TWO TRANSLATIONS OF A COCKNEY GIRL IN SHAW'S *PYGMALION*: THE WORKS OF JULIO BROUTÁ AND FLOREAL MAZÍA.

Dialects are linguistic variations, which feature groups of people and allow us to know more about those with whom we interact. Nevertheless, the translation of dialects is a problem to which scholars cannot give a unique solution or valid in all the circumstances.

Pygmalion, or *Pigmalión* in its Spanish version, is one of the best-known plays by Bernard Shaw and, in it, the author plays with the dialect of Eliza, the main character, in such a way that it becomes a basic element, the element, which we cannot eliminate if we want to understand all the underlying ideas which the play tries to transmit. In the Spanish speaking countries, it has been translated in six different occasions along the century, which has passed since 1919, date of its first edition, to 2016, date of the last.

In this work, I will investigate the way in which two meta authors, Julio Broutá and Floreal Mazía have translated the original Cockney in their works, one stage edition, the first, and one reading edition, the second, as they were able to find a counterpart of the original Cockney in the dialects of their countries, Spain and Argentina. This study is framed in the so-called "descriptive translation studies" as defined by Holmes (1988:71). To a better understanding, I will follow the methodology of comparisons of translations of the group TRACE (Translation and Censorship) which uses the replica or utterance as the basic element to compare the original with the two different versions.

1. Introduction

1.1. The play and its language

Pygmalion, the story of a young Cockney who needs to speak another dialect, is a demonstration of Shaw´s mastery at language. Rodríguez (2011) provides us with some keys of the style of the Irish writer shown in his plays: the verbal agility of the characters, the constant presence of all types of verbal games, the versatility of his style in different dramatic genres and, above all, the linguistic consciousness of an author obsessed with the expressive potential of language. Additionally, the social characterization, especially that of the lower social classes, is one of the dramatic techniques, which Shaw uses more deeply, and successfully (Rodriguez, 2011).

Focusing on the Cockney characters, Shaw features them by means of two elements. The first is the dialect. In fact, the first utterances by Eliza in the play are written following the Cockney pronunciation although the author stops the transcription "(h)ere with apologies, this desperate attempt to represent her dialect without a phonetic alphabet must be abandoned as unintelligible outside London" (Shaw, 1990:16-17). Actually, we should not forget his words when he defined *Pygmalion* as "an advertisement on the science of phonetics" (Tauber, 1963:161). This way, "this emphasis on sounds pervades Shaw's dramatic discourse in a manner that supersedes anecdotal idiolects" (Rodríguez, 2015:292).

The second feature, according to Rodríguez (2011), is the phraseological units, used mainly by Mr. Doolittle, which belong to the low register that he uses. Mills (1969) summarizes the functions of this featuring device:

In many instances, perhaps most, the spectator is merely invited to enjoy the gusto and rich expressiveness of vulgar speech as a thing of beauty in itself... but vernacular speech, artfully manipulated, may also represent a more or less pronounced deviation from the linguistic norm of a given audience… Finally, low speech may be ordered so as to serve as an objective correlative of other comic

aspects of character… In the plays of Bernard Shaw, low speech operates on all three of these levels. (*cf.* Rodríguez, 2011:44)

On the other hand, we should not forget Rodríguez, when he refers to Shaw's "language awareness, and the multitude of layers in which language is relevant for his works and worldview" (2015: 290), what, added to the previous, shows the complexity of Shaw's speech.

1.2. Brief history of *Pygmalion* in the Hispanic sphere

Pygmalion has been translated into Spanish in six occasions in two different countries: Spain and Argentina. Julio Broutá was the first meta author who rendered the play in the year 1919. In fact, he was the person who introduced the plays of Bernard Shaw into Spain by translating his works. This first translation is considered the "canonical one". As we will see, he chose one linguistic variations of Madrid, called *cheli*, as the counterpart of Cockney.

In 1943, Ricardo Baeza translated the work. It was printed in Argentina, as, due to the post-war recession, there was shortage of paper in Spain. This version was intended for the Spanish audience as the author chose the Castilian dialect. Floreal Mazía translated the play in 1952 in Argentina, changing the meta linguistic variation, choosing *lunfardo*, the one spoken by the most deprived social class in the area of Buenos Aires, the city capital of Argentina.

In Spain, we have three more works. Juan Leita rendered it in 1982, an unknown hand made some amendments to the text by Broutá in 1990 and Miguel Cisneros translated it in 2016. This last work is a complete annotated edition, which delves deep in the texts although the meta author neutralizes the linguistic variation, what in general "masks the dialectal marks of the characters" (Montalt, Ezpeleta and Teruel, 2012:122)

Among these six different translations, we count with two meta authors, Julio Broutá and Floreal Mazía, who were able to understand that, in their respective countries, there were two linguistic variations, which could make the spectators feel the same way in which the British audience felt when they watched the performance: a person who needs to change the way in which she speaks to accomplish her dreams and feel welcomed in society. Thus, we are going to focus on the first and third translations of *Pygmalion* to study how the meta authors dealt with the linguistic variation.

Due to the outstanding importance of the dialect in the play, we should define what a dialect is and study Cockney, together with the geolects, which the two translators chose as its counterparts, *cheli* in Spain and *lunfardo* in Argentina.

2. LINGUISTIC VARIATIONS

2.1. Definitions

According to the origin or the type of speakers of a linguistic variation, we can distinguish between two main groups: dialects and sociolects.

Professor Alvar (2007) stated that a dialect is a system of signs, which comes from a language alive or dead, usually with a definite geographical limitation; however, it lacks a strong differentiation, in opposition to others with which it shares the same origin. To this definition, we can add another defining concept: a dialect is never per se, but with reference to a language (Heger, 1980). Following this definition, dialects are linguistic variations mainly ascribed to a certain geographical location or area, indifferently of its size.

On the other hand, as Hasan explains, "there exists specifiable correlations between language and elements of social structure" (2004:224) because "language is primarily a social phenomenon" (idem). Thus, a sociolect is a combination of linguistic

features, which belongs to a group, social stratum or class (Moreno, 2009). The distribution of sociolects, then, depends on the social division of the communities.

