella *The Red Pony* in 1933, which was highly inspired by his childhood, he published his second novel, *To a God Unknown* in that same year. The seasons he spent in Monterey wandering among canneries also served as an inspiration for novels like *Tortilla Flat*, *Cannery Row*, and *Sweet Thursday*. (Parini 1994: 112) He always used to work in several projects at a time and, in fact, between 1932 and 1950 he managed to publish nearly a book a year. (1994: 122)

The 1930s were marked by his acquaintance and close friendship with Edward Ricketts, which was the ‘real’ person behind some of the most important characters in many of his novels, among which, *The Grapes of Wrath*. But it was also a time marked by agricultural strikes widespread in California amid the Depression which would inspire his novel *In Dubious Battle*, published in 1936. (Section dedicated to *In Dubious Battle*, NSC 2022) In 1937, *Of Mice and Men* was published and sold in big numbers, amid both negative and positive reviews, one of which referred to the short novel as “the finest bit of prose fiction of this decade”. (Parini 1994: 228) On the same year, Carol and Steinbeck went on a road trip along Route 66, following the journey that so many migrants had taken, with the goal of writing a book about the situation of the Dust Bowl had caused. (1994:

237-238) Between 1936 and 1938 he paid some visits to migrant camps to witness the situation in which they were living, where he also helped, especially during the great flood in the Visalia area in 1938. (1994: 245) During these visits in 1936, Steinbeck wrote a series of articles published in the *San Francisco News* which reported the migrants' situation during the Dust Bowl. This series was named *Harvest Gypsies* and was republished in 1938 in pamphlet form by the Simon J. Lubin Society with an added chapter under the title *Their Blood is Strong*. (Plaque accompanying a reprint of *Their Blood is Strong*, NSC 2022) Shortly after, in 1939, *The Grapes of Wrath* finally saw the light and became a bestseller. By 1940, Steinbeck won the Pulitzer Prize for Fiction and the National Book Award for his novel on migrants' struggles. While trying to get rid of the accusations that branded him as a Communist, the marriage with Carol was coming to an end. His 1940 trip to Baja California with Ricketts served him to write *Sea of Cortez: A Leisurely Journal of Travel and Research*, a piece of non-fiction published in 1941, and *The Log from the Sea of Cortez*, published in 1951. His second and brief marriage, with Gwyndolyn Conger, didn't influence his works nearly as much, however, their first son was born in 1944. In 1943, he spent some months working as a war journalist in England, North Africa, and Italy. (Parini 1994: 331) After the impact the war caused on him, he finally finished and published *Cannery Row* in 1945, a 'light' and readable novel. In 1946, his second son with Gwyn was born. His next best-known work was *The Pearl*, a novella published in 1947 which he later adapted into a screenplay. (1994: 355) However, it was not very well received and was deemed as an unsuccessful melodrama, "artistically inferior to most of Steinbeck's previous works". (1994: 383)

In 1948, his best friend, Ed Ricketts, died in an accident, and Gwyn asked for the divorce. In Hollywood, while working on the *Viva Zapata!* script, he met his third future wife, Elaine, a Broadway and Hollywood star. (1994: 404) They ended up getting married in 1950 and moved to New York –she would remain his wife until his death. Now that he was happy again, he set himself to write his longest novel, as Steinbeck wrote, "I shall get to the large book of my life –*The Salinas Valley*. I don't care how long it takes. It will be nearly three quarters of a million words or about twice as long as *The Grapes of Wrath*." (as quoted in Parini 1994: 396) He would later rename the novel into *East of Eden*, which was finally published in 1952, and has been considered his *magnum opus*. It was written for his sons, Thom and John, a mix of autobiography and fiction to explain them where they came from. In 1960, Steinbeck bought a van, called it Rocinante (named after Don Quijote's horse), and went on a road trip with his dog Charley through America with the

goal to see, hear, and experience how was America at that time. After the many travels to Europe, and having been sick and having recovered, he felt disconnected from his country, and it was time for this to change. In other words, it was a travel to reconnect with America and Americans. In Steinbeck's own words: "What I'll get I need badly – a re-knowledge of my own country, of its speeches, its views, its attitudes and its changes". (qtd. in Parini 1994: 503) In a way, this knowledge of his own country is what had brought him to write great novels like *The Grapes of Wrath*, *In Dubious Battle*, or *Tortilla Flat*. This adventure would be published in 1962 in the form of a travelogue, under the title of *Travels with Charley*. His last novel, *The Winter of our Discontent*, was published in 1961. In October 1962, John Steinbeck was awarded with the most prestigious prize: the Nobel Prize for Literature, to which he said "This prize is a monster in some ways. [...] I have always been afraid of it. Now I must handle it". (1994: 533) After this, he spent some more time traveling with Elaine and he didn't write much more than journalism pieces. Slowly, his health started to deteriorate, and, in autumn of 1968, he died peacefully at home, in the company of his wife and a couple of friends, among which were his longtime friend and literary agent Elizabeth Otis. (1994: 578)¹³

As Jones writes, Steinbeck was a highly skilled person with many different interests: he coauthored a textbook on marine biology; he wrote *Of Mice and Men*, an awarded play in Broadway; he supported the US military by writing some publicity for the recruiting of new men; he translated a classic, *Morte d'Arthur*, written in Middle English into contemporary English, which was published as *The Acts of King Arthur and His Noble Knights*; and even did some extensive research on Emiliano Zapata, the leader of the Mexican Revolution, in the course of some trips to Mexico. (Jones 2021: 3) As one can read at the National Steinbeck Center, he would later use this research to write the screenplay *Viva Zapata!*, thanks to which he got two nominations to the Oscars for best story and best screenplay in 1952. (Section dedicated to *Viva Zapata!*, NSC 2022) "More in the tradition of European than American writers, Steinbeck published novels, plays, essays, stories, screenplays, memoirs, travel articles, and a great deal of political and cultural journalism." (Parini 1994: 505) Judging by his biography, then, it is easy to see how multifaceted he was and how this ended up influencing his work. Partly due to his friendship with Ed Ricketts, he developed a deep interest in biology and the natural world,

¹³ Not all Steinbeck's works and life events have been mentioned in this brief account of his biography. Only the main ones, and those which are considered to have influenced his style and, foremost, his novel *The Grapes of Wrath*.

and Parini even argues, that Steinbeck “was in some ways a founding father of modern ecological thinking, viewing all parts of nature as a united whole and recognizing that the existence of any single part is intricately dependent upon all other parts.” (1994: 5) This relationship and connection of humans and nature is perceived in many of his works, also in *The Grapes of Wrath*, where the mistreatment of the land in men’s hands leads to, or severely aggravates, the Dust Bowl. It is also in this book where migrants are compared to ‘bugs’ with great adaptive power to the changing environment and natural conditions, connecting, once again, nature, animal kingdom and humankind.

As already mentioned above, Steinbeck won the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1962. But this achievement wasn’t a bed of roses: criticism rained over him from many directions. Many people claimed he didn’t deserve the prize, and he was criticised for being too sentimental and nostalgic. The American literary critic Leslie Fiedler was one of the harshest voices and said that *The Grapes of Wrath*, the novel that probably led him to win the prestigious prize, was “ruined by didacticism, sentimentality, and melodrama, by hopelessly contradictory politics and equally sloppy writing”. (qtd. in Jones 2021: 1) Like him, there were other critics who didn’t appreciate Steinbeck’s writing and his changes in styles and genres, from brilliant passages to ‘bad’ ones, in Wilson’s words. (2021: 3) Nonetheless, Steinbeck had, and still has, an array of fans who defend its legacy and are in awe by the depth of his stories and the way he describes human relationships, among them, but also their relationship with the land. In the next section, I will elaborate more on the reception of *The Grapes of Wrath*.

4.2. *The Grapes of Wrath*

The Grapes of Wrath is a story about social and moral crisis. It questions how far human morality can hold when pushed to the limits, and how the fight for dignity implies the existence of hope. Steinbeck’s work forces the reader to look at the eyes of hunger, humiliation, and despair, but is also a celebration of sturdiness, determination, and charity. In this text, Steinbeck reflected some of the topics that concerned him the most, that is, philosophy, social injustice, the effects of the human actions on the land and, consequently, on the climate, and men’s relationship with God. The novel also shows how a female figure, Ma, is the strongest character and the one that fights to keep the family together, the thinking head and the decision-maker. “She seemed to know, to accept to welcome her position, the citadel of the family, the strong place that could not be taken.” (Steinbeck

2017: 85) With this, Steinbeck proved to be advanced in his mentality of the role of the woman in society. A mentality that also calls Pa's and Tom's attention: "Funny! Woman takin' over the fambly. Woman sayin' we'll do this here, and we'll go there. An' I don' even care." (2017: 499) It must be noted however, that the story is not only a migration journey, the search of the American dream, or human injustice. As Parini explains, it is the story about "what Steinbeck calls 'Manself'. It is about the human quest for self-realization, as a group and as separate individuals." (Parini 1994: 273)

That being said, the novel explains the story of the Joads, a family from Oklahoma forced to leave their cotton farm as a result of the Dust Bowl and the pressure of the banks. When Tom Joad leaves prison after four years, he finds that his house has been left behind, empty and slightly out of its foundations. Together with old Casy, who has lost his faith and stopped preaching, they figure out thanks to Muley that the Joad family have moved to Uncle John's house while preparing for the long journey to California, the promised land. Once they get there and they reunite with the whole family (Ma, Pa, Noah, Rose of Sharon, Grampa, Granma, Al, Winfield, Ruthie, Uncle John, and Connie), the preparations for the trip have already started. Useful tools, clothes and useful utensils have been separated and packed for the journey, the things too heavy to carry have been sold at a ridiculous price, and the 'useless' memories, souvenirs, and objects accumulated through a lifetime have been burned. With the few money earned, they buy a jalopy to get to California. Leaving aside the sadness and frustration of being forced to leave their land and their home, there is a hint of optimism in the air, both among older and younger generations. As Ma expresses it, "I like to think how nice it's gonna be, maybe, in California. Never cold. An' fruit ever'place, an' people just bein' in the nicest places, little white houses in among the orange trees. [...] maybe we can get one of them little white houses." (Steinbeck 2017: 105) The whole family expects a fruitful land with unlimited oranges and grapes, but what awaits them is completely different. A dream coming from the yellow handbills that promise work for everyone and good wages.

Already on the Road 66, they find themselves surrounded with people who, like them, are on the look for a better life in California after having been pushed off their lands and homes. The first member of the family to die is Grampa, who, in the last moment, refuses to leave Uncle John's house and has to be sedated to be put in the car. In a way, he never leaves his land, just as he wanted. Right before entering California, Noah, the oldest brother, decides he won't continue the travel with his family, but he will stay and live next to the river. And shortly after, Granma also dies. They then go on from settlement to

settlement, called Hoovervilles, trying to find extremely bad-paid jobs and living in horrible conditions, being pushed aside by policemen or by bands of angry Californian men, who see their lands and jobs threatened by the sudden number of migrants looking to work their fields. At a certain point, Connie, Rosaharn's husband, leaves and abandons the family, his wife and his yet-to-be-born child. They live their best month when staying at the government camp living in a tent, where police is not allowed and there is a sense of community among all the migrants, who struggle to find some normality among the desperation and the hunger. Once the food is about to run out and there's no more work around, Ma, the strongest pillar of the family that keeps them together, states that they have to leave the government camp to find other jobs and avoid starvation.

The family finds a job picking fruit for five cents a box, and Casy, which has started a transformation into a political activist, gets involved in the creation of a union and wants the workers to go on strike because of the miserable money they get. Eventually, he gets killed by the vigilantes for his revolutionary ideas, and Tom, in turn, kills one of Casy's killers. After that, the price per box drops to the half and the family decides to leave again, also to protect Tom. They move to Weedpatch, they settle in one end of a boxcar they share with another family, and work picking cotton, while Tom hides nearby, until he leaves his hiding place and goes away, with a new idea of justice and the will of revolution in his head. Shortly after, Rosaharn gives birth to a stillborn baby and, at the same time, the rains come, taking everything with them, making cars useless. The gripping end shows Rosaharn feeding an old man in the verge of starvation with the milk of her breasts, which should have fed her still-born baby. As Parini puts it, "This simple act of charity is crucial, symbolizing the humanity of these people. Misfortune has both united and ennobled them." (Parini 1994: 271) This is also the climax that shows the difference between the big landowners, who have everything and share nothing, against the position of migrants, who have nothing and share everything.

Structurally, the novel has two distinct types of chapters: the ones where the story of the Joads develops, and the purely narrative ones written in a mix of prose and poetry, which have been described as interchapters or intercalary chapters. These interchapters don't narrate the Joads' struggles, they rather serve the purpose of describing and contextualising the situation the Joads—and the other thousands of families—are going through. They usually also serve as a prelude to the actions that will be narrated in the following chapters with the presence of the Joads. In other words, they help to historically contextualise the plot. As Steinbeck explained, these chapters are pace-changers, "designed

to slow things down, to open readers and leave them vulnerable to a plunging violence of description.” (Jones 2021: 135) References to this slowness, the slow advance and the slow change which Jones named *emergence*, can also be found along the text, not only in the way characters are described and the extreme attention to detail, but also explicitly, as in the passage where Ma explains the adaptation capabilities of women when trying to reassure Pa and Uncle John that everything will be alright: “Woman, it’s all one flow, like a stream, little eddies, little waterfalls, but the river, it goes right on. Woman looks at it like that. We ain’t gonna die out. People is goin’ on—changin’ a little, maybe, but goin’ right on.” (Steinbeck 2017: 500)

Regarding its **context**, Steinbeck set his story in the years of the Dust Bowl, a series of dust storms that swept the center of the United States between 1935 and 1938. It affected especially the states of Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, and Kansas, and it was the result of severe draught combined with the single crop agricultural system, which exhausted the land’s resources and ended up killing it. In combination with the Great Depression (1929-1939), this phenomenon caused the mobilization of 3,5 million people and around 90.000 of them moved to California. (Worster 1972: 49-50)

Steinbeck, who, as already mentioned was highly interested in topics like social justice and the human influence on the land, decided to portray the situation as it was unfolding: how the Dust Bowl affected the American people and their land—especially in the Oklahoma and surroundings—, and how California received more people than it could accommodate and more workers than it could employ. He wanted to see everything firsthand, that is why he went on several tours of migrant camps to see in what conditions they were living. During one of the tours he did in 1938 accompanied by Tom Collins, manager of a government-funded camp, he wrote a letter to a friend saying, “I don’t know if you know what a bomb California is right now or not. I can only assure you that it is highly explosive. I want to see it all and hear it all.” (Correspondence, Series I, NSC 2022) He later went on another tour between to see the impact the flood had caused in the migrant camps. That time, he went with the photographer Horace Bristol, whose photos were not published until 1940 for being too explicit. (Section dedicated to *The Grapes of Wrath*, NSC 2022)

The American readership did not give a very warm **reception** to Steinbeck text. The novel received many strong reactions when it was first published. The negative critics argued that the text was a direct criticism of the American society, which had been portrayed as inhumane and insensitive. Even before the publication of the book, the news

started to spread branding Steinbeck as a Red revolutionary and a communist, and he even claimed that he was being investigated by the FBI. On top of that, he was being approached by left-wing groups, who were trying to pull him to their side, as the presumed communist he was. (Parini 1994: 267)

Nonetheless, the numbers of copies sold was extremely high and “by the end of 1939, over 430,000 books had been shipped.” (1994: 276) Once published, an extensive article written by Father Arthur D. Spearman, director of the library of Loyola University, appeared in *The Los Angeles Examiner* and *The San Francisco Examiner* in which he analysed and meticulously criticised the novel for being morbid, discrediting religion, for the presence of profane expressions, for being socialist propaganda, and instigating revolution. (Newspapers, NSC 2022) However, the *New York Times* was more favourable and was able to grasp the complicated dual temporality of the novel, “It is a very long novel... and yet it reads as if it had been composed in a flash, ripped off the typewriter and delivered to the public as an ultimatum. It is a long and thoughtful novel as one thinks about it. It is a short and vivid scene as one feels it.” (qtd. in Jones 2021: 135) *The Grapes of Wrath* also got positive reviews from *The Atlantic Monthly* and *North American Review*, written by two highly influential literary critics. Charles Angoff wrote: “With his latest novel, Mr Steinbeck at once joins the company of Hawthorne, Melville, Crane, and Norris, and easily leaps to the forefront of all his contemporaries. The book has all the earmarks, of something momentous, monumental, and memorable.” (as quoted in Parini 1994: 268) He also got positive reviews from *The New Yorker* and *The New Republic*, where his work was put at the same level to Victor Hugo’s *Les Misérables* due to its revolutionary nature. (1994: 269)

Another interesting reaction to Steinbeck’s novel was M. V. Hartranft’s own novel, *The Grapes of Gladness*, which was published in the very same year: 1939. According to him, Steinbeck’s novel was inaccurate and close to a lie. He argued that people who came to California and were willing to work hard, could afford to get a piece of land. (Newspaper article, NSC 2022)

Yet another book was written in response to *The Grapes of Wrath*. This time, its title was *Of Human Kindness*, it was written by Ruth Mitchell, and it was published only one year later, in 1949. It counterargued some of the points of Steinbeck’s novel and attempted to offer the complete story of what happened with the migrants in California. As Peggy Conaway Bergtold explains, according to Mitchell, “one of the biggest holes in Steinbeck’s story was its failure to acknowledge the measure of relief that was offered by

local authorities to those newly arriving in California”. (Steinbeck Now 2021) This is a statement that Steinbeck would later corroborate in a Voice of America radio interview.

It is worth drawing attention to the fact that the place where *The Grapes of Wrath* was strongest criticised, was in Oklahoma and, naturally, in California. In fact, there were places in California where the novel was banned from schools and libraries, and even more shockingly, as stated in the National Steinbeck Center,

Steinbeck’s writings were publicly burned in Salinas on two occasions, and at times he did not feel welcome in his own hometown. Yet he ultimately was honored for his achievements. A school, the main public library, and numerous businesses are named for Steinbeck. (Plaque accompanying a school picture of Steinbeck, NSC 2022)

We have seen then, an array of negative and positive opinions on Steinbeck’s *The Grapes of Wrath*, but also on him as a writer, which culminated with his Nobel Prize in Literature.

4.3. Steinbeck’s language

We have already mentioned that many of Steinbeck’s novels included dialogues in vernacular, colloquial and vulgar expressions, and regionalisms. The reason behind this choice was the will of portraying the speech of the people as true and faithful to reality as possible. In other words, to mirror society through language. Only like this, he would be able to transport the spirit, the character, and the struggles of the people into the pages. Not to do so, would result in an artificial effect of the novel and a huge loss of credibility. This was the source of much criticism and of many attempts by agents and publishers to ‘correct’ the harsh language. As he himself said, “A working man bereft of his profanity is a silent man. [...] To try to reproduce the speech of these people and to clean it up is to make it sound stiff, unnatural and emasculated.” (qtd. in Čerče 2017: 70) The non-standard language that Steinbeck used in *The Grapes of Wrath*—and for that matter, in *Of Mice and Men* and many of his other works portraying working-class men—is one of the reasons his book was strongly criticised. As one can read in Steinbeck’s extensive biography by Parini, the editors of the book were afraid that the bookstores wouldn’t want to sell a book with such ‘obscene’ language and that, ultimately, the book would be banned. That is why, he had to ‘clean’ and ‘purify’ the novel from the harshest words, a process which, as he later explained, was painful and “each little change [...] felt like a blow.” (Parini 1994: 265)

The vernacular found in his works was the result of listening to people at work and in the streets, of having conversations with them, and of working shoulder by shoulder next to them. It was the result of the summers he spent working in ranches and farms, his strolls through the streets of Monterey and Pacific Grove, and his visits to the canneries in Cannery Row. Steinbeck described his representation of the dialect in the written form in a letter to McIntosh and Otis as follows:

There are curious things about the language of working men. I do not mean the local idioms, but the speech which is universal in this country among travelling workers. Nearly every man uses it individually, but it has universal rules. It is not grammatical error but a highly developed speech form... I tell you these things so you will understand why, in one sentence having two present participles, one 'g' will be there and the other left off. This is a pretty carefully done mss [sic!]. If you read such a sentence over, aloud, you will see that it naturally falls that way. (qtd. in Lisca 1958: 110 -111)

At the end of his career, as mentioned above, he went on a road trip through America to *listen* to people and get a sense of how their speech was, what concerns and worries they had.

To portray the vernacular in a written form, Steinbeck deviated from the conventional forms of grammar, lexis and phonology. As Čerče explains, “In the area of phonology, a noticeable characteristic of English colloquialism is the omission of consonants, unstressed vowels and syllables.” As well as the “merging of stressed words and particles, which is connected with subsequent sound reductions and alternations when such mergers result in consonant clusters that are difficult to pronounce.” (Čerče 2017: 74) For example, as we can see in this passage of *The Grapes of Wrath*:

Your grampa didn't wanta kill the guy drivin' that cat', an' that was Willy Feeley, an' Willy knowed it, so he jus' come on, an' bumped the hell outa the house, an' give her a good shake like a dog shakes a rat. Well, it took somepin outa Tom. Kinda got into 'im. He ain't been the same ever since. (Steinbeck 2017: 53)

In this very short example, we find a high number of consonant omissions, as in “an” (and), “jus” (just), or “'im” (him). Regarding the clusters of consonants mentioned by Čerče, we see “wanta” (want to), “outa” (out of), or “kinda” (kind of). Not as usual, we also find the word “somepin” as a way of easing the pronunciation of the word *something*, a recurrent trait of the Southern White Vernacular English represented by Steinbeck. Other common features to be found in the example above are the incorrect use of irregular verbs –“knowed” instead of *knew*–, and the widely-spread negation form “ain't”.

As we will later see, all these features and dialectal markers have proven to be a big complication for translators in every language. However, the common tendency has been to standardize the non-standard dialect and resort to some colloquial markers in the TT.

V. LAS UVAS DE LA IRA

In this section, I will examine through his translations, how Steinbeck was received among the Spanish speaking readership, what his levels of popularity were, and I will contextualise the three chosen translations of *The Grapes of Wrath* in Spanish, that is, *Las uvas de la ira*, by Hernán Guerra (the 1951 edition), María Coy (the 2002 edition) and Pilar Vázquez (the 2010 edition).

