

Dialect Usage in *Sophia's Secret Translation*

Jorge Almeida e Pinho
(FLUC/ESE-IPP/CETAPS)

Introduction

The multidisciplinary and comparative nature underpinning Anglo-Portuguese Studies is a longstanding claim in many national and international academic works. As a result, Anglo-Portuguese Studies are placed at crossroads between several disciplines – particularly, in this case, history, politics, linguistics, literature and translation – allowing for a unique insight into the transference from one language into another of distinct sociocultural realities, based on a sound comparative perspective.

The excerpts of the book analysed in this article will indicate the validity of such a statement, highlighting the interaction between the above-mentioned different disciplines and promoting a research based on the materials available in this special case study. The intercultural dialogue in this article shows clearly the “aesthetics of difference”, but also the interest in the Other, in what is different, in the otherness.

When trying to develop some special *dramatis personae* in a work, any author likes to give them as much authenticity as possible, and one of the forms authors use for this purpose is showing where such *personas* are from and how they speak. But allowing characters to use

a specific dialect can be a serious and very difficult challenge. While the use of dialects in writing has changed over the years, negative responses have increased over time because of the use of this technique, with some notable exceptions, namely in children's literature, where to some degree some forms of dialect are still used, namely in contemporary novels and picture books. (Sommer 2014) The challenge is even more difficult when it comes to the translation of any work from one original language into other languages, where besides many other needs, there is an essential problem: that of finding a similar or equivalent dialect (if existing).

Alexandra Assis Rosa in her Introduction to "Translating Place: Linguistic Variation in Translation" (2012, 75-77) describes extensively, and quite accurately, international studies already published concerning linguistic variation and translation. Thus, the indispensable reference to the names of: Annie Brisset and her work *A Sociocritique of Translation: Theatre and Alterity in Quebec, 1968-1988*; Annich Chapdelaine and Gillian Lane Mercier, with the special issue of the journal *TTR* entitled *Traduire les sociolectes*; and Michael Cronin's work on the growing visibility of Irish Gaelic in literary (non) translated texts, included in *Translating Ireland. Translation, Languages, Cultures*. But the essential study of Birgitta Englund Dimitrova on the translation of dialect in fiction, in "Translation of Dialect in Fictional Prose – Vilhelm Moberg in Russian and English as a Case in Point", is also a key reference.

Anglo-Portuguese Studies on this matter are also noteworthy, namely Alexandra Assis Rosa's own work ("The Centre and the Edges. Linguistic Variation and Subtitling Pygmalion into Portuguese", *Translation and the (Re)Location of Meaning. Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminars in Translation Studies 1994-1996*, edited by Jeroen Vandaele (Leuven: CETRA Publications, 1999, 317-338); "Features of Oral and Written Communication in Subtitling", *(Multi)Media Translation. Concepts, Practices and Research*, edited by Yves Gambier and Henrik Gottlieb (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001, 213-221); Alexandra Assis Rosa, Luísa Falcão, Raquel Mouta, Susana Valdez and Tiago Botas, "Luso-Canadian Exchanges in Translation Studies:

Translating Linguistic Variation", *Proceedings of the International Congress "From Sea to Sea – Literatura e Cultura do Canadá em Lisboa* (Special issue of *Anglo-Saxónica* 3/2 (2011): 39-68); or Sara Ramos Pinto, with "How important is the way you say it? A Discussion on the Translation of Linguistic Varieties," *Target* 21/2 (2009): 289-307; and *Traduzir no Vazio: a Problemática da Variação Linguística nas Traduções de Pygmalion, de G. B. Shaw e de My Fair Lady, de Alan Jay Lerner* (*Translating into a Void: the Problem of Linguistic Variation in Portuguese Translations of Bernard Shaw's Pygmalion and Alan Jay Lerner's My Fair Lady*) (PhD thesis, University of Lisbon, 2009); and, finally, Lili Cavalheiro and her paper "Linguistic Variation in Subtitling for Audiovisual Media in Portugal", published in *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, 7 (2008): 17-28.