Nevertheless, we would like to mention another entity, which we consider that defines more accurately the linguistic variations of our study, the geolects. It was Wächtler, in 1977, who explained the fact that in Cockney both regional and social variations were interrelated (*cf.* Lipka, 1988), explanation, which was later developed by Lipka, who claimed that:

> We clearly have an intersection of different parameters of linguistic variation. It is primarily restricted to a specific social class in London, although some features (and people) have been exported to Australia, and some phonological features seem to be acquiring a prestige value in some far-away urban varieties of English in Britain (1988:321).

Thus, we are before a socio-geographical linguistic variation. According to Gimeno, a geolect is a geographical and social linguistic variety, as all speakers have both, a geographical localization and a social ascription although it is mainly a social variation (1990). Therefore, we can conclude that Cockney is a geolect as it is defined by the two parameters mentioned by Gimeno.

2.2. Cockney

2.2.1. Cockney when & where

Scholars have written thousands of pages about this geolect, however until the 20th century they most frequently "deny it the status of a dialect and describe it as a vulgar speech based upon error and misunderstanding" (Matthews, 1972:xii). In accordance with Chambers and Trudgill, "Cockney is, of course, a southern accent" (1984:39), which shares some features with other dialects of the area. In this line, Weekly stated:

Of all those historic dialects which still distinguish, to a greater or less degree, the speech of most Englishmen, none of such interest as *Cockney*, that noble blend of East Mercian, Kentish, and East Anglian, which, written by Chaucer, printed by Caxton, spoken by Spencer and Milton, and surviving in the mouths of Sam Weller and Mrs. Gamp, has, in a modified form and with an artificial pronunciation, given us the literary English of the present day (Weekley, *cf.* Matthews 1972:vi).

Regarding its origins, Matthews considers that "Cockney is a lineal descendant of the speech of London in the 16th century" (1972:188), and Neagu that "Cockney spoken nowadays is the heir of centuries of London speech, seen in its early forms in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Knight of the Burning Pestle* and Shakespeare's tavern scenes in *Henry IV*" (2001:110). Due to these statements, and to the fact that Chaucer also used this geolect in his work (Matthews, 1972), we can deduce that it developed along the 13th and 14th centuries, this is to say, in the late middle Ages. As developed in Goñi-Alsúa (2017), we could also name other writers who depict Cockney in their plays such as Ben Jonson or Charles Dickens, who gave voice to that Cockney population who lived in London in the 19th century. Additionally, we can find other texts, which show the vitality of this dialect in London along the 16th and 17th centuries, the parish registers, mostly anonymous, now archived in the Guildhall Library. In these documents, scholars have observed grammar and pronunciation deviations of the standard language, which even today feature Cockney.

The last author who we ought to mention in this part is George Bernard Shaw, the Irish playwright who, according to Fowler,

Was a far more accurate and original observer of the dialect even than he had been acclaimed, although he had to exaggerate it a little for stage purposes. Shaw's own written attempts to record Cockney were as detailed as they could be without

employing a phonetic alphabet, and he eventually devised a new alphabet of forty symbols to cope with all the sounds of Standard (1984:3).

Before Shaw, the literary representation of Cockney in Literature "had always conformed to the written norm and stayed far from the real features of accent and dialect one could hear while walking on the streets. Accuracy on the scale illustrated by George Bernard Shaw had been avoided because, as his example illustrates, too much accuracy can compromise the reader's understanding of the character's speech" (Ramos, 2009:291).

2.2.2. Main features of Cockney

In accordance with Matthews (1972), the main characteristics of Cockney lie on three aspects, phonetics, grammar and lexicon.

With relation to phonetics, we can appreciate changes in the pronunciation of vowels, diphthongs and consonants. Among them, we can mention the introduction of a esvarabatic vowel in stressed syllables, the tendency to nasalization, the glottal stop which replaces [t] and [k], the substitution of [v] and [f] by [θ] and [ð] respectively or the dropping of [h] at the beginning of words.

With respect to grammar, the main features are the use of double negatives, the addition of /a-/ at the beginning of gerunds or the use of the third person suffix /-s/ in all the forms of the present simple. Likewise, Fowler stated that, "word order is vital to Cockney grammar" (1984:4) although speakers obey the rules of Standard English, they usually vary the regular order for emphasis. Besides, they usually commit redundancies or omit words (Fowler, 1984).

Regarding the vocabulary, we can allude to two distinctive features: the rhyming slang in which words are replaced by rhyming words or phrases, with the rhyming element omitted, and the back-slang (Hotten and Egan *cf.* Matthews, 1972), which

consists of saying the words beginning from the end. Apart from this, Cockney is featured by taking words from other fields and languages (Matthews, 1972). A great deal of these words and expressions have disappeared with the passing of time. Nonetheless, speakers have used some others since the 16th century (Matthews, 1972).

2.2.3. Sociolinguistics

The *cockney* mode of speech, with its unpleasant twang, is a modern corruption without legitimate credentials, and is unworthy of being the speech of any person in the capital of the Empire. 1909, "Conference on the Teaching of English in London Elementary Schools" (Matthews, 1972:157).

So say Chambers and Trudgill, "whenever there is class differentiation in a linguistic variable, it is the variant used by the higher classes that is ascribed more status or prestige than the other variants" (1984:82). In Great Britain, the Southern dialect with the RP pronunciation became the most prestigious linguistic variation, as the royalty, aristocracy and upper classes spoke it, while Cockney was underestimated for the lowest social class in the city, the unqualified workers spoke it from the East End and the port area of London. As Fowler explains:

A great social gulf has long existed between London's West and East Ends. East End life was and is, to a degree, harsh. The language of this region confirms this with its many words for "exhausted," "slatternly," etc., along with many names for ordinary things like parts of the body and everyday food and clothing. Furthermore, very few words can be found for philosophic ideas, which only the leisured classes have time to ponder. The picture emerges of a Cockney community caught in a poverty trap, leaving little time for anything except work or sleep (1984: 20).

Based on this social situation, Görlach points out that "(t)he metropolitan county presents little in its dialect worthy of remark, being for the most part merely a coarse pronunciation of London slang and vulgarity" (1999:156), consideration which comes from the fact that "aversion to the dialect is that it is the symbol of the conditions of life in the slums" (Matthews, 1972:150-151).

