María-Luisa Arias-Moreno

A Discourse Analysis Model Applied to Literary Translations

Un modelo de análisis del discurso aplicado a las traducciones literarias

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this paper is to present the results of an investigation which employed a discourse analysis' model to analyze the translations into Spanish and French of a literary work (*The Lord of the Rings* by J. R. R. Tolkien (1892-1973) in order to show the advantages of using such a model and to demonstrate how such a model can helps both the analysis of the source and target texts and the translation process. Halliday's discourse analysis model was used as proposed by Hatim and Mason with its three metafunctions (ideational, interpersonal and textual) and taking into account semantic, morphological, syntactic, textual and pragmatic elements. The final aim of this article is to show that a translation-oriented source text analysis using a discourse analysis model or any other linguistic-derived model can be used as an analytical tool to achieve an in-depth understanding of literary texts, since it heightens the literary translators' awareness of its characteristics, enhances their reflective process and help them select the best alternatives to reproduce the complex world of the source text with all its details, which, in turn, will help the readers of the target text understand the world created by the author.
KEYWORDS: Systemic functional grammar, literary translation, discourse analysis.

RESUMEN: El objetivo del presente artículo consiste en presentar los resultados de una investigación en la que se empleó un modelo de análisis del discurso para analizar las traducciones al español y al francés de la obra literaria de J.R.R. Tolkien *El Señor de los Anillos* y mostrar las ventajas de aplicar uno de dichos modelos tanto en el análisis de los textos fuente y meta como en el proceso de traducir. Se empleó el modelo de gramática sistemático-funcional de Halliday como lo propusieron Hatim y Mason con sus tres metafunciones (ideacional, interpersonal y textual) tomando en cuenta elementos semánticos, morfológicos, sintácticos y pragmáticos. El objetivo final del presente trabajo es mostrar que se puede emplear un modelo de análisis del discurso o cualquier otro modelo lingüístico como una herramienta analítica en la traducción de textos literarios para lograr una comprensión más profunda de éstos, puesto que el modelo hace más consciente a los traductores

María-Luisa Arias-Moreno
marialuisaa@hotmail.com
University of Guadalajara,
Mexico

de sus características, les ayuda en su proceso de reflexión y a seleccionar las mejores alternativas para reproducir el mundo complejo creado en el texto fuente con todos sus detalles, lo que, a su vez, facilitará la comprensión de los lectores de dicho mundo.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Gramática sistémico-funcional, traducción literaria, análisis del discurso.

Introduction

Literary translators are keenly aware that translating works of literature is a very complex task which is not just a matter of a word-for-word equivalence and, therefore, must be approached from different perspectives and taking into account a wide variety of elements. They also assert that

> No two translators perceive every moment in a text with a similar awareness or intensity, which leads to varying value judgments within a text about what elements should be chiseled out for the act of transplantation from the source-language situation into the target language (Biguenet and Schulte 1989: xv).

Nowadays recent research in linguistics provide a wide range of approaches and methodologies with their own models, each focusing on the aspects they consider more important (linguistic, pragmatic, functional, etc.), which can be used as a valuable tool by translators, including literary ones, to analyze the source text and make the best decisions. For instance, there are some disciplines which can help to explore in a more systematic and rigorous way how a source text was developed and what the intentions of the author were in order to create an equivalent target text; some even

have been discussed and recommended by translation researchers. One can find, for example, some linguistic research deal with translation focusing on semantics (Larson, 1998); others, on function and skopos (Nord, 1988); others on Chomsky's transformational generative grammar Nida (1982); Vázquez Ayora (1977); others on pragmatics (Delisle, 1993); others on discourse analysis (Hatim & Mason, 1990). All of them may be very useful both for analyzing translations and for analyzing a source text in order to be aware of all its characteristics which will result in a more accurate translation.

Bearing this in mind, research was carried out to find out how the use of a discourse analysis model could be used to analyze the most frequent mistranslations in a literary text and its causes. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to present the results of an investigation where a discourse analysis' model was used to analyze the translations into Spanish and French of a literary work (*The Lord of the Rings* by J. R. R. Tolkien) in order to show the advantages of using such a model and how such a model can be of help both for the analysis of the source and target texts and the translation process. The reasons behind choosing *The Lord of the Rings* were the following: the advantage of having a work that has been translated into several languages, including the ones

with which we work[1]; a wide range of academic and non-academic papers related to it, since it has been studied by different researchers from various perspectives (literature, religion, ideology, philosophy, mythology, etc.); and academic papers which have focused on translations of this work into different languages, some of them from the linguistic point of view, including one article which analyzed socio-linguistic features, such as linguistic variation and idiolects (Bayona, 2003).

However, it is interesting to note that in the case of the academic papers, none of these used a specific model to analyze the translation and to systematize the findings. Thus, after reviewing the models available in discourse analysis, the model suggested by Hatim and Mason (1997), which is actually based on Halliday's model used in translation, was chosen for our research. In addition to the advantage of being previously used by these authors for similar purposes, the model is very comprehensive, can be applied to any text, including literary texts (as Halliday (2002) himself illustrates), and can be used specifically to study the two main aspects which are the object of our research. Furthermore, other authors, such as Eggins and Slade (1997),

and Martin and Rose (2002), have added more categories to each metafunction making it more complete and its use more rigorous.

Thus, first Halliday's model will be briefly outlined complemented with the categories added by Eggins and Slade (1997) and Martin and Rose (2002). Then, there will be a description of the corpus analyzed and why it was chosen, followed by the categorization and discussion of examples of the most frequent non-equivalent metafunctions found in the analysis of the Spanish and French translations of *The Lord of the Rings* and their possible causes. And, finally, some general conclusions of the findings that can be taken into account for future reference will be presented.

The Systemic Functional Grammar

Halliday's model (1994: xiii) is based on systemic functional grammar. It is systemic because language is a system which consists of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. And it is functional because meaning in language is conveyed through functions (which Halliday named metafunctions), which are interpreted not just as the use of language but as a fundamental property of language itself. Halliday believed that linguists must study meaning and to do that they must study texts in the context of situation, a concept he took from Malinowski (1969) He considered a context of situation was important since it includes "all aspects of the situation in which a language event takes place which are relevant to the interpretation of the event" (Hatim and Mason, 1990: 240). Thus, the utterance and the context of situation cannot be separated in order to

---

[1] For analysis of the translations of this work into German, Hebrew, and Swedish, see Thomas Honegger (2004): *Translating Tolkien: Text and Film*. Zurich and Berne: Walking Tree Publishers, 21-52, 53-66, 115-124. For its analysis into Russian, see Natalia Grigorieva (1995): Problems of Translating into Russian. *In*: Patricia Reynolds and Glen Goodknight eds. *Proceedings of the J.R.R. Centenary Conference*. Milton Keynes and Altadena: Mythopoetic Press, 200-204.

understand the meaning. For Halliday, then, any text is an actualized meaning potential (Halliday, 2002) which is found in the linguistic choices made by the author of the text, which, in turn, are related to a cultural framework. Munday (2001) affirms that due to these characteristics Halliday's model has been the model that has had more influence on translation.