My own work *O Escritor Invisível*, (Pinho 2006, 111-131) has shown that such a worry is essential for most translators and a constant object of their own observations in para-texts associated to the commissioned translated works. In this book there are several useful references and quotations from the commentaries of famous Portuguese translators, such as: Daniel Pearlman and Luísa Campos in the preface to Ezra Pound's *Do Caos à Ordem* (*From Chaos to Order*); António Neves-Pedro about Norman Mailer's *Os Nus e os Mortos* (*The Naked and the Dead*); Marina Prieto and Mário César de Abreu's conflicting views concerning two different translations of *Pigmalião* (*Pygmalion*), by George Bernard Shaw; Ana Luísa Faria reflecting upon her translation work on *A Fogueira das Vaidades* (*The Bonfire of Vanities*), by Thomas Wolfe; the playwright Jorge Silva Melo about his translation of *A Estalajadeira* (*The Mistress of the Inn – La Locandiera*), by Carlo Goldoni; Daniel Gonçalves in his translation of *Ritos de Passagem* (*Rites of Passage*), by William Golding; the translation by Luís Cardim of Shakespeare's *A Tragédia de Júlio César* (*The Tragedy of Julius Caesar*); Tereza Coelho's observations on *O Amante da China* (*The North China Lover – L'Amant de la Chine du Nord*); the writer's José Luandino Vieira cunning remarks about *A Laranja Mecânica* (*Clockwork Orange*), by Anthony Burgess; and, finally, Alfredo Margarido's commentaries about his own translation work of James Joyce's *Retrato do Artista Quando Jovem* (*A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*).

The conclusion I reached in this book, after so many references and research, is that for each case there was a different solution. Each translator adopted the more convenient method to adjust to the author's original creation and, for every situation there would be an adapted vehicle to express the meaning but also the dialect and / or nuance of language hinted by the original piece.

1. Dialect

Dialect is one of those words that is problematic to define and subject to diverse interpretations. A simple definition is that a dialect is any variety of a language that is marked off from others by distinctive linguistic features. Such a variety can be connected to a place or region, or it may also be linked to gender, social or age group (male or female, young or old, etc.). Often dialects are geographically based – geography is, in fact, one of the fundamental factors for this difference. Rather than referring to accents or dialects, it is perhaps better to talk of varieties of English, which, since the language is a continuum of speech, avoids the pejorative overtones of dialect. (McCum 1992, 4-5)

It is also very common to confuse a 'dialect' with an accent, muddling up the difference between words people use and the sounds they make, that is their pronunciation. Very often, when claiming to discuss a dialect, people will focus just on pronunciations. It is quite clear that accent, or pronunciation, is a special element of a dialect that needs separate attention to be properly understood.

In the case of literary works, the placing of sounds on paper to intentionally create an identity for some *persona* or to situate that specific character within its peculiar geographic original setting, social class, ethnicity, and gender is the main reason for the use of some identifiable variety of the language. But there are degrees as to how this may be accomplished. There are also different ways to achieve this purpose, namely through the usage of specific vocabulary to portray some regional characteristics, different upbringings or social

backgrounds, or even deviations from standard grammar that may establish the intended variety usage.

One of the most extreme situations is related to the use of phonetically spelt words to replicate what is being said. In such a case, the words are written exactly as they sound. This way it will sound like a transcript of what is said and it becomes somewhat more difficult to read, but shows an important distinction. Depicting the dialogues may have little to do with exact phonetic transcriptions, but sometimes it is used as a feature by the author to show the inclusion of a different variety. Thus, it can be said that dialect is symbolized rather than formally transcribed.