In accordance with Trudgill:

Because language as a social phenomenon is closely tied up with the social structure and value systems of society, different dialects and accents are evaluated in different ways […]. It follows that value judgements concerning the correctness and purity of linguistic varieties are social rather than linguistic. There is nothing at all inherent in non-standard varieties, which makes them inferior. Any apparent inferiority is due only to their association with speakers from under-privileged, low-status groups. In other words, attitudes towards non-standard dialects are attitudes, which reflect the social structure of society (1983:19-20).

Holmes confirms this concept with these words:

People generally do not hold opinions about languages in a vacuum. They develop attitudes towards languages, which reflect their views about those who speak the languages, and the contexts and functions with which they are associated. When people listen to accents or languages they have never heard before, their assessments are totally random (1988:345).

This attitude towards languages or the prestige associated to them entails a series of assumptions towards their speakers. In fact, "people are better considered if they speak R.P" (Holmes, 1988:354), while those who do not speak it "are disadvantaged by negative attitudes towards them" (Holmes, 1988:356). This is what Sanmartín defines as the cohesive function of the dialect, as the speakers believe that they have the privilege to possess something unique, which only the members of the group share. Therefore,

the dialect identifies the ones who belong to the group and excludes those who do not belong to it. This way, the language is the strongest bond in the unity of the members of a group, becoming the symbol of their life in common (1998).

With reference to our geolect, Matthews declared that "Cockney, we had been taught by teachers and society, was vulgar, something to discard in favour of Standard Speech, and all of us who had professional ambitions took the warning very seriously" (1972:vii). This author, being a Cockney himself, who wrote his work in the 1930's, is a perfect representation of Elisa's aspirations.

2.3 Cheli

Unfortunately, there are not specific scholar articles that deal with this geolect; this is the reason why we must address to the Academy of the Spanish Language, which defines *cheli* as slang with pure, marginal and countercultural elements[1].

Nevertheless, we should centre our focus of attention on the geolect spoken at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, not on the evolution which became relevant during the 1970's and 1980's, for the first is the diachronic level which Julio Broutá used in his translation.

There are two main pillars on which *cheli* stands, the first is Madrid, the city where it developed and, the second, the plays by Carlos Arniches, prolific playwright from those times. Madrid, as the city capital always received immigrant population from the whole country, especially from the South of Spain, who brought their dialects with them. In fact, as Díaz (2010) stated, between 1850 and 1900 the population of the city doubled, becoming half a million inhabitants during the decade of the 1890's. In accordance with this scholar, as they were blue-collar workers, they constituted the workforce of the city and established in the neighbourhoods of the south, which became

---

[1] https://dle.rae.es/cheli?m=form

the breeding ground for a new dialect. Little by little, this group could accede to entertaining activities such as the theatre, which became one of the favourite shows of this low class (Díaz, 2010). Therefore, the playwrights felt the need to produce plays, which entertained this specific public (Seco, 1970).

The second pillar is Carlos Arniches, a playwright who depicted the life, the attitudes, the atmosphere and, in our case most importantly, the dialect of this population. He inherited the costumbrist tradition of previous authors such as López Silva (Arniches, 1993:17), but was able to abstract its main features to colour the language of his characters. This way, he depicted the popular classes of Madrid by the use of vulgar pronunciations, gipsy words or learned words deformed with a dry and marked accent (Arniches, 1993), so that the audience felt themselves reflected on stage.

Following Seco (1970), the features, which define this geolect, are:

- Phonetics: it shares the features of the vulgar speech:

☐ Reduction of vowels in diphthongs and triphthongs.

☐ Changes in the stress of the words, especially in learned words and those which share a similar root.

☐ Dissimilations of unstressed vowels.

☐ Elision of the phoneme /d/ in past participles.

☐ Variation in consonants such as elisions (even syllables are lost), metathesis, additions and reduplications.

- Morphology

☐ Feminization of words which do not have this possibility.

☐ Changes in plurals and regressive singulars.

☐ Tendency to transform irregular verbs into regular ones, especially in past participles.

☐ Use of the passive with the verb to be with comical purposes.

Abuse of the prefixes re-, requete- and rete- in the composition of new words.

 Use of the appreciative suffixes -augmentatives, diminutives, intensives and pejoratives.

- Lexicon:

 Use of Gypsy words.

 Use of words taken from different semantic fields such as the tauromachy or delinquency.

 Use of dialectal words, especially those from Andalusia.

 Use of learned words, usually with phonetic, morphologic or semantic variations.

 Creation of new words by means of:

1. Different derivational processes –apheresis, apocope, composition, metathesis and suffixation.

2. Change of categories, especially between substantives and adjectives.

3. Other procedures such as ellipsis, euphemism, metaphor or synonymy.

Afterwards, Julio Broutá versed Cockney into this geolect. We could assume that he considered two facts. On the one hand, the audience would be accustomed to it and, on the other, changing the way of speaking of the lower class characters could have negative effects on the public, as it meant a rupture with the tradition. Nonetheless, Broutá added a footnote in which he explained that some critics considered the use of *cheli* as the counterpart of Cockney as a mistake (Shaw, 1973).

2.4. Lunfardo

The Academy of the Spanish Language defines *lunfardo* as slang used in the city of Buenos Aires and its surroundings by people of the low social class, whose words

extended to the colloquial dialects of Argentina and Uruguay[2]. Le Bihan (2011) adds that the origin of this word lies on the gentilic "*lombardo*" (meaning "from Lombardy"), which is a synonym of "thief". Additionally, Pitkowski (2008) explains that it is a repertoire of popular terms, which was born in Buenos Aires as result of the immigration, which is considered coarse or indecent and has evolved along time, penetrating the different social classes and regions of the country. Le Bihan (2011) also focuses on the social group who started to use it, mentioning that they were immigrants, marginal people and criminals and adds that it is neither a language, nor a dialect, but a lexicon, which enriches the Spanish spoken in Buenos Aires, the literature, poetry and the lyrics of the tangos.