5.1. Steinbeck in Spanish

Each and every work of Steinbeck has been translated into Spanish. However, the translations didn't appear as fast or as regularly as the new works were being written. In some cases, there is a difference of quite some years between the publication of the original work and the publication of its Spanish version. Does this mean that Steinbeck was not a beloved author in the Spanish-speaking world? Or maybe in Spain? One could argue that the presence of the fascist dictator Franco in Spain between 1939 and 1975, delayed the connection of the country with the rest of the world and increased the difficulty of the publication of an author that had been criticised as being leftist, anti-capitalist, and even communist. As Craig points out, translations (together with children's books) were victims of a harsher censorship, and not only due to the "specific proscription of left-wing ideas" as *The Grapes of Wrath* would be, but also due to "the excessive number of translations in the Spanish book market" which embodied a different world view. (Craig 1997: 74)

The fact is that the first Spanish translations were published in Buenos Aires, Argentina. And it took still some time to see them published in Spain. Steinbeck's first novel in Spanish was *La luna se ha puesto* (*The Moon is Down*), which saw the light in Buenos Aires in 1942, the same year than the source text. It was seven years later when the first translation in the Iberian Peninsula was published: *El Ómnibus Perdido* (*The Wayward Bus*), in 1949, two years later than the publication of the original. However, still six translations more were published in South America before having any single one in Spain. One of those was *Las uvas de la ira* (*The Grapes of Wrath*) by Hernán Guerra Canévaro, published in 1947 in Santiago de Chile, which would later be adapted to the Spanish from Spain and published in Barcelona in 1951. This is the version I have taken for the analysis and comparison to Coy's and Vázquez's translations. The translation by Hernán Guerra

would keep being published in new editions, but it wasn't until 1989, when a new translation of *The Grapes of Wrath* appeared in Spanish, this time by María Coy Girón in Madrid. This version would be reissued in different editions by different publishers in Madrid and Barcelona, and it is the translation that would be used for the centennial edition—the one that I will use in the analysis and comparison. The last and most recent translation of the migrants' story in Spanish was completed by Pilar Vázquez and published in Barcelona in 2010. We can see, then, that *The Grapes of Wrath* has been translated into Spanish by three different translators in nearly 30 editions. This shows us that, even if the first translation of this novel took a considerable time to appear into Spanish, and even more to reach Spain, it is still very present and beloved, or at least, considered relevant enough for the publication of new editions every few years.

It is interesting, as Álvarez Maurín points out in the *Diccionario Histórico de la Traducción en España*, that it wasn't until 1986 when the first translation of *Of Mice and Men* appeared in Spain. The highly popular novella which was first published in the United States in 1937, was indeed published in Buenos Aires in 1945, but it took way longer to reach Spain. This fact rises some questions regarding the reasons behind the choices of texts to translate, and why is there such a big difference in time in the translations between Argentina and Spain. In view of the data gathered by the Index Translationum and the Biblioteca Nacional de España, it can be assumed that Steinbeck was, at least at the beginning, much more popular in Argentina than in any other Spanish-speaking country. With the time, however, around the second half of the 1950s, Barcelona took the lead as the main publishing place for Steinbeck's translations.

Another fact worth mentioning is the increase in new and re-translations in Spain during the 60s, when Steinbeck was awarded with the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1962, which increased his visibility, appreciation, and recognition in Spain and, probably, around the world. However, the first contact of Steinbeck with the Spanish world would be through films, and not through the written word. The movies, the Nobel Prize and the publication of his complete works in three volumes by the publisher Luis de Caralt would be the main contributing factors for the recognition of the author in Spain.

The Spanish critics, especially Josep M. Castellet and Carlos Rojas, were more or less in the line of their American counterparts. While they agreed that Steinbeck's prose was quite irregular in effects of quality, they also praised his abilities as a realist narrator and his claim for social justice. They all mostly agreed that Steinbeck's best works were *Of Mice and Men*, and *The Grapes of Wrath*. (Dasca 2015: 27)

5.2. The translation by Hernán Guerra Canévaro

The first of the three translations of *The Grapes of Wrath* that I will analyse first appeared in Santiago de Chile in 1947.¹⁴ That version would be later adapted for the Spanish market and would be the first to be published in Spanish from Spain, that is, Castilian. This adaptation, published in 1951 by Editorial Planeta, is the one that will be used in the following analysis and comparison. Guerra also translated H. G. Wells' *The Shape of Things to Come*, and Waldo Frank's *The Re-Discovery of America*, both published in Santiago de Chile by the publishing house Zig Zag.

But let's focus on *The Grapes of Wrath*. When checking through the pages and reading a passage at random, one can immediately notice that something is missing. Or I should rephrase it saying that one person who has read the original can notice that something is missing. The 'eye dialect' mentioned before is nowhere to be seen. No elisions, no contractions, no apostrophes showing missing letters. In other words, there are absolutely no dialectal markers, no regionalities, and not even the casual register has been extensively used. The only deviation from a standard and very much correct Spanish are the few scattered swear words across the novel. Here we can see a very short example of the missing 'eye dialect':

–Es un canalla, el hombre más perverso que ha pisado la tierra. Dios querrá que se vaya derecho al infierno. ¡Quiere guiar el camión! – exclamó, con tono desdeñoso –. Pero no lo va a conseguir. (Guerra 1951: 89-90)

The Spanish translation offers an abysmal contrast with the original dialogue Steinbeck wrote:

“A wicketer, cussin’er man never lived. He’s goin’ to hell on a poker, praise Gawd! Wants to drive the truck!” she said spitefully. “Well, he ain’t goin’ ta.” (Steinbeck 2017: 92)

It immediately strikes one's eye the divergence between the two versions. Guerra doesn't reproduce any of the non-standard forms of the original, which offers a depiction of orality through consonants omission (*goin'*), contractions (*ain't*), or the imitation of the phonology of the SWVE, as in *Gawd* for *God*. The Spanish version doesn't show any deviation, and the only word that could be regarded and accepted as not part of a formal register is *canalla*,

¹⁴ Sadly, I haven't been able to locate this first version of *Las uvas de la ira* published in Chile, so no comparison has been made between the aforementioned version and the translation published in Spain.

“persona despreciable y de malos procederes”¹⁵, according to the dictionary of the Real Academia Española. This term used to be part of the colloquial register, but its use is no longer that extended anymore. An interesting fact, however, is the choice of the word *guiar* for *drive*, which is not common in Peninsular Spanish, but rather belongs to the Spanish of Latin America. Here is where we can see the traces of the place of origin of the translation, and it can lead the reader into thinking that it got forgotten in the adaptation for the Spanish readership.

It is true that the year of publication of the translation brings us back to a different and more conservative era, when it comes to language. This, together with the fact that the Spanish literature doesn't have a strong tradition in the use of non-standard dialect, could be a reason for the absence of an imitation of a dialect in the TL. In seeing how this text has been transported into the TL, does it really mean that a Spanish-speaking person reading this book has actually read Steinbeck? While the story is the same, the essence is lost. The characters are also formed and shaped by their language; their struggles are shown through their language; as well as their joys. What the reader gets after reading Guerra's translation is an accurate idea of the whole story, but where the emotional depth has been mangled and the language has been cleaned –which is exactly what Steinbeck feared and against what he fought.

This section only aims to be a presentation of the translation itself. In a later section, Guerra's text will be more precisely analysed and explored through extensive examples and it is also going to be compared to Coy's and Vázquez's translations, as well as to Steinbeck's original text.

5.3. The translation by María Coy Girón

The second translation I will analyse is the one completed by María Coy Girón. Her first version was published in Madrid in 1989 by the publishing house Cátedra, and it would be published by several publishers in Madrid and Barcelona in new editions. The one used in this study is the Steinbeck centennial edition, published in 2002 by Penguin Books using the copyrighted translation belonging to Cátedra from 1999.

As in the translation by Guerra, when choosing a page in Coy's version at random, the reader is not able to see any dialectal markers. As before, there are no elisions, no

¹⁵ My own translation of the dictionary entry: “A despicable person with bad manners”.

apostrophes and no contractions that indicate that the dialogue in the novel is not happening in a standard language, but rather in a variant spoken by poor farmers of Oklahoma with no education. Coy has chosen a standard Spanish to transmit Steinbeck's ideas. Hence, most of the social and historical background and its nuances get lost on the translation. Nonetheless, we can perceive how Coy has tried to reflect –to some extent– the SWVE of the ST by means of the colloquial register. The following example can give us a taste of how she approaches the issue of the dialect:

–Claro que llevo pecados. Todo el mundo los lleva. Un pecado es algo de lo que no estás seguro. Esas personas que están seguras de todo y no tienen ningún pecado... vaya, con esos hijos de puta, si yo fuera Dios los echaba del cielo de una patada en el culo. No los aguantaría. (Coy 2002: 253)

And let's take a look at Steinbeck's version:

“Sure I got sins. Ever’body got sins. A sin is somepin you ain’t sure about. Them people that’s sure about ever’thing an’ ain’t got no sin—well, with that kind a son-of-a-bitch, if I was God I’d kick their ass right outa heaven! I couldn’ stand ’em!” (Steinbeck 2017: 264)

Visually, the original text can easily be recognised as a non-standard variation, which is something that can't be said from Coy's translation. However, when paying closer attention and reading the TT, we do find an increase in colloquial expressions, as “de una patada en el culo”, and even the swear word has been kept and not ‘cleaned out’. Nonetheless, there are no phonological, syntactical, or lexical divergences from the standard Spanish. On the contrary, Steinbeck's version overflows with such features, with a special emphasis on words that have been adapted to imitate the pronunciation of the dialect, as in “somepin”, “ever’body”, “ever’thing”, or “outa”. We also find the omission of some consonants as in “’em” or “an’”, or the widely extended contraction “ain’t”.

None of these features have been reflected in the TT. There has been no visible attempt from the translator's side to try to find a suitable form in Spanish that could represent a similar characteristic and have a similar effect on the reader. This results in an alienated experience of the expected impact that the reading of Steinbeck's novel should cause in the reader. Once again, as in Guerra's translation, the text misses the character that the careful language choice carries in *The Grapes of Wrath*. This loss becomes of special importance in a novel produced to impact, provoke, and leave a mark in the readership. And it all comes down to a very basic fact, and that is that not only the message or the story

is important, but also the way the message is transmitted –the words and the character behind them.

In a later section, as with Hernán Guerra’s translation, I will analyse Coy’s text in more depth by means of its comparison with the original text and with the other two translations.

5.4. The translation by Pilar Vázquez Álvarez

The third translation that will serve as a basis for this study is the one by Pilar Vázquez Álvarez. Her version was first published in Barcelona in 2010 by the publishing house Tusquets. It is the most recent Spanish translation of *The Grapes of Wrath* and has already been published in five editions, the last one in 2019. In contrast to the other translators, the information about Vázquez is quite abundant and easily accessible. She was known as ‘*la traductora de John Berger*’ due to her strong bond with the author, who only wanted to have his works translated into Spanish by her. (Magrinyà 2020) She also translated classics as Tracy Chevalier’s *La joven de la perla* (*Gril With a Pearl Earring*), and Arthur Golden’s *Memorias de una geisha* (*Memoirs of a Geisha*). Regarding her translation of *The Grapes of Wrath*, she admitted having felt under pressure, since a new translation of an already translated work means, according to her, that it should be better than the existing one. (Magrinyà 2020)

Yet again, when checking the translation, the non-standard language is conspicuous by its absence: no eye dialect catches the reader’s attention, no contractions, no apostrophes marking the omission of letters. In other words, no visual dialectal makers have been kept in the Spanish text. In the following example, the divergence in style can be perceived at first glance:

–Eso es –dijo–. Y ya va siendo hora. Mi hermano se fue a California hace lo menos cuarenta años. No volví a saber nada de él. Era un cuco mi hermano. Menudo hijo de puta. Nadie le quería bien. (Vázquez 2019: 116)

This passage isn’t particularly permeated by a colloquial register, the only marker that allows its the classification into a more relaxed register is the expression “Menudo hijo de puta”. In contrast, let’s examine Steinbeck’s version:

“Yes, sir,” he said. “An’ goddamn near time, too. My brother went on out there forty years ago. Never did hear nothin’ about him. Sneaky son-of-a-bitch, he was. Nobody loved him. (Steinbeck 2017: 107)

The original text carries the same message but it has a stronger effect thanks to the lower register, achieved by expressions like “goddamn” and “son-of-a-bitch”. Regarding the pronunciation, we also see how Steinbeck has reflected the vernacular through some omissions, like “An” for *and*, and “nothin” for *nothing*. As in the translations by Guerra and Coy, Vázquez doesn’t manage, or try, to come up with a suitable solution for these omissions and markers in Steinbeck’s text. Hence, the readers of the translations get a decaffeinated Steinbeck, instead of the real one. In her defense, it must be added that she does, in contrast to the other two translators, add subtle markers of a non-standard language in her translation, such as the omission of the *d* in adjectives and the gerund forms of the verbs, as we can see in “mareao” (2010: 484) (*dizzy*) instead of *mareado*, as well as other occasional omissions like the *y* in *muy* (very). (Vázquez 2010: 484) Yet another sign of non-standard speech, is the use of an incorrect imperative form, using the infinitive form with the imperative meaning, as we can see in “Dejar algo para Winfield.”¹⁶ (2010 :486) The correct form in the second person plural of the imperative mood would be *dejad*. Interestingly, Vázquez chooses the Joad children to address their mother in the form ‘usted’¹⁷, a form that denotes respect for older people and strangers. And, even though it is no longer used within families in Peninsular Spanish, during the 30s was a common trait in most families. This is the form, however, that is still used in many countries in Latin America.

A look at the end of Vázquez translation is definitely worth it. Unlike her predecessors, she adds a comment on the translation at the end of her edition, which I transcribe in its entirety because of its relevance for this study:

El 4 de febrero de 1935, John Steinbeck escribía a Mavis MacIntosh: “El habla de los trabajadores puede parecer un poco exagerado en los clubs de damas, pero dado que, en cualquier caso, en los clubs de damas no creen que sucedan estas cosas, poco importa lo que pueda parecerles. Conozco esta habla y estoy harto de que se castre a estos hombres de su modo de expresión natural, hasta el punto de que terminan hablando con un marcado acento oxoniano...”. En consonancia con esta observación de Steinbeck, y por fidelidad al original, esta traducción de *Las uvas de la ira* recoge, en una pequeña medida, el habla de sus personajes. Así pues, por primera vez en una traducción de esta obra al español, los personajes no sólo emplean expresiones coloquiales, sino que además cometen algunas incorrecciones muy arraigadas y extendidas en nuestra lengua hablada. (Vázquez 2010: 557)¹⁸

¹⁶ In the source text: “Save some for Winfield.” (Steinbeck 1939: 470)

¹⁷ The Spanish form *usted* is the equivalent to the German form *Sie*, nonexistent in modern English.

¹⁸ My own translation of Vázquez’s comment: “On February 4, 1935, John Steinbeck wrote to Mavis MacIntosh: ‘The workers’ speech may seem a bit over the top in the ladies’ clubs, but since, in any case, in

Vázquez comment acts, in a way, as a self-defense strategy, similar in essence as the one Mark Twain wrote proclaiming his reasons to make use of the dialect and its veracity. As well as Shaw's comment about Eliza's cockney speech. Or like Steinbeck himself, who defended the use of the vernacular to stay true to reality. Every time non-standard language is printed on the pages of a book, the person behind them has the urge to 'apologise' for it and to defend their decision, in an attempt to avoid confrontation with the readership who might not get the point of the incorrect use of a gerund, so to say. Vázquez acknowledges that her attempt to reproduce the vernacular speech in the Spanish translation is only achieved in a very small scale by means of the inclusion of incorrect language, which is a reflection of the spoken language. Like Steinbeck, she tries to reproduce the orality and fluency of the dialogues, though her result is not as satisfactory as that of Steinbeck. She also lets the reader know that no other translation into Spanish from this novel has ever attempted a reproduction of the farmers' speech beyond some colloquial expressions, but hers does. Leaving aside the fact if she succeeds in her attempt or not, it is already a significant step forward in the field of translation that she bothers to include the comment where she mentions how the characters in the original language are marked by a non-standard speech.

These three sections were aimed at providing a general overview of the character and the main qualities of the three translations, focusing on the question of how they have or have not offered a solution to the translational problem of the vernacular speech. With the inclusion of a very short example of each translation, the already mentioned tendency to standardise language in translation remains an active factor in the art of translation. However, it is also interesting to highlight the slight decrease of standardization between the first translation and the last one, owing to a time difference of nearly 60 years. Does it mean, then, that modernity is slowly entering literature, and that translators –and of course the readers– are more open to the presence of non-standard language in literary works?

the ladies' clubs they don't think these things happen, it matters little what it may seem to them. I know this speech and I am sick of these men being emasculated from their natural mode of expression, to the point where they end up speaking with a thick Oxonian accent....' In accordance with Steinbeck's observation and the aim of remaining loyal to the original, this translation of *The Grapes of Wrath* includes, in a small scale, the speech of its characters. That is how, for the first time in the translation of this novel into Spanish, the characters not only make use of colloquial expressions, but they also commit some very deep-rooted and widespread incorrections in our spoken language."

VI. METHODOLOGY

Here I offer a detailed explanation of the process of this research. The reason behind the choice of the topic for this research started with the question “How has the dialect been translated into Spanish in this novel?” while reading *The Grapes of Wrath* in its original language. And it was followed by the thought of not recalling having read many books written in –or including references of– non-standard Spanish. This led to the hypothesis that Spanish literature doesn’t have a broad tradition of keeping dialect markers in its translations, and I set it as my objective of this study to figure out what other solutions, if any, are applied by the translators in order to compensate for the loss. In choosing three translations of the same work from different points in time, I developed my second hypothesis according to which the newest translator would be the one making the most efforts to find a way to translate the dialect or compensate for its loss. In order to reach a satisfactory answer to these questions, the theoretical frame of this study dives into the meaning of sociolinguistics, exploring how the language varies depending on different factors, such as social class or geological region, just to mention two of the most relevant aspects for this research.

With the objective in mind of figuring out how the dialect gets translated and wanting to confirm (or deny) my hypothesis of the lack of tradition of dialect translation in Spanish language literature, I have set *The Grapes of Wrath* and three Spanish translations as my object of study. To answer my questions, I developed a methodology that is partly influenced by Sali A. Tagliamonte in *Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation*. I have taken highly valuable orientation from her methodology, but I have adapted it to fit my case of study. Tagliamonte’s methodology is designed to analyse oral speech through data extraction from recorded speeches by means of the variable rule program, a method to conduct “statistical analysis on natural speech”. (Tagliamonte 129) Since this aspect lies far from my objective, I only got inspiration from certain aspects of her methods and reasonings.

The first step towards the completion of the comparison of the Spanish translations was the choice of the passages to be analysed. For the sake of space availability, I decided to choose four passages. I based my decision on the amount of oral speech represented in dialogues, since the object of my study is the vernacular, and it appears only during conversation. Another deciding factor was the presence of any specific feature that was of

interest for the analysis, as is the case of the Biblical quotes as we will later see. I argue the reason behind the choice of every passage before the analysis of the passage of the ST, that is, after offering an explanation of the chapter in order to provide context for the passage.

The second step was the location, explanation, and analysis of the non-standard language markers, be it a representation of the vernacular or a common feature with other dialects from the AmE, in the original text. The analysis was done focusing on the linguistic variables, which Labov describes as the existence of “two or more ways of saying the same thing”. (qtd. in Tagliamonte 2006: 70) As Tagliamonte specifies, this can happen at a level of phonology –which can refer, for example, to the realisation or non-realisation of consonant clusters at a final position– and at a level of morphosyntaxis –as variable inflections, for instance. (2006: 71) In my analysis I also focused on colloquial and vulgar expressions and the presence of idioms, which, together, defined the register of the passage.

The next step was the analysis of each of the three translations of every passage. This was done by taking the language variables and the dialect markers found in the source text and (successfully or unsuccessfully) trying to find an equivalent in the target texts, involving the same sentences and words, and looking for new markers inexistent in the ST. Besides determining the presence or absence of the (eye) dialect, I also inspected the colloquial and vulgar expressions, the idioms, and the register.

Once I gathered all this information, I made a comparison among the three translations reflecting on the analysis of every passage and answering the following questions:

- Is there a representation of non-standard language?
- In case of a lack of dialect representation, is there any compensation method in place? If yes, which one(s)?
- Which approach, either domestication or foreignization, does prevail in the translation of each passage?

With the answers to these questions, I can finally assess how much gets lost in translation in the case of *The Grapes of Wrath*, how different –or similar– each translation is, and if there have been attempts to provide a satisfactory adaptation of the vernacular. I can, as well, prove or reject the theory that newer translation are more open to change and more daring to challenge the status quo.

VII. COMPARING THE THREE SPANISH TRANSLATIONS

This part will offer an analysis of four passages of *The Grapes of Wrath* in its original language regarding the use of the vernacular. Every passage will then be followed by the three translations. The versions I will be using are the following: the first edition of Hernán Guerra's version, published in 1951 by Editorial Planeta in Barcelona; María Coy's version published by Penguin Books in 2002 in the USA; and the fifth edition of Pilar Vázquez's translation, published by Tusquets Editores in 2019 in Barcelona. Each of the fragments extracted from each translation will be analysed and compared to one another other.

7.1. Analysis of Passage I

The first chosen passage belongs to chapter 13, which marks the beginning of the Joads' long journey to California. It spans from the moment they leave Uncle John's farm, to the moment when Grampa dies in the outskirts of Bethany, Oklahoma, with the company and help of another migrant family and the subsequent start of a friendship –or comradeship– between the two families. The passage depicts the scene that develops right after Grampa dies and the Joads are about to bury him. In an attempt to dignify the old man, and finding themselves unable to provide a funeral, they decide to write some words and bury the note with him.