The use of local phrases, idioms or colloquialisms also serves to set the location and the time period, since many regions have phrases that are unique to them. But the method that is easiest to read and understand simply mentions in the text that a certain character belongs to or uses the accent of a certain place, and in this way refers to the dialect being spoken. All of this serves to identify patterns of linguistic variations and deviations to such usage patterns. As Alexandra Assis Rosa so eloquently puts it:

By resorting to what some may call linguistic sensitivity, or actually one's knowledge of sociolinguistic stereotypes, defined as attitudes and beliefs towards language, a proficient speaker of a language is able to relate the patterning of linguistic features (defined as accents and dialects) with particular time and space coordinates (both physical and social), including a given communicative situation; and all these features combine into a speaker's linguistic fingerprint: his or her idiolect. So a proficient speaker of a given language is able to correlate a cluster of linguistic forms with contextual meaning, i.e. time, space, and user. (2012, 77-8)

On the other hand, this may look offensive and insulting to some minority groups, since such deviations to the patterns of speaking or to the common language usage may be considered backward, crude, or even show other negative qualities related to any given character in the literary work. This is obviously true and perhaps the best

example is known to most readers... That is the case of Elisa Doolittle, a London fictional character who appears in the play *Pygmalion*, by George Bernard Shaw, in 1912, and in the musical version of that play, *My Fair Lady*. Eliza is a Cockney flower girl, who goes to Professor Henry Higgins asking for elocution lessons, after a chance encounter at Covent Garden. Professor Higgins accepts her challenge for the purposes of a wager: that he can introduce her to the elite London society.

Her Cockney dialect includes words that are common among most working-class Londoners, and Doolittle receives voice coaching and learns some rules of etiquette. The outcome of all this is her acceptance in high society. This is a recognition that, even with a poor upbringing and coming from a lower social class, it is possible for anyone to be socially recognized and highly regarded, as long as they follow the established patterns of behaviour and (concerning our specific object of study) if they use the Queen's (Standard) English. Nevertheless, this feature is, most of the time, a simple and common literary strategy, and not a manipulative device, employed by authors all around the world to briefly depict a *dramatis persona's* traits through their use of the language.

2. Susanna Kearsley and *Sophia's Secret (The Winter Sea)*

Susanna Kearsley was born in Brantford, Ontario in the late 20th century. She is a best-selling Canadian novelist of historical fiction and mystery, as well as thrillers, in this case under the pen name Emma Cole. In 2014, she received the Romance Writers of America's RITA Award for Best Paranormal Romance for *The Firebird*. *Sophia's Secret* (aka, *The Winter Sea* in the USA market) was short-listed for both the UK Romantic Novelists' Association, Romantic Book of the Year Award and the Romance Writers of America RITA Award in 2009. According to the author:

The first idea for it started forming twenty years ago, when by pure chance I found a little book called *Playing the Scottish Card*, by historian John S. Gibson, detailing "The Franco-Jacobite Invasion of 1708". I'm always

intrigued by episodes of history that I've never heard of, and this one began with an irresistible quote from Lord Dacre: "History is not merely what happened: it is what happened in the context of what might have happened." (Beverly 2006)

Sophia's Secret, by Susanna Kearsley, is an historical fiction work, set in the present day and, simultaneously, in 1708 Scotland, that narrates the Scots uprising in favour of James Stewart. In the present, Carrie McClelland is a bestselling author of historical fiction works (the *alter ego* of Susanna Kearsley) who is unable to write due to writer's block. Because of this, she travels to Scotland to follow up some research on the Scots uprising in favour of James Stewart. Carrie chooses as her main *dramatis persona* one of her own ancestors, Sophia Paterson, a young woman who was deeply involved in the events of 1708. Suddenly Carrie discovers that she has begun to channel her ancestor's memories and starts to quickly write the novel. The book cleverly intertwines both present and past narratives, and the lines between fact and fiction become increasingly blurred.

As Sophia's memories draw Carrie more deeply into the intrigue of 1708, she also becomes deeply involved in a captivating love story lost in time. After three hundred years, there is a mix of suspense, romance, and magic in the book, which is swiftly paced, and the heroines of both narrative threads are strong and interesting. To make it easier for the reader to identify both tales the author created a parallel path, mingling the stories but using two different systems of identification. The present is identified with the title "Chapter #", while the past is numbered according to the old-fashioned Latin numbers "I, II, III, etc."