On the other hand, Conde (2013) has studied the vocabulary deeply and has stated that it is composed of 6,000 words of which only 310 have been registered in the dictionary of the Academy of the Spanish Language. These words were taken from different languages from America, Africa and Europe, such as French, English, Italian Portuguese and the Spanish *germanías*, the historical dialect associated with the criminal world.

Until 2002, this geolect was considered slang, as there were neither phonetic nor morphologic characteristics in *lunfardo*. Of this opinion is Conde (2004), who stated that it could be thought that in its origins it was close to a sociolect, because a socially distinguishable group of people from Buenos Aires and its surroundings spoke it. Nevertheless, Viegas (2002) was able to identify some grammatical features.

Mario Teruggi (1998) refers to three main stages in the history of *lunfardo*:

1) Development: between 1865 and 1870 and the First World War. The immigrant population, coming especially from Italy, spoke a linguistic variation, which took loanwords from European languages and from the substrate of the area. It

---

[2] https://dle.rae.es/lunfardo?m=form

was mainly spoken in the area of the port of Buenos Aires although it spread to other neighbourhoods first and, later, to other cities. The tango singers and composers started to use the vocabulary in the lyrics of these songs.

2) Assimilation: from the end of the First World War until the end of the Second. The language developed localisms, since the migrations had ceased. It spread through the middle class in the province of Buenos Aires and, thanks to the broadcasting of the tangos on the radio, to the whole country.

3) Outbreak: from 1953 until nowadays. After a period of prohibition and censorship, it revived covering a new niche of population, the youth, who, according to Iribarren (2009), have recuperated old words and created new ones.

Nonetheless, the same as *cheli*, we must focus synchronically on the first and second decades of the 20th century, which is the moment in which Bernard Shaw wrote the play and it reached Spain, not on the subsequent evolution, which both geolects have undergone.

Regarding its acceptance, Van Mourik (2011) refers that, originally, *lunfardo* did not have any prestige and only the lower classes spoke it, what becomes the unifying thread of the three geolects mentioned: Cockney, *cheli* and *lunfardo* were despised, the same way as their speakers in their respective countries.

Consequently, and based on the previous ideas, we can conclude that the three linguistic variations should be defined as geolects as they bind together the two coordinates of geography and social class.

4. ANALYSIS OF THE PLAYS.

Translation, versions, adaptations, reading editions, stage editions, are terms usually found in the literature regarding the featuring of plays and their translation. Bassnet, (1985), Merino (1994b) or Pérez L. de Heredia, (1999a) are some of the scholars who

have studied the existing differences between the written and the oral text, the one that is intended for the stage. However, following Ezpeleta (2007), we prefer to consider both texts as co-existent and no detachable. Especially in this case, as Shaw wrote his plays to be read, too, what is shown in the rich and descriptive stage directions that he included.

Having these concepts present, in this part, we are going to follow the structure proposed by TRACE -Translation and Censorship-, project developed in the universities of León and the Basque Country, which studies the translated literature and the effects of the censorship on it. To investigate on the plays, they propose a 4-level analysis, which consists of:

-Preliminary level: data taken from the book, such as place, date, type of edition, copyright, etc.

-Macrotextual level: comparison at the level of acts.

-Microtextual level: level of replicas or utterances used to compare the translations with the original text, to establish the type of translation, and the basic methods used by the translator.

-Intersystemic level: information about the performances of the play.

In our study, we are going to explain briefly the type of editions and focus on the microtextual level since, as we have said before, it is the language level, in which we can appreciate the use of the social variations, the responses that the translators have given to them and the strategies used in the renderings.

4.1. Preliminary level.

Julio Broutá (1919)

According to Crawford (2000) Julio Broutá was a journalist and translator to whom Shaw contracted, recommended by Siegfried Trebitsch, as he had worked at a great

speed with *Arms and the Man*, on one condition, that he used the original English text for the translation. "This is a common complaint among critics in different languages, who accuse Shaw of choosing his translators" (Rodriguez, 2015:291) due to the "flaws in the target versions" (idem) which he had perceived.

Broutá's was a translation for the stage, or acting edition (Merino, 1994a) elaborated in 1919 and published in 1920. As Broutá refers (Shaw, 1973), Gregorio Martinez Sierra modified his translation to adapt it to the needs of the Spanish scene, by eliminating the first act and modifying the end of the fourth act.

This first edition seems to have been published in Madrid in 1920 –sources vary-, but the first edition of which we have a copy is that of 1923, which is kept in the National Library of Argentina. The name of the publishing house is not recorded on it.

Floreal Mazía (1952)

Floreal Mazía was a prolific Argentinian meta author who developed more than one hundred and fifty translations. He elaborated his version in Buenos Aires in 1952, being the first and only professional who has rendered *Pygmalion* in America. His translation is based on the edition of *Pygmalion* of 1941, thus he includes the additions, which Shaw wrote.

His is a reading edition (Merino 1994a), what implies that its goal is the written work, independent of a later performance. In this type of editions, the translation tends to adjust to the original text and the meta author can clarify concepts by means of footnotes.

Editorial Sudamericana published this edition in Buenos Aires in 1953 although the first edition kept in a library is the one of 1969, edited by Centro Editor de América Latina.

4.2. Microtextual Study: Réplica/ Utterance

A réplica or utterance, as coined by the scholar who stablished this term, can be defined as "the words to be delivered by a certain actor, including the name of the character, the words to be said on the stage and the stage directions related to these words" (Merino 1994c:129).

By means of the comparison of the utterances, we can appreciate the strategies of translation, which the meta author has followed, and the faithfulness of the translation to the original text. In this work, we are going to focus on the utterances written in Cockney in the original text to study how the meta authors deal with the geolect. Previous to this step, we have created a chart with four columns. The first column is to number the utterances, in the second we have put the Cockney utterances from *Pygmalion*, 203 of the edition of 1916, plus 36 of those added in the edition of 1941, the first ones are in black, numbered in Arabic figures, the second ones are in Roman characters in green. In parallel to them, in columns three and four, we have placed the corresponding translations by Broutá and Mazía. As the translators introduced new utterances, we have listed them by means of letters of the alphabet, being these numbers and letters the ones, which appear in brackets before all the utterances in the charts below. We have marked in bold all the variations, which both meta authors proposed so that the comparison is clearly seen.