There are three types of metafunctions which can occur at all ranks and levels of language: ideational, interpersonal and textual. The ideational metafunction (Halliday, 2002: 91) is concerned, as Martin and Rose (2003: 66) state, "with how our experience of 'reality', material and symbolic, is construed in discourse" including the inner world of their own consciousness. In other words, how the speakers encode reality, either real or fictitious, through language. This metafunction both expresses and constrains our concept of reality. With the ideational metafunction people ascribes qualities or characteristics to other people or things in order to identify, classify, describe or evaluate them. Transitivity, modifiers, contrasts, synonyms, repetitions, etc. are some of the means used to express the ideational metafunction.

Based on Halliday, Martin and Rose (2003) affirm that there are four categories that structure the ideational meaning: first, one finds what speakers do or the different actions they perform (*doing*); second, what the speakers express through discourse (*saying*); third, the reaction to events on the part of speakers and how they convey their feelings (*sensing*); and fourth, it is used to ascribe qualities to people or things, to classify them, to name their parts or to identify them (*being*). This last category is

in turn divided, since one classifies in order to point out that somebody or something belongs to one kind or another (*class*), to identify somebody or something (*identity*), to describe one or several characteristics (*quality*) or merely to say that there is something or somebody (*existence*).

Presuppositions, intertextuality, frameworks, scripts and schemes also play a role in the ideational function, since they all are related to cultural knowledge and are necessary to codify the experience of the world. Therefore, the ideational metafunction is very important to translation, since the translator must act as a mediator because, as the recipients of the target culture do not belong to the same culture as the author of the source text, this knowledge is very likely to be very different or nonexistent in the target culture.

The interpersonal metafunction is used to express comments and attitudes, and evaluate things, people and their feelings in order to negotiate them with the interactant. The writer or speaker may state his own comments, attitudes and evaluations or somebody else's, and they can be expressed explicitly or implicitly. The interpersonal metafunction is also concerned with the way in which people interact through language, the particular speech role they adopt, and the complementary role which the interactant wishes the other to adopt in his/her turn. Variables such as hierarchy, gender, and age are an essential element in this metafunction.

To complement Halliday's model, Eggins and Slade (1997) proposed four additional categories to analyze the different types of appraisal that can be done as part of the interpersonal metafunction:

a) Appreciation: speakers' reaction to reality and how they evaluate it (for example: interesting, high, beautiful, etc.).

b) Affect: the speakers' expression of positive or negative emotional states (for example: I am afraid that, I regret, it makes me mad, etc.)

c) Judgement: The speakers' expression about people's behavior from the point of view of their sense of ethics, morality or social values. It includes social sanction and social esteem. Social sanction consists of the evaluative judgements about moral norms, that is, the speaker evaluates if the behavior of the other people is ethical with respect to the social system accepted by the speaker (for example, if they are generous, good, bad, dishonest, etc.).Social esteem consists of the speaker evaluating if the behavior of the other person meets the socially desirable requirements of the speaker. Social esteem can be subdivided in three types: first, when the behavior of the other is sanctioned or approved in terms of the force he/she has (for example, brave, coward, dynamic, etc.); second, when the behavior is sanctioned or approved in terms of what is considered normal or abnormal (for example, crazy, peculiar, strange, etc.); third, when the behavior is sanctioned or approved in terms of the degree of competence or skill when doing something (for example, skillful, incompetent, brilliant).

d) Amplification: the lexical resources speakers use to grade their attitude towards people, things or events. It includes enrichment, augmenting and mitigation.

Modality, either through modal verbs or adverbs such as maybe, or any evaluative word, as well as speech acts and linguistic variations are used to express the interpersonal metafunction.

The textual metafunction enables the ideational and interpersonal metafunctions to make a message coherent and not in isolation, but in relation to what precedes it in the linguistic co-text. Through the textual metafunction the text is created and organized using all the available linguistic resources to make discourse possible. For the textual metafunction not only it is important to analyze the resources used to give the text meaning, coherence and cohesion, but also all the elements that surround the text, such as the situation, and its relation with other texts (intertextuality). Deictic words, anaphoric and cataphoric references, and all types of textual indicators such as ellipsis, collocations, connectors, etc. are important in this function.

The Corpus

The corpus consisted of three dialogues of *The Lord of the Rings* where the characters clearly showed the characteristic way of speaking of the community or social group to which they belonged. The first one was a dialogue between Treebeard, an Ent, and two non-working-class hobbits. The second dialogue was among working class hobbits gossiping about other characters and events. And the third one was about the first encounter between a man from Gondor (Faramir) and two hobbits, a master (Frodo) and his servant (Sam). Both the first and the third dialogues were chosen because, being the first time, the characters met somebody who belonged

to an unknown group, it contained many explicit explanations about the language each group speaks and their mutual history. The second one was chosen because it was a very good sample of the way working class hobbits spoke in order to contrast it with non-working hobbits of the other dialogues. Examples will be provided of the three dialogues for each of the metafunctions to illustrate how the model can be used to analyze the source text and its usefulness for its translation.

The Analysis

The ideational metafunction

For the ideational metafunction we were interested in analyzing forms of describing an object or person in order to get a picture or image of them and how this was conveyed in the French and Spanish translations. According to Martin and Rose (2003), description can be used to determine a quality of a person or thing, to differentiate one class from another or to identify or give a detailed description of their parts.

In the first dialogue studied, which is a conversation among two hobbits and an Ent, there are several descriptions of the characters because neither the hobbits nor the Ent know of the existence of the other group, so when the hobbits discover the presence of a being they cannot identify there is a description of the unknown creature: "*They found that they were looking at a most extraordinary face. It belonged to a large Man-like, almost Troll-like, figure, at least fourteen foot high, very sturdy…*"(Tolkien, 1973: 64). Here the narrator is also introducing the Ent to the reader, but the intention is to show that

it was not easy to identify him, since the hobbits had never seen a creature with its characteristics and they do not know what it is or who it is. The description begins with an evaluation made by the narrator of the Ent's face which he qualifies of being "most extraordinary" assigning it a quality which is a subdivision of the category *being*. Then, it is mentioned that he is similar to a man or almost to a troll, which is used to classify it or assign him a class. Finally, its body is described, that is, his height and his bodily appearance.

However, in the TT in Spanish we found: "*Se encontraron entonces mirando una cara de veras extraordinaria. La figura era la de un hombre corpulento, casi de troll, de por lo menos catorce pies de altura, muy robusto…*" (Tolkien, 2001: 76). In the second sentence the thematic progression was not followed, that is, the order of the presentation of the information in the text was changed. The problem is that it affected the cohesion of the text in Spanish, since cohesion occurs when the interpretation of an element in the discourse depends of the other elements; thus, the existence of an element presupposes the other.