The historical events mentioned are mostly based on real facts, namely on the facts of 18th century British history. James Francis Edward Stuart, who was born June 10, 1688, in London, England, and died January 1, 1766, in Rome, Papal States (Italy), was the son of the deposed Roman Catholic monarch James II of England and claimant to the English and Scottish thrones. He would be known as the "Old Pretender". The birth of James led to the invasion of England by William, Prince of Orange, because his wife was also the heir to the throne.

Styled James III of England and James VIII of Scotland by his supporters, he made several efforts to gain his crown. His father, James II, had fled from England on 23 December 1688 and never returned. James was brought up at the castle of St-Germain-en-Laye, in France. After his father's death, in 1701, he was declared King James III of England and VIII of Scotland, and was recognized as the rightful monarch by France, Spain and the Pope. In 1708, James attempted to invade Scotland and recapture the throne, but his army was prevented from landing by the British fleet. After spending some time fighting the French army, in 1713 he was expelled from France as a condition for the country's peace treaty with Great Britain.

After James refused to convert from Catholicism to claim the throne, it passed to the Protestant Elector of Hannover, who succeeded as King George I. James landed in Scotland and set out for the Scottish throne, in January 1716, but with government forces approaching, he left Scotland secretly in February. After a brief stay in Avignon, the Pope offered James refuge in Rome in 1717, where he would remain for the rest of his life. James was involved in an attempted Spanish invasion of Scotland in 1719, but the next, and last, serious Jacobite uprising was led by his son Charles Stuart (1720-1788) in 1745. Charles's defeat at Culloden, in 1745, effectively ended Jacobite hopes for the restoration of the throne.

The episode of the attempt to recover the lost throne in 1708 is central to the plot of *Sophias' Secret*, and most of the action revolves around that moment. The historical *dramatis personae* represented in the novel are also consistent with some real and existing ones at that time, to make it sound even more credible and interesting for current readers.

3. The Translation into Portuguese

The translation of this book into Portuguese certainly implied a close attention to some nuances, especially because of two distinct, but intertwined aspects: firstly, the *dramatis persona's* speech associated

to the 18th century was marked by some formalities deriving from their social status and upbringing; secondly, one local character, who lives in the 'present', uses Doric, a Scots dialect.

3.1.

Concerning the first aspect, the outdated form of language use was mostly associated to a deference treatment. The distinctive marks are related to the social status and upbringing, notably in dialogues, but also when *dramatis personae* mingle and upper classes need to communicate with lower classes, and it is an aspect that played a decisive role in this translation. This was clearly stated and explained by Mona Baker in a well-known reference:

The familiarity / deference dimension in the pronoun system is among the most fascinating aspects of grammar and the most problematic in translation. It reflects the tenor of the message (...) and can convey a whole range of rather subtle meanings. The subtle choices involved in pronoun usage in languages which distinguish between familiar and non-familiar pronouns is further complicated by the fact that this use differs significantly from one social group to another and that it changes all the time in a way that reflects changes in social values and attitudes. (1994, 98)

Thus, it must be said that the use of 'You' in English allows for this distinctiveness of speech to be less evident in the original work. The difficulty here arises from the need of the target language – Portuguese – to highlight that difference using one out of three possibilities:

- "Tu" – the rather familiar and intimate form;
- "Você" – the somewhat distant reference, but many times used nowadays, which is a present adaptation of the old format "Vossa Mercê". In fact, "Você" is a personal pronoun used to refer to the second person, but since it is a pronoun used for referring to someone, it is employed in

the third person (as well as “he” or “she”). The etymology is to be found in the deference expression to *vossa mercê* (your mercy), which was successively transformed into *vossemecê*, *vossemecê*, *vosmecê*, *vancê* and *você*, and which was an expression conferred upon people who could not be addressed by the pronoun *tu* (you);

- “Vós” – the second person of plural, which was used in previous centuries to acknowledge some respect for an older person or for someone placed at higher social positions.