The quotations from the Bible in this passage allow us to better perceive the linguistic differences between the dialogue –in vernacular–, the narration –in standard English–, and the quotations from the Scriptures –which are written (and spoken) in a higher register than the narrative part. Another interesting fact of this passage is that there is even another layer within the vernacular: this is the only example of a transcription of one of the character's writing, that is, the only representation of the vernacular that doesn't reflect a form of speech, but rather the written form. We can see how Tom struggles to write the note; how the orality of the vernacular and the misspellings of the written form are combined in the prayer for his grandfather, in what comes to be his own idiolect. The first quotation of the Bible, "And Lot said unto them, Oh not so, my Lord" is part of the Genesis 19:18, from the King John Version, while the second one belongs to Psalm 32:1, from the King John Bible as well. This is yet another point worth comparing, to find out

what versions of the Bible have been used in the translations, or if the translators have opted to translate the two quotes themselves.

Before starting with the analysis of the four texts, I want to acknowledge that in the three Spanish translations, the punctuation has been kept the way it was printed, which is the reason behind the irregularities in the three versions regarding the use of the dash marking the dialogues.

Let's start, then, by taking a look at the original version, the source text written by Steinbeck:

Tom sat down in the firelight. He squinted his eyes in concentration, and at last wrote slowly and carefully on the end paper in big clear letters: "This here is Williams James Joad, dyed of a stroke, old old man. His fokes bured him becaws they got no money to pay for funerls. Nobody kilt him. Jus a stroke an he dyed." He stopped. "Ma, listen to this here." He read it slowly to her.

"Why, that soun's nice," she said. "Can't you stick on somepin from Scripture so it'll be religious? Open up an' git a-sayin' somepin outa Scripture."

"Got to be short," said Tom. "I ain't got much room lef' on the page."

Sairy said, "How 'bout 'God have mercy on his soul'?"

"No," said Tom. "Sounds too much like he was hung. I'll copy somepin." He turned the pages and read, mumbling his lips, saying the words under his breath. "Here's a good short one," he said. "'An' Lot said unto them, Oh, not so, my Lord.'"

"Don't mean nothin'," said Ma. "Long's you're gonna put one down, it might's well mean somepin."

Sairy said, "Turn to Psalms, over further. You kin always get somepin outa Psalms."

Tom flipped the pages and looked down the verses. "Now here is one," he said. "This here's a nice one, just blowed full a religion: 'Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered.' How's that?"

"That's real nice," said Ma. "Put that one in." (Steinbeck 2017: 166-167)

Of course, the original text is the one more prone to a wider and deeper analysis, due to its high number of non-standard variables. As already mentioned, the most dominant feature of the passage is the reproduction of the spelling of Tom's note, which is his own attempt at the depiction of the orality of the SWVE in a written form. This reaffirms that, even if the family are not illiterate, they are not educated either. In contrast with Steinbeck's reproduction of the oral vernacular in the dialogues, which adapts the grammar and lexica to fit the pronunciation of the characters while avoiding misspellings, Tom's writing does include misspellings that are added to the adaptations. An example for that is how Tom writes "fokes" for *folks*, omitting the silent letter 'l', or "funerls" for funerals, which gives us a clear idea of how he might have pronounced the term. In Tom's note we can also find some of the same irregularities present in the dialogues,

however, the omission of a letter (or syllable) isn't marked by an apostrophe. This shows us that he has no real knowledge of the correct spelling of the word, as we can see in "jus" –which we normally find as *jus* ' in the dialogues–, or "an" instead of the form *an* '.

If we put the analysis in numbers, from the 35 words of Tom's writing, 9 of them show some degree of irregularity, this means, they have a dialectal mark and are, as a result a deviation from the standard norm. These words are: "dyed", "fokes", "bured", "becaws", "funerls", "kilt", "jus", "an", and once again "dyed". Other signs of the strong orality of this short passage –but not necessarily of the vernacular– are the repetition in "old old", which appears also without the comma, and the absence of *have* in "they got no money" (*they haven't got any money*).

Leaving the note aside and diving into the dialogue, we find many markers of non-standard speech that offer a reflection of the vernacular. One of the most repeated ones is "somepin" for *something*, where we see how the dental non-sibilant fricative sound /θ/ has been substituted by a *p*, thus facilitating the pronunciation of the word. Another feature which can be frequently found in several English dialects is the loss of the voiced velar nasal /ŋ/ at final position, in other words, the substitution of the *-ng* phonemes at the end of the word for the sound of the laminal denti-alveolar /n/, as in "sayin'", "nothin'", or "somepin". Similarly, there is also a drop of the final *d* in "soun's nice" and the drop of the final *t* in "room lef". These two features –which we see marked by the apostrophe– are also common in other AmE dialects and represent, as well, an easing of the pronunciation.

It is also interesting to see how the preposition *of* has also been avoided, where *full of* and *out of* have been replaced by "just blowed full a religion" and "You kin always get somepin outa Psalms" respectively. In "blowed" we find an incorrect form of the participle. Steinbeck also represents the dialect in the contraction of *going to*, as in "you're gonna put one down"; the form *ain't*, as in "I ain't got much room lef", and the widely spread double negation, as in "Don't mean nothin'". We also find the merger of the vowels [ɛ] and [ɪ] in *get*, as we can see in "Open up an' git a-sayin' somepin outa Scripture", a similar phenomenon to the Pin-Pen merger, but before a plosive consonant instead of a nasal one; and the shift of *can* into "kin". We also find the omission of the subject in "Got to be short", instead of *it's got to be short* or *it has to be short*. One last aspect to comment, which is quite popular as a sign of non-standard language representation, is the use of *this here* for *this*, as we can see in "This here's a nice one". All these features are strong representatives of the non-standard language and greatly improve the sense of orality and the credibility of the passage.

Drawing the attention towards the register, we see how the two quotations from the Bible act as a big contrast in formality in comparison to the dialogue, jumping from a colloquial and low register characterised by numerous dialectal markers to a formal register in StE.

The **first translation** to be analysed is the first chronologically, the 1951 version by Hernán Guerra.

Tom se sentó a la luz de la hoguera. Frunció las cejas concentrándose, y por último comenzó a escribir lenta y cuidadosamente, con letra grande y clara: *Este que yace aquí es William James Joad, muerto de un ataque a edad muy avanzada. Sus parientes lo enterraron porque no tenían recursos para pagar los funerales. Nadie lo ha matado. Tuvo un ataque y murió.*

Se detuvo y dijo:

—Ma, escuche lo que he escrito.

Y se lo leyó en voz alta.

—Está muy bonito — dijo —. ¿No podrías poner algo de la Escritura, para que tenga algo de religioso? Abre ese libro y busca alguna frase sagrada.

—Tiene que ser corta — dijo Tom —. No me queda mucho espacio en la página.

Sairy dijo:

—¿Qué les parecería: «Que Dios tenga piedad de su alma»?

—No — dijo Tom —. Suena a ahorcado. Copiaré alguna de este libro.

Volvió las páginas y leyó moviendo los labios, diciendo para sí mismo las palabras.

—Aquí hay una bonita y corta — dijo —: «Y Lot le dijo: ¡Oh, así no, Señor!»

—Eso no significa nada — dijo la madre —. Ya que vas a copiar una, que al menos signifique algo.

Tom siguió volviendo las páginas y se detuvo en los versos.

—Ahora sí — dijo —; aquí hay una. Esta es bonita y muy religiosa: «Bendito aquel cuya culpa sea perdonada y su pecado olvidado». ¿Cómo está ésta?

—Esa sí que está bien — dijo la madre —. Escribe esa. (Guerra 1951: 157-158)

Looking back at all the information gathered up to this point regarding the representation of dialect in Spanish translation, it doesn't come as a surprise that Guerra's version doesn't include any hint of dialectal speech. However, after going through it, the reader does feel some degree of informality and colloquialism. Under closer inspection, the first thing we notice when comparing the translation with the original, is the form in which Tom's note has been reproduced: leaving the choice of the italics aside, we do see how Guerra has missed the evident opportunity of adding misspelled words in this part of the translation. It is true that Tom's writing denotes a higher degree of orality than the rest of the passage in the TT in the way the sentences are constructed and how they are connected. However, even when leaving out the non-standard language of the ST, it would have been very easy from a translational point of view to add some incorrect grammar and spelling to be more faithful to the original text. The repetition ("old old") has also been sacrificed in this translation, which would have also added up to the feeling of orality.

Moving forward, we see how Guerra has opted for Tom's use of the formal and respectful way to address his mother: *usted* –the equivalent of the German *Sie*–, a solution that differs between the three translations. As mentioned earlier, this decision does make sense regarding the historical time of the novel, also in a Spanish context, and not only in Latin America. Sairy also makes use of the courtesy form to address the Joads, owing to their very recent acquaintance.

And here comes one big mistake in Guerra's translation, which, lucky for him, is only noticeable if compared with the ST. His version misses Sairy's intervention: "Sairy said, 'Turn to Psalms, over further. You kin always get somepin outa Psalms.'" Since there is no reasonable motivation for omitting this line on purpose, the most plausible explanation is that it was simply forgotten.

A very interesting choice in Guerra's version is the fact that he seems to have opted for translating the Bible quotations for himself instead of using an existing one. After researching the Genesis 19:18 and the Psalm 32:1 in 19 different versions of the Bible in Spanish and not finding the exact same translation, I've come to the conclusion that he did, indeed, translate the verses himself. However, it might also well be, that he extracted the translations from another version I haven't been able to have access to.

Even though Guerra hasn't been able to keep certain features of the ST, such as the double negation, the particle *why* at the beginning of a sentence –as in "Why, that soun's nice"– or any of the other dialectal markers, the TT does have some expressions that slightly balance out the loss of the vernacular, as in "Está muy bonito", instead of *es muy bonito*; or "suena a ahorcado", instead of *suena como si hubiese muerto ahorcado*. It is also by means of the Biblical quotes that the difference in the registers –during the dialogue and when quoting the Psalms– is highly emphasised.

Let's now take a look at the **second translation** from the same passage, completed by María Coy:

Tom se sentó junto al fuego, a la luz. Guiñó los ojos en un gesto de concentración y finalmente escribió lenta y cuidadosamente en letras claras y grandes: Aquí yace William James Joad, murió de un ataque, era muy, muy viejo. Su familia le enterró porque no tenía dinero para pagar un funeral. Nadie le mató. Le dio un ataque y se murió—se interrumpió—. Madre, escucha esto —se lo leyó despacio.

—Suena muy bien —dijo ella—. ¿No puedes meter algo de las Escrituras para que quede más religioso? Abre la Biblia y saca algún dicho algo de las Escrituras.

—Ha de ser corto —dijo Tom—. Me queda poco espacio en la página.

—¿Qué te parece «que Dios se apiade de su alma»? —sugirió Sairy.

—No —replicó Tom—. Así parece que murió en la horca. Copiaré alguna otra cosa —fue pasando páginas, leyendo, moviendo los labios y diciendo las palabras en voz baja.
 —Aquí hay uno corto —dijo—. «Y Lot les dijo: Oh, así no, mi señor.»
 —No significa nada —objetó Madre—. Si vas a poner algo, mejor sería que tuviera significado.
 —Pasa a los Salmos, más adelante —sugirió Sairy—. Siempre encontrarás algo en los Salmos.
 Tom pasó las hojas y fue pasando los ojos por los versos.
 —Aquí hay uno —dijo—. Éste es bonito, está lleno de religiosidad: «Bendito sea aquel cuya transgresión es perdonada, cuyo pecado es cubierto».
 —Muy bien —dijo Madre—. Escribe ése. (Coy 2002: 160-161)

A first glance confirms what seems to be the norm or tendency in the translation of non-standard language into Spanish: there is no visual evidence of a dialect being reflected into the TT, in other words, the ‘eye dialect’ that marks Steinbeck’s version is not present in this translation. And, after reading the text, the suspicion becomes a fact when we see that the translation has been written in standard Spanish and not a single clue of a dialectal speech has been kept. The tone of voice is not as informal or colloquial as it ought to be, and the text doesn’t transmit a very strong feeling of orality. Just like Guerra, Coy hasn’t used the opportunity of writing Tom’s note with some grammatical errors and misspellings. It would already have been a significant achievement to delete the accents in the words to transmit to the reader the level of literacy of the characters, in this case Tom. It is a pity, then, that Steinbeck’s efforts at the characterization of the note as a representation of Tom’s mind and abilities has been lost. The only slight sign of colloquialism is the repetition “muy, muy” (for “old old”). This means, then, that the translator hasn’t made the effort to try to imitate Tom’s way of writing in the TT, but rather kept the same level of standardisation across the whole passage.

In contrast to Guerra, Coy has opted for not introducing the courtesy form of address between Tom and Ma, and Sairy and Tom. This decision could be regarded, as well, as a valid one. However, the migrant’s level of education shouldn’t be connected to an ignorance of good manners. With that, I mean that an informal setting shouldn’t exclude the formalisms used to show respect to an older relative or a stranger.

There is an ambiguous sentence in her version which makes it unclear if it is a mistake, or rather a sign of the orality which should be present in the whole conversation: “Abre la Biblia y saca algún dicho algo de las Escrituras.” The fact is that *algún dicho algo* does not make sense as a syntactic construction. What would make sense is either *saca algún dicho de las Escrituras*, or *saca algo de las Escrituras*. There is, however, no way to know what the true reason behind this structure is.

Regarding the quotations from the Bible, just like the case in Guerra's version, the verses in Coy's text don't seem to be part of any of the 19 official Spanish translations I consulted. The fact is, that her quotations are more similar to Guerra's verses than to the verses of any of the official translations. Implying that she might have taken inspiration from his texts instead of choosing an existing translation of the Bible. However, and as I already mentioned above, it could also be that she got access to a different translation, or a different edition of one I did consult, that escaped me.

Lastly, I will proceed with the analysis of the **third translation**, completed Pilar Vázquez:

Tom se sentó a la luz de la hoguera. Entrecerró los ojos concentrándose, y por fin escribió despacio, aplicadamente, en letras grandes y claras: «Aquí esta enterado William James Joad, que fayeció de conjestión, de viejo. Su familia lo enteró aquí por no disponer de posibles pal funeral. No lo mato nadie. Se murio de una congestión». Dejó de escribir y dijo:

–Madre, escuche lo que he puesto. –Se lo leyó despacio.

–Parece muy bonito –dijo–. A lo mejor puedes escribir también algo del libro de las Escrituras, y sonará religioso. Abre el libro y copia algo de ahí.

–Tiene que ser algo corto –dijo Tom–. No me queda sitio en la hoja.

Sairy dijo entonces:

–¿Por qué no pones «Que Dios se apiade de él»?

–No, eso no, que parece que murió en la horca. Voy a copiar algo de aquí. –Pasó las páginas y leyó, moviendo los labios y diciendo para sí las palabras que leía–. Aquí hay una cosa corta –dijo–: «Lot les dijo: “No, por favor, Señor mío”».

–Eso no dice nada –opinó Madre–. Si vas a copiar algo, tiene que entenderse lo que dice.

Sairy intervino:

–Mira en los Salmos, más adelante. De los Salmos siempre se saca algo.

Tom pasó las páginas mirando los versos.

–Ya lo he encontrado –dijo–. Aquí hay una buena, suena muy religioso –dijo–. «Dichoso el que es perdonado de su culpa, y le queda cubierto su pecado.» ¿Qué le parece, madre?

–Muy bonito –respondió ella–. Pon eso. (Vázquez 2010: 177)

This version might be the one that stands out in comparison to the two previous ones. Even though the reader can't guess that the text is supposed to represent a dialectal form of speech at first glance, when paying closer attention and reading Tom's note, we finally find some features that deviate from the standard norm. Vázquez has decided to be loyal to Steinbeck and reproduce Tom's writing with misspellings and non-grammatically accepted forms. From the 33 words in the note, 10 present some kind of spelling mistake: “aqui” (written twice, for *aquí*), “esta” (for *está*), “enterado” (for *enterrado*), “fayeció” (for *falleció*), “conjestión” (for *congestión*), “enteró” (for *enterró*), “pal” (for *para el*), “mato” (for *mató*),

and “murio” (for *murió*). The misspellings in these words are generally the omission of an accent (as in *está*) and of the second *r* in the phoneme *rr* (as in *enterró*), and they are the sort of grammatical mistakes native speakers do as children –and for that matter, also people who study Spanish as a foreign language– when they are learning how to write and guide themselves through pronunciation and not through grammar. The same happens with “fayeció”, due to the evolution in Castilian Spanish of the pronunciation of the phoneme *ll* into *y*. The form “pal” –which means *for*– corresponds to an elision of the preposition *para* and the definite article *el*, and even though it is not considered grammatically correct, its use is widely spread in the Spanish-speaking community. No other word, besides the ones aforementioned, carries any dialectal marker.

Interestingly, Vázquez hasn’t omitted all the accents, which produces a very real inconsistency, relatable to the way people with low education would write. This inconsistency is also to be found in *congestión*, which we find first with a spelling mistake (where the *g* has been switched with the *j*), and afterwards, in its grammatically correct form. This decision in the translation increases the credibility of Tom’s note. Its tone holds a noticeable hint of orality, partly influenced by the spelling mistakes, as well as for the repetitions and the rhythm produced by the short sentences. As a whole, the effect of orality of the ST is not kept at its full extent. However, the credibility is also strengthened across the rest of the passage due to some additions like “No, eso no” for a plain “No” in the ST.

The courtesy form in this version is only used when Tom addresses his mother, but not when Sairy addresses Tom, even if their acquaintance is very recent. Vázquez has opted, then, to use this form for younger people addressing older people.

Lastly, the biblical quotes in this version are extracted from an existing translation of the Bible, and they both belong to the version called *Biblia de Jerusalem*.

7.2. Comparison I

Let’s start with the most relevant factor in the frame of this study, that is, the **presence or the absence of dialect representation** in the Spanish translations. The three versions are characterised by the lack of visual markers that would point to the eye dialect and, for that matter no trace of the dialect present in the ST can be found. Nonetheless, it is important to mention that Vázquez’s translation does present the reader with some degree of language variation through some words that don’t follow grammar rules, as seen in the analysis of her version and as she writes at the very end of her translation in a note to the reader of her

version (as mentioned in chapter III). However, Tom's note is the only place where she makes use of this solution.

As commented in the previous analyses, Tom's note is a great opportunity for the translators to include some sort of non-standard language, an opportunity that has been mostly missed. In Guerra's version, even if it doesn't include misspellings and grammar mistakes –as Vázquez's version does–, this passage has been written in a slightly more colloquial and casual register than the rest of the text. On the other hand, in Coy's version –who doesn't include any type of language variation–, the differentiation in the register between Tom's writing and the rest of the passage is nearly imperceptible.

This leads us to the following comparison point. Taking into consideration the absence of the dialect in all three translations, it is interesting to verify if the translators have chosen any specific **compensation method** to counteract the loss. Bearing the analysis of each version in mind, we find that the aforementioned methods have been used to compensate for the lack of the dialect. Only in the case of Vázquez we see a combination of the reproduction of misspellings and a lower register as a solution, while in the cases of Guerra and Coy, there is only a shy attempt to make use of a low register to atone for the loss.

We see, then, that the register plays a meaningful role in this passage, where it can be differentiated in three degrees: Tom's note, the dialogue between the characters, and the Biblical quotes, from lower to higher. Again, it is only Vázquez who has been able to maintain and emulate the three levels. Coy's and Guerra's versions, having kept Tom's note in the same register than the one coating the dialogue, haven't been able to reproduce the differentiation between these two elements. In their case, this differentiation is only perceptible with the formal register of the Biblical quotations.

Connected with the register, let's now focus on the form of address. In her translation, Coy has decided to use the informal form of address (*tú, vosotros*) among all the characters, attempting to give an informal tone to the passage. Guerra has used the formal or courtesy form (*usted, ustedes*) when Tom addresses Ma, and when Sairy addresses Tom, while assigning the informal one when Ma talks to Tom. Similarly, Vázquez has opted for the courtesy form when Tom addresses Ma, but has switched to the informal one when Sairy and Ma address Tom.

Only relevant for this passage is the comparison of the translation of the Biblical quotations. As mentioned during the analysis of each version, according to my research,

only Vázquez has used an official translation of the verses, while it seems that Coy and Guerra have opted for translating them themselves.

The last point of this comparison is the general **translation approach** used for this passage. Considering that this specific part is short and doesn't offer many specific elements that are prone to domestication (opposite to what we will later see), I base this choice on the natural tone and the credibility. With this in mind, I consider Guerra's and Coy's translation to be leaning towards foreignisation, and Vázquez towards a domestication approach. As we can see after comparing the three translations of this small passage sets Vázquez's version aside as the one that better solves the challenges posed by the source text. Despite not finding (or not attempting to find) a suitable replacement for the vernacular, Vázquez manages to produce a similar (even if diluted) effect on the reader of the receiving culture than the original text produces to its own readership.

7.3. Analysis of Passage II

The second passage that will be analysed belongs to chapter 18, which starts the moment the Joads, together with the Wilsons, cross the border into Arizona and on to California, driving by night and trying to avoid the sun and the heat of the desert during the day. It is during one of the breaks they take right after entering California, that they start to realise how different reality is from what the yellow handbills promised and the high expectations they had. While cleaning themselves in a river, the Joads, Pa, Uncle John, Tom, Al, and Casy, meet a father and a son who are returning from the West. They have already experienced the struggles of hunting ridiculously low paid jobs, and the rejection from the Californians. The chapter ends with Granma's death after crossing the desert.

This passage is particularly important, content-wise, because it is the first time the Joads hear the word *Okies* and start having an idea of what awaits them; they hear about the hate people like them awaken among the locals; how they will be bullied by sheriffs and vigilantes; and how unfair the ownership of the land is. The dichotomy 'us vs them' is strongly emphasised in this fragment, probably for the first time, thanks to the introduction of the concept *Okie* and all its connotations. This idea is strengthened, as well, through the positioning of the migrant workers as *us* and the Californians as *them* from the perspective of the migrants; and the positioning of the locals as *us* and the migrants as *them* from the

point of view of the Californians. This is, in other words, the concept of otherness summarized in the word *Okie*.

Language-wise, this passage is exclusively a conversation with only one very short intervention from the narrator. This allows for a proliferation of dialectal markers in the original text by Steinbeck, which results into a source of problems for the translator. We will also see how each translator has solved the transference of the word –and the concept– of *Okie* into Spanish.