Halliday (1985) points out that, in the clause's organization, it is the theme that serves as the point of departure to communicate a message and the rest of the message, which is where the topic is developed, is the rheme. Thus, the structure of the message is expressed through the order of these two elements. In order to interpret a text, it is important to pay attention to how the elements of a text are connected from the lexical and grammatical point of view. While each language follows its own syntactic order, the speaker or writer can

change this order intentionally to cause different effects. When the ST is analyzed, one can see that in the first sentence the pronoun they (the hobbits) functions as the theme and the fact that they are observing an extraordinary face is the rheme. The same happens in Spanish. However, in the next sentence in English the personal pronoun "it" is used, which is functioning as an anaphor of the word face, and whose rheme is that it belonged to a figure, which is then physically described using several adjectives. These adjectives follow a logical order, that is, first it is explained the resemblance of the creature to other beings, then its height is mentioned to make the reader aware of how huge he is, and then it begins describing its appearance.

Nevertheless, in Spanish there is no anaphor. The theme is the word "*figura*", instead of "face" or a pronoun substituting it, and in the physical description it is said that it is a bulky (not large) man, almost like a troll, then it states his height, and its appearance is described again using a synonym of the adjective used before. The lack of equivalence, then, comes from the fact that the ideational metafunction is used to organize experience, which is not the same in the source and the TT. But what is even more important is that in English the character is described as similar to a man (that is with anthropomorphic characteristics), and similar to a troll (due to his huge height and aspect), while the TT in Spanish says it is a man which is almost a troll. Therefore, the subdivision of *being* called *class* of the ideational metafunction which is used to point out that somebody or something belongs to one kind or another is not the same in both texts and the reader

of the TT gets a different image of an Ent than the reader of the ST.

In the ST in French the Ent is described as follows: " *Ils se trouvèrent alors à regarder une figure des plus extraordinaires. Sa forme était semblable à celle d'une Homme, presque d'un Troll, de haute taille, quatorze pieds au moins, très robuste…* " (Tolkien, 1972: 101). Here the theme was also changed in the second sentence and again instead of "face" or a pronoun substituting it, the theme is the bodily form of the character. However, the described characteristics do follow the order of the English text and, what is more important, is that he is something similar to a man, almost a troll, which is what it says in English. Therefore, the subdivision of *being* called *class* of the ideational metafunction is the same in both texts and the reader of the TT gets the same image of an Ent than the reader of the source text.

The second example of the lack of equivalence in the ideational metafunction was taken from a dialogue of two hobbits (Frodo and Sam) and a Gondorean (Faramir). In the example analyzed a person is described; thus, the category that may be employed is the category of being which is used to ascribe qualities to people or things. In this fragment, Sam describes enthusiastically and with admiration the female elf Galadriel, mentioning how beautiful she is to which Faramir reacts:

(1) 'Then she must be lovely indeed,' said Faramir. 'Perilously fair.' 'I don't know about perilous,' said Sam. 'It strikes me that folk takes their peril with them into Lórien, and finds it there because they've brought it. But perhaps you could call her perilous,

because she's so strong in herself. You, you could dash yourself to pieces on her, like a ship on a rock; or drownd yourself, like a hobbit in a river.' (Tolkien, 1973: 324)

Faramir expresses the impression he gets from Sam's description, which corresponds to the ideational metafunction of sensing, using the connector which indicates consequence "then", which is followed by the modal verb that indicates probability "must", the verb "be" and a quality ("lovely"), and ends with the adverb "indeed" whose function is to support what was said. But he adds "*perilously fair*", that is, he is amplifying the quality with a negative modifier. Sam replies he does not know if the adverb perilous can be applied to her (note that perilous is written in the source text with italics), but he adds that, to him, the people take with them the peril to Lórien, the place where elves live, and that is the reason why they found it there, which implicitly means that he does not agree that Galadriel or the other elves are perilous. However, he starts a counterargument using the connector "but" conceding that she could be considered perilous for which he uses the adverb "perhaps" that functions as a modalization of probability together with the modal verb "could", and to explain why he says that she is very strong. Then to reinforce this idea he adds what could happen to somebody if he/she faced her: "*you could dash yourself to pieces on her, like a ship on a rock*" or one "*could drownd*", where he uses the diatopic variation "drownd" which is used by the working class hobbits, thus marking that he belongs to that class. And finally, he adds "*like a hobbit in a river*"

which is a reminder to the reader that hobbits are afraid of water and for that reason they do not like to swim or sail.

In the TT in Spanish, the ideational equivalence is achieved:

(2)–Ha de ser muy bella en efecto – dijo Faramir-. Peligrosamente bella.
 –No sé si es peligrosa –dijo Sam-. Se me ocurre que la gente lleva consigo su propio peligro a Lórien, y allí lo vuelve a encontrar porque lo ha tenido dentro. Pero tal vez podría llamársela peligrosa, pues es tan fuerte. Usted podría hacerse añicos contra ella, como un barco contra una roca, o ahogarse, como un hobbit en un río. (Tolkien, 2001: 376).

However, in the TT in French there is a problem with equivalence of the ideational metafunction when Sam speaks:

(3) –Elle doit donc être bien belle, en effet, dit Faramir. Dangereusement belle.
–Je ne sais pas trop ce qui est du danger, dit Sam. J'ai idée que les gens apportent leur danger avec eux en Lorien et qu'ils l'y trouvent parce qu'ils l'y ont apporté. Mais peut-être pourrait-on l'appeler dangereuse parce qu'elle est si forte en elle-même.
Vous, vous pourriez vous briser en miettes contre elle, comme un navire sur un rocher ou vous noyer, comme un Hobbit dans une rivière. (Tolkien, 1972: 462)

If Eggins and Slade's (1997: 125) categories are employed to analyze the type of

María-Luisa Arias-Moreno. A Discourse Analysis Model Applied to Literary Translations

appraisal both characters are making, in the source text Faramir uses amplification when he intensifies the reality both characters are negotiating (Galadriel's beauty) by adding the adverb dangerously. On the other hand, Sam makes an appraisal when he reacts to the reality of the beauty of Galadriel and Faramir's comment when he says that he does not know if she is dangerous. However, in the TT in French, after Faramir's opinion that Galadriel must be dangerously beautiful, Sam answers that he does not know much about danger, that is, he changes an adverb that functions as an amplifier (dangerously) and which is used to appraise the beauty of the female elf for an abstract entity (danger), which shifts the focus of the utterance. It is very likely that this change caused the omission of a textual mark, the italics, since it did not make sense to maintain the emphasis. Maybe the translator had problems trying to convey the coherence between these two sentences and the next one where Sam talks about danger in general and, for that reason, he changed completely the idea of the original to link the idea of danger with Sam's opinion that it is people who carry danger with them. Although it works to maintain the coherence, there is an important change in focus which do not make the source text and the TT equivalent and which may cause a different impression on the readers of the target culture: they may think that Sam is very innocent and has not faced any danger or that he is not very intelligent and that is the reason why he does not know.