The transition of ‘you’ into Portuguese becomes then a problem because of the abovementioned diverse forms of the same original pronoun in the target language. The degree of familiarity or formality between speakers in a dialogue and the corresponding form of transmitting such differences can also be an issue. Once again according to Mona Baker, this falls into a large “grammatical equivalence” category, which is substantiated in several ways. (1994, 82-118) The most relevant one for this paper is the following:

A large number of modern European languages, not including English, have a formality/politeness dimension in their person system. In such languages, a pronoun other than the second-person singular, usually the second- or third-person plural, is used in interaction with a singular addressee in order to express deference and/or non-familiarity (...). (96)

An example related to the formality with the use of ‘you’ appears in the book when Sophia – the protagonist – is talking to John Moray – her loved one, who had lived next to King James in France for a long time. The relationship between both (Sophia and John) is still at its initial stages and any attempt to make it sound closer with the use of ‘tu’ would certainly feel strange for any Portuguese reader. Besides, Sophia’s social status – she is not of noble origins – would not allow her to address Moray in a direct way without making even contemporary readers feel like it is awkward for the first time they met to be talking to each other like that. Therefore, the solution would be to adopt a more distant form of treatment.

Nevertheless, which would be appropriate, since both 'você' and 'vós' would be possible? The next step ascertained that the scene for this part of the novel was set at the beginning of the 18th century. The conventions for the language usage of that time in the corresponding Portuguese idiom of that same time would imply a very high degree of formality between members of lower classes and any nobleman. Some research into the language conventions of that time immediately revealed (namely through the reading of excerpts of Portuguese books written at that time) that this more archaic Portuguese language would use the pronoun 'vós' in an analogous situation. This would serve to keep the social distance, but also the unfamiliarity between both *dramatis personae*. Therefore, this was the adopted solution in the translated book:

She asked, 'And do *you* live at Court?'

'At Saint-Germain? Faith, no,' he said. (Kearsley 2008, 199)

Ela perguntou: – E *vós* morais na Corte?

– Em Saint-Germain? Por Deus, não – disse ele. (Kearsley 2012, 190)

It is worth noticing that parallel characters in the present – keeping in mind that they are alter egos of those ancient past *dramatis personae* – while maintaining a distant form of treatment to each other in the past use a quite different form of treatment in the Portuguese translation for the present. In this case, and since at the beginning of their mutual acquaintance they do not know each other, it was kept a greater distance between both by using the more informal 'você' form:

'He asked, 'Has Dad been telling tales about me, then? Is that it?'

'No. It's just that I keep tripping over members of your family. First your brother, and now you. There aren't any other Keiths running around here in Cruden Bay, are there?'. (Kearsley 2008, 115)

Perguntou: – Então, o meu pai já lhe contou algumas histórias sobre mim? É isso?

– Não. O que se passa é que continuo a tropeçar nos membros da sua família. Primeiro o seu irmão e agora *você*. Não existe mais nenhum Keith por aqui em Cruden Bay, ou existe? (Kearsley 2012, 112)

It is also noticeable that the Portuguese translated text, in some instances, omits the pronoun, as it is also common. This particular usage is coded in the inflection of verbs, whereas in Portuguese it is possible to avoid addressing a person directly, by simply using the adequate verbal form:

‘The what?’

He repeated the name, taking care to speak slowly. ‘A sort of a sea cave, not far to the north.’

‘No, I haven’t.’

‘Because I was thinking, if *you’re* feeling up to a bit of a walk, I could take *you* tomorrow.’ (Kearsley 2008, 116)

– À quê?

Ele repetiu o nome, tendo o cuidado de falar devagar. – É uma espécie de caverna marinha, não muito longe, a norte.

– Não, não fui.