First of all, let's take a look at the source text, Steinbeck's version of the passage:

"Well, if you truly wanta know, I'm a fella that's asked questions an' give her some thought. She's a nice country. But she was stole a long time ago. You git acrost the desert an' come into the country aroun' Bakersfield. An' you never seen such purty country—all orchards an' grapes, purtiest country you ever seen. An' you'll pass lan' flat an' fine with water thirty feet down, and that lan's layin' fallow. But you can't have none of that lan'. That's a Lan' and Cattle Company. An' if they don't want ta work her, she ain't gonna git worked. You got in there an' plant you a little corn, an' you'll go to jail!"

"Good lan', you say? An' they ain't workin' her?"

"Yes, sir. Good lan' an' they ain't! Well, sir, that'll get you a little mad, but you ain't seen nothin'. People gonna have a look in their eye. They gonna look at you an' their face says, 'I don't like you, you son-of-a-bitch.' Gonna be deputy sheriffs an' they'll push you aroun'. You camp on the roadside an' they'll move you on. You gonna see in people's faces how they hate you. An'—I'll tell you somepin. They hate you 'cause they're scairt. They know a hungry fella gonna get food even if he got to take it. They know that fallow lan's a sin an' somebody' gonna take it. What the hell! You never been called 'Okie' yet."

Tom said, "Okie? What's that?"

"Well, Okie use' ta mean you was from Oklahoma. Now it means you're a dirty son-of-a-bitch. Okie means you're scum. Don't mean nothing itself, it's the way they say it. But I can't tell you nothin'. You got to go there. I hear there's three hundred thousan' of our people there—an' livin' like hogs, 'cause ever'thing in California is owned. They ain't nothin' left. An' them people that owns it is gonna hang on to it if they got ta kill ever'body in the worl' to do it. An' they're scairt, an' that makes 'em mad. You got to see it. You got to hear it. Purtiest goddamn country you ever seen, but they ain't nice to you, them folks. They're so scairt an' worried they ain't even nice to each other." (Steinbeck 2017: 240-241)

The passage is overflowing with dialectal markers that can be *seen* before they can be *read*. Steinbeck makes sure, thanks to the 'eye dialect', that the reader knows what to expect. Once again, the reproduction of the vernacular is achieved by the omission of consonants –with a high number of them being the drop of *d* in a final position– as in "worl'", "lan'", or "thousan'"; the omission of nearly all velar nasal sounds /ŋ/, as in "workin'" or "nothin'"; the contractions, as in "ain't"; the omission of the auxiliary *to be* in conjunction with the verb *going to*, as in "You gonna see", and the variations resulting from an easing of the pronunciation, as in "gonna", "got ta", or "ever'thing". The verb *have to*, has also been stripped off its first particle, leaving sentences like "You got to see it". And we can also

recognise a similar phenomenon to the Pin-Pen merger in “git” (instead of *get*), with the difference that the merger doesn’t precede a nasal, but an alveolar consonant. The words “somepin” and “purtiest”, which appear repeatedly throughout the passage and the whole novel, are also interesting markers of the vernacular that ease the pronunciation of the fricative sound in *something* and the rhotic sound in *prettiest*. We also find two grammatical features popular in the SWVE –and in other non-standard varieties–, that is the use of *was* instead of *were*, as in “you was from Oklahoma”; and the use of *ever-* instead of *every*’, as in “ever’thing” or “ever’body”. Finally, Steinbeck also reflects the vernacular with non-standard past participle tenses of some irregular verbs, such as “stole” for *stolen*.

A fact that helps achieve the orality of the dialogue and increases its credibility is the inconsistency of the way some words or sounds are pronounced or the presence of different forms of writing for the same expression. For example, in *want to*, which we first find as “wanta”, and later, spoken by the same character, as “want ta”; or in the word “ever’thing”, where the velar nasal sound has been kept, but dropped in “nothin”.

Besides the grammatical aspect of this fragment of the dialogue, there is an abundance of colloquial and even vulgar expressions, as in “son-of-a-bitch” and “dirty son-of-a-bitch”, which we see repeated twice; “you’re scum”, and the colloquial expressions “goddamn” and “what the hell”, and the informal and widely used form of address “fella”. Yet another relevant characteristic is the use of the personal pronoun *she* and its possessive *her* to refer to inanimate objects or abstract concepts, as the land or a question.

It is worth mentioning that the man with whom the Joads have this conversation is not from Oklahoma, but from Panhandle in the North of Texas, a territory also affected by the Dust Bowl. However, there is no noticeable difference between the way he speaks and the dialect of the Joads, due to their geographical proximity.

Let’s take a look at the first translation, by Hernán Guerra:

—Si ustedes desean realmente saberlo, yo soy un hombre que ha hecho muchas preguntas y pensado mucho en las respuestas. Es un hermoso país. Pero fue robado hace mucho tiempo. Una vez que se atraviesa el desierto se llega a los alrededores de Bakersfield. Y usted nunca ha visto un país tan hermoso..., todo huertos de cultivo y viñedos, el país más hermoso que usted haya visto. Y pasará junto a una tierra llana, buena, con agua a treinta pies de profundidad, y que está abandonada. Pero usted no puede tener ni un pedazo de esa tierra. Es de una Compañía Explotadora de Tierras y Ganado. Y si ellos no quieren trabajarla, se quedará sin ser trabajada. ¡Si usted se mete allí y planta una mata de trigo, irá a la cárcel!

—¿Buena tierra, dice usted? ¿Y no la trabajan?

—Sí señor. ¡Buena tierra y no la trabajan! Bien, señor, eso le enfurecerá un poco, pero todavía no habrá visto nada. Toda la gente lo va a mirar con una expresión muy curiosa. Lo van a mirar y sus rostros parecerán decirle: «No me gustas nada». Se

presentarán diputados del *sheriff* y le harán moverse constantemente. Si acampa junto al camino, allí irán para que se marche. Verán en los rostros de la gente cómo les odian. Y... yo les voy a decir algo. Los odiarán porque tienen miedo. Saben que un hombre hambriento tendrá que comer algo, aunque le sea preciso obtenerlo a la fuerza. ¡Qué demonios! A ustedes nunca les han llamado *okies* todavía.

—¿*Okie*? — dijo Tom —. ¿Qué es eso?

—Con eso querían decir que un hombre viene de Oklahoma. Ahora significa que es un hijo de perra. *Okie* significa que ustedes son escoria. En sí no significa nada, pero es el tono con que lo dicen. Pero yo no puedo decirles nada. Tienen que ir allí. He oído decir que allí están viviendo trescientos mil de los nuestros..., y viviendo como marranos, porque en California todo es propiedad privada. No ha quedado nada. Y los que poseen se aferran a sus posesiones y seguirán haciéndolo aun cuando para ello les sea preciso matar al mundo entero. Y están llenos de miedo, y eso los hace más hostiles. Tienen que verlos. Tienen que oírlos. Es el país más hermoso que ustedes podrán haber visto, pero sus habitantes no son cordiales para nosotros. Tienen tanto miedo y están tan preocupados, que ni siquiera son amables entre sí. (Guerra 1951: 226-227)

Guerras's text is, once again, missing the dialectal markers that coat the whole of Steinbeck's version. The fact that the passage is exclusively part of a dialogue allows for some features that hint to a higher degree of orality than in the previous passage of this translator. Here, Guerra has made use of some of the repetitions employed by Steinbeck, for example the repetition in only four lines of "es un hermoso país", "un país tan hermoso" and "el país más hermoso". However, his decision of using the word *país* for *country* in this context is an interesting one, since most probably, Steinbeck was referring in this case to the land used for farming and cultivating, in which case a more suitable solution would be to choose the word *tierra*. Guerra has also added a repetition that proceeds, as well, from the original text and adds to the sense of orality: "Ahora significa que es un hijo de perra. *Okie* significa que ustedes son escoria." This repetition is, nonetheless, marked by the inconsistency of the singular and the plural form of the courtesy form of address, which, in this context, contrasts with the rudeness of the two sentences. Going back to the factors that improve the feeling of orality, there is the presence of the suspensory points, which are the replacement of the dashes in the original version; and the interrogative and exclamative sentences, some of which are colloquial expressions such as "¡Qué demonios!". Addressing the topic of colloquialism, Guerra only achieves a very diluted result in comparison to the ST, his message doesn't come across as strong and powerful as the reader gets when reading the original text. This is partly due to the translation of "They gonna look at you an' their face says, 'I don't like you, you son-of-a-bitch'" for "Lo van a mirar y sus rostros parecerán decirle: «No me gustas nada»". Guerra has softened the message to the point of eliminating the harshness and the hate the words enclose. We find another example in the word choice

of “enfurecerá” for “that’ll get you a little mad”, a word that doesn’t fit the low register of the conversation, and could have been translated as *cabreará*. Guerra has, as well, softened the other expressions containing swear words in the ST, for example, he translates “hijo de perra” for “dirty son-of-a-bitch”; “ustedes son scoria” for “you’re scum”; and, in “Purtiest goddamn country”, he obviates the *goddamn* and translates it as “el país más hermoso”. Considering Guerra wants to avoid swear words in the TT, he achieves a diluted effect due to the use of softer words.

Nonetheless, the general tone of voice is, as mentioned, not so informal or colloquial as in the ST. In this text, there are some expressions that are more suitable in a formal context than in a conversation in the context of this scene. Some of the most obvious examples are “aunque sea preciso” which, in the ST we find as “even if he got to”; and the sentence “no son cordiales para nosotros”, which Steinbeck writes as “they ain’t nice to you”. Better options for these two expressions would have been, for example and changing as little as possible, *aunque tengan que* for the first one; and *no son amables con nosotros*, for the second one. Still in the topic of the degree of formality, Guerra chooses the courtesy form as the suitable form of address among the characters, who have just met and show their respect to one another this way. Interestingly, the first sentence has the plural mark in *ustedes*, meaning that the man is addressing all the Joads and Casy, while on the next sentence, we see a change into singular, that is, a switch to *usted*.

The word “Okie” could be regarded as a challenge for the translator. With the impossibility of translating the word, and not finding a similar concept existing in the Spanish culture that would fit in the Spanish market, he decides to keep the word as in the original, and to mark it in italics as the norm dictates when dealing with linguistic borrowings.

Interestingly, the measurement unit found in this passage, “with water thirty feed down”, has been kept in feet in Spanish (“treinta pies”), instead of opting for an adaptation into meters. While this decision can be an attempt from the translator to bring the reader even closer to the context of the novel, it also might result in a comprehension barrier for the reader in Spain, since this measurement unit is not common among the readership of the TT. On a similar note, Guerra has decided not to substitute the word *sheriff* for *policía*. However, this adaptation is probably unnecessary due to the popularity of the word –and, more importantly, the concept– among the readers of the TT. To mark the linguistic borrowing, the term has been written in italics. What Guerra decides to translate is the

“Lan’ and Cattle Company”, which he has adapted as “*Compañía Explotadora de Tierras y Ganado*”.

There is, however, a translation mistake in this passage. Where the original text says “that lan’s layin’ fallow”, the target text writes “que está abandonada”, which translates into *abandoned*. Hence, giving the reader the wrong idea of the state of the land. The correct term would have been *en barbecho*, which indicates that the land is ‘resting’ before being farmed at a later stage, and not simply abandoned.

Moving on to the **second translation**, by María Coy:

—Bueno, si de verdad les interesa, yo me he planteado algunas cuestiones y he reflexionado sobre ellas. California es una tierra hermosa. Pero la robaron hace mucho tiempo. Después de cruzar el desierto se llega a Bakersfield. Es una tierra preciosa, con huertas y vides, la tierra más hermosa que nunca hayan visto. Pasarán luego tierra llana y fértil, con agua a diez metros bajo la superficie, tierra que está en barbecho. Pero no podrán comprarla, es de la Compañía de Tierras y Ganado. Y si ellos no quieren que se trabaje, pues no se trabaja. Si coge una parcela para plantar un poco de maíz le meten en la cárcel.

—¿Dice que es buena tierra y está sin trabajar?

—Sí, señor. Buena tierra sin trabajar. Bueno, pues eso le cabreará un poco, pero aún no ha visto nada. La gente tiene una mirada en los ojos, le miran y sus rostros dicen: «No me gustas, hijo de puta.» Hay ayudantes del sheriff que le avasallan a uno. Si acampas al borde de la carretera te dicen que sigas adelante. Se ve en las caras de la gente el odio que nos tienen. Déjenme que les diga, nos odian porque nos tienen miedo. Saben que un hombre hambriento va a conseguir comida aunque la tenga que robar. Saben que una tierra en barbecho es un pecado y que alguien la va a coger. ¡Qué diablos! A ustedes nadie les ha llamado todavía okie.

—¿Okie? —preguntó Tom—. ¿Qué es eso?

—Antes significaba que eras de Oklahoma. Ahora quiere decir que eres un cerdo hijo de perra, que eres un mierda. En sí no significa nada, es el tono con el que lo dicen. Pero yo no les puedo explicar nada, tienen que ir allí. He oído que hay trescientas mil personas como nosotros, que viven como cerdos porque en California todo tiene propietario. No queda nada libre. Y los propietarios se van a agarrar a sus posesiones aunque tengan que matar hasta el último hombre para conservarlas. Tienen miedo y eso les pone furiosos. Ya lo verán. Ya lo oirán. Es la puñetera tierra más hermosa que hayan visto, pero su gente no les tratará bien. Tienen tanto miedo y están tan preocupados que ni siquiera se tratan bien entre ellos. (María Coy 2002: 231)

As we have seen in the previous example, Coy’s translation lacks, as well, an adaptation of the SWVE. This means that the audience of this version will read a dialogue in standard Spanish with some scattered colloquialisms. Nonetheless, being exclusively an exchange between two characters, the passage is characterized by a higher degree of orality. This is achieved through repetitions like “California es una tierra hermosa”, “es una tierra preciosa” y “la tierra más hermosa”, which appear at the beginning of the example in a consecutive manner, or “Tienen miedo” and “Tienen tanto miedo”, at the very end of the passage. Coy has, however, not kept every repetition present in the ST: where the original says “Okie use’ ta mean”, “Now it means”, and “Okie means”; it has been translated into

“Antes significaba”, “Ahora quiere decir” and “no significa nada”. As we can see, then, Coy has avoided the exact repetition by finding first a synonym expression, and then another tense of the same verb. The orality is also preserved and accentuated by the vulgar expressions and swear words found both in Steinbeck’s version and in Coy’s translation. The most obvious example of this is the sentence “I don’t like you, you son-of-a-bitch”, which has been translated into “No me gustas, hijo de puta”, keeping the strength and forcefulness of the expression. Coy has also found a good solution for “What the hell!”, which she has translated into “¡Qué diablos!”, and for the expression “livin’ like hogs”, which we find in the TT as “viven como cerdos”, a very common expression in Spanish from Spain. Interestingly, Coy has used a different translation for the second time the expression “son-of-a-bitch” appears, this time preceded by *dirty*, and has rightly opted for “cerdo hijo de perra”. And has adapted “you’re scum” for “eres un mierda”. The last colloquial expression that can be found in this translation is “la puñetera tierra”, which Steinbeck wrote as “goddamn country”, which is, in my eyes, a good solution.

“Okie” is, without a doubt, the most important word of the whole passage which has no possible translation nor adaptation into Spanish. Hence, Coy has also decided to keep it as it is and even to not mark it as a borrowing through italics. This word is also the one that emphasizes the concept of the otherness, that is, the *us* –or *nosotros*–, vs *them* –or *ellos*. On the same note, Coy has left the word *sheriff* untranslated since the concept is widely spread in the Spanish-speaking community. However, she has also opted to not use italics, contrary to what is recommended with borrowings from another language in Spanish.

What we find an adaptation of is the “Lan’ and Cattle Company”, which appears in the TT as “Compañía de Tierras y Ganado”, as well as the measurement unit of feet in the sentence “with water thirty feet down”. In this case, the translator has opted to transpose the *feet* into *meters* to localise the measurement and make it understandable to the readership in the receiving culture, resulting in “con agua a diez metros bajo la superficie”.

Regarding the form of address, we see some inconsistencies between the courtesy form and the informal one, as well as some irregularities between the singular and the plural forms. This is not necessarily a mistake but can rather be regarded as a reflection of naturalness. The first intervention of the man the Joads meet in the river is done using the courtesy form in plural. However, the second one from the man is first in singular, but he changes mid speech into the plural form, always in the courtesy form. The only part where

he leaves out the courtesy, is when he explains the meaning of *Okie*, switching to singular and to the informal form of address, as we can see in the words marked in italics: “Antes significaba que *eras* de Oklahoma. Ahora quiere decir que *eres* un cerdo hijo de perra, que *eres* un mierda.”¹⁹

Lastly, let’s take a look at the **third translation**, completed by Pilar Vázquez:

–Si de verdad quieren saberlo, yo soy de los que se calientan los cascos con estas cosas. Es una tierra hermosa. Pero hace tiempo que se la quedaron entre unos cuantos. Uno atraviesa el desierto y llega cerca de Bakersfield. Y no ha visto en su vida una cosa más bonita: todo son huertos y viñas, la tierra más bonita que ha visto en su vida. Y entonces empieza a pasar por tierras llanas, buenas tierras y con agua de sobra, y ve que están en barbecho. Pero nunca va a poder trabajar un solo pedazo. Hay una Compañía Agrícola y Ganadera. Y si ellos no quieren trabajarlas, no las trabajará nadie. Y si vas y plantas un poco de maíz, terminas en la cárcel.

–¿Dice que hay buena tierra y que nadie la trabaja?

–Eso es lo que digo. Buena tierra, pero no la trabajan. Les hervirá la sangre al verlo, pero todavía les queda mucho por ver. La gente les mirará malamente. Se le quedan mirando a uno con cara de decirle: «Vete de aquí, hijo de mala madre». Y luego está la policía, que no te deja vivir. Si acampan al lado de la carretera, vendrán a echarlos de allí. Lo verán en la cara de la gente, verán que les odian. Y les voy a decir algo: les odian porque tienen miedo. Saben que cuando uno tiene hambre hará lo que sea por encontrar algo que llevarse a la boca, aunque tenga que robarlo. Saben que dejar la tierra en barbecho es un pecado y que alguien terminará haciéndose con ella. ¡Qué diantre! Es que todavía no les han llamado *okies*.

–¿*Okies*? ¿Qué es eso?

–Pues así llamaban a los de Oklahoma. Pero ahora te lo llaman cuando te quieren decir que eres un cerdo asqueroso. *Okie* es lo mismo que decirte que eres una basura, lo peor de lo peor. Significar, no significa nada, es la manera como te lo dicen. Pero por más que yo les diga, no pueden hacerse una idea. Tienen que ir y verlo con sus propios ojos. Me han dicho que hay trescientos mil como nosotros allí, y que viven como animales, porque en California todo es de alguien. No queda tierra sin dueño. Y los dueños de la tierra no la van a soltar, aunque tengan que matar al mundo entero. Y tienen miedo y eso les pone furiosos. Tienen que verlo con sus propios ojos. Tienen que oírlo. La mejor tierra que habrán visto en su vida, pero no es buena su gente, con lo suyo que ni siquiera son buena gente entre ellos mismos. (Vázquez 2010: 254)

Vázquez’s translation lacks, as well, the eye dialect that is so characteristic in Steinbeck’s version, and with that, part of the essence of the characters. However, it does keep some of the dynamism thanks to the repetitions, exclamations, and the colloquial expressions. To exemplify the repetitions, just as we have seen above in the other two translations, the beginning of the passage has a paraphrasis to emphasize the beauty of the land. In this version, we see it translated as “Es una tierra hermosa”, “no ha visto en su vida una cosa más bonita”, and “la tierra más bonita que ha visto en su vida”. And at the very end of the

¹⁹ Italics added by me to highlight the informal form of address and the singular form of the verbs.

passage we find the same repetition yet again: “La mejor tierra que habrán visto en su vida”. Another example can be found in “Lo verán en la cara de la gente, verán que les odian”, or in the question and immediate answer of “¿Dice que hay buena tierra y que nadie la trabaja?”, which gets as a response “Buena tierra, pero nadie la trabaja”. All these repetitions, which are also found in the ST, help make the dialogue more realistic and relatable, as well as the indirect speech of what someone else says or thinks –a stylistic device very common oral speech. Here we can find it in “Se lo quedan mirando a uno con cara de decirle: «Vete de aquí, hijo de mala madre».”

There is only one exclamation in the passage, “¡Qué diantre!”, which is a colloquial euphemism for *devil*, and is the translation of the expression “What the hell!” in the ST. Vázquez’s translation sounds, in this case, too softened in comparison to the strength of the original one, so a better solution for it would have been, in my opinion, *¡Qué diablos!* or, to make it even harsher, *¡Qué cojones!* or *¡Joder!*.

On the same note, there are some scattered informal, colloquial, and even vulgar expressions and swear words along the passage. Starting with the colloquial expression “yo soy de los que *se calientan los cascotes* con estas cosas”,²⁰ which is Vázquez’s translation for “I’m a fella that’s asked questions an’ give her some thought”. Interestingly, here the translator has opted for making use of an idiom to transmit the idea to the audience of the TT. Continuing with the vulgar expressions and swear words, we see that Vázquez has translated “you son-of-a-bitch” for “hijo de mala madre”, which, even though it is indeed harsh, is not as vulgar as the literal translation would have been. Similarly, the second time this insult appears in the ST, Vázquez avoids it again by translating it as “cerdo asqueroso”, which literally means *disgusting pig*. And since this expression might be considered slightly milder than the one Steinbeck uses, Vázquez decides to translate “you’re scum” with something as coarse: “eres una basura”, but she emphasizes it by adding “lo peor de lo peor”, which we can’t find in the original text. We also see how “livin’ like hogs” has been translated as “viven como animales”, an expression commonly used in the Castilian Spanish to refer to horrible living conditions.