Broutá

After the elaboration of the chart and the comparison, we have counted fourteen utterances, which Broutá added, twenty-one, which he eliminated, and an obvious mistake. Apart from this fact, Broutá also adds and eliminates parts of utterances. Thereupon, we reproduce some examples.

1. Additions.

1.1. Of sentences in an utterance:

TO	TM
(1) "A BYSTANDER He won't get no cab not until half-past eleven, missus, when they come back after dropping their theatre fares".	"UN DESCONOCIDO. - No se hagan ustedes ilusiones. Ahora, a la salida de los teatros, no se encuentra un coche por toda la ciudad. *Si sigue lloviendo, no tendremos más remedio que esperar que vuelvan de sus carreras*".

1.2. Of utterances:

TO	TM
-	(B) *"LA FLORISTA. - ¡Pues ni que fuás el Padre Santo! ¡Mira que anunciarse con cardenales!"*

2. Eliminations.

2.1. Of parts of utterances:

TO	TM
(16) "THE FLOWER GIRL I ain't done nothing wrong *by speaking to the gentleman*. I've a right to sell flowers *if I keep off the kerb*. I'm a respectable girl: *so help me,* I never spoke to him except to ask him to buy a flower off me. *Oh, sir, don't let him charge me. You dunno what it means to me. They'll take away my character and drive me on the streets for*	"LA FLORISTA.- Yo no he hecho naa malo. Tengo derecho a vender flores, que pa eso pago mi licencia. Yo soy una chica honraa, y a ese cabayero sólo le dije que me comprase unos ramilletes"

speaking to gentlemen. They—"	

2.2. Of utterances:

TO	TM
(6) "THE FLOWER GIRL I can give you change for a tanner, kind lady"	-

2.   Additions or eliminations of words and phrases with no clear patterns, maybe to add comicalness.

3.1. Of words:

TO	TM
(22) "THE FLOWER GIRL It's because I called him Captain. I meant no harm. Oh, sir, don't let him lay a charge agen me for a word like that. You—"	"LA FLORISTA. - ¡Qué voz pone! Pero vamos a ver: ¿es un crimen el que yo haya llamao general al señor cuando tal vez no sea más que coronel? *Usté dirá, cabayero, si me he propasao en algo"*

3.2. Of utterances:

(4) "THE FLOWER GIRL There's menners f' yer! Te-oo banches o voylets trod into the mad."	"LA FLORISTA. - ¡Vaya unas maneras que tienen algunos! ¡Moño, las tienen de...! ¡Y poco barro que hay! ¡Pues ya nos hemos ganao el jornal!"

4. Modifications to adapt the play to the features of the theatre of the times.

4.1. Of words:

TO	TM
(19) "THE FLOWER GIRL *I take my Bible oath* I never said a word—"	"LA FLORlSTA.-*Ustedes, señores, son testigos*, que yo no he hecho naa malo"

4.2. Of popular demonyms:

TO	TM
(149) "DOOLITTLE. Well, what else would I want money for? *To put into the plate in church*, I suppose. Don't you give me none of your lip; and don't let me hear you giving this gentleman any of it neither, or you'll hear from me about it. See?"	"DOOLlTLE.-Creo que nada más natural. ¿Para qué quería yo los cuartos, si no? *No, que iba a echarlos al cepillo de la iglesia.* ¡Qué cosas se oyen! *ELISA. - ¡Miau!* DOOLITLE. -Oye, tú, no seas desvergonzada. Conmigo te va a salir mal. Y que no sepa yo que hayas faltado a estos caballeros, ¿eh?, porque entonces sí que sabrás quién soy yo"

In this example, Broutá modifies the utterance by including the word *miau* (Spanish for meow or miaow) as people from Madrid are commonly known as *gatos* (cats). This seems a wink towards the audience.

4.3. Of colloquial phrases:

(3) "THE FLOWER GIRL. Nah then, Freddy: look wh' y' gowin, deah."	"LA. FLORISTA.- ¡Anda, pasmao! ¡Vaya con el señorito cegato! Nos ha amolao el cuatro ojos. ¡Ay, qué leñe!"

5. Neutralizations:

TO	TM
(26) "A SARCASTIC BYSTANDER Park Lane, for instance. I'd like to go into the Housing Question with you, I would."	-

By eliminating utterances, we lose references such the one to the Housing problem.

6. Mistake

There is a mistake in the translation of "leaving", which is rendered as *vivir*, instead of *dejar, abandonar*, as the word is similar to "living".

TO	TM
(25) "THE FLOWER GIRL Oh, what harm is there in my *leaving* Lisson Grove? It wasn't fit for a pig to live in; and I had to pay four-and-six a week. Oh, boo--hoo--oo—"	"LA FLORISTA. - Sí, sí; en aquel barrio nací; no lo puedo negar; pero no me vaya usted a multar por ello..., que no lo volveré a hacer. Ahora *vivo* en Lisson Grove. Esto supongo que no es un crimen"

Mazía

In general, he is faithful to the original text, as he keeps the number of utterances and the ideas although we have recorded one mistake.

We are going to divide the analysis in two parts; the first one will refer to the microtextual study, the second to the configuration of the dialect, which Mazía proposed.

I. Microtextual study

1. Additions.

1.1. Of words:

TO	TM
(6) "THE FLOWER GIRL I can give you change for a tanner, kind lady."	"LA FLORISTA.- Puedo darle cambio *d'un biyete* de dieh chelineh. bondadosa dama."

1.2. Of phrases:

TO	TM

(112) "DOOLITTLE I'll tell you, Governor, if you'll only let me get a word in. I'm willing to tell you. I'm wanting to tell you. I'm waiting to tell you."	"DOOLITTLE. - Se lo diré, jefe, si me deja decir una *palabra de tanto en tanto*. Estoy dispuesto a decírselo. Quiero decírselo. Estoy esperando la oportunidad de decírselo."