– Porque eu estava a pensar que, *se tiver* vontade de fazer uma caminhada, eu poderia levá-la até lá amanhã. (Kearsley 2012, 113)

Finally, and with the progression of Carrie and Graham Keith’s relationship to a closer stage, both characters start using a more intimate form of treatment. This implies that, in Portuguese, they’ll use ‘tu’, instead of ‘você’:

‘Who said,’ he asked, evenly, ‘I didn’t want to see *you*?’

‘*You* did.’ (Kearsley 2008, 253)

– Quem disse – perguntou ele, calmamente, – que eu não *te* queria ver?

– *Tu*. (Kearsley 2012, 244)

First, this clearly shows that in Portuguese there is some difference concerning the use of forms to convey the pronoun 'you' in English. For each instance of use the relationship between speakers needs to be assessed, as well as their proximity or formality in terms of social status and/or professional recognition. This also implies that for every use of 'you' the translator needs to opt for one solution in Portuguese and be consistent throughout the whole book. Although the evolution of some relationships, particularly from a more distant position to a closer one, may require some changes along the way.

3.2.

The second aspect mentioned before is related to the use of a specific dialect belonging to a specific Scottish region, the Doric dialect. Doric must have its origins in the tongue of the Anglo-Saxon invaders, whose first contribution to the history of the British Isles was to bring an end to the Roman Imperial rule and destroy most of the traces of Roman-British civilisation. Doric is not a separate language, but a form of Scots, though a very distinctive one. It is instantly and mostly recognisable as a mark of the highly individual and proudly-proclaimed identity of the North-East.

Before the Act of Union, in 1707, Gaelic was the dominant language in the Highlands with Scots mostly spoken in the Lowlands. After the Treaty, English was seen as the language of authority, used for legal documents and adopted by the wealthier classes. Scots is a Germanic language which developed from Old English and Old Norse, and was used mainly by lower strata. According to Robert Gordon, from the University Aberdeen:

Doric is a Scottish dialect spoken in the North East of Scotland around Aberdeen city and shire. The term 'Doric' is thought to come from the Greek for 'rural' or 'rustic' perhaps due to its strong associations with the farming and fishing communities of the region. (2017)

The most notable features of spoken Doric are its long vowels and the substitution of the letter 'F' for the 'Wh' in Scots and English interrogatives. Thus, an English-speaker would ask: "What is the time?"; a Scots speaker would ask: "Whit's the time?"; and a Doric-speaker would ask: "Fit's the time?" The same happens with: Why? (Fit wye?); Who? (Fa?); Where? (Far? or Faur?); When? (Fin? or Fan?) or How?, that is rendered in Doric as "Foo?". Another interesting aspect is connected to written Doric, and that is the near-absence of contractive apostrophes. For instance, 'singin' becomes 'singin'. But since it is mostly a spoken dialect (and even that is diminishing), it lacks consistency and is open to all sorts of phonetic nonsense in print which nobody disputes. (Harper 2017)

Susanna Kearsley gives voice to this dialect through one old character, the father of Graham Keith, Jimmy Keith. It is a form of acknowledging somehow the importance of this dialect to older generations in that area of the British Isles. But it is also a mark of local identity. It is, after all, a curious demonstration of the individuality of the dialect and the richness of the local culture of which it is an integral part. Some prominent features of this dialect are sometimes explained in the book, by the author, referring to how Jimmy used Doric and how he pronounced the words. Especially in the first instances such phrases appear, the author/narrator feels a deep need to clear meanings and protect readers from unwanted understandings that might deviate attentions:

'He speaks the Doric,' she had said. 'The language of this area. You'll likely find it difficult to follow what he says.'

I didn't, actually. His speech was broad and quick, and if I'd had to translate every word I might have had a problem, but it wasn't hard to catch the general sense of what he meant when he was talking.

Holding my hand out, I said, 'Mr Keith? Thanks for coming. I'm Carrie McClelland.'