As in the two previous translations, Vázquez also keeps the word “Okie” as it is in the original text. However, she decides to write it in italics following the writing convention of linguistic borrowings. Interestingly, the word *sheriff* in the ST has been adapted to a concept as close as possible to one existing in the receiving culture, in this case, *policía*. It

²⁰ Italics added by me to mark the idiom within the sentence.

must be noted, nonetheless, that her chosen word doesn't have the exact same meaning and that the concept of *sheriff* is already well-known in Spain –to the point that the word is accepted in the dictionary of the Real Academia Española–, so it would have been a good option to leave it in English and mark it in italics to signalize it as a borrowing. The word *pues* exemplifies an excellent choice for the translation of *well*, as we can see in “Well, Okie use’ ta mean you was from Oklahoma” which has been translated into “Pues así llamaban a los de Oklahoma”. This conjunction drastically increases the sense of orality of the sentence and, for that matter, of the whole intervention of this character. It continues with the repetition of “Significar, no significa nada”, which also helps enhance its naturalness and credibility. Going back to the topic of the adaptation of the text to the receiving culture, we see how Vázquez has avoided the mention of the unit of measurement in “with water thirty feet down” and substituted it for “con agua de sobra”, which roughly translates into *with plenty of water*, instead of adapting the feet into meters. Finally, we see how the “Lan’ and Cattle Company” has been translated into “Compañía Agrícola y Ganadera”.

At the end of the passage, there is one specific repetition that has been omitted. The last sentence of the ST reads: “They’re so scairt an’ worried they ain’t even nice to each other.” However, in the TT we find: “con lo suyo que ni siquiera son buena gente entre ellos mismos.” Here we see how the reference to fear and worry, which is also mentioned in the passage some lines above, has been entirely removed from the translation in this last sentence.

The translator has taken some liberties and added sentences or expressions that were not present in the original text. For example, in the ST we can read: “They know a hungry fella *gonna get food* even if he got to take it”, while the TT says: “Saben que cuando uno tiene hambre *hará lo que sea por encontrar algo que llevarse a la boca*, aunque tenga que robarlo.” The words I marked in italics in both languages are the supposed equivalent of each other, and the translation is noticeably longer than the original text, emphasising the liberties the translator has taken to express the idea of the ST.

All in all, we see how Vázquez has decided to move the text closer to the reader instead of moving the reader closer to the text. And she has achieved it by means of idioms, expressions and words rooted in the target culture, and repetitions that enhance the feeling of orality of the conversation as a whole.

7.4. Comparison II

The comparison of the second passage starts, as well, addressing the most important factor: the presence or absence of a **representation of dialect** or non-standard language in the target texts. And the answer is the same as in the comparison of the first passage. None of the translators have included dialect markers in their versions. Naturally, this doesn't come as a surprise, since the biggest opportunity for including language variation is found in the first passage and, as mentioned, it hasn't been taken advantage of.

Let's continue by focusing on the question if the translators have made use of any kind of **compensation method** to conceal or mitigate the loss of the dialect, which is such a relevant feature in the ST. Clearly, after analysing Guerra's version, we see that he hasn't sought any way to substitute the dialect and, additionally, is weak in its credibility, since instead of opting for a casual register, it has been pushed towards the consultative register, that is, a higher register, and has resulted in forms of expression which don't fit the context. Contrary to that, Coy's version offers a credible conversation with natural expressions, coated with a casual register –yet with some hints of the consultative register–, which produces a similar effect to the reader as the original text causes in its readers. Similarly, Vázquez goes one step further in naturalising the conversation and uses the casual register as a compensation method, together with slang and even vulgar expressions. Regardless of the register, all three translators agree that the suiting form of address in this dialogue is the formal one, that is, the courtesy form of address, owing to the counterparts being strangers.

This brings us to the following point, how the vulgar expressions and even swear words have been approached in the target texts. Guerra has favored a dilution of the harshest expressions. In other words, he has transformed the vulgar expressions, like “son-of-a-bitch”, into softer versions, or has omitted them. Coy is the translator who has maintained all the swear words of the original, with all its harshness, while Vázquez has opted for slightly softening them. Nonetheless, Vázquez is the only one who has kept the idioms of the ST, and has found an appropriate solution for all of them, unlike Guerra and Coy.

It is now time to address the last point of the comparison: the **translation approach** of this passage for each translation. Considering how natural does a translation sound, the cultural appropriation, and the use of local expressions in the receiving culture, Vázquez leans towards the approach of the domestication, and so does Coy, or at least partly. In her case, this statement is corroborated by the adaptation of “30 feet” into “10 metros”,

bringing the text closer to the reader instead of confronting the reader with a concept from another culture. Interestingly, Vázquez has omitted the mention of the measurement units and so avoided the confrontation with this topic (only in this case, as we will later see). The case of Guerra is, once again, different to the other two translators. His text leans more in the direction of foreignisation, and one argument to support this is, besides the lack of inventiveness when translating some of the idioms and his tendency to standardise Steinbeck's words, his choice to keep the American measurement unit. We see how he has kept the "30 pies" for "30 feet", which, as mentioned in the analysis of this specific part, presents the Spanish reader with an unintelligible concept.

7.5. Analysis of Passage III

The next passage that is going to be analysed belongs to chapter 20, which narrates the arrival of the Joads to their first Hooverville, one of the many migrant camps with the same name. Upon their arrival, they meet a man who is the self-proclaimed Mayor of the camp and acts very oddly. They later discover, thanks to Floyd, another migrant, that the Mayor is "bull-simple" because he has been pushed around by the cops too many times. It is also Floyd who explains to Tom why there are so many men looking for so few jobs, why it is impossible to strike –if a man is put into jail, his kids will starve–, and how the deputies keep pushing them from place to place. They also get notice of the existence of the government camp thanks to a girl in Hooverville, who explains to Ma that there is hot water and flush toilets, while a group of hungry children watch how Ma cooks a stew and wait to be fed. When a contractor from Tulare appears to offer a job to the men in the camp, without license and without telling how much he'll pay, the deputy tells the men they'll have to clear out the camp by the next morning, a fight starts and, as a result, Reverend Casy is taken into custody by four deputies. Right after, the Joads, and many of the other migrants, leave the camp. The passage below explains the moment when the Joads get stopped by a group of armed men on the road who don't want to let them through. Ma manages to keep the family out of trouble by holding on tight to Tom's arm and preventing him from starting a fight with them. From the distance, they see Hooverville burn.

This passage is relevant and interesting to analyse in a language level due to the change in Tom's tone of voice –from extremely angry to submissive while trying to repress his wrath– when he talks to one of the armed men; which is portrayed by means of a change

in register, that increases perceptibly in the short conversation with the vigilante and contrasts with his speech while talking to Ma. This passage is heavily charged with a desperate tone and a great number of vernacular markers.

First of all, let's analyse Steinbeck's version:

They climbed up to the highway and turned south. Tom said, "They comes a time when a man gets mad."

Ma broke in, "Tom—you tol' me—you promised me you wasn't like that. You promised."

"I know, Ma. I'm a-tryin'. But them deputies—Did you ever see a deputy that didn' have a fat ass? An' they waggle their ass an' flop their gun aroun'. Ma," he said, "if it was the law they was workin' with, why, we could take it. But it *ain't* the law. They're a-workin' away at our spirits. They're a-tryin' to make us cringe an' crawl like a whipped bitch. They tryin' to break us. Why, Jesus Christ, Ma, they comes a time when the on'y way a fella can keep his decency is by takin' a sock at a cop. They're workin' on our decency."

Ma said, "You promised, Tom. That's how Pretty Boy Floyd done. I knowed his ma. They hurt him."

"I'm a-tryin', Ma. Honest to God, I am. You don't want me to crawl like a beat bitch, with my belly on the groun', do you?"

"I'm a-prayin'. You got to keep clear, Tom. The fambly's breakin' up. You got to keep clear."

"I'll try, Ma. But when one a them fat asses gets to workin' me over, I got a big job tryin'. If it was the law, it'd be different. But burnin' the camp ain't the law."

The car jolted along. Ahead, a little row of red lanterns stretched across the highway.

"Detour, I guess," Tom said. He slowed the car and stopped it, and immediately a crowd of men swarmed about the truck. They were armed with pick handles and shotguns. They wore trench helmets and some American Legion caps. One man leaned in the window, and the warm smell of whisky preceded him.

"Where you think you're goin'?" He thrust a red face near to Tom's face.

Tom stiffened. His hand crept down to the floor and felt for the jack handle. Ma caught his arm and held it powerfully.

Tom said, "Well—" and then his voice took on a servile whine. "We're strangers here," he said. "We heard about they's work in a place called Tulare."

"Well, goddamn it, you're goin' the wrong way. We ain't gonna have no goddamn Okies in this town."

Tom's shoulders and arms were rigid, and a shiver went through him. Ma clung to his arm. The front of the truck was surrounded by the armed men. Some of them, to make a military appearance, wore tunics and Sam Browne belts.

Tom whined, "Which was it at, mister?"

"You turn right around an' head north. An' don't come back till the cotton's ready."

"Tom shivered all over. "Yes, sir," he said. (Steinbeck 2017: 328-329)

This passage is, once again, dominated by the eye dialect that permeates every dialogue in the book. Besides the apostrophes marking the omission of some consonants in final position and the contractions, we also see a proliferation of the *a-* prefixing in many verbs, especially in Tom's interventions. This phenomenon is mainly found in the SWVE and is attached to verbs with the suffix *-ing*. However, it's appearance is not systematic, this

means that we don't find it in every verb with this characteristics, but only in "a-workin'", "a-prayin'" and, the most repeated example of the passage, "a-tryin'", which appears three times and contains, as well, the substitution of the voiced velar nasal /ŋ/ (which corresponds to the *-ng* phonemes) at the end of the word, for the sound of the laminal denti-alveolar /ɲ/. Regarding this phonologic phenomenon, we find it for example in "goin'" or "burnin'", as in every other verb ending in *-ing*.

Another feature found in the passage –which is a marker of the vernacular– is the use of the plural form of the demonstrative *them* in place of the article *the*, as in "one of them fat asses". And similarly, the plural personal pronoun *they* in place of *there*, as in "They comes a time", and "they's work".

There are, as well, contractions and other forms to facilitate the pronunciation, such as the widely popular *gonna* and the form *ain't*. These words have already appeared in earlier examples, but in this case, we find both elements in the same sentence: "We ain't gonna have no goddamn Okies in this town." This leads us to our next point, that is, the presence of the expression *goddamn*, which appears in the novel a great number of times, as seen in the example above, and in the following one. In this passage it is repeated twice, both on the same intervention by one of the men that stop the Joads' truck in the middle of the road.

The text includes two expressions that reference religion (which are, in other words, profanity), and both of them reflect and emphasise the despair and rage Tom feels; first in "Jesus Chirst, Ma", and second in "Honest to God, I am". Similarly, the dropping of the *-d* in final position is found in "you tol' me", "flop their gun aroun'", and every time the conjunction *and* appears. As I have mentioned when introducing the chapter, there is a jump from a lower register to a higher one, which is also perceived in the tone of voice and through the indications of the narrator. This is achieved mainly through the last two sentences that Tom speaks in this passage, at the end of which Steinbeck has added the forms of address *mister* and *sir*, as we see in "Which was it at, mister?" and "Yes, sir". By adding these particles, Tom belittles himself and assumes a submissive position for the sake of the family.

One recurrent feature in the book is the word "fambly" (family), which could be the result of a way to facilitate the pronunciation. And, finally, one last example worth mentioning which is also a feature of the vernacular, is the incorrect past participle form of verbs. In this case, we find it in the verb *know*, as in "I knowed his ma", spoken by Ma.

The **first translation** I will analyse is the one completed by Hernán Guerra:

Llegaron a la carretera y torcieron hacia el Sur. Tom dijo:

—Llega un momento en que un hombre se vuelve loco.

Le interrumpió su madre:

—Tom..., tú me dijiste..., tú me prometiste que no serías así. Me prometiste.

—Ya lo sé, *Ma*. Y lo procuro. Pero esos alguaciles... ¿Has visto alguna vez un alguacil que no tenga las nalgas gordas? Y menean las nalgas y las cartucheras. *Ma*, si hicieran cumplir la ley, podríamos soportarlos. Pero no es la ley. Están tratando de amedrentarnos. Están tratando de que nos arrastremos como una perra azotada. Están tratando de destruir nuestro coraje. Llega un momento en que lo único que puede hacer un hombre para mantener su decencia es darle un sopapo a un policía. Están tratando de acabar con nuestra decencia.

—¡Me lo prometiste, Tom! — insistió su madre —. Así es como comenzó *Pretty Boy Floyd*. Yo conocí a su madre. Le hicieron daño y lo convirtieron en criminal.

—Yo trato de contenerme. Honradamente, *Ma*, trato de hacerlo. Pero tú no querrás que me arrastre por el suelo como una perra castigada, ¿no es verdad?

—Yo sólo sé pedir. Tienes que portarte bien, Tom. La familia se va deshaciendo. Tienes que portarte bien.

—Trataré de hacerlo, *Ma*. Pero cuando uno de esos individuos trata de molestarme, me es muy difícil. Si se tratase de la ley, sería distinto. Pero quemar el campamento no tiene nada que ver con la ley.

El camión se iba bamboleando. Delante de ellos se extendía a través de la carretera una hilera de lucecitas rojas.

—Supongo que habrá que volverse — dijo Tom. Disminuyó la velocidad y detuvo el coche, e inmediatamente rodearon el camión unos cuantos hombres. Iban armados con picos y carabinas. Usaban cascos de trincheras y algunos la gorra de la Legión Americana. Un hombre se acercó a la ventanilla, precedido de un olor a *whisky*.

—¿Adónde cree usted que va? — preguntó a Tom, acercando a la suya una cara rojiza.

Tom se crispó. Su mano descendió al piso del camión y buscó la manilla del gato. La madre le cogió el brazo y se lo sujetó con fuerza. Tom dijo:

—¡Oh!

Y su voz tuvo un acento servil.

—Somos forasteros — dijo —. Hemos oído a decir que hay trabajo en un lugar que llaman Tulare.

—¡Malditos sean! Van por otro camino. No queremos malditos *okies* en esta ciudad.

Tom mantenía los brazos rígidos, y por todo su cuerpo corrió un escalofrío. Su madre le sujetaba el brazo derecho. Toda la parte delantera del camión estaba rodeada por los hombres armados. Algunos de ellos, para dar impresión de que eran militares, llevaban capote y cinturón a lo Sam Browne.

Tom preguntó, con tono humilde:

—¿Por dónde se va, *mister*?

—Vuelva y tome hacia el Norte. Y no regrese hasta que sea tiempo de algodón.

Tom se estremeció todo.

—Sí, señor — dijo. (Guerra 1951: 307-308)

Not surprisingly and as we have seen in the earlier examples, Guerra's translation lacks any markers of language variation. In other words, the presence of a dialect or non-standard language is non-existent. Nonetheless, the conversation enclosed in the passage helps enhance the sense of orality, also achieved by means of the suspension points that signal

the doubt and insecurity in Ma's intervention, as well as the exclamative sentences, the questions, and the interjection. And even if Guerra has mostly achieved to keep a register similar to the ST, there are some parts that, due to the choice of words, diminish the colloquial register of the whole, such as "Están tratando de amedrantarnos" as the translation for the idiom "They're a-workin' away at our spirits". This expression in the TT has a very different effect on the reader than the one in the ST: the Spanish text not only does not belong to a low register –in contrast to the original text–, but also can lead the reader into thinking that the character speaks in a higher register. Another such example can be found in "Pero cuando uno de esos individuos trata de molestarme, me es muy difícil", which is the translation of "But when one a them fat asses gets to workin' me over over, I got a big job tryin'". The difference in formality between both versions is abysmal: Guerra has chosen to translate "one a them fat asses" as "uno de esos individuos", which is far away from producing the same effect on the reader. In the expression of the ST, the contempt and hate towards the deputies are greatly transmitted through these words, whereas when reading the expression in the TT, there isn't any emotion leaking through the words. Another point worth mentioning in this example is the way the idiom *work someone over* hasn't been transferred into the TT and has simply been translated as "molestarme", which doesn't signal any hint of a colloquialism. A better fitting option when taking the register into consideration would have been *Pero cuando uno de esos tipos se mete conmigo, no es nada fácil*.

The idiom that has been indeed kept from the ST is *to take a sock at someone*, which we find in "the on'y way a fella can keep his decency is by takin' a sock at a cop", and we find it in the translation as "lo único que puede hacer un hombre para mantener su decencia es darle un sopapo a un policía". Guerra has chosen the expression *dar un sopapo* which, even though it might sound slightly outdated, it helps increasing the colloquial sense of the sentence. However, it is important to put the translation in context, and keep in mind that it was published in 1951.

The passage contains a very predominant colloquial (if not vulgar) expression: "make us cringe an' crawl like a whipped bitch", which is later repeated in other words: "to crawl like a beat bitch". Guerra has translated both expressions as "que nos arrastremos como una perra azotada" and "que me arrastre por el suelo como una perra castigada". Both in the ST and in the TT, the word *bitch* can be interpreted in two ways, which means that the ambiguity from the ST has been transferred into the TT. However, the comparison doesn't sound completely natural in the TT, and it could have been replaced for *que me*

arrastre por el suelo como un gusano asqueroso, for example. As in every passage analysed until this point, the word *goddamn* also appears in this one and, in this case, we find it in the same intervention in the dialogue, spoken by one of the vigilantes: “Well, goddamn it, you’re going the wrong way. We ain’t gonna have no goddamn Okies in this town.” In the TT we find the term translated as *malditos*: “¡Malditos sean! Van por otro camino. No queremos malditos okies en esta ciudad.” The combination of this ‘blasphemy’ and the courtesy form of address produces a confusing effect on the reader. Here again we find the word *Okie* untranslated and unmarked as a borrowing, as we have seen in previous examples from the same translation.

In this passage we find again two more expressions mentioning God, both spoken by Tom. The first one, “Why, Jesus Christ, Ma”, has been omitted in the TT, where the sentence starts directly with “Llega un momento”. The expression could have been easily added as “Por Dios, *Ma*”. The second one, “Honest to God, I am”, has been translated into “Honradamente, *Ma*”, where the reference to God has been stripped off the expression. The result might sound slightly artificial and could have been translated instead as “Te lo juro, *Ma*” in case of wanting to omit the reference to God, or as “Lo juro por Dios, *Ma*”.

As we have already seen in the first example, Guerra decides not to localize the word the Joads use to address the mother, *Ma*, and keep it as in the ST, just adding the italics to mark its quality of linguistic borrowing. Another interesting fact is the presence of the italicized “Pretty Boy Floyd” a supposed character about whom the reader doesn’t receive any more information, and whose existence isn’t mentioned anywhere else. It can be understood as a nickname for a boy named Floyd, nonetheless, the fact of keeping it in English can create confusion to the readership. Right after, we see how Guerra adds, for no obvious reason, “y lo convirtieron en criminal” to the sentence of the ST “They hurt him”.

Focusing on the form of address, we see that the translator has chosen the informal form among Tom and Ma; and has opted for the courtesy form reciprocally between Tom and the vigilante. And even if it can seem uncoherent (considering that the Joads are being insulted while being addressed in the courtesy form) it helps increase the register, especially when Tom uses the words “*mister*” and “*señor*” as a sign of respect while talking to the armed man, painfully humiliating himself to avoid confrontation.

The **second translation** I analyse is the one by María Coy:

Subieron a la carretera y enfilaron en dirección sur. Tom dijo:
—Llega un momento en que uno se pone furioso.
Madre le interrumpió:

—Tom... me dijiste... me prometiste que no te habías vuelto así. Me lo prometiste.

—Ya lo sé, Madre. Lo estoy intentando. Pero esos ayudantes del sheriff... ¿Has visto uno alguna vez que no tuviera el culo gordo? Y menean el culo y muestran su revólver por ahí. Madre —dijo—, si ellos estuvieran trabajando con la ley, lo podríamos soportar. Pero no es eso. Su trabajo es minarnos la moral. Intentan que estemos encogidos, arrastrándonos como una perra apaleada. Tratan de destrozarnos. Por Dios, Madre, llega un momento en que lo único que uno puede hacer para conservar la dignidad es atizarle a un policía. Nos están comiendo la dignidad.

—Me lo prometiste, Tom —insistió Madre—. Eso que dices es lo que hizo Floyd Niño Bonito. Yo conocía a su madre. A su hijo le hicieron daño.

—Lo estoy intentando, Madre. Te juro por Dios que lo intento. Pero no querrás que me arrastre como una perra apaleada, con el vientre por el suelo, ¿verdad?

—Estoy rezando. No puedes meterte en líos, Tom. La familia se viene abajo. Tienes que portarte bien.

—Lo intentaré, Madre. Pero cuando uno de esos culones se mete conmigo es que me cuesta un esfuerzo tremendo. Sería distinto si se tratara de la ley. Pero pegar fuego al campamento no es la ley.

El camión traqueteó avanzando. Al frente, una pequeña línea de faroles rojos se extendía a través de la carretera.

—Creo que hay una desviación —dijo Tom. Frenó y el camión se detuvo e inmediatamente un montón de hombres rodearon el vehículo. Iban armados con mangos de picos y escopetas. Llevaban cascos de trinchera y algunos gorros de la Legión Americana. Un hombre se asomó a la ventana; le precedía el aroma cálido del whisky.

—¿A dónde tienen intención de ir? —acercó su rostro rojo junto al de Tom.

Tom se puso rígido. Su mano se movió furtivamente hacia el suelo buscando la barra del hierro. Madre le agarró el brazo y lo sujetó con fuerza. Tom dijo:

—Pues... —y entonces su voz adoptó un tono de servilismo lastimero—. Somos forasteros —dijo—. Oímos que había trabajo en un lugar llamado Tulare.

—Maldita sea, pues van en dirección contraria. No queremos ningún okie desgraciado en este pueblo.

Los hombros y los brazos de Tom estaban tensos y le recorrió un escalofrío. Madre se aferró a su brazo. Por delante el camión estaba rodeado de hombres armados. Algunos de ellos, para sugerir una apariencia militar, llevaban guerreras y cartucheras.

Tom preguntó plañidero:

—¿Por dónde se va, señor?

—Da la vuelta y dirígete al norte. Y no volváis hasta que el algodón esté a punto.

Tom se estremeció de la cabeza a los pies.

—Sí, señor —dijo. (Coy 2002: 317-318)

As we have seen in earlier examples, in Coy's translation there are no traces of eye dialect or any kind of non-standard language markers. But we do find signs of orality, just like in the example above, through suspension points right at the beginning –that mark the dubitative mood and the uncertainty in Ma's ideas–, the questions, and the general dynamism of the dialogue. Coy has achieved a general tone of the passage quite close to the tone in the ST: even if there are no regional or dialectal expressions, the high number of colloquial expressions and vocabulary help compensate this loss.

