

TRANSLATION OF PRONOMINAL FORMS OF ADDRESS IN *FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS*

Luzón Marco, María José

Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Románica, Universidad Jaume I, Campus de la Carretera de Borriol, Castellón, Tfno.: 964-345700, Fax: 964-345656, e-mail: luzon@fil.uji.es

(Recibido, Noviembre, 1997; aceptado, Marzo, 1998)

BIBLID [1133-682X (1999) 7; 161-184]

Abstract

The English system of personal pronouns lacks the distinction between polite and familiar second person forms, which is represented in Spanish by the opposition between "tú" and "usted". In *For Whom the Bell Tolls* Hemingway resorts to the Middle English distinction between "thou" and "you" in order to reflect the social and personal relationships of the characters. However, in this work "thou" and "you" are not used as exact equivalents of "tú" and "usted". Forms of address are basic elements in the communicative, pragmatic and semiotic dimensions of discourse; therefore the translator must analyse their functions in these dimensions in order to produce an adequate translation. In this paper we examine some examples of translation of "thou" and "you" to find out whether the linguistic item used in the target text has the same function and brings about the same effects in the translation as those of the personal pronoun in the source text.

Key words: Translation, pronouns, forms of address, Hemingway.

Résumé

Le système anglais de pronoms personnels manque de la distinction entre formes de deuxième personne formelles et familières. Cette distinction est représentée en espagnol par la opposition entre "tú" et "usted". Dans *For Whom the Bell Tolls* Hemingway recourt à la distinction qu'il y avait en Anglais Moyen entre "thou" et "tu" pour refléter les relations personnels et sociaux des personnages. Cependant, dans cette œuvre "thou" et "you" ne sont pas usés comme équivalents de "tú" et "usted". Une traduction appropriée de ces pronoms requiert un analyse à l'égard des dimensions communicative, pragmatique et sémiotique

du discours. Dans cet article nous examinons quelques exemples de traduction de passages pour rechercher si l'élément linguistique usé dans la traduction a la même fonction and produit les mêmes effets que le pronom personnel dans le texte original.

Mots-clés: Traduction, pronoms, formules de politesse, Hemingway.

Resumen

El sistema inglés de pronombres personales carece de la distinción entre formas de segunda persona formales y familiares. Esta distinción está representada en español por la oposición entre "tú/ vosotros" y "usted/ustedes". En *Por Quien Doblan las Campanas* Hemingway recurre a la distinción que existía en Inglés Medio entre "thou" and "you" para plasmar las relaciones sociales y personales de los personajes. Sin embargo, en esta obra "thou" y "you" no se usan como equivalentes exactos de "tú" y "usted". Las formas de tratamiento son elementos básicos en las dimensiones comunicativa, pragmática y semiótica del discurso; por tanto el traductor debe analizar las funciones de las formas de tratamiento en estas dimensiones para traducirlas apropiadamente. En este artículo examinamos algunos ejemplos de traducción de fragmentos con "thou" y "you" para averiguar si el elemento lingüístico utilizado en la traducción tiene la misma función y produce los mismos efectos que el pronombre personal en el texto original.

Palabras clave: Traducción, pronombres, formas de tratamiento, Hemingway.

Sumario

1. Introduction: forms of address and social roles. 2. Communicative, pragmatic and semiotic dimensions. 3. Translation of pronominal forms of address. 4. Conclusion. 5. References.

1. Introduction: forms of address and social roles

The use of forms of address in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* poses problems to the translator, who must carry out the translation of a "translation": Hemingway resorts to the Middle-English distinction between "you" and "thou" to reflect a sociolinguistic practice of Spanish speakers, who show the social relation between speech participants by the selection of different forms of address ("tú" or "usted").¹ The problem met by the translator arises from the fact that the choice between "you" and "thou" is not determined by the same rules as that between "usted" and "tú".

The question of forms of address in translation has to be dealt with within a social theory of language, that is, from a sociolinguistic perspective, which "gives

¹ See Fasold (1990) for a detailed analysis of address forms.

primacy to the role that languages play linking people together in various kinds of social interaction: defining relative statuses or personalities, establishing, maintaining or ending relationships" (Gregory and Carroll, 1978: 48). By virtue of its interpersonal function language both identifies and constructs relationships. It is used to express the roles people take on in speech and impose on others, their attitude and feelings. The interaction between individuals requires the acceptance of rules of social behaviour and of roles, which have to be identified by linguistic and non-linguistic means and which determine the forms participants use to address each other.

As a previous step to the analysis of the translation of the forms of address in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, it is necessary to make a few remarks about the novel. This novel, set in the Spanish civil war, was published in 1940 and the translation which we examine here in 1972. Taking into account that Hemingway was a supporter of the Spanish Republic, Baker (1973: 251) considers that the pervasive feeling in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is the treason of the Spanish folk. It's in this folk that Hemingway is interested, thus the relations between the partisans, reflected in the language, is one of the points that make the novel develop towards an end. What Hemingway does is dramatize the situation of the Spanish people; taking as the centre of his plot the life of a group of republican combatants living in a cave in La Sierra de Guadarrama in 1937. Robert Jordan, an American in the International Brigade, joins an antifascist guerrilla unit commanded by Pablo. Although Pablo despises him openly, Jordan is accepted by the group, including Pablo's wife, Pilar. The setting in which Hemingway wants to place his characters is basic to understand the use of the forms of address. The picture drawn in the novel is a primitive way of living, with people sharing all they have, eating together and living together; masculine courage is highly valued and the distinctions between characters are established in terms of their bravery or cowardice (Baker, 1973: 259).