1.3. Of utterances:

In this case, the meta author includes a stage direction as dialogue

(B)	"*¡No'mpies'agritar! ¿Quién t'hecho nada? Nadie piensa tocarte. ¿Para qué haceh tanto baruyo? ¡Cálmate! ¡Basta, basta! ¿Qué pasa? ¿Qu´'hizo ella? ¿Don'stá él? Un pesquisante que anotaba todo lo que decía. ¿Quién? ¿Él? Si, ese que'stá' í. Le quitó dinero'l caballero*, etc.*"

2. Eliminations.

2.1. Of phrases:

TO	TM
(31) "THE BYSTANDER Of course he ain't. Don't you stand it from him. See here: what call have you to know about people what never offered to meddle with you? *Where's your warrant?*"	"EL CIRCUNSTANTE. - Eh claro que sí. No se lo tolere. Oiga, ¿qué drecho tiene a meterse con gente que no l'hecho na?"

The next utterance should be considered the most important one, due to the fact that the meta author eliminates most of it, but also, he summarises the content:

TO	TM

(203) "LIZA. You think I like you to say that. But I haven't forgot what you said a minute ago; and I won't be coaxed round as if I was a baby or a puppy. If I can't have kindness, I'll have independence"	"LIZA.- *¡No es una respuesta correcta!*"

3. Modifications.

3.1. Of words:

TO	TM
(131) "DOOLITTLE.…ginger…"	"DOOLITTLE.-…*pimienta*…"

3.2. Of utterances:

TO	TM
(71) "LIZA Who told you I only—"	"LIZA.- ¿Quién le dijo que *yo no gano máh de*…?"

4. Neutralizations.

4.1. Unlike Broutá, Mazía does not neutralize cultural concepts: **TO**	TM
(25) "THE FLOWER GIRL … leaving Lisson Grove? …"	"LA FLORISTA. -…de Lisson Grove?…"

5. Mistake.

TO	TM
(200) "DOOLITTLE They played you off very cunning, Eliza, them two sportsmen"	"Doolitle.- Te la jugaron muy astutamente, Eliza, los dos deportistas"

This word has two main meanings in English, the first is "the person who practises sport", and the second one is "gentleman", nevertheless, it is noteworthy that

Mazía uses the first meaning when it is obvious that the second one is the correct equivalent.

II. Use of the slang:

As mentioned before, Mazía shows *lunfardo* lexicon in the play as follows:

    1. Lexicon: "pesquisante" (B), "desfachatada" (149), "fachendón" (p.1106).

    2. Vulgar expressions: "le hicieron clavar el pico" (158), "la hizo espichar" (161).

5. BROUTÁ, MAZÍA AND THE THEORY OF TRANSLATION.

Here's a good modern European play, possibly a great one. What's the translator's responsibility? Not to change its structure; that's a dramaturg's or director's job, though of course it may be the translator who goes on to fulfil that role for a given production. Not to accommodate the dialogue to the actors; this may be only too inclined to do that for themselves. No, his real responsibility, in my view, is to communicate the story and the characters as the author conceived them and to reproduce as far as possible his use of language (John Willet, 1983, *cf.* Merino, 1994b:23).

When we consider the essence of a play text, we must start from the fact that both, the dialogue and action, take precedence over the description and narration. This is the reason why Hamberg (1969) claims that the text must feature the speaker, the epoch and the place, together with the social class in an unequivocal way to attract the attention of the audience. As Chaume points (1994), the meta reader must decodify and understand all the information in its cultural context, this way, the translator will have to search for verbal solutions, as he cannot alter the visual message. Therefore, the inclusion of a dialect is not a trivial fact, but a reinforcement of the message, which the author wishes

to transmit. Díaz de Revenga (1999) considers that the playwrights include dialects in their texts with three main aims, namely, the realistic one, when the characters speak in accordance with their social and cultural condition, the featuring one, related with the previous, and the contrastive, in which two characters oppose each other both socially and culturally.

We must remember the fact that the core idea in *Pygmalion*, its axis, is the social stratification shown by the use of dialects, and this choice of linguistic variations allows the reader or spectator to understand not only the social origin of the characters, but also their identity. In this play, Shaw uses the dialect to show the rejection of a person, as a consequence, the dialect is a basic element which should be translated to show how Eliza "is an example of many thousands of men and women who have sloughed off their native dialects and acquired a new tonge" (Mortad-Serir 2013:19). Consequently, as translators, we are before a text in which there is a further element to consider, analyse and resolve, otherwise the meta works "lessen the force of the original" (Monti, 2016:99) and "fail to recreate the authentic sociolinguistic picture that the original versions instead portray" (Monti, 2016:99).

It is well known the fact that in the target language it is difficult to find convincing counterparts, which share the same connotations as the ones in the original text. As we have mentioned, scholars have not reached a consensus about how to translate dialects, however Nida and Catford developed a theory, the functional equivalence. They consider that meta authors must find a dialect with an equivalent function, this is, the choice must be based on the human geography, rather than on the physical geography (Caprara, 2009). On this very line, House explains that we are able to reach a functional equivalence by means of "the replacement of a text in a source language by a semantically and pragmatically equivalent text in the target language"

(1997:31). Ramos, following with these parameters, suggested four different ways to translate dialects, choosing *Pygmalion* as example:

The translator will have to choose between preserving or not preserving the spatial and/or time coordinates of the source text, having four possibilities:

-To maintain the space and time coordinates (e.g. *Pygmalion* in London in 1916)

-To maintain the space but not the time coordinates (e.g. *Pygmalion* in London in 2007)

-To not maintain the space and time coordinates (e.g. *Pygmalion* in Lisbon in 2007)

-To maintain the time but not the space coordinates (e.g. *Pygmalion* in Lisbon in 1916) (2009:295).

Other possibilities are those proposed by Uclés (2016), and Montant et al. (2012). The first provides us with ten different options to verse dialects, which can be grouped into four main categories: Linguistic variety, voice, context, and lexis and cultural references. Montant et *al.* (2012:123), on the other hand, propose to "try to reconstruct the dramatic function of these dialectal usages by resorting to the rich range of non-verbal codes that are available in performance", line which follows Cisneros in his translation of *Pygmalion* into Spanish (2016)

To finish with, due to its outstanding relevance, we should also underline the theory of Skopos by Toury (1980, 1995) and Vermeer, (1978, 1989, 1996), who defined translation as a product of the target culture. Following this statement, *Pigmalión* belongs to the Spanish audience, and that is the reason why the meta authors must translate the play into Spanish in all its extent. Thereby, Soto (1994) explains how a good literary translation of Cockney must reflect or approximate to the effect, which this dialect produces in the Anglophone reader, and, at the same time, feature the

characters assigned to a specific geographical and social area, with the distinctive traits, which differentiate the characters from those using the Standard English.