Let's start by focusing on the two expressions with references to God. The first one, "Why, Jesus Christ, Ma", is translated into "Por Dios, Madre", and the second one, "Honest

to God”, is found as “Te juro por Dios”. Both choices in the TT are based on expressions widely used among Spanish-native speakers. Jumping to the many times mentioned *goddamn*, we see that it has been differently translated the two times it appears. In the original text, we find both mentions in “Well, goddamn it, you’re going the wrong way. We ain’t gonna have no goddamn Okies in this town.” Coy has chosen to translate it into “Maldita sea, pues van en dirección contraria. No queremos ningún okie desgraciado en este pueblo.” The first time, we find the expression “maldita sea”, an accurate equivalent – and even a literal translation– of the word *goddamn*, whereas the second time, it has been translated as “desgraciado”, which, even though it does make sense, the whole sentence doesn’t sound completely natural. An alternative to Coy’s translation for this sentence could have been *No queremos malditos okies en este pueblo*.

Focusing on the idioms, the first one the reader encounters is “takin’ a sock at a cop”, which Coy translates as “atizarle a un policía”. Both expressions are popular in their respective languages, and they add credibility to the informal and colloquial tone of Tom’s speech. The second one, *to work someone over*, which we find in the sentence “But when one a them fat asses gets to workin’ me over, I got a big job tryin’”, has been brought in the TT as *meterse con alguien*, as we see in its context: “Pero cuando uno de esos culones se mete conmigo es que me cuesta un esfuerzo tremendo.” Coy’s solution produces a natural result in the TT. However, her choice for the word *culones* as a translation of *fat asses* might have a slightly comical effect on the reader, even though it does carry a colloquial and disrespectful connotation. An alternative could be, *Pero cuando uno de esos tipos con el culo gordo se mete conmigo es que me cuesta un esfuerzo tremendo*. Continuing with the topic of colloquial –and even vulgar– expressions, let’s analyse how Coy has translated “They’re a-tryin’ to make us cringe an’ crawl like a whipped bitch” and “crawl like a beat bitch”. The first expression appears as “Intentan que estemos encogidos, arrastrándonos como una perra apaleada”, and the second one has been equally translated into “que me arrastre como una perra apaleada”. As we can see, “whipped bitch” and “beat bitch” have been both translated into “perra apaleada”, instead of looking for a synonym as in the ST. As commented in the previous version, this expression is somewhat ambiguous and sounds slightly artificial, and the decision of using the female of the dog, further emphasizes the ambiguity, which could have been partly avoided by using the male form *perro*. It is also worth mentioning how “Pretty Boy Floyd” has been brought into the TT. Coy has decided to translate it as “Floyd Niño Bonito”, respecting the capitalization and the meaning of the nickname.

It is interesting to see that Coy has translated the word *Ma* –how the family refers to the mother– into “Madre” but has kept the informal way of addressing –*tú*– between Tom and his mother. This combination might have a slightly disconcerting effect on the reader, due to the unusual use of *madre*, which is normally substituted by *mamá*. In case of opting for *madre*, it would make more sense to combine it with the courtesy form of address, that is, *usted*. Nonetheless, we might not forget that the story is set on the 1930s, so the use of *madre* responds to the custom of addressing parents with a higher degree of respect. Coy has made use of the courtesy form of address between Tom and the vigilante with whom he talks when they get stopped in the middle of the road. However, in his last intervention, the vigilante changes de form of address to the informal one, while Tom keeps addressing him in the courtesy form. It is in this last part of the dialogue, when Tom addresses him using the word *señor*, as a higher sign of respect.

And lastly, let’s take a look at the **third translation**, completed by Pilar Vázquez:

Subieron a la carretera y giraron en dirección sur. Entonces Tom dijo:

–Hay veces que uno pierde la cabeza.

Madre lo interrumpió:

–Tom, me dijiste..., me prometiste que no iba a pasar nada. Me lo prometiste.

–Lo sé, madre. Y lo intento. Pero esos policías... ¿Ha visto alguno que no tenga el culo gordo? Y van por ahí moviendo el culo, con la pistola subiendo y bajando –dijo–. Madre, yo lo aguantaba si lo suyo fuera defender la justicia. Pero eso no es la justicia. Lo que hacen es corroyernos el alma. Lo que intentan es que nos arrastremos, que nos encojamos como un perro apaleado. Intentan destruirnos. Por Dios, madre, hay momentos que la única manera de mantener un poco de dignidad es zurrar a uno de esos agentes. Corroyen nuestra dignidad.

–Me lo prometiste, Tom. Así mismo fue con Floyd, el Niño Bonito, allá en el pueblo. Yo conocí a su madre. Le hicieron tanto daño que así acabó como acabó.

–Lo procuro madre, se lo juro por Dios. Pero tampoco quiere verme arrastrándome por el suelo como un perro apaleado, ¿no?

–Rezo. Hay que aguantar, Tom. La familia se está rompiendo. Tienes que aguantar.

–Lo procuraré, madre. Pero cuando un culo gordo de éstos viene buscando bronca, no se crea que es fácil. Otra cosa sería si los viera defender la justicia. Pero quemar un poblado no tiene nada que ver con la ley ni con la justicia.

El coche iba dando tumbos carretera adelante. Frente a ellos apareció de pronto una hilera de luces rojas extendidas de un lado al otro de la carretera.

–Será un desvío –dijo Tom.

Redujo la velocidad y paró. Inmediatamente un nutrido grupo de hombres se arremolinaron en torno al camión. Iban armados con picos y pistolas. Llevaban cascos militares y algunos de ellos gorras de la Legión Americana. Un hombre se asomó por la ventanilla, precedido por el caliente aliento del whisky.

–¿Adónde os creéis que vais? –Acercó su cara rubicunda a la de Tom.

Tom se puso rígido. Bajó la mano despacio, buscando la barra del gato. Madre le agarró el brazo y lo retuvo con todas sus fuerzas. Entonces Tom dijo:

–Pues... –Y su voz tomó un tono entre servil y quejumbroso–. No somos de aquí –dijo–. Nos dijeron que había trabajo en un sitio que se llama Tulare.

–¡Maltidos *okies*! Pero ¿no os dais cuenta de que estáis yendo en dirección contraria? Por aquí se va al pueblo, y no queremos veros en el pueblo, ¿entendido?

Tom tenía los hombros y los brazos completamente rígidos, y un escalofrío le recorrió el cuerpo. Madre no le soltaba el brazo. El frente del camión estaba rodeado de hombres armados. Algunos de ellos llevaban guerreras y correaes para dar a la banda una apariencia militar.

—¿Y por dónde se va, señor? —preguntó Tom, de nuevo en tono servil.

—Gira en redondo y sigue hacia el norte. Y no volváis hasta que el algodón esté para recoger.

Tom temblaba de la cabeza a los pies.

—Sí, señor —dijo. (Vázquez 2019: 342-344)

This version by Vázquez doesn't present any dialectal markers at first sight, that is, no eye dialect. However, as we have been seeing until this point, it does take some liberties in comparison to the ST. Vázquez has added more questions, colloquial expressions, and even some particular grammatical mistakes in Tom's speech that are the reflection of non-standard language. Even if those are scarce, they add more credibility to the situation and partly make up for the loss of the dialect.

As with the version above, I will start by inspecting how the expressions with God references have been rendered in the TT. The first one, "Why, Jesus Christ, Ma", has been translated into "Por Dios, Madre", a very common and widely used exclamation. Nonetheless, an equivalent of the particle "Why" hasn't found its way into the target text, since in this context, it doesn't have any suitable equivalent in Spanish. The second one is "Honest to God", which has been rendered as "se lo juro por Dios". Again, Vázquez has opted for a well-established expression. The term *goddamn*, which can be very frequently found in the novel, appears twice in this passage. In the original text, they appear in "Well, goddamn it, you're goin' the wrong way. We ain't gonna have no goddamn Okies in this town", which Vázquez has translated as "¡Malditos okies! Pero ¿no os dais cuenta de que estáis yendo en dirección contraria? Por aquí se va al pueblo, y no queremos veros en el pueblo, ¿entendido?". Only through the length of the statement, it is evident that the TT has been complemented with additional content. In other words, it has not followed a literal translation, but rather a freer one. Focusing on its content, we see that Vázquez has reorganized the content, has reformulated sentences, and has added rhetoric questions. First of all, we only find the translation of *goddamn* once, in "malditos okies", for "goddamn Okies", which is followed by the sentence of the ST "you're going the wrong way" reformulated into a question in the TT. After this, Vázquez has added "Por aquí se va al pueblo", which is new information that doesn't stem –but can only be inferred– from the ST. Finally, we find another question missing in the ST, "¿entendido?". All these additions

and modifications in the TT help increase the naturalness of the text, enhance the sense of orality, and boost its credibility.

Focusing now on the idioms, let's start by considering the expression "by takin' a sock at a cop". Vázquez has solved it by using the popular and colloquial verb *zurrar*, which perfectly fits the context and the register of the passage. The second one, "one a them fat asses gets to workin' me over", can be found in the TT as "un culo gordo de esos viene buscando bronca". The expression *to work someone over* has been rendered as *buscar bronca*, which, once again, is a suitable expression both due to its meaning and its register. Moving on to the most controversial expressions, "to make us cringe and crawl like a whipped bitch" and "to crawl like a beat bitch", they have been translated in the TT as "que nos arrastremos, que nos encojamos como un perro apaleado" and as "arrastrándome por el suelo como un perro apaleado" respectively. In the first one, we see that Vázquez has altered the order of the verbs *cringe* and *crawl* and has substituted the alliteration formed by the two verbs in the ST for an anaphora in the TT: "que nos arrastremos, que nos encojamos", achieving some degree of compensation. The ambiguity of these expressions on the ST has been avoided in the translation by using the male name for *dog*, instead of the female (*bitch*). We see that the word *apaleado* has been used in both expressions as a translation for "whipped" and "beat".

As discussed, Vázquez has opted for a freer translation and has added sentences or words that help improve the credibility of the passage, and for that matter, of her whole text, which also add clarification and improve the understanding for the receiving culture. For example, this intervention by Ma, "Me lo prometiste, Tom. Así mismo fue con Floyd, el Niño Bonito, allá en el pueblo. Yo conocí a su madre. Le hicieron tanto daño que así acabó como acabó.", which can be found in the original text as "You promised, Tom. That's how Pretty Boy Floyd done. I knowed his ma. They hurt him.". Clearly, the TT is more extensive and there have been some additions by the translator. First, the words "allá en el pueblo" help the reader understand where to set this character who is only mentioned this one time. And second, "que así acabó como acabó", a sentence that elaborates on the implied meaning of the ST. Here we also see how Vázquez has translated the nickname of the character "Pretty Boy Floyd" into "Floyd, el Niño Bonito", keeping the capitalization as part of a name. Yet another addition by the translator is found in "Pero quemar un poblado no tiene nada que ver con la ley ni con la justicia" as a translation of "But burnin' the camp ain't the law". We see how in the TT, "ni con la justicia" has been added and used as a way to emphasise the unfairness of the situation.

It is very important to highlight the misspellings and non-grammatical forms in this version. As we have seen in the translation by Vázquez of the first passage, here she also draws on non-standard forms to mark Tom's speech, as a compensation for the loss of the vernacular. First, we find a verb tense in "Madre, yo lo aguantaba si lo suyo fuera defender la justicia", where *aguantaba* is the past imperfect of the indicative mood but the meaning of the sentence is conditional, that is why the appropriate tense would have been *aguantaría*, the simple conditional. This phenomenon, though spread in the northern parts of Spain, is generally regarded as a colloquialism. The next two cases of misspellings can be found in the repetition of the verb *corroer*, which we find first as "corroyernos" and then as "corroyen". The correct grammatical forms would have been *corroernos* and *corroen*. The misspellings and mispronunciations of this verb are quite common and are, as well, associated to people with no or low education.

Lastly, let's focus on the form of address. The courtesy form of address is used when Tom talks to Ma, as a sign of respect suitable to the time of the story, and when Tom addresses one of the men that makes them stop in the middle of the road, as it is usually the case with strangers. This decision also helps increase the perception of a higher register, together with Tom's choice of using the form *señor* when asking something and answering the vigilante. However, it is not reciprocal: Ma logically uses the informal form of address (*tú*) when talking to Tom, and the vigilante also uses the informal form, which –considering the context of the scene and the fact that he is humiliating the Joads– is the form that makes most sense.

7.6. Comparison III

The third comparison starts, as well, with the central topic of the study: the **representation of the dialect** or the non-standard language. At this point it doesn't come as a surprise that none of the translators has provided a text with visual markers representing a diversion from a standard language. However, Vázquez does include two words –the same verb in two different tenses– with a grammar mistake which is usually found in oral speech. This could be regarded as a very distant representation of a visually recognisable language variety. As seen during the analysis, Vázquez also adds another marker of orality by means of the conjugation of another verb deemed incorrect for the mood intended, which produces the effect on the reader that the speaker is uneducated.

Following to the next comparison point, let's focus on the **compensation method** employed, or not, by the translators in order to make up for the loss of the dialect in their respective translations. Guerra hasn't used any specific method to attempt to produce a similar effect than the one in the original text. However, there are some small details that help increase the credibility of his work, such as the dubitative character of Ma's intervention, or Tom's interjection "¡Oh!". Coy's translation has partly compensated the loss of the dialect through the choice of register and the expressions chosen. Nonetheless, her attempt is only a shadow from Steinbeck's effect. Lastly, once again Vázquez is the one who has gone the extra mile and offers an effective compensation, yet not as powerful as a dialect. As already commented, her version includes misspellings common in the oral speech from Spanish native-speakers, but she does, as well, include idioms and widely used expressions which are not substituting an idiom from the ST, but adding value and credibility to the translation.

This brings us to the following question regarding the presence, absence or adaptation of idioms and expressions. As usual, I start with the oldest translation, where the adaptation of some of the expressions has been solved quite unsatisfactorily and has resulted in unnatural constructions, while some other expressions have been simply omitted. Coy's version has partly achieved to find suitable solutions for nearly all the expressions that serve in the ST to emphasise the informality of the language, thus increasing the credibility of the passage. Once again, Vázquez has achieved a higher degree of localisation, not only by maintaining and finding appropriate equivalents for the idioms in the ST, but also adding new idioms and colloquial vocabulary that enrich the TT.

As previously mentioned, one of the reasons for choosing this passage is the obvious switch of register in Tom's speech and the contrast between the register he uses and the one used by one of the men who forces Tom to stop the jalopy. In Guerra's translation, we see how this switch of the register is marked in Tom's speech, who goes from a casual register, to a consultative one. However, the register used by the vigilante, which in the ST is casual and disrespectful, is in this case the courtesy form of address. This choice can be regarded as uncoherent and not fitting in the context. In Coy's text, similarly to Guerra's, Tom's register increases in formality, while the other man's register sits somewhere in between the casual and the consultative one. Lastly, Vázquez manages to come up with a solution that best correlates to the ST. While Tom keeps the courtesy form of address both to address Ma and to address the man, his tone of voice and his register

drastically changes and gains in formality, while the vigilante makes use of a casual register with a highly contemptuous tone.

Keeping the same order as in the previous comparisons, the last point to address is the **translation approach** used by the three translators that best describes the resulting passage. Guerra's translation leans more in the direction of the foreignization, since there isn't a clear attempt of bringing the text closer to the receiving culture. As for Coy, her text leans towards the domestication, owing to the presence of natural expressions and idioms. And finally, with Vázquez it is clear that she has opted for the method of domestication, because of the many attempts (and the success) of adding cultural items in the text, which help bringing it closer to the target audience and make it relatable to their culture.

7.7. Analysis of Passage IV

The last passage that will be analysed belongs to chapter 24, which starts with the preparation for the Saturday dance in the government camp, and describes how the mood improves, the kids get bathed, the clothes get washed and the people dress up. In this rather short chapter, the reader gets to know that the sheriffs are not allowed to enter the camp without a very good excuse, since these camps belong to the United States Government and not to California. Hence, they are especially hated by the Californian justice. That is why, the central committee of the camp gets notice that there will be a riot to try and let the deputies in, so they organize themselves to stop it before it even starts. The chapter ends with the failure of the riot.

This specific passage recounts the meeting of the committee in the camp, just after they have received notice that there will be an attempt to start the riot during the dance, which is the only way the sheriffs can go in. The characters talk of the injustice of being pushed around and mistreated by the deputies and the conditions in which people live in other camps. One of the men explains an anecdote that he witnessed while living in the Land and Cattle Company camp. Since the passage is a conversation –with a conversation within–, the text has a marked dynamism and allows for a proliferation of dialectal and regional markers, as well as for a great number of colloquial expressions.

The reason why I decided to include it into the analysis is to check how the translators have dealt with the idioms, the measurement unit, and the great number of colloquial expressions and vocabulary that add up to the vernacular features.

Let's start by examining Steinbeck's version of the passage:

The tubby man said, “Jesus, God, Jeremy. You ain’t got to tell me. I was there. They got a block of shacks—thirty-five of ’em in a row, an’ fifteen deep. An’ they got ten crappers for the whole shebang. An’, Christ, you could smell ’em a mile. One of them deputies give me the lowdown. We was settin’ aroun’, an’ he says, ‘Them goddamn gov’ment camps,’ he says. ‘Give people hot water, an’ they gonna want hot water. Give ’em flush toilets, an’ they gonna want ’em.’ He says, ‘You give them goddamn Okies stuff like that an’ they’ll want ’em.’ An’ he says, ‘They hol’ red meetin’s in them gov’ment camps. All figgerin’ how to git on relief,’ he says.”

Huston asked, “Didn’ nobody sock him?”

“No. They was a little fella, an’ he says, ‘What you mean, relief?’

“‘I mean relief—what us taxpayers puts in an’ you goddamn Okies takes out.’

“‘We pay sales tax an’ gas tax an’ tobacco tax,’ this little guy says. An’ he says, ‘Farmers get four cents a cotton poun’ from the gov’ment—ain’t that a relief?’

“‘They’re doin’ stuff got to be done,’ this deputy says.

“‘Well,’ the little guy says, ‘how’d your goddamn crops get picked if it wasn’t for us?’” The Tubby man looked around.

“What’d the deputy say?” Houston asked.

“Well, the deputy got mad. An’ he says, ‘You goddamn reds is all the time stirrin’ up trouble,’ he says. ‘You better come along with me.’ So he takes this little guy in, an’ they give him sixty days in jail for vagrancy.”

“How’d they do that if he had a job?” asked Timothy Wallace.

The tubby man laughed. “You know better’n that,” he said. “You know a vagrant is anybody a cop don’t like. An’ that’s why they hate this here camp. No cops can get in. This here’s United States, not California.”

Houston sighed. “Wisht we could stay here. Got to be goin’ ’fore long. I like this here, Folks gits along nice; an’, God Awmighty, why can’t they let us do it ’stead of keepin’ us miserable an’ puttin’ us in jail? I swear to God they gonna push us into fightin’ if they don’t quit a-worryin’ us.” Then he calmed his voice. “We jes’ got to keep peaceful,” he reminded himself. “The committee got no right to fly off’n the handle.” (Steinbeck 2017: 392-393)

As we have been seeing in the previous examples, the eye dialect is the first feature of the text that strikes the reader’s attention, in a passage that abounds in apostrophes to mark elisions and contractions. Steinbeck achieves the reproduction of the vernacular by means of the omission of the sound /ŋ/ in final position, as we can see for example in “meetin’s”, “goin’”, “puttin’” or “doin’” and the drop of the letter *d* at the end of the words, as in “an’”, “aroun’”, or “poun’”. Another recurrent phenomenon is the elision of the dental sound in the beginning of the word as in “’em” (them) –found in the example “you could smell ’em a mile”– and in the word *than*, –as seen in “You know better’n that”; as well as the drop of the [t] sound at final position as in “jes’” (for *just*) and in “didn’”. We also find some dialectal markers which are the result of a contraction to facilitate the word’s pronunciation –such as “ain’t” and “gonna”– and also serve the purpose of shortening them. Other such examples are the omission of the first syllable in “’fore” (for *before*) and “’stead” (for *instead*), or the omission of the subject, as in “Got to be goin’ ’fore long” or in “Whisht we

could stay here”, where the termination of the verb *-ed* has been replaced by a final *-t* for easier pronunciation. Another word we see adapted to an easier pronunciation is “gov’ment” (for *government*), which has been stripped off its middle syllable.

As we have seen in an earlier example, here too we find a feature similar to the Pin-Pen merger. In this case, the affected word is the verb *get*, which has been written as “git”, meaning that there is a replacement of the vowel *e* for an *i*, as we can see in “Folks gits along nice”, and in “settin’” in place of *sitting*.

The text also contains examples of missing auxiliary verbs, a dialectal marker that is not exclusive of the SWVE but very common in different English variations. In this passage, we can find it, for example, in “What you mean, relief?”, where the auxiliary *do* has been left out; or in “I swear to God they gonna push us into fightin’”, where the auxiliary *are* has been omitted. Another feature that is very often repeated in this short passage –and common in other vernaculars too– is the use of “them” in place of the article *the*, as in “One of them deputies”, or in “You give them goddamn Okies stuff like that”.

Yet another feature of the Southern American English is the addition of *here* to *this*, resulting in the expression *this here* to refer simply to the demonstrative, as in “An’ that’s why they hate this here camp”, a sentence that is followed by the same phenomenon: “This here’s United States”.

Focusing on grammar, we see repeatedly the structure of the verb *gonna* (or *going to*) + *want*, a combination which is not considered correct in StE, as in “an’ they gonna want hot water”. The variation that would be grammatically accepted in this case would be *will want*. Also quite common, we see that often there isn’t an agreement in verb and subject, as in “We was settin’ aroun’”, instead of *were*; in “anybody a cop don’ like”, instead of *doesn’t*; or in “what us taxpayers puts in”, instead of *put*.

It is important to draw attention to the idioms of this passage, since they are an added challenge for the translator. First, we find *to give someone the lowdown*, then *to sock someone*, and finally, *to fly off the handle*. Lastly, the following recurrent expressions that add to the naturalness of the conversation are also worth mentioning: “God Awmighty”, “Jesus, God”, and “Christ”, which we find carrying an exclamatory meaning; and, most importantly, the expression *goddamn*, which is repeated five times, twice of them preceding the word *Okies*.