The translator of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* faces the problem of the difference between the language system in English and Spanish. There is a lack of correspondence in the expression of one aspect of deixis, the way the speaker addresses the hearer according to the relation between them. In most modern European languages there is a distinction between polite and familiar pronouns of address (in French "vous" and "tu", in Spanish "usted" and "tú", in German "Sie" and "du"). Following Brown and Gilman (1960) we will use T and V to refer to the familiar and the polite pronouns of address, respectively. In the Spanish system of personal pronoun there is a distinction between polite and familiar second person pronouns: "tú"/"usted". "Tú" is the form used when there is familiarity between the

speakers and also, in many rural regions, to address members of the lower class. Marín (1972: 150) mentions three cases in which "usted" is used instead: to address elderly people, people of a different social class or people with whom the speaker is not familiar. This distinction between polite and familiar forms of address does not only manifest itself in pronouns but also in verbal endings. The English system of personal pronoun does not make this distinction and there is no way to reflect the different addresser/ addressee relationships by means of pronouns.

This "gap" in the English system poses a problem to the translator of Spanish literature into English. Any switch from the V-form (polite) to the T-form (familiar) and viceversa has semiotic connotations, since it means a change in the relationship or a signal of some kind to the addressee, which must also be reflected somehow in the translation. Given that *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is a work written in English, a language which, as has been said, does not distinguish between polite and familiar forms of address, the lack of a Modern English T-form should not be so big a problem. However, the action takes place in Spain and the characters are Spanish, except Robert Jordan, who is American. In order to reflect with fidelity Spanish language, Hemingway opts for displaying in his novel the distinction made in Spanish. For this purpose he opposes "you" to "thou", an old-fashioned form that most people consider related to poetic or ecclesiastic language. While "you" can refer to one or more addressees, "thou" is similar to "tú" in representing a single addressee.

Although "thou" is now an obsolete form it was used until the middle of the 16th century as a familiar form of address. "You" was the polite form ("plural of politeness"): that is how superiors were addressed and how young people addressed adults (Mossé, 1987: 94). "Thou" was used among members of low class, while in upper class society "you" was used to address equals. Barber (1976: 209) stresses that, although the different use is related to the social class of the speakers, the distinction between the use of the two forms is not so clear-cut. "Thou" was used, even though "you" would be expected, when the emotional temperature raised, as in the expression of intimacy, affection, tenderness. It was also the normal form in the opposite situation: when the speaker tried to show anger, contempt or disgust, even when the addresser belonged to a social class inferior to that of the addressee. In these cases there was a new switch to "you" when the emotional temperature had fallen. "Thou" could also be used to address a stranger of equal rank with the purpose of insulting him. But the reverse can also be true: "you" could be used by a master who normally addresses a servant as "thou", to express his/her anger, as a form of irony.

With a view to mirroring the Spanish system, Hemingway adopts this obsolete system in his novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Hemingway takes into account the fact that switches in forms of address are motivated and always signal a change of tone or attitude in the speaker (Barber, 1976) and makes of the system "you"/"thou" a device masterly handled to exhibit the changing relations between the characters of the novel. While Modern English does not allow scope for the expression of somebody's change of mood or attitude by means of the pronouns of address, it can be done in Spanish and it could be done in Middle English. By "translating" Spanish forms of address into Middle English rather than into Modern English, Hemingway is able to convey how each character in the novel, by choosing one form or another, expresses his/her view of his/her relationship with the addressee. In this work some characters switch the address forms "you" and "thou" when speaking to the same person. The choice of form of address in a particular moment is not arbitrary, but must be explained in terms of the pragmatic and the semiotic dimensions, which should be considered in the translation.

2. Communicative, pragmatic and semiotic dimensions

From a pragmatic perspective the text is a dynamic process, not just a product. The consideration of the context, which a pragmatic perspective implies, involves a model of analysis of translation with three dimensions: communicative, pragmatic, semiotic. The translation is not only concerned with the rendering of specific source language items into target language items. As Hatim (1990: 230) puts it: "The translator takes on the role of mediator between different cultures, each of which has its own visions of reality, ideologies, myths and so on". We will comment briefly on a few aspects of each of these three dimensions which are relevant to our analysis of the forms of address in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*.

Two important elements of the text viewed as a communicative event in which an addresser intends to transmit something to an addressee are reference and tenor. Forms of address are referential devices which indicate the personal roles in the speech situation (Halliday, 1977: 188). The tenor of discourse is the aspect of register which refers to the relationship between the addresser and the addressee. Halliday (1977: 201) defines it as "the role structure: the cluster of socially meaningful participant relationships, both permanent attributes of the participants and role relationships that are specific to the situation". Gregory and Carroll (1978: 49-53) make a distinction between personal and functional tenor. Personal tenor depends on divisions of social structure which determine the number and type of roles we can

play, these divisions being in turn determined by factors like education, class, profession and sex, among others. On the other hand, functional tenor is the category which describes which use language is put to in a specific situation: persuasion, disapproval, exhortation, control.

This takes us to the second dimension of context: the pragmatic one. Language is used to perform actions (Austin, 1962), since utterances have an illocutionary force (e.g. deny, request). The translator should relay not only the referential meaning of the elements in an utterance but also the illocutionary force. As Stubbs (1983: 161-3) points out, in order to perform a speech act successfully the speaker must play a social role within the framework of a social institution. The same speaker can have different social roles, thus his/her utterances are interpreted depending on the role he/she is playing at that particular moment. Therefore, in order to interpret the illocutionary force correctly two factors should be considered: the linguistic form of the utterance and the social context, which includes the social role of the participants.