In the translations that we have studied, both meta authors have been able to find a linguistic variation functionally equivalent to the original one. To begin with, Julio Broutá rendered Cockney as *cheli*, the sociolect from Madrid. Thanks to this choice, Broutá accomplished two objectives; the first was that the public accepted the play; Shaw was a new name in the Spanish scene and, by adapting his work to the main trend of the theatre of those times, the public could feel identified with what he wanted to transmit. The second is that the Spanish audience could understand what the Irish author tried to transmit, as the consideration to both social groups were the same in both countries. It is true that Boutá's meddling in the text is patent, as he changed, modified, developed or eliminated parts in the text, focusing on the comicalness, what compelled him to develop the changes mentioned.

On the other hand, the second translator, Mazía, also focused on the functional equivalence as he rendered Cockney into *lunfardo*. We must underline that in the decade of 1950's, this geolect had spread along the country, thanks to the lyrics of the tango songs. However, at the same time as the play was written originally, during the second decade of the 20th century, the *lunfardo* was developing in Argentina among the impoverished social class of the city capital. Additionally, Mazía maintains the coordinates of space and time, as Broutá did. This way, by keeping the geolects both meta authors make "the target audience aware of the 'otherness' portrayed" on stage (Monti, 2016:100).

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have studied a part of the journey of Cockney -a medieval linguistic variation- from its origins to two translations of *Pygmalion*, play in which George

Bernard Shaw featured two characters by means of the geolect. In the first part, we have explained the main distinguishing marks, origin and history of the three linguistic variations, which are going to be the focus of our comparison: Cockney, *cheli* and *lunfardo*. Moreover, we have clarified how, rather than a dialect, they can be defined as geolects, as this type of variation is defined by two parameters: geography and social class. This is to say, a specific group of people –in this case impoverished citizens from the lower working class- speak them in a specific place -neighbourhoods in London, Madrid and Buenos Aires-.

The second part focuses on two of the six translations of the play into Spanish. We have chosen them, since the meta authors were able to establish the functional equivalence required to translate the dialects. Although we agree with those who explain that a certain part of the audience could feel offended by the choice of dialects, we consider that, if it is possible, translators must respect the social and human factor (Pascual, 1993) of the originals because, according to Soto (1998), this remnant of life belongs to the entrails of the text. This way, as Valle-Inclán wondered, "if the plays of the Quintero brothers were to be translated into Spanish, what would remain?" (*cf.* Seco, 1970).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALVAR, M. (2007). *Manual de dialectología hispánica. El español de España*. Madrid: Ariel.

ARNICHES, C. (1993). *El amigo Melquiades*. Madrid: Austral.

BASSNETT, S. (1985). "Ways through the Labyrinth: Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts" in Hermans, T. (ed.). *The Manipulation of Literature*. London-Sidney: Croom Helm Ltd., pp. 87-102.

CAPRARA, G. (2009). "Multilingüismo, variedades dialectales y traducción: el fenómeno Andrea Camilleri" in *AdVersuS* VI-VII, 16-17, pp. 85-137.

CHAMBERS, J.K and TRUDGILL, P. (1984). *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHAUME, F. (1994) "El canal de comunicación en la traducción audiovisual" in Federico Eguíluz Ortiz de Latierro, José Miguel Santamaría López, Vickie Olsen, Raquel Merino-Álvarez, Eterio Pajares Infante. *Trasvases culturales: Literatura, cine, traducción*. Vitoria: Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea,

CONDE, O. (2004). *Diccionario etimológico del lunfardo*. Madrid: Taurus.

CONDE, O. (2013). "Lunfardo rioplatense: delimitación, descripción y evolución". Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/10478705/Lunfardo_rioplatense_delimitaci%C3%B3n_descripci%C3%B3n_y_evoluci%C3%B3n_2013_

CRAWFORD, F. D. (2000). "Shaw in Translation". Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/40681622.pdf

DÍAZ, SIMÓN, L. (2010). *El casco antiguo de Madrid a principios del siglo XX*. Trabajo de Fin de Máster. Madrid: UCM. Retrieved from: http://eprints.ucm.es/11949/1/toledo.pdf

DÍAZ DE REVENGA TORRES, P. (1999). "El amante bilingüe y la percepción del dialecto" in Díaz de Revenga Torres, P., Jiménez Cano, J.M. et al. (eds.). *Estudios de sociolingüística: sincronía y diacronía II*. Murcia: Diego Marín, pp. 109-121.

EZPELETA, P. (2007). *Teatro y traducción. Aproximación interdisciplinaria desde la obra de Shakespeare*. Madrid: Cátedra.

FOWLER, J. "Cockney Dialect and Slang" (1984). *Honors Theses*. 191. http://scholarlycommons.obu.edu/honors_theses/191

GIMENO MENÉNDEZ, F. (1990). *Dialectología y sociolingüística españolas*. Alicante: Universidad de Alicante.

GOÑI-ALSÚA, E. (2017). *Traducción y censura, traducción de dialectos: las versiones al castellano de Pigmalión de George Bernard Shaw*. Doctoral Dissertation. Universidad del País Vasco/ Euskal Herriko Unibersitatea.

GÖRLACH, M. (1999). "Attitudes towards British English Dialects in the 19th century" in *Leeds Studies in English*, 30, pp. 139-164. Retrieved from: https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=124839&silo_library=GEN01

HAMBERG, L. (1969). "Some practical considerations concerning dramatic translation" in *Babel*, nº 2, vol. XV, p. 91.

HASAN, R. (2004). "Code, register and social dialect" in Bernstein, B. *Class, Codes and Control*. Vol II. Routledge: London and New York, pp. 224-255.

HATIM, B. y MASON, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. Londres: Longman.