We start, then by analysing the **first translation**, the version by Hernán Guerra:

El hombre regordete dijo:

—¡Jesús, Dios, Jeremías! A mí no necesitas contarme eso. Yo también viví allí. Tenían una manzana de chozas..., treinta y cinco a lo largo y quince a lo ancho. Y para todo el rebaño sólo tenían diez retretes. El olor se sentía a una milla de distancia. Un comisionado del *sheriff* me explicó por qué odian a estos campamentos. Estábamos sentados juntos y me dijo: «En estos malditos campamentos del gobierno, les dan agua caliente, y ahora todos van a querer agua caliente. Les dan papel higiénico y se les ocurrirá que les den papel higiénico.» Y añadió: «Si a los malditos *okies* se les dan todas esas cosas, querrán encontrarlas en todas partes. En esos campamentos del gobierno los rojos celebran mítines. Todos tratan de encontrar el modo de vivir del auxilio fiscal.»

—¿Y nadie le dió un bofetón? — preguntó Huston.

—No. Pero había un hombrecito pequeño por allí cerca, y le dijo: «¿Auxilio fiscal? ¿Qué es eso?»

«—Pues..., el auxilio fiscal..., un impuesto que pagamos nosotros los contribuyentes para que se lo den a ustedes, malditos *okies*.

» —Nosotros pagamos impuestos por lo que compramos, por la gasolina, por el tabaco — le replicó el hombrecito. Y siguió diciendo: —Los agricultores reciben del gobierno cuatro centavos por cada libra de algodón... ¿No es auxilio eso? Las compañías navieras y las compañías de ferrocarriles reciben subsidios... ¿No es auxilio eso?

» —Son servicios necesarios — dijo el comisionado.

» —Bueno — dijo el hombrecito —. ¿Cómo podrían recoger sus cochinas cosechas si no fuese por nosotros?

El hombre regordete paseó la mirada por sus oyentes.

—¿Qué dijo el comisionado? — preguntó Huston.

—El comisionado se puso furioso. Y dijo: «Ustedes, malditos rojos, siempre andan creando dificultades. Venga conmigo.» Y se llevó al hombrecito, y lo metieron en la cárcel sesenta días, por vagancia.

—¿Y cómo pudieron hacer esto, si tenían trabajo? — preguntó Timothy Wallace.

El hombre regordete rió:

—Usted sabe que para un policía cualquiera es un vago. Y por eso odian estos campamentos. Aquí no puede entrar ningún policía. Este campamento es territorio de los Estados Unidos, no de California.

Huston suspiró:

—Me gustaría que pudiésemos quedarnos aquí. Tendremos que irnos. Me gusta esto. Toda la gente se lleva muy bien; y, por el amor de Dios Todopoderoso, ¿por qué no pueden dejarnos aquí en vez de andar persiguiéndonos y metiéndonos presos? Juro por Dios que tendremos que llegar a los hechos si no cesan de molestarnos.

Su voz recuperó su calma.

—Tenemos que ser pacíficos — continuó, como recordando —. El Comité no tiene derecho a consentir que suceda algo que pueda perjudicarnos a todos. (Guerra 1951: 365-366)

Guerra's translation, as we have already seen in the other examples, doesn't include dialectal markers that could help the reader to place the characters in a certain time and place. He has, however, partly managed to keep the pace of the conversation and to add the pauses that are natural in a dialogue, by adding the suspension points in five different spots. Nonetheless, when comparing the translation with the original, the reader can perceive that part of the orality has been lost, together with great part of the idioms and colloquial expressions, which, as we will now see, have been mostly omitted instead of finding an equivalent or appropriate expression fitting in the TT.

I will start by commenting on the last point analysed in the ST, that is, the expression *goddamn*. As we can see in the TT, Guerra has opted for the colloquial expression *malditos* in four of the five occasions, which is, in my opinion, a suitable solution, as in “*malditos campamentos*” or “*malditos rojos*”. However, we see how “*goddamn crops*” has been translated into “*cochinas cosechas*”, a doubtful choice. First of all, the order in the construction of adjective + noun is not widely spread in the Spanish language, especially in oral speech; and secondly, the chosen adjective doesn’t fit the context. Hence, it would have made more sense to keep the repetition found in the ST (“*goddamn crops*”) and write *malditas cosechas* instead. Staying with the topic of the expressions that help increase the credibility of the conversation, let’s address the allusions to God. For “Jesus, God”, Guerra has opted for a literal translation, that is “Jesús, Dios”, nonetheless, this is not a common or used expression, which might lead us to think that the translator misunderstood it. This suspicion is emphasised by the fact that he has translated the name Jeremy into Jeremías – even though he hasn’t done so for any other character’s name –, and he has mistaken Steinbeck’s character for the biblical character. The second religious reference –in the original “An’, Christ, you could smell ’em”– has been skipped in the translation, in contrast to the last two, which have been kept and literally translated. Hence, we find the expression “por el amor de Dios Todopoderoso” in the text as a translation of “God Almighty”, and “Juro por Dios” for “I swear to God”. One could argue, however, that the first of these two expressions adds a slight comic effect on the sentence in the Spanish translation. A good solution to avoid the slightly ludicrous tone would have been to leave *Todopoderoso* out and settle for the broadly used *por el amor de Dios*.

Focusing on the idioms mentioned in the analysis of the ST, we see how they have been removed from the translation, that is, their meanings have been decoded and plainly translated. That is how we have “me explicó por qué odian a estos campamentos” for “give me the lowdown”; “le dió un bofetón” for “sock him”; and “que suceda algo que pueda perjudicarnos a todos” for “to fly off’n the handle”. Even though it is clear that idioms don’t usually have equivalent translations, Guerra could have searched for other ways to compensate this loss, hence, following the compensation method.

Interestingly, Guerra has taken the freedom to make a change in terms of content in the first part of the passage: instead of staying loyal to the original where it says: “Give ’em flush toilets, an’ they gonna want ’em”, the translation reads: “Les dan papel higiénico y se les ocurrirá que les den papel higiénico”, switching the flush toilet for toilet paper. This

decision doesn't seem to be founded on any translational problem or comprehensible reason.

In regards to the form of address, the translator has used the informal form (*tú*) among the men in the committee, but has assigned the courtesy (*usted*) between the 'little guy' and the deputy. That is, when the little guy addresses the deputy, he does it using the formal form, but the deputy uses it as well to address to the 'little guy' and the Okies in general. This decision creates an interesting effect, especially in the sentence where the deputy insults the Okies using the courtesy form, as in “un impuesto que pagamos nosotros los contribuyentes para que se lo den a ustedes, malditos okies”.

As we have seen in the previous translation by Guerra, he opts to leave the word *Okie* as in the original and only adds the italics. Interestingly, he has added the word *sheriff* in the TT (“Un comisionado del *sheriff*”) as a translation of “One of them deputies”, probably due to the popularity of the word in the receiving culture. Lastly, Guerra has translated the measurement unit of *pounds* into *libras*, and the *cents* into *centavos*, as we see in “cuatro centavos por cada libra de algodón”, from the original “four cents a cotton poun”. Attention should be brought to the fact that the pound is not a unit used in Spain, nor in the Spanish-speaking countries in Latin America, where the International System of Units is the established one. With this information in mind, the reader won't be able to assess how much cotton this is. Similarly, the measurement unit of the mile in “you could smell 'em a mile”, has been simply literally translated into Spanish as *milla*, as we can see in “El olor se sentía a una milla de distancia”. Even though in Spain the concept and meaning of the mile is better known and understood than the concept of the pound, the translator could have adapted the distance into kilometers, helping the reader to get a better idea of what the actual distance is. Yet, it is true that through the decision of keeping the miles and the pounds, the translator brings the reader closer to the original text and its geographical and cultural context.

Summarizing, Guerra's translation has softened the tone and the essence of the dialogue and has reduced the sense of orality. Nonetheless, the dynamism of the conversation has been partly kept.

Let's move on to the **next translation**, the version completed by María Coy:

El hombre rechoncho intervino:

—Dios, Jeremy. No hace falta que me lo digas. Yo estuve allí. Hay un bloque de chabolas, treinta y cinco en una fila y quince de fondo. Y tienen diez cagadores para todo el tinglado. Y ¡por Dios!, podías olerlos a una milla de distancia. Uno de los ayudantes me dijo la razón. Estaba allí sentado y me dice: Estos malditos campamentos del gobierno. Les

dan agua caliente y la gente quiere agua caliente. Si les das retretes también los querrán. Dales a esos okies cosas y querrán todo. En esos campamentos hacen reuniones de rojos. Planean cómo conseguir los subsidios.

Huston preguntó:

—¿Nadie le atizó?

—No. Había un tipo pequeño que le preguntó, ¿qué es eso de subsidios?

—Subsidios, lo que los contribuyentes pagamos y os lleváis vosotros, malditos okies.

—Nosotros pagamos impuestos en lo que compramos, en la gasolina y el tabaco, dice el pequeño. Y dijo: A los granjeros les da cuatro centavos por libra de algodón el gobierno. ¿No es eso subsidio? ¿Y no tienen subsidio las compañías de ferrocarril y transportes?

—Esos hacen cosas que hay que hacer —dice el ayudante.

—Bueno —dice el otro—, ¿cómo se iban a recoger las cosechas si no fuera por nosotros? —el hombre rechoncho miró a su alrededor.

—¿Qué dijo el ayudante? —preguntó Huston.

—Se puso furioso. Y dijo: malditos rojos, todo el día causando agitación. Mejor será que vengas conmigo. Así que se llevó al hombre y le echaron sesenta días por vagancia.

—¿Cómo hicieron eso si tenía trabajo? —preguntó Timothy Wallace.

El hombre rechoncho se echó a reír.

—Ya lo sabes —dijo—. Sabes que un vago es cualquiera que no le cae bien a un policía. Y por eso odian este campamento. La policía no puede entrar. Esto es los Estados Unidos, no California.

Huston suspiró.

—Ojalá pudiéramos quedarnos. Nos tendremos que ir pronto. Yo estoy a gusto aquí. La gente se lleva bien; y Dios Todopoderoso, ¿por qué no nos dejan hacerlo en lugar de tratarnos mal y meternos en la cárcel? Juro que nos van a empujar a luchar si no nos dejan en paz —entonces su voz se apaciguó—. Tenemos que seguir siendo pacíficos —se recordó a sí mismo—. El comité no tiene derecho a echarlo a perder. (Coy 2002: 378-379)

As we have already seen in the last three examples, Coy's translation doesn't include any eye dialect at first glance. When reading closely, the language doesn't reflect any regional markers –yet, there is an increase in colloquial expressions in comparison to the other passages analysed. Regarding the form of the passage, it is not clear that the first half of it is a conversation within a conversation. When comparing this translation with the original, the ambiguity of who is talking is even more obvious in the TT, since the change in speaker is not signaled in Coy's version. However, this ambiguity doesn't prevent the text of being perceived as dynamic and quite natural.

Regarding the form of address, Coy has decided to use the informal form (*tú*) among all the characters. This is also valid for the dialogue within the dialogue between the deputy and the small guy, which can be a controversial decision because of the supposed position of authority of the deputy and the lower position of the migrant. However, Coy's choice also helps to set the tone of the conversation into a more accentuated form of informal register.

Focusing on the language itself, I will start commenting on the repeated expression *goddamn*. From the five times this word appears in the ST, we can only find it three times in the TT, and it has been translated as *malditos*, as in “malditos campamentos”, “maditos okies”, and “malditos rojos”. Nonetheless, the word has been left out in “You give them goddamn Okies stuff like that an’ they’ll want ’em”, which has been translated as “Dales a esos okies cosas y querrán todo”. The word *esos* carries, in this context, some of the contemptuous effect of the word *goddamn*, but is not as harsh. It must be added that the structural order of the sentence in the TT doesn’t sound very natural, that is why my suggestion would be *Dales algo a esos malditos okies y lo querrán todo*. The second sentence where the word *goddamn* has been omitted is “how’d your goddamn crops get picked if it wasn’t for us?”, which has been translated into “¿cómo se iban a recoger las cosechas si no fuera por nosotros?”. Here, there isn’t any term that expresses the contempt or disdain of the ‘little guy’. Hence, the sharpness of the statement gets lost in translation.

Let’s take a look at the expressions with mention to God. As we have already seen, the original text has four direct mentions of religious elements; these are “Jesus, God, Jeremy”, “An’ Christ”, “God Awmighty”, and “I swear to God”. The first one has been translated as “Dios, Jeremy”, leaving Jesus out of the sentence in a right decision to find a common expression in Spanish. *Por Dios*, would have also been an appropriate possibility, which has been used in the second mention: “Y ¡por Dios!, podías olerlos a una milla de distancia”. The next expression, “God Awmighty”, hasn’t been successfully translated, in my opinion. Coy has chosen “Dios Todopoderoso”, which is not that frequently used and sounds artificial and unnatural. A better solution, more fitting to the situation, would have been *y por el amor de Dios*.

As we have seen in the ST, Steinbeck included three idioms in his text: “One of them deputies give me the lowdown”, “Didn’ nobody sock him?”, and “The committee got no right to fly off’n the handle”. The first expression has been translated into “Uno de los ayudantes me dijo la razón”, the meaning of the idiom simply put in clear and standard language. We find the second one as “¿Nadie le atizó?” in the TT, a solution that has made use of the colloquial verb *atizar*, which in this context means *to hit*. And lastly, we find the third expression as “El comité no tiene derecho a echarlo a perder”, where we see how the original idiom has been translated into a common idiom in the receiving culture.

In the earlier passages of Coy’s translation, we have already seen how she keeps the word *Okie* untranslated and without the marker of a linguistic borrowing, that is, in round letters. Regarding the units of measurement present in the ST, that is, the miles and

the pounds, Coy has decided to translate them into *millas* and *libras* –as we see in “podías olerlos a una milla de distancia”, and “cuatro centavos por libra de algodón”– instead of choosing to adapt them into kilometers and kilograms. As mentioned above, this decision can be a barrier in the way the reader understands the text, but at the same time, it is also a feature that helps the reader to feel closer to the culture of the ST.

As a whole, Coy’s translation doesn’t include regional markers, but she has made an effort to include colloquial words and expressions that compensate, to some extent, the loss of the dialect. For example, the word *crapper* in the ST has been translated into *cagaderos*, a term which, even though it is not widely used, is easy to understand and states very clearly the register the speaker uses. *Chabola*, found in the very first sentence, has been chosen as the translation of *shack* and, even though it is not strictly speaking a colloquialism, or at least it is not signaled as one in the dictionary of *la Real Academia Española*, it is more commonly found in conversations or texts with a lower register. It is not only the choice of words that helps with the colloquial tone of the dialogue, but also the way the sentences are structured, as we see in the following example: “A los granjeros les da cuatro centavos por libra de algodón el gobierno”. The structure of this sentence according to the standard norm would be *El gobierno da cuatro centavos por libra de algodón a los granjeros* or *El gobierno da a los granjeros cuatro centavos por libra de algodón*. However, the way Coy has chosen to write the statement greatly increases the sense of orality and the credibility of the conversation.

Lastly, let’s analyse the **third translation**, completed by Pilar Vázquez:

–Qué me vas a decir a mí, Jeremy, si yo también estuve allí –le dijo el hombre achaparrado–. Hay un montón de barracas, al menos treinta y cinco por fila, y quince filas como poco. Y no habrá más de diez retretes para todas. Y el olor se sentía a más de un kilómetro a la redonda. Uno de esos agentes del sheriff..., bueno, un día se le calentó la boca, y yo..., pues que me abrió los ojos. Estábamos allí sentados y viene y dice: «Estos campamentos del gobierno..., hasta agua caliente les dan, y claro, ahora todos quieren agua caliente. No te fastidia». Tal cual lo dijo. «Tú dales, dales a esos *okies* cosas así, que luego van y las piden. Y además en esos campamentos son todos unos rojos y se reúnen. Supongo yo que buscan la manera de cobrar del auxilio social.»

–¿Y nadie le arreó una buena? –dijo Huston.

–No. Pero había allí un hombre bajito sentado con nosotros y le preguntó: «¿Qué dice del auxilio social?», y el policía le responde: «Pues lo que digo, el auxilio social... que lo que nosotros pagamos en impuestos os lo lleváis vosotros». Pero el bajito aquel no se mordió la lengua y le dijo: «A ver qué se cree. ¡Como si nosotros no pagáramos también impuestos! Y los de la gasolina y el tabaco, ¿qué?». Y todavía le dijo más: «Las grandes compañías cobran del gobierno nueve centavos por kilo de algodón. ¿Es que eso no es también auxilio social? ¿Y qué me dice de las subvenciones que se llevan las compañías de ferrocarril y las navieras? ¿No es también auxilio social?». Eso le dijo, y el policía siguió en sus trece: «Ellos hacen cosas necesarias para todos», le dijo. «Pues ya me dirá», le dijo

entonces el hombre al policía, «ya me dirá cómo iban a recoger sus malditas cosechas si no fuera por nosotros.» –El achaparrado miró a su alrededor.

Y Huston preguntó:

–¿Y qué dijo a eso el policía?

–Pues se puso como una fiera y dijo: «Malditos rojos, todo el tiempo alborotando. Pues, ¿sabes lo que te digo?, que estás detenido. ¡Vente conmigo!». Y dicho y hecho, se lo llevó, y le cayeron sesenta días de calabozo por vago y maleante.

–Pero si tenía un trabajo..., no podían acusarlo –intervino Timothy Wallace.

El hombre achaparrado sonrió:

–Timothy, hombre, pero ¿es que no lo ves? –le dijo–. Maleante es cualquiera que no le gusta a un poli. Por eso la han tomado con este campamento, porque no se les deja entrar cuando les viene en gana. Esto es Estados Unidos, no California.

Huston suspiró.

–Yo por mí me quedaría, pero no vamos a tener más remedio que irnos pronto. Bien sabe Dios que me gusta esto. Nos entendemos bien entre nosotros. ¿Por qué no nos dejan tranquilos? ¿Por qué nos hacen la vida imposible y nos detienen a la primera de cambio? Juro por Dios que lo único que van a conseguir así es un enfrentamiento. –Dicho esto, su tono se hizo más sosegado–. Bueno, no hay que perder la calma –se recordó a sí mismo–. El Comité no puede perder la cabeza. (Vázquez 2019: 409-411)

Vázquez's translation offers a small degree of visual orality, achieved by means of exclamative sentences and suspension points. Even though there are no dialect markers in the conversation, Vázquez has made use of a high number of idioms, and regional and colloquial expressions, thus making the passage dynamic, credible and natural for the readers of the receiving culture. Regarding the form of the passage, the conversation within the conversation has been clearly marked, in a way that allows the reader to follow who is saying what, in a way that is as distinct as in the ST.

On a general note, when reading this translation on its own, the reader gets, as mentioned above, a sense of naturalness and credibility. When comparing it to the original text, it is important to note that Vázquez has chosen the path of a freer translation, that is, she has brought the text closer to the reader, instead of bringing the reader closer to the text. She has done so by adding new expressions and words to the TT, by making changes on the punctuation or structuring sentences in a different way. Let's take a look at some examples. The first sentence of the passage, "Qué me vas a decir a mí, Jeremy", is found in the original as "Jesus, God, Jeremy". We see how Vázquez has omitted the religious reference and has combined it with the following sentence in the ST, "You ain't got to tell me". Even if the religious expression could have been easily kept in the TT, for example as *Por Dios, Jeremy, qué me vas a decir a mí*, Vázquez achieves a very natural result with her version.

The next big modification in comparison to Steinbeck's text is "Uno de esos agentes del sheriff..., bueno, un día se le calentó la boca, y yo..., pues que me abrió los ojos",

which we find in the original as “One of them deputies give me the lowdown”. This example gathers various elements to be considered. First, it is obvious at first glance, how Vázquez has extended the sentence of the ST, and has added two new idioms: *se le calentó la boca* and *me abrió los ojos*. The first expression is used when someone talks too much, gets angry and can’t stop him- or herself of insulting someone or using swear words. And the second one refers to realising something, usually the truth about a situation. This means that Vázquez has substituted the idiom in the ST for two idioms in the TT, which, even though they don’t carry an equivalent meaning, they act in the frame of the compensation strategy in translation. Vázquez has freely added, as well, the suspensive points, which help create pauses in the speech that, together with the widely used *bueno*, enhance its credibility. And the last element to highlight in this example is the use of the term *sheriff*. Even if the word doesn’t appear in the ST, the translator has opted to translate *deputy* for *agente del sheriff*.

Yet another addition in the translation, absent in the original text, is the expression found in the sentence “Pero el bajito aquel no se mordió la lengua”. *No morderse la lengua* is used when someone says what he or she thinks, regardless of its appropriateness, and Vázquez has used it to translate “this little guy says”. This sentence is followed by yet another free interpretation of the ST: “«A ver qué se cree. ¡Como si nosotros no pagáramos también impuestos! Y los de la gasolina y el tabaco, ¿qué?». Y todavía le dijo más: «Las grandes compañías cobran del gobierno nueve centavos por kilo de algodón»” which we find in the original as ““We pay sales tax an’ gas tax an’ tobacco tax,’ this little guy says. An’ he says, ‘Farmers get four cents a cotton poun’ from the gov’ment—ain’t that a relief?’”. Once again, we see how the translator has rearranged the order of the sentences of the ST and has added her grain of salt to the TT, including new markers and expressions to further emphasise the sense of orality, and rewriting some parts to increase the naturalness of the outcome, as in “A ver qué se cree”, which is an addition by the translator. In this example, we also see that Vázquez has decided to localize the measurement unit of pounds into kilograms, following Venuti’s principle of domestication, thus, easing the comprehension for the receiving reader. The same happens with the miles in “you could smell ’em a mile”, which Vázquez has localised into “el olor se sentía a más de un kilómetro”.