The third example of the lack of equivalence in the ideational metafunction was taken from a dialogue among several hobbits who are gossiping about the double birthday party for Frodo and Bilbo, which will be celebrated in several days. They know Bilbo very well since he is part of the community, but Frodo is an outsider and he has arisen their desire to know more about him and his family. Therefore, part of the dialogue, which is the very first dialogue of *The Lord of the Rings*, will consist of the description of the two characters. Thus, after a brief introduction made by the narrator about Bilbo and Frodo, there are several hobbits trying to find out the "real story" behind them. Part of the narration will be analyzed here, because it presents problems with the ideational metafunction.

The narration begins explaining Bilbo's situation and then describing the qualities of an event that all hobbits are waiting for: Bilbo's and Frodo's birthday party. After explaining that since Bilbo returned from his adventure, every year he celebrated his birthday party with his nephew since both birthdays happened on the same day, the narrator adds:

(4) Twelve more years passed. Each year the Bagginses had given very lively combined birthday-parties at Bag End; but now it was understood that something quite exceptional was being planned for that autumn. Bilbo was going to be eleventy-one, 111, a rather curious number, and a very respectable age for a hobbit (the Old Took himself had only reached 130); and Frodo was going to be thirty-three, 33, an important number: the date of his 'coming of age'. (Tolkien, 1973: 22)

To analyze the text, from the four categories that structure the ideational mean-

ing in discourse proposed by Martin and Rose (2003), the fourth category (*being*) will be used, because it is used by speakers to describe or classify reality. As Martin (2003: 76) states: "Figures of 'being' are used most commonly to ascribe qualities to people and things, to classify them as one thing or another, to name their parts, or to identify them." The narrator of this text describes the quality of the birthday parties ("very lively"). Then he uses a connector which indicates an opposition ("but"), whose function is to highlight the difference between the previous parties and the one being prepared for that autumn. Therefore, he ascribes to the future birthday party the quality of being exceptional together with an intensifier ("quite"). Then comes an explanation about why it is exceptional: Bilbo's birthday 111th and Frodo's 33th.

It is important to notice that Tolkien creates a neologism for Bilbo's birthday (eleventy-one) which implies both creativity on the author's part and a sense of humor which gives the narration a light mood. Humor plays an important role in some parts of *The Lord of the Rings* and it is used more in the beginning of the first book than in the other three books, because it is a continuation of *The Hobbit*, which is a book written for children (Carpenter: 252). In this case, humor is used on a lexical level[2]. This humor is reinforced when the narrator later explains that another hobbit "had only reached 130," which with the use of "only", which is normally used in conversations to minimize (Eggins and Slade, 1997: 136), implies that it was very normal to reach such an advanced age. It is worth noticing too that the age of both characters is written in letters and in numbers, which is not only peculiar in its written form, but explains why the first one is a "curious" number (111) and the second one an important number, that is, the hobbits coming of age at 33.

In the TT in Spanish, there are two omissions: it is not specified that there was only one birthday party for both hobbits and the translator not only did not create a neologism, but he omitted the number in relation to the ages:

> (5) Pasaron doce años más. Los Bolsón habían dado siempre bulliciosas fiestas de Cumpleaños en Bolsón Cerrado; pero ahora se tenía entendido que algo muy excepcional se planeaba para el otoño. Bilbo cumpliría ciento once años, un número bastante curioso y una edad muy respetable para un hobbit (el viejo Tuk había alcanzado sólo los ciento treinta; y Frodo cumpliría treinta y tres, un número importante: el de la mayoría de edad) (Tolkien, 2001: 34).

In translation it is normal to omit certain elements when they are redundant in the target language or when there is no equivalent and the information is not es-

---

[2] Tolkien's humor is found in different ways, that is, he resorts to action comedy, to situation comedy, to funny characters, and sometimes it is found in language through indirect references, philological word plays, humoristic incongruence, etc. (For examples about Tolkien's humor using language, see Isaacs, Neil D. "*On the Possibilities of Writing Tolkien Criticism*" in *Tolkien and the Critics*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1970:10).

sential for the text (Vázquez Ayora: 1977, 359). So the first omission about the party being celebrated for both characters is not so serious, because it is implicitly understood with the rest of the information provided after this paragraph. However, when the translator omits the numbers, the reader does not have the visual perception which makes logical the narrator's comments that it is a "curious" age. To avoid creating a neologism affects the creativity present in the source text.

In the TT in French, the text is not only equivalent in all the aspects already mentioned, but the translator created a neologism for the age (*undécante-un*):

(6) Douze autres années s'écoulèrent. Tous les ans, les Sacquet avaient donné des réceptions d'anniversaire pleines d'entrain à Cul-de-Sac ; mais à présent il était entendu que quelque chose de tout à fait exceptionnel se préparait pour cet automne. Bilbon allait avoir undécante-un ans, 111, chiffre plutôt curieux et âge très respectable pour un Hobbit (le Vieux Touque lui-même n'avait atteint que 130 ans) et Frodon allait en avoir trente-trois, 33, chiffre important : la date de sa "majorité" (Tolkien, 1972: 44).

The interpersonal metafunction

For the interpersonal metafunction we were interested in analyzing forms of interaction and social interplay between the participants in the communicative situation and how all this was conveyed in the French and Spanish translations. One of the resources employed by an author is to use some words repeatedly with a pragmat-

ic or stylistic purpose. This repetition provides semantic coherence to the text and is useful to emphasize certain characteristics. Thus, to maintain the intention and the stylistic effect these words should be repeated in the translation too, being careful to preserve the author's intention within the linguistic boundaries imposed by the target language (see Abdulla, 2001: 289).

In our corpus we found the repetition of "hasty" in the first dialogue between two hobbits and an Ent to reinforce the idea that the Ents considered the hobbits hasty creatures in contrast to themselves who were slow in their way of speaking and thinking due to their similarity with trees. The first time "hasty" is used by the Ent is when he says he feels he dislikes the hobbits as a first impression, but adds to himself: "... I almost feel that I dislike you both, but do not let us be hasty" (Tolkien, 1973: 63).

In Spanish we find the verb "*apresurar*": "... *Me parece que no me vais a gustar, pero no nos apresuremos*" (Tolkien, 2001: 76)*,* whereas in French "*jugements*" ("judgment") is added in order to indicate that the Ent should not judge them hastily: " … *J'ai presque l'impression que vous m'êtes tous les deux antipathiques, mais pas de jugements hâtifs* " (Tolkien, 1972: 101).Even if this translation can function in this context as a general idea, when the French translator repeats the same expression paragraphs later when the Ent says again "Do not be hasty, that is my motto" (Tolkien, 1973: 64); "*Pas de jugement hâtif, c'est ma devise* "(Tolkien, 1972: 102) the intention changes. That is, when the translator adds the word "*jugements*" (judgements) the meaning changes because, while in the source text "hasty" is an adjective used to express a behavior, in the TT it is an ad-

jective which denotes a way of thinking. In other words, being hasty is not the same as making hasty judgements. When one uses Halliday's model, one can see that the Ent is identifying himself as being hasty, which is a very important characteristic of the Ents (*identity*) and in the French translation it can be only a characteristic of this specific Ent in this particular moment.