HEGER, K. (1980). "Relaciones entre lo teórico y lo empírico en la dialectología" in *Lexis*, vol. 4, nº 1. Retrieved form: http://revistas.pucp.edu.pe/index.php/lexis/article/viewFile/4671/4675

HOLMES, J.S. (1988). "The Name and nature of Translation Studies" in Holmes, J.S. 1988. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 67-80.

HOUSE, J. (1997). *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tubinga: Gunter Narr.

IRIBARREN CASTILLA, V.G. (2009). *Investigación de las hablas populares rioplatenses: el lunfardo*. Madrid: UCM. Doctoral Dissertation. Retrieved from: http://eprints.ucm.es/9814/1/T31438.pdf

LE BIHAN, U. (2011). *Italianismos en el habla de la Argentina: herencia de la inmigración italiana. Cocoliche y lunfardo*. Oslo: Universidad de Oslo. Master Dissertation. Retrieved from: https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/25849/MASTEROPPGAVExIxSPANSKxHFxVxRx2011.pdf?sequence=1

LIPKA, L. (1988). "Variety is the Spice of Life: Language Variation and Sociolinguistics" in Coseriu E. (ed.) *Das sprachtheoretische Denken Eugenio Coserius in der Diskussion (1) eingeleitet und herausgegeben von Harald Thun*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, pp. 317-325.

MATTHEWS, W. (1972). *Cockney Past and Present. A Short History of the Dialect of London*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

MERINO ÁLVAREZ, R. (1994a). *Traducción, tradición y manipulación: Teatro inglés en España 1950-1990*. León: Universidad de León y UPV/EHU.

MERINO ÁLVAREZ, R. (1994b). "A Framework for the Description of Drama Translations" in *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, nº29, pp. 127-138.

MERINO ÁLVAREZ, R. (1994c). "La réplica como unidad de descripción y comparación de textos dramáticos traducidos" in Raders, M. y Martín-Gaitero, R.1994. *IV Encuentros complutenses en torno a la traducción*. Madrid: UCM, pp. 397-403.

MONTALT, V., EZPELETA P. and TERUEL M. (2012) "Gallivanting Round the Globe: Translating National Identities in Henry V" in *Alicante Journal of English Studies* 25(2012), pp. 113-126.

MONTI, S. (2016). "Translating British Dialects: The Interplay Between Cockney and Cockney Rhyming Slang in *Lock Stock and Two Smoking Barrels* and *Snatch* and their Italian Dubbed Version" in *Translating British Dialects*, SQ 11(2016), pp. 75-103.

MORENO FERNÁNDEZ, F. (2009). *Principios de sociolingüística y sociología del lenguaje*. Barcelona: Ariel.

MORTAD-SERIR, I. (2013). "Rhetorical Use of Literary Dialect in English Literature: from Chaucer to Shaw" in *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 2(2), pp. 102-123.

NEAGU, M. (2001). *Variety and Style in English*. Buzau: Editura Alpha.

PASCUAL FEBLES, I. (1993). "La traducción de las variedades de lengua. Problemas y dificultades" in Ruiz de Mendoza, F.J. y Cunchillos, C. (eds.) *Actas XV Congreso de AEDEAN*. Logroño: Universidad de La Rioja, pp. 755-759.

PÉREZ L. DE HEREDIA, M. (1999a). *Las traducciones españolas del teatro inglés (1898-1939).* Vitoria-Gasteiz: UPV/EHU.

PITKOWSKI, E.F. (2008). "Roberto Arlt revolucionario: El lunfardo de *Los Siete Locos* (Si no te interesa el título "rajá, turrito, rajá")" in *Tinkuy: Boletín de investigación y debate*, nº10, pp. 102-115. Retrieved from: https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=3303791

RAMOS PINTO, S. (2009a). "How important is the way you say it? A discussion on the Translation of Linguistic Varieties" in *Target* vol. 21:2, pp. 289-307.

RODRÍGUEZ MARTÍN, G.A. (2011). *Modificación estilística de las unidades fraseológicas en la obra dramática de George Bernard Shaw*. Doctoral Dissertation. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298297827_Modificacion_estilistica_de_las_unidades_fraseologicas_en_la_obra_dramatica_de_George_Bernard_Shaw

RODRIGUEZ MARTÍN, G. A. (2015). "Language" in Kent, B. (ed.) George Bernard Shaw in Context. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 289-296

SANMARTIN SÁENZ, J. (1998). "A propósito de 'Apuntes sobre lexicografía del argot español'" in *Revista Española De Lingüística*, *30*(2), pp. 505-526. Retrieved from: http://revista.sel.edu.es/index.php/revista/article/view/1664

SECO, M. (1970). *Arniches y el habla de Madrid*. Madrid: Alfaguara.

SHAW, G.B. (1966). *Teatro Completo. Tomo II*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana. Traducción: Floreal Mazía.

SHAW, G.B. (1973). *Comedias escogidas*. Madrid: Aguilar. Traducción: Julio Broutá.

SHAW, G.B. (1990). *Pygmalion. A Romance in Five Acts*. London: Penguin Books.

SNELL-HORNBY, M. (2012 [1995]), *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

SOTO VÁZQUEZ, A.L. (1994). "El cockney de Charles Dickens. ¿Una traducción utópica?" in *Lenguaje y Textos* (4), pp. 95-99.

SOTO VÁZQUEZ, A.L. (1998b). "El arte de traducir la expresión dialectal" in Soto Vázquez, A.L. (ed.) *Insights into Translation*. A Coruña: Universidade de A Coruña, pp. 23-31.

TAUBER, A. (ed.). (1963). *George Bernard Shaw on Language*. Nueva York: Philosophical Library.

TERUGGI, M. (1998). *Panorama del lunfardo*. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana.

TRUDGILL, P. (1983). *On Dialect*. Oxford: Blackwell.

UCLÉS, G. (2016). "La traducción de las referencias a la variedad diatópica en el doblaje al español" in *Normas* 6, pp. 77-92. doi:10.7203/Normas.6.8146

VAN MOURIK, L. (2011). *El Estatus del lunfardo. El avance de un argot*. Retrieved from: http://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/205301

VIEGAS BARROS, J.P. (2002). "Evidencias gramaticales de que el lunfardo no es una jerga". Retrieved from: http://www.geocities.ws/lunfa2000/viegas.htm