Continuing with the additions in the TT by the hand of the translator, we find “el policía siguió en sus trece”, an expression used on people who don’t want to accept any opinions that differ from their own. And even though it is not very popular, it helps increase

the credibility of the whole passage. The following quotation is yet another example in the conversation within the conversation, where the translator has adapted the text to increase its orality, and he has done it by adding the repetition: “«Pues ya me dirá», le dijo entonces el hombre al policía, «ya me dirá cómo iban a recoger sus malditas cosechas si no fuera por nosotros.»”. In this example we can also see how Vázquez has translated the colloquial fragment “goddamn crops” as “malditas cosechas”. The only other time the expression *goddamn*, which we see repeated five times in the ST, appears in the TT is “malditos rojos” (“goddamn reds”). The three remaining times, Vázquez has opted for leaving the word out. However, she has used the demonstrative adjectives *esos* –as in “esos okies”– and *estos* –as in “estos campamentos”. Both particles carry a subtle contemptuous meaning which could be regarded as a much weaker but effective equivalent for *goddamn*.

The following sentence is another example of an addition by the translator: “Pues, ¿sabes lo que te digo?, que estás detenido”, which is an attempt to emphasise the fact that the ‘little guy’ is getting arrested. The rhetoric question also works as a way of naturalising the speech and it adds to the orality and strengthens the attempt to produce a speech in a lower register. Vázquez adds still two more expressions to the translation which don’t figure in the ST: the first one is the addition of the idiom “Y dicho y hecho”, which translates into English as *no sooner said than done*. The second one is the mention of “maleante” as another reason besides vagrancy for putting the small guy in jail, which translates into *wicked* or *criminal*. This is also the word used right after when the ‘tubby man’ explains to Timothy Wallace that “You know a vagrant is anyone a cop don’t like.” In this specific case, Vázquez has translated the word “cop” for “poli”, a shortened form of *policía* which is broadly used in informal contexts.

In the sentence “Timothy, hombre, pero ¿es que no lo ves?” we see how the translator has decided to add the speaker’s name along with a rhetoric question and the address “hombre”, which is frequently used in colloquial conversations. Next, there is the expression “Bien sabe Dios que me gusta esto”, with the religious reference that we found in the ST one sentence later: “God Awmighty, why can’t they let us do it [...]?”. In this case, Vázquez has decided to move the expression a sentence earlier but has found a natural and appropriate solution. As for the expression “I swear to God”, it has been kept in the same place and translated as “Juro por Dios”.

Focusing on the idioms present in the ST, Vázquez has found equivalents for her translation. As the first one has already been discussed, let’s take a look at the second one: “Didn’ nobody sock him?”, which has been translated as “¿Y nadie le arreó una buena?”.

This solution comes as credible, yet it is not a very popular expression. And moving to the third one, “The Committee got no right to fly off’n the handle”, has found its equivalent in “El Comité no puede perder la cabeza”, a good solution based on a frequent expression in Castilian Spanish.

To conclude the analysis of this passage, let’s focus on the form of address. Vázquez has adopted the informal form of address (*tú*) for all characters but has kept the courtesy form only when the migrant talks to the deputy in the conversation within the conversation, as a sign of respect towards the authority. In conclusion, Vázquez’s translation follows the compensation method mentioned by Leppihalme (2000: 263), where the loss of the dialect has been balanced out with colloquialisms and a low register, hence, opting for the translation strategy of domestication.

7.8. Comparison IV

The last comparison of this study revolves around a passage with an abundance of idioms and colloquial expressions in the ST. Starting once again with the central aspect of the thesis, let’s look at how the three translators have approached the **representation of the dialect** in this specific passage. Having seen the results of the analysis of the three previous passages, it doesn’t come as a surprise that there are no traces (neither visual nor content-wise) informing the reader of the presence of a language spoken by the characters heavily marked by regional markers. In other words, that the original dialogues are a vivid representation of the Southern American vernacular, or more precisely, Southern White American English.

The next step is to determine if the translators have made use of any specific **compensation method** to atone for the absence of the dialect in their versions, and if yes, which one. The oldest translation, the one by Guerra, doesn’t present any specific technique to make up for the loss, which doesn’t necessarily mean that his text sounds artificial. On the contrary he has achieved, despite this absence, an acceptable translation due to the sense of orality that his version produces. In Coy’s translation, the amount of colloquial and even vulgar words can be regarded as her way to compensate for the loss of the dialect itself, thus adding to the colloquialism of the text and its casual register. Vázquez manages, by and by, to produce an even more credible and natural translation. The compensation found in her version is achieved through an abundance of idioms and expressions widely used by the Spanish native speakers, which result in a very natural, relatable, and credible

translation framed by a casual register. Thus, coming closer to the effect produced by the original text in the English-speaking readers.

This leads to the next comparison point. As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, this passage is rich in idioms and expressions considered profanity, which have been kept to a greater or lesser extent by each translator. In this case, all three translators have respected the increase on the number of such expressions in comparison to other parts of the novel. Again, Guerra's text is the one that has included the lower number of idioms, meaning that not only hasn't he found equivalent expressions to some of the ones of the ST, but neither has he added other idioms in different places to compensate for the loss of the other ones. Coy has managed to include a similar number of idioms and regional expressions than Steinbeck, achieving a credible and natural text for the receiving culture. Lastly, Vázquez has found genuine equivalents, and has been able to compensate for those idioms from the TT that she hasn't included by adding new ones in different parts of the conversation. These new expressions and the absence of some of the idioms that don't have an equivalent in the Spanish language have helped to create a target text that could be 'mistaken' as an original.

Undoubtedly, regional expressions and idioms play an essential role in the classification of a certain text or speech into one register or another, that is, they help shape the degree of formality of said text. Yet, there are other factors –such as the overall vocabulary, the tone, or the form of address, for example– which help define a register. As mentioned, all translators have achieved a certain degree of informality through the colloquial vocabulary and the regional expressions. In the case of Guerra, the choice of the informal form of address between the men in the committee helps to set the passage in the casual register, even though he has opted to use the courtesy form of address (*usted*, *ustedes*) between the deputy and the migrant worker. Coy, however, has decided to make use of the informal form of address (*tú*, *vosotros*) among all the characters from this passage, another factor that puts emphasis in the casual register. Vázquez manages, through the regional idioms, the choice of words and the overall tone, to reproduce the credibility from the ST. In her translation, she has made use of the informal form of address among the committee men, as well as when the deputy addresses the migrant in the conversation within the conversation, while she has rightly decided for the courtesy form when the migrant worker speaks to the deputy, thus, increasing the credibility of the text.

The last point of the comparison among the three translations is, as in the last three comparisons, the **translation approach** reflected on this specific passage. Taking into

consideration the elements analysed in Guerra's version, we see that his version leans towards the foreignization, a statement supported, as well, by the choice of translating the measurement units but not to localise them, as in "una milla" and "cuatro centavos por libra del algodón", instead of switching to km and kg. Similarly, Coy's decision is also to translate and not to localise the units of measurement, which would tilt the scales towards foreignization, but considering the other factors of her translation, such as the appropriateness of the regional expressions, her translation can be regarded as a well-balanced mix of both approaches. Lastly, Vázquez translation is a clear example of domestication approach, due to her inventiveness with the regional idioms and the natural result of her text, as well as the localisation of the units of measurement, as we see in "más de un kilómetro" and "nueve centavos por kilo de algodón".

7.9. Results

After analysing four passages of *The Grapes Of Wrath* and the same four passages of three different Spanish translations, those of Hernán Guerra, María Coy and Pilar Vázquez, it has been made clear that none of the three translations include any representation of the vernacular that permeates the whole of Steinbeck's novel. Even if the three versions were completed in different points in time, the tendency to avoid forms of language that diverge from the standard and socially accepted one has persisted over time.

The results also show that, generally, the translators haven't found a specific method to compensate for the loss and absence of the dialect. Nonetheless, the causal register and the inclusion of idioms and regional expressions have slightly helped to make up for its omission. The translation that stands out when comparing it to the other two is the one completed by Vázquez. Her text is the one that has been able to represent the struggles of the Joads in the most convincing way and, even if the dialect –and everything it encompasses– has been lost in translation, she has achieved a good translation.

When gathering the information of the preferred or applied translation method for each passage, we see that Guerra's text leans generally towards the foreignization, while Coy's translation has aspects from both methods, and Vázquez's text is an example of a higher degree of domestication. These results can imply that translation, and for that matter, literature, are becoming more progressive with time and that the forms of language that differ from the norm are slowly being represented and integrated into literature, and, thus, normalised.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Dialects are a fundamental part of oral language. They are not only a communication tool and not only a collection of words and expressions that don't follow the norms of syntax or grammar, but are also a contributing factor in defining one's identity and a mirror of society. They are a combination of cultural, social, regional, historical, and contextual elements that permeate and transform a language and give it meaning. Being such a substantial part of everyday life and everyone's lives, we should ask ourselves why its representation in the written form is so scarce, and why, still nowadays, people who use their own dialect and vernacular are considered uneducated and uncultured.

By beginning the study taking a look on sociolinguistics, dialectology, and the role they play in our societies, I wanted to bring attention to this extremely wide area of linguistics that is such a meaningful part of our lives but doesn't receive the attention it deserves. And even worse, whose object of study isn't considered of any worth by many people, who, instead of celebrating variety in language and its richness, see it as something to be ashamed of and don't realise that the so-called standard language is indeed a dialect too.

The research on sociolinguistics and the insights on the different vernaculars of the American English and the different Spanish dialects in Spain, were aimed at a better understanding of the use of the vernacular in literature in general, and the challenges it poses to translators, being one of the biggest problems in translation. By taking a look at the Spanish dialects, I wanted to highlight the possibilities that could be used when choosing to portray non-standard language in a Spanish work of literature. However, this study has also brought attention to the existence of a standardisation tradition in the Spanish language, both in original pieces of literature, as well as in translations.

Together with the information gathered during my research on the topic, and reflecting on my own analysis, the difficulty –or even impossibility– of finding a way to successfully portray the vernacular was corroborated. In other words, the transferring of the dialect from one language or culture into another one has been rendered nearly impractical. Mostly owing to the cultural, social, and historical meaning dialects carry, it is normally not possible to find any existing dialect in the receiving language with an equivalent –or not even similar– background. At this point, it is the translator's job to decide which approach should be used when facing such a situation. Either the substitution of the

dialect from the ST for an existing one in the receiving culture; the omission of any reference to the dialect but with an attempt to compensate its loss by emphasising other elements –such as the register and the regional markers–; the complete standardisation of the dialect without trying to offer any compensation to the reader; or the invention of a new dialect by means of a combination of real dialects and other elements. Nonetheless, the risks of attempting to use an existing dialect to translate another one have to be considered, as this attempt can end up ridiculing the original dialect, as Antoine Berman warns.

In my opinion, in those cases where the translator isn't able to find a suitable way to come up with a representation of the dialect found in the ST, it is especially important to resort to keeping as much of the essence of the original work as possible, be it through idioms, through the combination of registers or through an invented dialect, always taking into account what is the method that fits the target readership best. That is how the question from the beginning of the study regarding the best approach to translate dialect remains unanswered from my point of view, contrary to Lander's strong opinion that the translation of dialects shouldn't be attempted, as commented earlier. The sole objective of a translator should be to produce a natural, readable, and credible work of literature that captures as much as possible the essence of the original text.

However, during the course of this study, I have also learnt the importance of not harshly criticising another translator's job, since it is not possible to know in which circumstances the translation has been done. It might well be that some decisions, such as including, modifying, or omitting swear words and vulgar expressions in the translation, are out of the translator's hands and are taken by literary agents or publishers, or even regulated by a government, considering there is any kind of censorship in place. As discussed earlier in the thesis, Steinbeck himself was limited in his freedom of including in *The Grapes Of Wrath* the kind of language he wanted to use, and was advised by his agent to "clean" his novel of the worst swear words if he wanted to see his novel published. Allowing myself to use again a quotation found earlier in the study owing to its relevance, I want to bring back attention to Steinbeck's reply to the request of purifying his work, to which he partly had to comply: "A working man bereft of his profanity is a silent man. [...] To try to reproduce the speech of these people and to clean it up is to make it sound stiff, unnatural and emasculated." (as quoted in Čerče 2017: 70) Here he stated, once again, the vital importance language had in his novels.

Sadly, but unsurprisingly, the results of the study have shown that the dialect has been lost in the three translations, corroborating the rule of standardization of dialects in

the tradition of literary translation, as Toury, Venuti and Rodríguez Herrera sustain. Needless to say, this decision is usually the result of acknowledging that attempting otherwise wouldn't probably work. Thus, the translators choose to produce texts that will be readable and will sound natural by making themselves invisible and achieve a feeling of originality. In this study, Guerra's translation, which dates back to 1951 and is the oldest version I could reach, is the most conservative, while Vázquez's version, which is the newest available, is the most progressive language-wise, and the one that better attempts and achieves to break language rules and conventions. Coy's translation lies in the middle, both regarding the publication date, and the innovation in her solutions for the loss of the dialect. Clearly, Vázquez's translation is the one that best maintains the essence of Steinbeck's novel and helps approximate the story to the Spanish readership. However, no translation will ever achieve the exact same effect than the original text, and the question remains if the receiving readership of a translation, in this case, *Las uvas de la ira*, will be reading Steinbeck, or simply an approximation achieved by the translator. In this case, Spanish readers will miss Steinbeck's mastery of language, but, in exchange, they will be able to follow the story and feel the struggles of the Joad family and the other hundreds of thousands of migrant workers and their families.

The key findings of this research then, point towards a modernisation of language. However, it is a reality that Spanish is, still, quite behind in the portrayal of non-standard language in literature in comparison to the literature in English. Hopefully, time will make language even more progressive, and writers and translators will be more and more daring to play around language rules, push boundaries and end with limiting traditions.

And, while it is true that so much gets lost in translation –especially regarding language variation–, and that the perfect literary translation doesn't exist, we mustn't forget that very good translations do exist. That is why, despite the near impossibility of reaching complete equivalence between languages, translation will continue building bridges between cultures, stories, and different realities, and thus, broadening minds around the world.

IX. CITED WORKS

9.1. Primary Literature

Shaw, Bernard & Topolski, Feliks (1976). *Pygmalion : a romance in five acts*. Repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Steinbeck, John (1951). *Las uvas de la ira*. Translated by H. Guerra Canévaro. Barcelona: Editorial Planeta.

Steinbeck, John (2002). *Las uvas de la ira*. Translated by M. Coy. New York: Penguin Books.

Steinbeck, John (2017). *The Grapes of Wrath*. 5th ed.. London: Penguin Books.

Steinbeck, John (2019). *Las uvas de la ira*. 5th ed.. Translated by P. Vázquez. Barcelona: Tusquets Editores.

Twain, Mark (1985). *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Oakland: University of California Press.

9.2. Secondary Literature

Álvarez Maurín, María José (n.d.). Steinbeck, John. *Diccionario Histórico de la Traducción en España*. <https://phte.upf.edu/dhte/ingles/steinbeck-john/>. (Accessed 28.10.2022).

Bailey, Guy (2001). The relationship between African American and White Vernaculars in the American South. In: Lanehart, Sonja L. (ed.) *Sociocultural and Historical Contexts of African American English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 53–92.

Biber, Douglas (2009). *Dimensions of Register Variation : a Cross-Linguistic Comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cerce, Danica (2017). Between translation and transformation: recreating Steinbeck's language in *Of Mice and Men*. *Translator* 23(1), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2016.1183092>.

Chambers, J. K. & Trudgill, Peter (1998). *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Conaway Bergtold, Peggy (2021). The Novel that Counters and Mirrors The Grapes of Wrath. *Steinbeck Now*. <http://www.steinbecknow.com/2021/04/14/novel-counters-the-grapes-of-wrath/> (Accessed 28.10.2022).
- Conolly-Smith, Peter (2009). Shades Of Local Color: “Pygmalion” And Its Translation And Reception In Central Europe, 1913-1914. *Shaw*, 29(1), 127–44. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40691864>.
- Craig, Ian S. (1997). *Children's classics translated from English under Franco: the censorship of the William books and the Adventures of Tom Sawyer*. Queen Mary University of London.
- Cukor-Avila, Patricia (2003). The Complex Grammatical History of African-American and White Vernaculars in the South. In: Nagle, Stephen J., & Sanders, Sara L. (eds.) *English in the Southern United States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 82–105.
- Dasca, María. (2015). La recepción crítica de la obra de John Steinbeck en España entre 1940 y 1964. *Anuari Trilcat*, 5. Universitat Pompeu Fabra: Barcelona.
- Dodsworth, Robin & Benton, Richard (2019). *Language Variation and Change in Social Networks : a Bipartite Approach*. Milton: Routledge.
- Eckert, Penelope (2012). Three Waves of Variation Study: The Emergence of Meaning in the Study of Sociolinguistic Variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41(1), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-092611-145828>
- Fawcett, Peter (1997). *Translation and Language : Linguistic Theories Explained*. 1st ed. Manchester: St. Jerome Publ.
- Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés. (2016): Dialectos del español peninsular. In: Gutiérrez, Javier Rexach (ed.), *Enciclopedia lingüística hispánica*, Londres & New York: Routledge, 2(1), 387-404.
- Gordon, Matthew J. (2013). *Labov : a Guide for the Perplexed*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Gramley, Stephan, et al. (2020). *A Survey of Modern English*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Hualde, José Ignacio (2031). *Los Sonidos Del Español*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, Gavin (2021). *Reclaiming John Steinbeck*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Labov, William (1973). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William (2010). *Principles of Linguistic Change. Volume 3, Cognitive and Cultural Factors*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Landers, Clifford E. (2001). *Literary Translation : A Practical Guide*. 1st ed. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Leppihalme, Ritva (2000). The Two Faces of Standardization. *Translator* (Manchester, England), 6(2), 247–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2000.10799068>
- Lisca, Peter (1958). *The Wide World of John Steinbeck*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press
- López García, Ángel (2019). Lenguas y Dialectos. *Pluricentrismo, Hibridación y Porosidad En La Lengua Española* 42, 31–42.
<https://doi.org/10.31819/9783865278739-003>.
- Magrinyà, Luis. (2020). Pilar Vázquez: ver las palabras. *El País*.
<https://elpais.com/cultura/2020-05-12/pilar-vazquez-ver-las-palabras.html>
(Accessed 30.10.2022)
- Nagle, et al. (2003). *English in the Southern United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- National Steinbeck Center. (2022). Salinas, California.
- Parini, Jay (1991). *John Steinbeck : a biography*. London: London Heinemann
- Perteghella, Manuela (2002). Language and Politics on Stage: Strategies for Translating Dialect and Slang with References to Shaw's *Pygmalion* and Bond's *Saved*. *Translation Review* 64(1), 45–53.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07374836.2002.10523826>.
- Rodriguez Herrera, Jose Manuel (2014). The Reverse Side of Mark Twain's Brocade: The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn and the Translation of Dialect. *European Journal of English Studies* 18(3), 278–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13825577.2014.944021>.
- Rosa, Alexandra Assis (2012). Translating Place: Linguistic Variation in Translation. *Word and Text* 2(2), 75–97.
- Rusu, Iris (2021). Bridging the Gap between Cultures: The Translation of Cockney and Slang in G. B. Shaw's "Pygmalion". *East-West Cultural Passage* 21(2), 105–132.
<https://doi.org/10.2478/ewcp-2021-0016>
- Sánchez, María T. (2009). *The problems of literary translation : a study of the theory and practice of translation from English into Spanish*. Oxford, Wien: Lang.

- “Sociolinguistics” (2008). *Encyclopedia Britannica*.
<https://www.britannica.com/science/sociolinguistics>. (Accessed 23.03.2022)
- Spencer, Edmund T. (2010). *Sociolinguistics*. Hauppauge: Nova Science Publishers, Incorporated.
- Tagliamonte, Sali A. (2006). *Analysing sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Venuti, Lawrence (2000). *Translation Studies Reader*. 1st publ. London: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence (2008). *The Translator's Invisibility : a History of Translation*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- “Vernacular”. *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*,
<https://web.archive.org/web/20220530012911/https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/vernacular> (Accessed 29.03.2022)
- Worster, Donald (1979). *Dust bowl : the Southern plains in the 1930s*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Yu, Jing (2017). Translating ‘others’ as ‘us’ in Huckleberry Finn: Dialect, Register and the Heterogeneity of Standard Language. *Language and Literature* 26(1), 54–65.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947016674131>.
- Yule, George (2010). *The Study of Language*. 4. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Zamora Salamanca, Francisco José (2012). El español general y las traducciones literarias. Un decenio (1933-1942). In: Lebsanft, Franz, et al. *El español, ¿desde las variedades a la lengua pluricéntrica?* Madrid: Iberomericana Vervuert.

X. ABSTRACT

In 1939 John Steinbeck published *The Grapes Of Wrath*, one of his most acclaimed works which helped him win the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1962. The novel of the already-famous author didn't go unnoticed and was received amidst a wave of positive and negative criticism. Some of the negative comments it received were based on his "bad" use of language. This Master's thesis dives into the realm of Sociolinguistics and offers an analysis of the way the vernacular language spoken by Steinbeck's characters has been transferred into the written word. Taking into consideration the reflections on literary and dialect translation by authors like Venuti or Schleiermacher, the study follows as an examination of how the translational problem has been solved by three Spanish translators, Hernán Guerra, María Coy, and Pilar Vázquez. The three Spanish versions are later analysed and compared in an attempt to bring attention to the lack of dialect representation in Spanish language literature.

XI. ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Im Jahr 1939 wurde John Steinbecks *The Grapes Of Wrath* veröffentlicht, eines seiner bekanntesten Werke, das ihn geholfen hat, den Nobelpreis für Literatur am 1962 zu gewinnen. Der Roman des bereits berühmten Autors blieb nicht unbemerkt und wurde von einer Welle positiver und negativer Kritik begleitet. Ein Teil der negativen Kritik bezog sich auf den „schlechten“ Sprachgebrauch des Autors. Diese Masterarbeit taucht in den Bereich der Soziolinguistik ein und analysiert, wie die von Steinbecks Figuren gesprochene Vernakularsprache in das geschriebene Wort übertragen wurde. Unter Berücksichtigung der Überlegungen von Autoren wie Venuti oder Schleiermacher zur literarischen und dialektalen Übersetzung wird im Folgenden untersucht, wie das Übersetzungsproblem von drei spanischen Übersetzern, Hernán Guerra, María Coy und Pilar Vázquez, gelöst wurde. Die drei spanischen Versionen werden anschließend analysiert und verglichen, um auf die mangelnde Darstellung von Dialekten in der spanischsprachigen Literatur aufmerksam zu machen.