Another aspect to pay attention to when dealing with the forms of address is politeness, whose maxims are necessary to ensure the cooperative interaction. The problem for the translator is that politeness strategies vary from culture to culture.²

The last dimension, the semiotic one, has a great importance for translation. Language consists of signs inside a culture, every linguistic item in an interaction behaving as a sign. Halliday (1978: 182-192) has a conception of language as a system, as social semiotic, which means that the relation of language to the social system is a "complex natural dialectic in which language actively symbolizes the social system, thus creating as well as being created by it" (Halliday, 1978: 283). Fairclough (1992: 26) describes in the following way the Hallidayan concept of the grammar of language: "a system of 'options', amongst which speakers make 'selections' according to social circumstances, assuming that formal options have contrasting meaning, and that choices of form are always meaningful." Language is considered by Halliday as a metaphor of reality and reality as a metaphor of language. Thus, reality, being a social construct, can only be constructed through an

² Wierzbicka (1985) studies how the cultural values and differences between Polish-speaking and English-speaking communities account for the different politeness devices and the different speech acts.

exchange of meanings. Apart from their use to designate objects or states, signs "refer to the system of units in which the various cultures organize their perception of the world" (Eco, 1973: 115). The forms of address are signs that allow the exchange of meanings. The way a person addresses another is a sign of the relationship between them, but it can also convey different implicatures, such as anger, encouragement, or approval. Any sign holds a paradigmatic relation with other signs that could have been used instead. The selection of a sign instead of others which are in quasi-synonymous relations with it is a stylistic choice that brings about shades of meaning that should be rendered in the translation.

In any translation we should consider three semiotic categories that impose constraints in intersemiotic transfer: genre, discourse and text. Genre is a form of text whose conventions reflect the goals for which language is used in particular social occasions and the purposes of the participants. These conventions are indexes of particular cultures, which influence the way genres are encoded in texts. Literary genres follow the norm of preserving the cultural references and making them clear when necessary. This is important for the translation of the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, where there are characters of two different cultures, who will show cultural conventions by means of their languages. Discourses, or modes of expression involving attitudes, also bring constraints to the translation, since they involve the participants in adopting a particular view on certain socio-cultural aspects. Finally, texts are the basic units for semiotic analysis. Hatim defines them as "division within discourses which signal shifts from one rhetorical purpose to another" (1990:142), rhetorical purpose being understood as a set of mutually relevant communicative intentions, like describing, arguing, or counteracting.

Hatim proposes a model of translation that should incorporate all the semiotic aspects we have mentioned. Drawing on Morris' semiotic theory, Hatim (1990: 116) states that the semiotic description of a sign must include three types of relations: syntactic relations (those between signs belonging to the same syntactic set), semantic relations (those that obtain between the sign and the real world entity to which it refers) and pragmatic relations (those that hold between the sign and its users). Following this idea Hatim (1990: 105-106) suggests the procedures the translator ought to follow when engaged in a semiotic translation:

- 1.-Identification of a source system semiotic entity, with which he/she should cope.
- 2.-Identification of an informational core, that is, a target language denotational equivalent for the source language sign.
- 3.-Explanation of the sign by means of synonyms, paraphrase, etc.

when the informational equivalent fails to convey enough information.

4.- Transformation, or inclusion of the elements that, after the explication of the information core, are still missing in terms of intentionality and status.

3. Translation of pronominal forms of address

As the object of this study is the pronominal forms of address we will analyse a few passages of the target text to find out whether the communicative, pragmatic and semiotic dimensions have been taken into account in the translation.

The forms of address in *For Whom The Bell Tolls* are semiotic elements that point to the relations between the speakers, and also pragmatic units which point to the illocutionary force of the utterances in which they are included. The most interesting phenomenon for translators and the most complex one is the occurrence of switches from "thou" to "you" and the reverse when an addresser is speaking to the same person, in which case the translator has to pay special attention to the whole context, in order to produce an appropriate translation of the forms of address.

Hemingway shows an awareness of the link between social roles and language with the use of "you" and "thou". As Halliday (1978: 25) says there is an intimate connection between language and modes of thought and behaviour towards the other. That is, our view of the other's social role influences the way we address him/her; but this form of address will also help to fix the other's role. Robert Jordan also seems to be aware of this fact, therefore he feels upset when Pilar calls him "Don".

ST³. "How well **you** begin and how it ends, **Don** Roberto"

"Don't call me **Don** Roberto"

"It's a joke. Here we say Don Pablo for a joke. As we say the Señorita María for a joke"

"I don't joke that way" Robert Jordan said. "Camarada to me it is what all should be called with seriousness in this war. In the joking commence a rottenness"

"**You** are very religious about **your** politics" The woman teased him.

³ Henceforth, we will refer to the source text as ST and to the translation, or target text, as TT.

"Thou makes no jokes?"

"Yes. I care for jokes, but not in the form of address. It is like a flag"

"I could make jokes about a flag, any flag" The woman laughed. (...)

"Are **you** a comunist?" (Pilar to Jordan) (p. 65-66)

TT. "¡Qué bien había **usted** empezado y qué mal acaba **Don** Roberto!"

"No me **llames** don Roberto"

"Es una broma. Aquí decimos en broma don Pablo y decimos en broma señorita María"

"No me gustan esa clase de bromas" dijo Jordan "Camarada es el modo como debieramos llamarnos todos en esta guerra. Cuando se bromea tanto las cosas comienzan a estropearse"

"Eres muy místico con **tu** política" dijo la mujer, burlándose de él.

"¿No **te** gustan las bromas?"

"Sí, me gustan mucho, pero no con los nombres. El nombre es como una bandera"

"A mí me gusta reírme de las banderas, de cualquier bandera", dijo la mujer, echándose a reír. (...)