'A pleasure tae meet ye.' His handshake was sure. 'But I'm nae Mr Keith. Ma dad was Mr Keith, and he's been deid and beeried twenty years. Ye ca' me Jimmy.' (Kearsley 2008, 26)

– Ele fala dórico – dissera ela. – É a língua desta região. É provável que tenha alguma dificuldade em entender o que ele diz.

Na verdade, não senti qualquer dificuldade. O seu discurso era carregado e rápido, e se eu tivesse de traduzir todas as palavras poderia ter sentido alguns problemas, mas não era difícil apanhar o sentido geral do que ele queria dizer quando falava.

Estendi a mão e disse: – Mr. Keith? Obrigado por vir até aqui. Eu sou Carrie McClelland.

– É um prazer conhecer-vos – o seu aperto de mão era forte. – Mas não sou Mr. Keith. O meu pai era Mr. Keith, e ele está morto e enterrado há vinte anos. Chamem-me Jimmy. (Kearsley 2012, 24)

There are, in the original book, some heavily loaded Doric expressions. Some other times, the narrator even explained how Jimmy used some peculiar forms of expressing himself in Doric, related to the idiomatic expressions he employed:

‘What way?’ Jimmy asked, which I knew from my past trips to Scotland meant ‘Why?’ But when Jimmy pronounced it in Doric the first word came out more like ‘fit’ – which I later would learn was a feature of Doric, the way that some ‘w’s sounded like ‘f’s – and the second word came out as ‘wye’. So, ‘Fit wye?’ Jimmy asked. ‘She can folly me fine.’ (Kearsley 2008, 39)

– Que maneira? – perguntou Jimmy, uma frase que eu sabia de viagens anteriores à Escócia que significava «Porquê?». Mas quando Jimmy pronunciou a frase em dórico, a primeira palavra saiu mais como «se» – algo que mais tarde eu viria a perceber que era uma característica do dórico, pela forma como alguns «ques» soavam a «ses» – e a segunda palavra saiu como «meneia». Assim: – Se meneia? – perguntou Jimmy. – Ela consegue entender-me bem. (Kearsley 2012, 35)

This short description of some particularities of Doric in the dialogues wouldn’t be complete if the strategies used to overcome such problems in the translation into Portuguese weren’t mentioned. The fact that some of the direct references to a dialect seem to be

disregarded in the final translated result in Portuguese seems quite clear in the excerpt shown above:

– É um prazer conhecer-vos – o seu aperto de mão era forte. – Mas não sou Mr. Keith. O meu pai era Mr. Keith, e ele está morto e enterrado há vinte anos. Chamem-me Jimmy. (Kearsley 2012, 24)

Although just a moment before it was referred to in the text that he spoke Doric, a strange language...

– Ele fala dórico – dissera ela. – É a língua desta região. É provável que tenha alguma dificuldade em entender o que ele diz. (Kearsley 2012, 24)

Thus, it is evident a straightforward and quite regular form of the message presented to Portuguese readers, showing that there is no difference at all in Portuguese. So, what were the identifiable changes in the speech, according to what the author wrote? What were the signs marking such modifications? The answer is that there are not in the Portuguese book any noteworthy changes. All translated items simply omitted the use of a dialect and made it a simple and unmarked text.

The dialect was lost and, except for some cases, as it was shown in the idiomatic expressions used above (– Que maneira? – perguntou Jimmy, uma frase que eu sabia de viagens anteriores à Escócia que significava «Porquê?» (Kearsley 2012, 35) there is nothing identifying Doric as a pertinent and relevant stylistic and rhetorical feature of the original text. Since most of these markers are originally taken from the orthographic level, in the form of an alternative spelling that shows a deviation from the standard pronunciation, this could have been the strategy used by the translator into Portuguese.

But it did not happen. The overall translation strategy seems to have left out from the translation any linguistic markers that could be identified as belonging to the specific dialect of Doric. The strategy seems to consider as acceptable only some minor syntactic or lexical markers in the translated text.