Although this in the source text emphasizes the slowness of the Ents and makes the reader build a picture of these creatures, if the Ent would not have said anything more about being hasty it would not be important. However, when the dialogue continues, the Ent is surprised by the fact that the hobbits give what he considers too much information too quickly, and he asserts: "Hm, but you are hasty folk"(Tolkien, 1973: 66).While in Spanish it has an equivalent translation ("*Hm, sois realmente gente apresurada*" (Tolkien, 2001: 78), in the French translation it becomes "*Hum, vous êtes vraiment des gens irréfléchis.*"(thoughtless) (Tolkien, 1972: 104). Obviously being hasty not necessarily means being thoughtless, which has a more negative connotation than hasty. When Halliday's model is used, the lack of equivalence is even more evident. As was explained above, the interpersonal metafunction is divided into four categories when an appraisal is made (Eggins, 1997): appreciation; affective; judgment; amplification. The Ent is making a judgment of a behavior in relation to a standard. Thus, in the source text the Ent does not approve of the hobbits' behavior according to his norm (normal is being slow), that is, he is doing a social evaluation about behavior according to his social standards; however, in the French TT the Ent does not approve of the hobbit's behavior according to degree of competence or skill, that is, for him they lack the ability to do things. It is then a social evaluation about their behavior according to degree of competence or ability; in other words, in the French text it seems that the Ent considers the hobbits incapable of pondering things.

The second example was taken from a dialogue of two hobbits (Frodo and Sam) and a Gondorean (Faramir). They talk about things they experienced and their history, especially the history and mythology of the Gondoreans. For Tolkien, history in the Middle Earth should be full of legends and true historical facts. In this case, the information shared by the characters about their own experiences is already known by the readers; however, the information about Gondor's history and mythology is new for them as well as for the hobbits. Therefore, the information about things that had happened previously in the story is more related to the ideational metafunction because the characters try to organize through language the experience they lived, while in the information about Gondor's history and mythology the interpersonal metafunction is more important, since when Faramir narrates he is sharing with the other characters (and the readers) his own experiences, values, attitudes, sensations and feelings about them and, at the same time, he is negotiating his identity with the other characters who have just met him.

Faramir tells the hobbits that Gondor had been a very important civilization, but the problems started when the Gondoreans became corrupted due to their pride, indo-

lence and idleness. He mentions that some fell under the influence of Darkness and the "black arts". However, he adds:

> (7) It's not said that evil arts were ever practised in Gondor, or that the Nameless One was ever named in honour here; and the old wisdom and beauty brought out of the West remained long in the realm of the sons of Elendil the Fair, and they linger there still. Yet even so, it was Gondor that brought about its own decay, falling by degrees into dotage, and thinking that the enemy was asleep, who was only banished not destroyed. (Tolkien, 1973: 322)

Faramir narrates the story giving his own opinion and impressions. However, he uses an impersonal structure ("it's not said") in order to express what seems like an impersonal fact when, in reality, he is giving them his personal opinion. Halliday (1994: 266) calls this type of verbal process, which belongs to the category of *saying*, a speaker's projection, which happens when the speaker is not (or does not want to be) the direct participant which expresses somebody else's opinion. Faramir is using it to mitigate the information he had given in the previous sentence and to make sure that his listeners understand that he is not saying that it was in Gondor where evil arts were practiced or Sauron was honored.

In the ST it is obvious that the Gondorean is trying to be objective in his descriptions; however, although he admits the situation was not ideal, he tries to minimize what he says in order to avoid the sense that all Gondoreans had followed the evil

way. Nevertheless, in the TT in Spanish one finds the following:

> (8) No se dice que las malas artes fueran siempre practicadas en Gondor, ni que honraran al Sin Nombre; la sabiduría y la belleza de antaño, traídas del Oeste, perduraron largo tiempo en el reino de los Hijos de Elendil el Hermoso, y todavía subsisten. Pero aún así, fue Gondor la que provocó su propia decadencia, hundiéndose poco a poco en la extravagancia, convencida de que el Enemigo dormía, cuando en realidad estaba replegado, no destruido. (Tolkien, 2001: 372)

The first lack of interpersonal equivalence is found in the first sentence, when the adverb "ever" is translated as "*siempre*", although in the second sentence it is omitted in Spanish. Using "*siempre*" implies that Faramir, instead of setting right the previous information (that is, that only some men fell under the influence of Darkness and the black arts), reaffirms that those arts did were practiced in Gondor, although not always. In addition, the omission of the adverb means that the Nameless one was never honored there, which is exactly the opposite of what it says in the source text.

There are two options in Spanish to translate "ever" to mean frequency: it can be used to indicate "at any time, on any occasion" as in "did you ever smoke?" or to indicate: "at all times: ALWAYS…" (Webster: 788) as in "he is ever making the same mistake." Whereas in the first meaning "ever" is usually used in questions, it can also be used in negative sentences as in this case, which does not happen with the sec-

ond meaning, since instead of "ever," "never" would be used. When the translator chooses "*siempre*" the coherence between the analyzed sentence and the following one, where Faramir mentions the wisdom and beauty of old times, is weakened.

The second lack of interpersonal equivalence in the TT is found when Faramir, after admitting that although it was Gondor which caused its own decay, in the subordinate sentence explains that Gondor's civilization gradually fell into "*extravagancia*" (extravagance). The word "dotage" used by Tolkien in a figurative sense usually is used to indicate "feebleness or imbecility, particularly in old age" (Webster, 1986: 676). Thus, one can infer that he used it to mean that Gondor gradually weakened, losing its power and splendor. However, "*extravagancia*" is a characteristic that is applied to someone who "*hace cosas raras y, correspondientemente, a sus acciones y costumbres*" (Moliner, 1981: 1267) (does weird things and, accordingly, it refers to his actions and customs).

If one follows Eggins and Slade's classification, one can see that in the first part in the source text Faramir is judging according to the category of social esteem, since he thinks that the behavior of the Gondoreans does not meet the social standard he approves and, in the second part, he criticizes their weakness or degree of force. However, in the TT, although the first part of the judgment is also of social esteem, the second part is about social sanction because he sanctions their behavior in terms of what he considers abnormal, that is being "extravagant." The result is that both the characters and the readers in the TT perceive the Gondoreans as people of

weird or abnormal behavior, instead of understanding that they entered into an era of weakness.