"¿Eres comunista?" (82-83)

In this passage we get information about Jordan's and Pilar's attitude towards the role of language in social structure. For Jordan it is of great importance and throughout the novel he uses "thou" whenever possible to make himself a member of the group, acknowledging the inclusive function of forms of address. Pilar's inconsistent use of "you" and "thou" reveals that she does not attach so much importance to the way one addresses someone else. The use of "you" in her speech is ironic here and contributes to her teasing tone, offering in this way a proof of what she has said about her view of the role of forms of address. The translation does not reflect these switches. The translation of "Are you a comunist?" as "¿Eres comunista?" does not convey the same implicatures. In the original Pilar is exemplifying her previous statement and challenging Jordan's attitude, addressing him with a V-form, which does not happen in the translation.

There is a correlation of the pronouns of address with other forms of address, as can be seen when Pilar tells about the slaughter Pablo and the partisans made in the village and remembers how the partisans addressed one of the fascists:

ST. "Someone shouted from the line. "Here, **Don** Guillermo, up here, Don Guillermo.

In this direction. Here all we have **your** product" (...)

"**Don** Guillermo", another shouted. "Should we send to the house for **thy** spectacles?" (p. 116)

TT. "Por aquí, **don** Guillermo. Por aquí, **don** Guillermo. En esta dirección. Aquí tenemos todos **sus** productos" (...)

"¡**Don** Guillermo!" gritó otro "¿Quieres enviar a alguien a **tu** casa a buscar **tus** lentes?" (p. 142-143)

There is a very meaningful switch. At the time when the action takes place upper class people were addressed by lower class people as "Don" and "usted" (and the possessive form related to it: "su"). The change from "you" to "thou" reflects the rejection of the former authority, the establishing of a system of equality, or rather, of superiority of the lower class. But the most significant fact is that the formal address form "Don Guillermo" is kept, the contrast between "thou" and "don" giving rise to the irony and the mocking effect, which is rendered in the translation.

The translator of the novel is also conscious of the importance of the switch from "you" to "thou", and she makes explicit this switch on several occasions by means of the verb "tutear". Lyons (1979: 236) remarks that in some languages there are delocutive verbs which have the meaning "to address as V" and "to address as T", as happens in French ("vouvoyer", "tutoyer") or German ("siezen", "duzen"). As the distinction between polite and familiar verbs of address does not exist in English, these verbs do not exist, either. Spanish only has the verb meaning "to address as T", thus the translator only stresses the switch from "you" to "thou". These delocutive verbs can be used in two senses:

"a) To describe particular acts of using V or T (whether occasional or habitual)

b) to describe a relationship between two or more persons, who may or may not be interlocutors at the time to which they are referring" (Lyons, 1979: 236)

The second case is when a person is on T-terms (or V terms) with another. The translator of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* uses the verb "tutear" in the first sense to indicate a sudden change in the form of address. However, if this switch does not

happen, there is no point in making it explicit in the translation that a person is addressing another as "tú". This is the case in the following example, in which Pilar, Jordan and María are speaking in a friendly way about María's beauty.

ST. "Then I had better stop", Robert Jordan said. "Already **thou** seemest beautiful and more" (p. 65)

TT. "Entonces, más vale que no beba", dijo Jordan, "Me **pareces** guapa, y más que guapa", dijo **tuteándole abiertamente**. (p. 82)

"Tuteándola abiertamente" is a superfluous explanation since Jordan usually addresses María as "thou" in the novel. Maybe the translator wanted to emphasize the emotive tone, but the use of "tú" conveys the same intimacy as that of "thou" without requiring an explicit mark of it.

The following example offers a similar situation. After having talked to Robert Jordan about the war, Pilar goes on to speak about María, who seems to have fallen in love with Jordan.

ST. "Good. I am very content that **you** have come" (Pilar to Jordan) (...)

"And listen to me about another thing. Be very good and careful about the girl. The María. She has had a bad time. Understandst **thou**?"

"Yes. Why do **you** say this?"(p. 31)

TT. "Bien, me alegro mucho de que **haya** venido" (...)

"Y **escuche**, quiero decirle otra cosa. **Sea usted** bueno y muy cariñoso con la chica, con la María. Ha pasado una mala racha. ¿**Comprendes?**" dijo **tuteándole súbitamente**.

"Sí. ¿Por qué me dice **usted** eso?" (pp. 44-45)

When Pilar addresses Jordan as "you" she is being polite and she acknowledges him as the one who will share the leadership with her. The switch to "thou" can have many implicatures, but taking the context into account it can be said that it helps to give the utterance the illocutive force of a threat. Pilar considers herself María's protector and warns Jordan that if he hurts María she will not care about his role. That accounts for Jordan's answer. Another clue of the illocutive force is the adjective "careful about", which has been translated as "cariñoso". "To

care about someone" is "to like him very much", but there is not corresponding adjective and "careful" does not mean "affectionate" but "cautious". If we keep these two senses for "careful" it seems clear that Pilar is asking Jordan a favour but in a threatening way. The addition of "tuteándole" is again unnecessary because it does not provide new information.

A problematic point in the translation of this passage is the imperative form. In Spanish there is a distinction between a polite form and a familiar one in the imperative form,⁴ but this does not happen in English, thus it is not possible to know at what point the change from the familiar to the polite form takes place. The translator assumes that this switch happens just when "thou" appears and she translates the imperative forms as polite forms, but if we consider that the imperative forms already reflect a familiar way of addressing ("Escúchame") the aggressive tone of the original text would be clear. In any case there is no way to keep the ambiguity of the ST regarding the use of the familiar or the polite form of address.