Some Conclusions

The specific historical moment under analysis in this work deals with verbal transits about the dignity of vernaculars and the conflicts and alliances at that particular moment in Europe's history and Atlantic geopolitics. Thus, the usage of words, and especially the dialect used by one *dramatis personae* are needed in the target language to emulate and highlight an important literary characteristic in the original work. Nevertheless, there was an overall strategy of effacing such matters from the target text. The reasons for that might have been the lack of an equivalent (or somewhat close) regional or dialectal variant into Portuguese. But they also surely rest upon one significant explanation provided by Englund Dimitrova:

As possible explanations for this phenomenon, I would like to suggest that at least the following two factors are of importance: translators' perceptions of their own status and prestige as text producers and translators' perceptions of the connotations of dialects. (1997, 62)

Taking into account the common language usage norms for Portuguese used by the translator (Jorge Almeida e Pinho) for the target text were firstly and foremost meant to contribute to the recognition of the identifiable markers in the original text. By creating a minimal variant to Portuguese written norm, particularly based on a specific foreign dialect work may have thought that he would not contribute to a linguistic, the translator intended to produce a variation that would imply some linguistic innovation. Besides, he considered that he had a duty to conform and uphold the original text norms in the written form of the target language. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that the publishing house and their editor played a decisive role in the final version of the translated text imposing their own in-house strategy. The use of unknown words and/or orthographic deviant forms of the written text were strictly banned or highly restricted. Thus, this translation became much more standardized than the original work regarding the language use and it was

made a more reliable and normative work of literature, as stated by Gideon Toury (1995).

There are still two important open questions that will need answers concerning this type of translated texts: How can a globalized usage of English as a *Lingua Franca* in present times cope with the needs to adapt some of its own dialects or variants to local cultures, especially, as it may have been clear in this case, to the Portuguese context? How can local cultures emulate dialectal uses and not deviate from the original work's intention and stated purpose when publishers and editors are not willing to do so?

Works Cited

- Baker, M. *In Other Words*. London / New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Beverly, M. *The Word Wenches*, 2006. http://wordwenches.typepad.com/word_wenches/2009/09/an-interview-with-susanna-kearsley.html Accessed on 7 July 2017.
- Dimitrova, B. E. "Translation of Dialect in Fictional Prose-Vilhelm Moberg in Russian and English as a Case in Point". *Norm, Variation and Change in Language. Proceedings of the Centenary Meeting of the Nyfilologiska sällskapet, Nedre Manilla 22-23 March 1996*. Estocolmo: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1997. 49-65.
- Gordon, R. (ed.) *Doric Dictionary*, 2017. <http://www.rgu.ac.uk/file/doric-dictionary-pdf-1-5mb>. Accessed on 24 July 2017.
- Harper, N. *Norman Harper*, 2017. <http://www.stronach.co.uk/what-is-doric>. Accessed on 24 July 2017.
- Kearsley, S. *Sophia's Secret*. London: Allison & Busby Limited, 2008.
- Kearsley, S. *O Segredo de Sophia*. Trad. J. A. Pinho. Lisboa: ASA, 2012.
- Kearsley, S. *Susanna Kearsley*. <http://www.susannakearsley.com/> Accessed on 7 July 2017.
- McCum, C. A. *The Story of English*. Londres: Faber & Faber, 1992.
- Pinho, J. *O Escritor Invisível*. Porto: QuidNovi, 2006.
- Rosa, A. A. "Translating Place: Linguistic Variation in Place". *Word and Text: A Journal of Literary Studies and Linguistics*, II. Ed. U. P.-G. Ploiești, 2012. 75-97.

- Sommer, J. *Writing in Dialect in Fiction: A History and Study*. Saint Paul, Minnesota: Unpublished Thesis, 2014. <http://jennifersommer.weebly.com/jenreflecting/writing-in-dialect-in-fiction-a-history-and-study>. Accessed on 7 July 2017.
- Toury, G. "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation". *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. 53-69.