In the TT in French, however, one finds that there is no lack of equivalence in this part. One can even say that the translator took a risk when he translated "dotage" as "*gâtisme*" in the figurative sense of the word, since, according to the French informants consulted, "*gâtisme*" is only used with people, not to indicate the state of a civilization:

> (9) On ne dit pas que les mauvais arts aient été pratiqués en Gondor ou que le nom de l'Innomé y ait jamais été honoré; et la sagesse et la beauté du temps jadis, amenées de l'ouest, demeurèrent longtemps dans le royaume des fils d'Elendil le Beau, et elles s'y attardent encore. Mais, même ainsi, ce fut le Gondor qui amena sa propre décadence, tombant petit à petit dans le gâtisme et croyant au sommeil de l'Ennemi, qui n'était que banni et non détruit. (Tolkien, 1972: 458)

For the third example about the dialogue among the hobbits, there is this fragment where Sam's father begins by describing Bilbo:

> (10) A very nice well-spoken gentlehobbit is Mr. Bilbo, as I've always said,' the Gaffer declared. with perfect truth: for Bilbo was very polite to him, calling him 'Master Hamfast', and consulting him constantly upon the growing of vegetables- in the matter of 'roots', especially potatoes, the Gaffer was recognized as the leading authority by

all in the neighbourhood (including himself). (Tolkien, 1973: 22).

To analyze this fragment, from the four categories proposed by Eggins and Slade (1997) used to examine different types of appraisal, judgment is the one that can be used, since the Gaffer is expressing a judgement about Bilbo's social values, which is favorable. And from the subcategories of appraisal, social esteem can be used, since the hobbit is evaluating Bilbo's behavior in relation to socially desirable standards for the hobbits. Social esteem is also important because, after the Gaffer's comment, the narrator confirms the appraisal made by the hobbit about Bilbo, and then presents the appraisal the other hobbits make of the Gaffer's competence as a gardener to end with the appraisal this character makes of himself, which would be the part of social esteem where it is evaluated how ably or competent someone is, here as a gardener. Please note that here too Tolkien creates a neologism to classify Bilbo: "gentlehobbit", neologism that makes implicit social values which mean that he is polite and well behaved.

In the TT in Spanish we found that the translator did not create a neologism, but used the word "*caballero*" (gentleman) and "hobbit," which works in Spanish because "*caballero*" does not have as part of it any word related to man and the social value of politeness is one of the qualities of being a "*caballero.*" The problem of not being equivalent in the interpersonal function is present when the narrator states who considers the Gaffer as an authority, since in Spanish it is Bilbo who recognizes the Gaffer as an authority in the vicinity instead

of being recognized "by all in the neighborhood," and it is not clear who is "él mismo" (himself). It even seems that it was Bilbo who considers himself as an authority, since Bilbo is the immediate referent of the sentence:

(11) –El señor Bilbo es un caballero hobbit muy bien hablado, como he dicho siempre–. Declaró el Tío. Decía la verdad, pues Bilbo era muy cortés con él, y lo llamaba "maestro Hamfast" y lo consultaba constantemente sobre el crecimiento de las legumbres; en materia de tubérculos, especialmente de patatas, reconocía al Tío como autoridad máxima en las vecindades (incluyéndose él mismo). (Tolkien, 2001: 34-35).

The lack of equivalence in the interpersonal metafunction is found since to the ST's reader it is obvious that it is the Gaffer who considers himself an authority as a gardener, which can be interpreted as being proud of his profession and skills, but which can also express a sense of humor since it shows him as a little vain. So in the interpersonal metafunction the writer is negotiating with the reader or listener the evaluations he does and, in this case, that evaluation is not the same for the target reader, since he is not aware that all the hobbits respect the Gaffer's experience and skills, not only Bilbo, making him the best gardener in the Shire, let alone the humoristic allusion. Besides, in the TT, it seems that it is Bilbo who believes that when it says "*incluyéndose a sí mismo*" and not the Gaffer.

The TT in French also has some lack of equivalence. For example, in the source

text it is said that Bilbo "was well spoken", which is changed to "à la parole affable," or who used friendly words, which is not the same, because in English it means he speaks well because he is educated. This interpretation is reinforced when one reads the story: Bilbo reads a lot, knows many stories and taught the Gaffer's son, Sam, to read. Thus, in the target French the social value of politeness is emphasized, not the degree of Bilbo's competence. However, one does find the neologism in French "*gentilhobbit*", following Tolkien's procedure of taking an already existing word "*gentilhomme*" and changing the end, which is equivalent because the same social values of the word in English are conveyed:

(12) "C'est un aimable gentilhobbit à la parole affable que M. Bilbon, comme je l'ai toujours dit", déclarait l'Ancien. Ce qui était l'exacte vérité : car Bilbon se montrait très poli à son égard, l'appelant "Maître Hamfast" et le consultant constamment sur la pousse des légumes – en matière de "racines", et en particulier de pommes de terre, tout le voisinage (lui même compris) le considérait comme l'autorité maîtresse. (Tolkien, 1972: 45).

With regard to the second part of the TT in French, both texts are equivalent in relation to the narrator's evaluation and how Bilbo addresses the Gaffer; nevertheless, when it is explained why, although it is equivalent when it states that all the hobbits in the neighborhood consider the Gaffer as an authority when it comes to gardening, it does not take into account the referent in the source text and, just like the TT in

Spanish, it is mentioned that Bilbo is the person who has this opinion, not the Gaffer himself. Thus, the French reader perceives that the Gaffer is very competent as a gardener, but not the idea that the Gaffer has of himself losing again the sense and the humor.

The textual metafunction

For a text to be easily understood by the reader, it must be coherent and have cohesion (Halliday, 1976). One important part of cohesion is the textual marks which the author uses to guide the reader in the interpretation of the text. Cohesion in written texts can also be affected by the moment of utterance, that is, the space and the reference time of these texts are different to the oral ones, due to the time and space distance between the author and the reader. Thus, textual deictics such as adverbs of place and time in combination with verbal tenses are essential to situate the reader in the context of situation of those texts.

In the dialogue of the hobbits with the Ent, the narrator explains the impression the hobbits had when they saw the Ent for the first time: *"But at the moment the hobbits noted little but the eyes. These deep eyes were now surveying them, slow and solemn, but very penetrating"* (Tolkien, 1973: 74). It is a situation that happened in the past, so that in the source text the past tense and textual marks, such as "at the moment" and "now", were used.

It is precisely these marks which cause a problem in the TT in Spanish: *"Pero en este momento los hobbits no miraron otra cosa que los ojos. Aquellos ojos profundos los miraban ahora, lentos y solemnes, pero muy penetrantes"* (Tolkien, 2001: 76). The TT is situated in the narrator's present with the use of the textual

María-Luisa Arias-Moreno. A Discourse Analysis Model Applied to Literary Translations

mark "*en este momento*" ("in this moment") which indicates that the situation is happening now, in the moment of utterance; however, the past tense is used immediately after "*miraron*" ("looked"), which is an unusual combination in Spanish since the time deictic "*este momento*" is usually combined with a present tense. The narration continues using a past tense (*copretérito or imperfecto*), but combined with the textual mark "*ahora*" (now). While both in English and in Spanish the time adverbs "*ahora*" and "now" can be combined pragmatically in narrations with the past tense in order to approach the situation to the reader, its combination in this text with the time deictic of the previous sentence is not logical. Therefore, the cohesion within the texts is not adequate, since the translator did not take into account the logical relations between the time deictic of the first sentence and the rest of the linguistic elements related to time. The result is that the TT sounds weird, and even though the readers can interpret the information based on their experience of the world as well as to the information surrounding this fragment, it is necessary for them to make a bigger effort to understand it.