After the warning Pilar uses the polite form of address again to make a request.

ST. "You and the Anselmo can take her when this terminates" (p. 31)

TT. "Anselmo y usted pueden llevársela cuando acabe esto", dijo dejando momentáneamente el tuteo. (p. 45)

As above, the explicit allusion to the form of address is unnecessary. This is a case of indirect speech act, in which what Pilar is trying to convey is the effect of a command. The cause of this indirectness is politeness, which accounts for the use of "you" and of the auxiliary "can". Therefore, if the two utterances (in the ST and the TT) have the same illocutionary force it is no use adding something that will increase the processing effort of the translation.⁵

⁴ Address forms are only a part of a whole semantic system related to social relationship. An example of this statement is provided by Geertz's study (1960) of Javanese. In this language there are alternate forms of nouns and verbs whose use is determined by the level of formality.

⁵ See Gutt (1991) for a full explanation in terms of Relevance theory of the role of the "processing effort" in translation.

Therefore, it seems that a good translation should not make explicit that in the ST there is a switch in forms of address, if this explicitness does not occur in the ST, but it should convey all the implicatures that this switch has in the ST.

Another interesting passage where we can see the relationship between Pilar and Jordan is the following.

ST. "I believe **you**" (Jordan to Pilar)
"And **you** have this same faith?"
Yes, he said hoping it was true.(...)
"But **you** care for María?" (Pilar to Jordan)
"Yes, suddenly, very much" (...)
"I will leave **you** alone with her after we have seen El Sordo"(...)
Robert Jordan put his arm on her big shoulder.
"I care for **thee**, too", he said. "I care for **thee** much"
"**Thou** are a regular don Juan Tenorio", the woman said,
embarrassed now with affection. (pp. 91-92)

TT. "Le creo"
"¿Y **tú**, tienes esa fe?"
"Claro", contestó él, confiando en que fuese verdad (...)
"Pero **quieres** a María"
"Sí, mucho; no sé por qué." (..)
"Os dejaré solos cuando volvamos de ver al Sordo"(...)
Robert Jordan puso la mano en los recios hombros de Pilar.
"**La** quiero a **usted**", dijo, "**La** quiero a **usted** mucho"
"**Eres** un Don Juan Tenorio de marca mayor", dijo la mujer de
Pablo, turbada ligeramente. (pp. 112-114)

At the beginning of the ST there is a certain degree of distance between Jordan and Pilar, they are on V-terms to each other. The translation does not reflect this social distance, so when the switch from "you" to "thou" occurs in the ST it does not occur in the TT. The use of "you" and "thou" in the ST and the TT follow different rules. In the ST "you" indicates distance both on the part of Jordan and Pilar and "thou" is used by both when the emotive tone rises: they are giving up formality and showing their feelings. Jordan is grateful to Pilar for her understanding and Pilar is impressed by the man's affection. In the TT the use of "tú"/"usted" seems to be ruled by an important social factor: age and respect. Robert Jordan

always addresses Pilar as "usted" and Pilar addresses Robert Jordan as "tú". Thus, the reader of the TT is not aware of the emotive tone of the passage. What is more, even lexical markers of this emotive tone are omitted in the translation. The ST phrase "embarrassed now with affection", which accounts for Pilar's use of "thou", has been replaced by "turbada ligeramente".

There is another occasion when Pilar uses a T-form to address Robert Jordan at the beginning

ST. "If it is necessary that I..." Robert Jordan said quietly but with difficulty.

"Thee would have done it, I believe." The woman said. "Nay, it isn't necessary. I was watching thee. But thy judgement was good"

"But if it is needful- "

"No", the woman said. "I tell you it is not needful. The mind of the gipsy is corrupt"

"But in weakness a man can be a great danger"

"No. Thou dost not understand. Out of this one has passed all capacity for danger"

"I do not understand""Thou are very young still", she said. (p. 68)

TT. "Si fuera necesario que yo...", insinuó Jordan de manera tranquila, pero premiosa.

"Eres muy capaz de hacerlo", dijo la mujer, "lo creo. Pero no es necesario. He estado observándote. Tu comportamiento ha sido acertado"

"Pero si fuese necesario..."

"No", insistió ella. "Ya te lo diré cuando sea necesario. El gitano tiene la cabeza a pájaros"

"Un hombre que se siente débil puede ser un gran peligro"

"No. No entiendes nada de eso. Ese está ya más allá del peligro"

"No lo entiendo"

"Eres muy joven todavía", afirmó ella. (p. 85)

The use of "thou" by Pilar gives a patronizing tone to her speech and at the same time it means that Robert Jordan is accepted as a member of the group. Among these occurrences of "thou" there is an occurrence of "you", which helps to convey the illocutionary force of insistence. Pilar does not want to go on with the discussion

because she is sure she is right, so "you" is a signal to Jordan that he must give up this subject. The translator, when rendering the sentence in which "you" appears does not use "usted" because the contrast would be too strong. But she reflects the illocutionary force of the original by means of the illocutive verb "insistió".

The relationship between Pablo and Jordan can also be better understood taking the forms of address they use into account. When they first meet they both have some kind of authority. That is why Jordan and Pablo keep on V-terms. Jordan addresses Pablo as "you", acknowledging that he is the leader of the partisans, and Pablo uses "you" when addressing Jordan, making it clear that Jordan is not a member of his group. The way they address each other constitutes a clear instance of the inclusive-exclusive social function of tenors (Gregory and Carroll, 1978: 61): they are used to mark the boundaries of relationships, to accept somebody as member of a group or to reject him. This distant relationship between Jordan and Pablo changes when Pablo refuses to help Jordan and loses his authority.

ST. "I don't go for the bridge", Pablo said, looking down at the table
"Neither me nor my people" (...)

"Then we will do the bridge without thy aid", Robert Jordan said to Pablo.

"No", Pablo said, and Robert Jordan watched his face sweat. "Thou will blow no bridge here"

"And thou?", Robert Jordan spoke to the wife of Pablo who was standing, still and huge, by the fire. She turned towards them and said, "I am for the bridge" (...)

"What do you say?", Pablo said to her and Robert Jordan saw his betrayed look on his face and the sweat on his forehead as he turned his head.

"I am for the bridge and against thee" (p. 52)

TT. "No estoy por lo del puente", dijo Pablo mirando a la mesa, "ni yo ni mi gente" (....)

"Bueno, haremos lo del puente sin tu ayuda", dijo Jordan a Pablo, **tuteándole de repente.**

"No", replicó Pablo, y Jordan vio que su rostro se había cubierto de sudor, "tú no haras volar aquí ningún puente" insistió Pablo.

"¿Y tú?", preguntó Jordan a la mujer de Pablo, que estaba de pie, tranquila y arrogante junto al fuego. La mujer se volvió hacia ellos

y dijo:

"Yo estoy por lo del puente"(....)

"¿Qué dices tú?", preguntó Pablo y Jordan vió que se sentía traicionado y que el sudor le caía de la frente al volver hacia ella su cabeza.

"Yo estoy por lo del puente y contra tí" (p. 68)

Jordan is rejecting Pablo's authority with the use of "thou". As has been said above, the explicitness conveyed by "tuteándole" is unnecessary. The use of "thou" by Jordan when addressing Pilar also has the effect of diminishing the distance, of saying that they are in the same group. As for Pablo, he uses "thou" when addressing Jordan in order to add force to his commands by showing that he is the leader and Jordan is an inferior there. "You" conveys distance and politeness, thus it is not appropriate for strong commands, but for polite requests. Pablo's use of "you" instead of "thou" when addressing Pilar is accounted for by Barber's claim that "you" was used in Middle English as a hostile form when the unmarked form was "thou", so it expresses anger (1976: 212). As "usted" is not used in this way, it does not express hostility, "usted" would not be a good translation of "you". But the translator's choice ("tú") does not convey this implicature, either. That does not mean that translation is impossible, but that the translator should look for means other than the pronoun system to convey the meaning of the source text. The solution could be found in the verbal system, maybe in the use of a progressive tense like "¿Qué estás diciendo?"

Pablo keeps addressing Jordan as "you" until the end when he finally apologizes and acknowledges they are fighting together: "Thou wilt cover us well with the máquina and with thy small máquina when we come back, eh, Inglés?" (p. 403). The constant use that Pablo makes of "you" to address Jordan is not taken into consideration by the translator that renders "you" as "tú", thereby brushing the distancing tone away:

ST. "Don Roberto", Pablo said heavily.

"Don Pablo", Robert Jordan said.

"You are not professor", Pablo said, "because you haven't got a beard. And also to do away with me you have to assassinate me and for time, you have no cojones" (p. 196)

TT. "Don Roberto", dijo Pablo con voz torpe.
"Don Pablo", replicó Robert Jordan.
"Tú no eres profesor porque no tienes barba", insistió Pablo, "Y además, para deshacerte de mí será menester que me mates y para eso no tienes cojones" (p. 253)

In this example the use of "you" by Pablo reflects the distance between them, and at the same time it is ironic: Pablo addresses Jordan as "you", while he refuses to admit that Jordan is superior to him and claims that Jordan lacks courage, the most valued quality in this context. The translation of "you" as "usted" in this case would have been appropriate because it can also be used in an ironic way, to deprive somebody of the authority he claims to have. But the translator does not relay this ironic effect with the use of "tú".

An interesting point is the way the rest of the characters address Anselmo, the oldest member of the group. Jordan regards Anselmo as an old person and addresses him with the V-form "usted", the Spanish form used to address elderly people; Pablo regards him rather as a comrade and always addresses him as "thou", which makes any switch to "you" meaningful. A clear example occurs when Anselmo reproaches Pablo for his behaviour and Pablo gets angry:

ST. "You are an old man who will make himself trouble with his mouth"
"I am an old man who is afraid of no one" Anselmo told him (...)
"You are an old man who may not live long"
"I'm an old man who will live until I die", Anselmo said. And I am not afraid of foxes"
Pablo said nothing but picked up the pack.
"Nor of wolves either," Anselmo said, picking up the whole pack, "if you are a wolf"
"Shut thy mouth," Pablo said to him. "Thou are an old man who always talks too much" (p. 16)

TT. "Eres un viejo que vas a buscarte un disgusto por hablar demasiado"
"Soy un viejo que no tienen miedo a nadie", replicó Anselmo (...)
"Eres un viejo que no va a vivir mucho tiempo"
"Soy un viejo que vivirá hasta que se muera", concluyó Anselmo. "Y

no me dan miedo los zorros"
Pablo no añadió nada pero cogió otra vez el bulto.
"Ni los lobos tampoco", siguió Anselmo, cogiendo su fardo, "en el caso de que fueras un lobo"
"Cierra el pico", ordenó Pablo, "eres un viejo que habla demasiado" (p. 26)

The difference between "you" and "thou" in the original is not reflected in the target text. The change to "you" is a signal of anger as we have said above. It has a threatening effect, achieved by the distant relation that "you" implies. When the argument has ended Pablo uses again "thou" to show that they are on the same good terms as ever. The translation does not reflect this switch so the critical situation loses part of its intensity.