In the TT in French, however, there is cohesion between these elements, since a time deictic is used which indicated the moment the narration was taking place in the past ("*sur le moment*") with past tenses, although the translator also combines a past tense ("*examinaient*") with "now" ("à présent") which is not common either: "*Mais sur le moment les hobbits ne remarquèrent guère que les yeux. Ces yeux profondes les examinaient à présent, lents et solennels, mais très pénétrants*" (Tolkien, 1972: 101).

The next dialogue presents problems in the TT in Spanish with coherence in relation to anaphoric relations and deictics. This time the problems were so serious that the distortion of the source text affected comprehension. After Faramir tells Frodo a vision he had had where Boromir, Faramir's brother, was dead in a boat and he describes the objects that Boromir had, Frodo is surprised because Faramir's description is very accurate of what really happened. Then Faramir asks Frodo to tell him more about his brother and Frodo answers:

(13) "No more can I say than I have said," answered Frodo. "Though your tale fills me with foreboding. A vision it was that you saw, I think, and no more, some shadow of evil fortune that has been or will be. Unless indeed it is some lying trick of the Enemy. I have seen the faces of fair warriors of old laid in sleep beneath the pools of the Dead Marshes, or seeming so by his foul arts." "Nay, it was not so," said Faramir. "For his works fill the heart with loathing; but my heart was filled with grief and pity." (Tolkien, 1973: 309)

The lack of equivalence in the textual metafunction is that the use of possessive adjectives in the TT in English with an anaphoric function is replaced in Spanish by other grammatical elements. As a result the relationship changes and becomes more inaccurate:

(14) – No puedo decir más de lo que he dicho- respondió Frodo. Aunque tu relato me trae presentimientos som-

bríos. Una visión fue lo que tuviste, creo yo, y no otra cosa; la sombra de un infortunio pasado o porvenir. A menos que sea en realidad una superchería del Enemigo. Yo he visto dormidos bajo las aguas de las Ciénagas de Los Muertos los rostros de hermosos guerreros de antaño, o así parecía por algún artificio siniestro.

– No, no era eso- dijo Faramir–. Pues tales sortilegios repugnan al corazón; pero en el mío sólo había compasión y tristeza. (Tolkien, 2001: 356-357)

The lack of equivalence consists of omitting the possessive adjective for the indefinite article "*algún*" (some). Among the textual resources to keep track of who or what is being talked about (Martin and Rose (2003: 145) call it "tracking") one finds the possessive adjectives and pronouns. While it is true that Vázquez Ayora (1977: 119) states Spanish tolerates much less the possessives than English, French and German, we consider that the omission of the possessive was not a good choice. To replace a possessive in Spanish is possible when the use of the article is informatively sufficient, since the reader can infer from the context the relation of "belonging." However, the cases where this can be done according to the translation's handbooks consulted (García Yebra, 1977; López Guix and Minett, 1997) are limited to parts of the body, mental faculties or proprieties of the body as well as clothes or objects of a personal nature where there is no doubt of who is the owner since he/she is the immediate referent.

However, in the fragment analyzed in Spanish, the lack of textual equivalence

occurs when the possessive adjective is replaced by the indefinite article and it is not clear that the "foul arts" are the arts of the enemy which is mentioned before, and it seems that it could be any person with the ability to use them. Then, when Faramir answers, the possessive "his" is replaced by "*tales*" (such) which again does not indicate clearly that the foul arts are the arts of the enemy (that is Sauron) as it is clear in the source text. Therefore, there is also a lack of equivalence in the ideational metafunction.

In the TT in French, the relations established in the original are maintained with the use of the possessive adjectives:

(15) – Je ne puis en dire plus que ce que j'ai dit, répondit Frodon. Encore que votre récit m'emplisse de mauvais pressentiments. C'est une vision que vous avez eue, je pense, et rien de plus. Quelque ombre d'une mauvaise fortune passée ou à venir. A moins que ce ne soit, en vérité, une supercherie de l'Ennemi. J'ai vu les visages de beaux guerriers de jadis gisant endormis sous les eaux des Marais des Morts, ou qui le paraissaient grâce à ses perfides artifices.

–Non, il n'en était pas ainsi, dit Faramir. Car ses œuvres remplissent le cœur de répugnance; mais le mien n'éprouvait que chagrin et compassion. (Tolkien, 1972: 439)

And finally, in the third dialogue, there is a lack of equivalence in the textual metafunction in the fragment analyzed above about Bilbo's and Frodo's birthday in the TT in Spanish (see example 5): changing the punctuation in the TT text to include

María-Luisa Arias-Moreno. A Discourse Analysis Model Applied to Literary Translations

Frodo's birthday inside the parenthesis, which was used in the source text to explain that there was another character who was older than Bilbo and to use humor as explained before, separates the information of both ages, which in the ST helps to understand why the party was going to be exceptional. However, the punctuation in the TT text makes the information about Frodo's age become something secondary. This is just an example which shows that it is very important that the translator pay attention to textual marks. In the TT in French, the text is equivalent in the textual metafunction, because it respects the punctuation of the ST.

The Results

The total number of the results of the research, not just the ones analyzed here, showed that there were more cases of lack of equivalence in Spanish and French in the ideational metafunction (43 in Spanish and 23 in French) than in the other two metafunctions (18 in Spanish and 10 in French, 19 in Spanish and 10 in French, respectively). This was probably due to the predominance of descriptions in the dialogues. But more important than these numerical results are the general findings in both TTs.

The analysis showed that regarding the ideational metafunction, the lack of equivalence distorted the fictional reality. In the Spanish translation, the lack of equivalence mainly consisted of a lack of creativity when rendering neologisms and adding unnecessary information (a whole proverb, for example). And in both translations, they consisted in not taking into account the real historical background alluded to; the different use of intensifiers either adding or omitting them; using words with stronger negative connotations; mistranslation of phrasal verbs and pragmatic particles such as "now"; literal translation of phrases instead of recognizing their pragmatic function.

As for the interpersonal metafunction, as it affects the image the reader gets of the characters and the situation, the lack of equivalence consisted in the way the readers of the TTs perceive the characters in comparison with the source reader. In both languages were found many instances where the judgments or opinions the characters have of other characters or some situations were more negative in the TT than in the source text, when in the latter they are neutral or even positive.

Finally, in the textual metafunction the main problem was the lack of recognition of referents (time and place deictics), textual discourse markers, genre markers, pragmatic particles, and even typographical markers (i.e. italics). It is possible that the translation was done sentence by sentence without taking into account the whole text, and hence the whole picture. Another problem was thematic progression: both translators felt free to change the thematic progression of the sentences of the source text. The result was a distortion in the intention of the plot, the logic of the text and the style of the author and, in the worst cases, a completely incoherent translation. These caused a distortion of Tolkien's world and even sometimes a lack of coherence and cohesion. Omission of information was also present in both TTs, and addition of unnecessary information in one instance in Spanish.