A good example of the translation of "you" by "usted" is the following, where "you" functions as a semiotic sign of the gypsy social structure. When he addresses Anselmo the gypsy always uses "you", which shows the respect of gypsies towards old people.

ST. "I'll get a tank", the gipsy told him. "I will get a tank. And you can say it is what you please" (p. 19)

TT. "Ya me haré con el tanque", dijo el gitano, "me haré con el tanque y puede usted darle el nombre que le guste" (p. 29)

The best examples of switch are to be found in the speeches between Robert Jordan and María, the young woman who falls in love with him. The first time María goes to Jordan's place there is inconsistency on both sides as to which form to use, owing to the lack of familiarity. However, the translator only uses "tú" conveying a higher degree of familiarity in the relationship than the original does. Although in the next meetings the form of address between them is mostly "thou", when Jordan is dying and tells María to go away he switches constantly from "thou" to "you", which gives the passage a dramatic effect.

ST. "**Thou** will go now, rabbit. But I go with **thee**. As long as there is one of us there is both of us. Do **you** understand?"
"Nay, I stay with **thee**"
"Nay, rabbit. What I do now I do alone. I could not do it well with

thee. If **thou** goes then, I go too. Do **you** not see how it is?"(....)
"But **you** don't understand, Robert. What about me? It is more difficult for me to go."
"Surely", he said. "It is harder for **thee**. But I am **thee** also now. Now **you** will go for us both. **You** must not be selfish, rabbit. **You** must do your duty now" (p. 463)

TT. "Tú te vas ahora, conejito, pero yo voy **contigo**. Mientras viva uno de nosotros, viviremos los dos. ¿Lo **comprendes**?
"No. Me quedo contigo"
"No, conejito. Lo que hago yo ahora tengo que hacerlo solo. No podría hacerlo **contigo** ¿Te **das** cuenta? Cualquiera que sea el que se quede es como si nos quedáramos los dos."(...)
"Pero ¿No lo entiendes Roberto? ¿Y yo? Es peor para mí el irme"
"Claro que sí", dijo él. "Es más difícil para **ti**. Pero yo soy **tú** ahora. Ahora **te** irá como si fuéramos los dos. No hay que ser egoísta, conejito, **tienes** que hacer lo que **debes**" (p. 534)

In the ST the switch to "you" is intended to make the utterance more persuasive. As there is little time, since Jordan is dying, the speakers want at the same time to transmit their affections for each other and to persuade the other. This is achieved by playing with the forms of address. It would not be appropriate to translate "you" as "usted" in this context, since "usted" always implies certain degree of distance. Therefore, the translator has to convey similar effects to those of the original in a different way. However, the translator has not made any difference whatsoever: she uses "tú" in all cases without signalling the switch. The translator could have resorted to alternative intensifying devices in Spanish, like the surface occurrence of subject (e.g. translating "Do you not see how it is?" as "¿Es que no tú no te das cuenta?").

Finally, we will analyse how the relationship between Jordan and the gypsy is reflected in the forms of address they use. In the following example the gypsy switches from "thou" to "you" to express a change in attitude:

ST. "Roberto", the gypsy said softly. (...)
"Why didst **thou** not kill Pablo?", the gypsy said very softly.
"Why kill him?"
"**You** have to kill him soon or later. Why did **you** not approve of the

moment?" (.....)

"I thought it might molest you others or the woman"

"Que va! And the woman waiting as a whore waits for the flight of the big bird. **Thou** are younger than you appearest" (...)

"Provoke him then", the gipsy said, "But **you** have to kill him" (p. 60)

TT. "Roberto", dijo el gitano en voz baja. (...)

"¿Por qué no **has** matado a Pablo?", preguntó el gitano, siempre en voz baja.

"¿Para qué iba a matarle?"

"**Tendrás** que matarle más pronto o más tarde. ¿Por qué no **aprovechaste** la ocasión?" (...)

"Pensé que podrá molestar a los otros o a la mujer"

"Qué va! La mujer está esperando como una puta que caiga un pajaro de cuenta. **Eres** más joven de lo que aparentas." (....)

"Provócale entonces", dijo el gitano, "**pero tienes** que matarle". (pp. 76-77)

These switches are not reflected in the translation, thus part of the effect is lost. By using "thou" the gypsy is trying to convey an impression of familiarity, he is trying to plot against Pablo. The occurrence of "you" in the following utterances gives rise to several implicatures: "you are the leader now", "the duty of the leader is to get rid of the disturbing elements", etc. With the use of "you" the gypsy identifies Jordan with a role that brings with it a series of obligations. That is why he uses "thou" ("thou are younger...") again when he speaks about him as a young person, not as a leader. Therefore, the switch to "you" is a controlling strategy: the gipsy's utterance has the illocutionary force of a command, meant to be the desire of the whole group. It implies a threat of loss of privileges if the command is not obeyed. The translator keeps the use of "tú" throughout the whole speech, which makes the implicatures brought about by the switch disappear and rules out the distinction between a person and his/her role. A similar switch occurs when Jordan, after spending the night with María, sends the gipsy on a mission.

ST. "It is much work", the gipsy smiled. "**You** are sure there is no one **you** would rather send than me"

"Take things a little seriously." Robert Jordan said. "This is serious."

"**Thou** askest me to take things seriously? After what **thou** didst last night? When **thou** needest to kill a man and instead did what **you** did? **You** were supposed to kill one, not make one!" (p. 79)

TT. "Es mucho trabajo", dijo el gitano sonriendo, "¿No sería mejor que **enviaras** a otro?" (....)

"Tómate las cosas más en serio", dijo Robert Jordan. "Éste es un trabajo serio"

"¿Y eres **tú** quien me dice que me tome las cosas en serio después de lo que **has** hecho esta noche ¿**Tenías** que haber matado a un hombre y, en lugar de eso, que **has** hecho? **Tenías** que haber matado a un hombre y no hacer uno?" (p. 99)

We find the same distinction as above: the gipsy uses "you" when he addresses Robert Jordan as a leader, and "thou" when he addresses him as a man. This is a consequence of the fact that every individual in a society can play different roles: a person can at the same time be a teacher, a father, a tennis player, etc. Quoting Gregory and Carroll (1978 50): "the person will be defined in terms of categories like these and there will be an appropriate code of behaviour both linguistic and non-linguistic for each of these identities". In the example above, when the emotive tone rises the gipsy uses "thou" to turn his utterance into a reproach. The use of "tú"/ "usted" in the TT to reflect this switch and the changing mood of the gipsy would have been appropriate in the translation but the only form that occurs is "tú".

4. Conclusion

Differences in the systems of pronouns of address pose problems for the translator, which can even result in the impossibility of translation. Address forms are communicative, pragmatic and semiotic units, and the effects produced in the ST owing to this tridimensional character should be rendered in the TT.

The lack of a difference between familiar and polite forms of address in English, which exists in Spanish, makes it necessary to render the connotations originated by this distinction in other ways when translating from Spanish into English. Middle English pronominal system makes this distinction between polite and familiar, thus a solution could be the adoption of the Middle English system, relaying "tú" as "thou" and "usted" as "you". However, this solution, apparently easy, is not

appropriate, because, although both systems make a difference between polite and familiar forms, their pragmatic use is different: there is not a pragmatic correspondence between "thou" and "tú" or "you" and "usted", since they are used in different circumstances, this usage bringing about different implicatures.

Hemingway desired to reflect Spanish language with accuracy, since the language is a "mirror" of the social structure, and social relations are very important in this work. This desire, together with the intention to give an epic tone to the work, led him to adopt the Middle English distinction between polite and familiar forms. But, as has been said, these forms ("thou" and "you") are not used in the work complying with the Spanish system, that is, they are not conceived as exact equivalents of "tú" and "usted". The distinction between polite and familiar is kept, but their usage in context is very complex, rather than being an exact mirror of that of "tú" and "usted".

The reciprocal use of "thou" betokens a solidarity relation, while a power relation is signalled by the use of different pronouns of address by the speaker. However, the occurrence of "thou" or "you" in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is not only explicable in terms of solidarity or power relations. The distinction is used to produce a poetic effect, which is sometimes rather striking, owing to the constant switch from one form to the other. It reflects not only social differences but also changes in the vision of a character's role, and, of course, changes of mood. The switch is specially relevant for its contribution to the expression of the illocutionary force of the utterance. This results in the impossibility of translating "you" as "usted" and "thou" as "tú". The translator needs to resort to other devices, among them the use of illocutive verbs, which makes the illocutionary force of an utterance explicit in the same way as the switch of forms of address would do, the conveyance of similar implicatures by means of verb tenses, etc.

In conclusion, forms of address are very difficult to translate, in some cases almost impossible, because they are narrowly linked to the cultural and social system of the society in which they are produced. The system of address pronouns is different in the different languages (English/ Spanish) and there is not an exact equivalence between the forms of a system and those of the other. For this reason the set of implicatures brought about by the use of particular forms of address in the ST should not only be conveyed by means of the apparently equivalent forms of address in the other language but also by means of other devices.

5. References

- AUSTIN, J.L. (1962), *How to Do Things with Words*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- BAKER, C. (1973), *Hemingway: the Writer as an Artist*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- BARBER, Ch. (1976), *Early Modern English*, London, André Deutsch.
- BROWN, R. and GILMAN, A. (1960), "The pronouns of power and solidarity" in Sebeok, T.A. (ed.), *Style in Language*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- ECO, U. (1973), "Looking for a logic of culture," *Times Literary Supplement*, 5 and 12 October, 1973.
- FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1992), *Discourse and Social Change*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- FASOLD, R. (1990), *The Sociolinguistics of Language*, Oxford, Cambridge, Blackwell.
- GEERTZ, C. (1960), "Linguistic etiquette" in Geertz, C. (ed.), *The Religion of Java* Glencoe, IL, The Free Press, 248-260.
- GREGORY, M. and CARROLL, S. (1978), *Language and Situation: Language Varieties and their Social Contexts*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- GUTT, E.A. (1991), *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K. (1977), "Text as semantic choice in social contexts" in VAN DIJK, T.A. and PETÖFI, J.S. (eds), *Grammars and Descriptions*, Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K. (1978), *Language as Social Semiotic: the Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*, London, Edward Arnold.
- HATIM, B. (1990), *Discourse and the Translator*, New York, Longman Group UK Limited.
- HEMINGWAY, E. (1987), *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, New York, Mac Millan.
- HEMINGWAY, E. (1972), *Por Quién Doblan las Campanas*, Translation by Aguado de, Loli, Círculo de Lectores, S.A.
- LYONS, J. (1979), "Pronouns of address in Anna Karenina: the stylistics of bilingualism and the impossibility of translation", in Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (eds.), *Studies in English Linguistics (for Randolph Quirk)* London, Longman, 235-249.
- MARCOS MARÍN, M. (1972), *Aproximación a la Gramática Española*, Madrid, Editorial Cincel S.A.

- MOSSÉ, F. (1987), *Handbook of Middle English*, Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- STUBBS, M. (1983), *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistics Analysis of Natural Language*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- WIERZBICKA, A. (1985), "Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts", *Journal of Pragmatics* 9, 145-78.