Conclusions

Our aim was not to criticize the Spanish and French translations, but to show that using a linguistic model that takes into account linguistic criteria as well as pragmatic and textual criteria is very useful for analyzing translations (the product), but also for using it as a tool to make translations (the process), since it helps the translators undertake an in-depth analysis of the source text which will allow them to make the best decision needed in each case.

The corpus studied consisted of three dialogues which were chosen because it was considered that they showed how the characters structured experience and conceived the world (ideational metafunction); how they expressed their attitudes and feelings, commented and evaluated things and other people, and how they negotiated them with the other characters (interpersonal metafunction); and how the text was created and organized (textual metafunction). These dialogues were first analyzed and then a comparison was made with their respective translations into Spanish and French using Halliday's systemic-functional model which was complemented by Eggins' and Slade's classification as well as with Martin and Rose's, since these authors have developed more metafunctions. Halliday's model was chosen because it has been used to analyze different types of text and it has been discussed and recommended by other translation experts (Hatim and Mason, 1990). Halliday has even used it to analyze literary texts (Halliday, 2002) which was the aim of this paper. However, we are aware that there are other models that can be used for the same purpose and they can also be a very useful resource for the analysis of literary text in the process of translating.

Our findings confirmed that the use of a linguistic model for the translation of a literary text gives an insight into many details in the source text that are not very evident and, at the same time, helps to distinguish the best resources in the target language to solve the problems encountered. It also could be useful to identify some aspects that are likely to be systematized for the translation process which could make it a valuable tool for the translation itself and for learning translation. Our research showed that the lack of equivalences between the ST and the TT resulted in a very different perception of the characters and the whole work for the target readers and this could mean the difference between a novel being accepted or rejected by the target culture.

The results of the research also revealed that the lack of equivalences could be the result of not doing an in-depth analysis which may cause an apparent lack of linguistic and textual competence (although in the Spanish translation, most of the problems with the textual metafunction could be the result of having two translators working independently) and even preconceived ideas dealing with translation taken to the extreme. For example, one of the main problems in the Spanish translation in one of the dialogues analyzed was possessive adjectives: the translator tried to avoid using them at all costs because that is one of the first things that is taught when learning to translate from English into Spanish. And, although it is true that they are more infrequent in Spanish than in English, it only happens in certain spe-

cific cases. Not using the possessives where it was necessary caused illogical relations and, therefore, confusion.

Finally, we think that it would be interesting to use other models to see if they are easier or more appropriate to use for the analysis of literary translations, if they take into account other aspects that the chosen model does not, what are its advantages and disadvantages, etc. In other words, we believe that translators in general, but literary translators too, should know all possible models and that any model that helps the translators perceive all the important elements used by the author to create the world he wants to convey (lexical, morphological, syntactical, pragmatic, etc.) will enhance the translation process and make the decision making more conscious and less intuitive.

References

Abdulla, A. K. (2001). Rhetorical Repetition in Literary Translation. *Babel*, 47 (4), 289-303.

Bayona, S. (2003). "*Begging your pardon. Con el perdón de usted: some socio-linguistic features in the Lord of the Rings in English and Spanish*" en *Tolkien in Translation*. T. Honegger (ed.).69-90. Zurich: Walking Tree Publishers.

Biguenet, J. & Schulte, R. (1989) *The Craft of Translation*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Carpenter, H. (comp.) (1993). *Cartas de J.R.R. Tolkien*, Translation by Rubén Masera. Barcelona, Minotauro.

Delisle, J. (1993). *La traduction raisonnée. Manuel d'initation à la traduction professionnelle de l'anglais vers le français*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa.

Eggins, S. & Slade, D. (1997). *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.

Ferré, V., Lauzon, D. & Riggs, D. (2003). "*Traduire Tolkien en français: on the Translation of J.R.R. Tolkien's Works into French and their Reception in France*" in *Tolkien in Translation*. Thomas Honegger (ed.) Zurich and Berne: Walking Tree Publishers, pp. 45-68.

Ferré, V. (2004). "*Pour un recherché francophone sur J. R. R. Tolkien*" in *Tolkien, trente ans après [1973-2003]*. Vincent Ferré (ed.). Paris: Christian Bourgois Éditeur, pp. 7- 46.

García Yebra, V. (1982). *Teoría y práctica de la traducción*. Madrid: Gredos.

Grigorieva, N. (1995). Problems of Translating into Russian. *In*: P. Reynolds & G. Goodknight (eds.) *Proceedings of the J.R.R. Centenary Conference*. Milton Keynes and Altadena: Mythopoetic Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (2002). *Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse*. London: Continuum.

Hatim B. & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.

Honegger, T. (2004). *Translating Tolkien: Text and Film*. Zurich and Berne: Walking Tree Publishers.

Isaacs, N. D. (1970). "*On the Possibilities of Writing Tolkien Criticism*" in *Tolkien and the*

Critics. Neil. D. Issacs and Rose A. Zimbardo (eds.). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame.

Larson, M. L. (1998). *Meaning-Based Translation*. Maryland: University Press of America.

López Guix J. G. & Minett Wilkinson, J. (1997). *Manual de traducción inglés-castellano*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Malinowski, B. (1969). *Supplement I. The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages* en Ogen C. K. & I. A. Richards. *The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence upon Thought and of Science of Symbolism*. Londres: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd, pp. 306-307.

Martin J. R. & Rose, D. (2003) *Working with Discourse*. London: Continuum.

Moliner, M. (1981). *Diccionario de uso del español*. Madrid: Gredos.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. London: Rou.

Nida, E. & Taber, C. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. The Netherlands: United Bible Societies.

Nord, C. (2011). *Funktionsrechtigkeit und Loyalität*. Berlin: Frank & Timme GmbH Verlag.

Tolkien, J.R.R. (1972). Le *Seigneur des Anneaux. Parte I. La Communauté de l'anneau*. Translated by F. Ledoux. France: Christian Bourgois

Tolkien, J.R.R. (1972). Le *Seigneur des Anneaux. Parte II. Les Deux Tours*. Translated by F. Ledoux. France: Christian Bourgois.

Tolkien, J.R.R. (1973). *The Lord of the Rings. Part I. The Fellowship of the Ring*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Tolkien, J.R.R. (1973). *The Lord of the Rings. Part II. The Two Towers*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Tolkien, J.R.R. (2001). *El Señor de los Anillos. Parte I. La comunidad del anillo*. Translated by L. Doménech. Barcelona: Minotauro.

Tolkien, J.R.R. (2001). *El Señor de los Anillos. Parte II. Las Dos Torres*. Translated by L. Doménech and M. Horne. Barcelona: Minotauro.

Vázquez Ayora, G. (1977). *Introducción a la traductología*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary (1986). Chicago: Encyclopaedia Británica, Inc.