Emphatic Sentences: A Comparative-Translational Study of Formal-Functional Relations in English and Romanian

Mona ARHIRE

Universitatea Transilvania din Brașov
Transilvania University of Brașov
Personal e-mail: mona.arhire@unitbv.ro

Abstract: Emphasis, a well-acknowledged stylistic device, is a carrier of a considerable load of emotional content in the fictional dialogue. Its manifestation can take sundry forms and can be attached to a wide range of feelings and can take different degrees of intensity, all of which determines the creation of the atmosphere and impacts the reception by the readership. This paper reports on the investigation of the occurrence of emphasis embedded in the dialogic utterances of John Fowles' novel Mantissa. The focus lies on the relation between the formal construction of emphatic sentences and the functional values deriving therefrom. The study entails a comparative analysis of emphatic utterances depicted from the English original text and its translation into Romanian. The three research questions refer to the comparative-contrastive realization of emphatic sentences in the two languages, to the extent to which the functional component succeeds in being transferred to the target language and to possible means of compensation when structural differences pose translational problems. The analysis is structured along a typology of sentences adapted to the nature of the text under scrutiny and to the aims of this study. The findings and conclusions ultimately indicate the importance of establishing a relation between form and function in matter of emphasis in the literary dialogue as an act of communication depending on linguistic devices for its effectiveness.
Keywords: literary dialogue, emphasis, translation, contrastiveness, form and function.

Citation suggestion: Arhire, Mona. "Emphatic Sentences: A Comparative-Translational Study of Formal-Functional Relations in English and Romanian." *Transilvania*, no. 4 (2021): 75-84.
https://doi.org/10.51391/trva.2021.04.10.

1. Introduction

This paper reports on the partial results of a more comprising project dedicated to the comparative-translational investigation of emphasis. Addressing the manifestation of emphasis at sentence level, it adds up to the component of the project which dealt with the examination of lexical means of emphasis from a translational perspective (Arhire 2019). While acknowledging the force of lexical items and stylistic means of expression in creating emphatic and emotional content, this paper is concerned with the contribution of structural devices to such content. The investigation inherently takes account of adjacent linguistic and non-

linguistic devices which contribute to the emphatic value of the sentences apart from the purely structural ones.

The text under scrutiny is John Fowles' novel *Mantissa* (1982) and its translation into Romanian made by Angela Jianu (1995). This parallel translational type of research is meant to reveal how emphasis *per se* is manifested in the two languages, but also to discover whether and to what extent the emphatic value and intensity present in the source language is preserved in the target language text. The focus in this paper lies on the emphatic utterances, *i.e.* the sentences with emphatic value within the dialogue. Being fundamentally a generator of meaning, syntax can acquire in literature the additional function of creating artistic effect, but also of highlighting attitudes and beliefs within the narration or the dialogue. This means that the value of emphasis extends so as to impact the overall literariness of the work, which is what makes this undertaking additionally worthwhile. The choice for Fowles' work is motivated by the fact that it is, to a large extent, made up of dialogue, a considerable part of it being emphatic.

2. Theoretical Considerations

This section provides the theoretical background which serves as framework for the analysis and data processing. It first refers to the quality of the literary dialogue to create - or at least substantially contribute to - the social context, and the second section deals with the linguistic manifestation of emphasis in speech generally and in dialogic utterances particularly, which guides the way for the analysis.

2.1. The literary dialogue, creator of social context

Sundry scholarly voices recognized the worthiness of granting more attention to the literary dialogue of the Modernist and Postmodernist literary prose, being "one of the main paths of emancipation", to recall Genette's words (1980: 173). Experimenting with characters' speech has been for decades now a point of focus in literary studies, but it has also challenged studies in stylistics. This is due to the quality of dialogue to bring forth language aspects typical of the fictional dialogue, along with important information about the nature of the speakers themselves. What is more, the literary dialogue plays an ever-greater role in the creation of atmosphere and the overall stylistic picture of a work of prose. As Thomas (2012) claims, writers themselves have started been received and appreciated by the way they can master the dialogic interaction. Specific aspects of the speech of literary heroes and linguistic technicalities of the realization of dialogue have been discussed by scholars, such as Bishop 1991, Fludernik 1993, Herman 2006, Kinzel and Mildorf 2012, Thomas 2012, etc.

Given this particular scholarly context and that of the expanding spread of literature in translation, comparative studies in the area of literary dialogue appear not only justified, but necessary indeed. Fowles' novel *Mantissa* (1982) is a wealthy resource for such an enterprise since the bulk of the text consists of dialogue. Besides, it is the dialogue that determines the whole special atmosphere and triggers the readership's curiosity and engagement.

As mentioned above, the dialogue is meant to provide information about the characters. In more precise terms, it is the entire social context that is uncovered, and which embeds information about personalities along with their personal and social background, relationships, states of mind, momentary and deep feelings, reactions, opinions, beliefs, etc. For it is a well-acknowledged fact posited by sociolinguists that "[t]he way people use language in different social contexts provides a wealth of information about the social relationships in a community, and the way speakers signal aspects of their social identity through their language" (Holmes 2008: 1). Similar theoretical concerns on the matter are reflected in works authored by Bell 1976, Hudson 1996, Bonaffini 1997, Trudgill 2000, Gardiner 2008, Holmes 2008, Spolsky 2010, Wardhaugh 2010, etc.

The comprehension of the complexity and intricacy of the social context in Fowles' rather scarce narrative contribution depends considerably on the potential of the dialogue to construct the social picture. Thus, much understanding depends on the literary heroes' speech in terms of content, but also the use of vocabulary, grammar, rhetorical devices, irony, sarcasm, etc.

Additionally, Fowles' vividness and authenticity are present not only in the dialogue, but also is his interior monologue and in the narrative as the writer's means of generating a captivating reading experience and keeping the reader alert. This technique enhances the tense atmosphere no less created by the unexpected situations mainly occurring due to the main character's recovery from (pretended) amnesia. Here is a relevant and dense example of a string of elliptical sentences in a mixture of narrative devices comprising speech, the character's thoughts in his interior monologue and the narrative proper:

> (1) "Can you tell me your name?"
> "Of course. Name! No name. Nothing. No past, no whence or when. The abyss perceived, and almost simultaneously, its irremediability." (Fowles 1982: 6).

2.2 Emphasis in the fictional dialogue

This investigation of emphatic language means is integrated in the theoretical framework offered by Swan (2009) which is pursued for the sake of an orderly approach to emphasis. Albeit used as a pertinent and valid starting point, Swan's classification of the types of emphasis has triggered some nuancing insights, which will be further presented and accounted for.

The typology posited by Swan (2009: 164-166) proposes four categories of emphasis in English, namely (i)

emotive and contrastive emphasis; (ii) pronunciation: stress; (iii) vocabulary: special words; (iv) structures. The fourth category is of interest in this very study, *i.e.* emphasis realized by structural language means. Viewing the problem in closer detail, Swan's classification of emphasis includes specifications on the possibility to resort to structures which are distinct from the regular and common language usage and from the implicit neutral expression. Words can be fronted as in *I knew he was going to cause trouble, and cause trouble he did!* Cleft sentences starting with *It* or *What* can be used to lay emphasis on a particular part of a sentence., such as in *What he needed was a good rest* (Swan 2009: 166). Stress can also be obtained by using emphatic pronouns like *myself, yourself*, etc., and obviously by intensifying adverbs or repetition.

3. Research Questions and Methodology

Considering the importance of emphasis as a stylistic device, this paper attempts at finding answers to three research questions: one employs aspects of contrastiveness in matter of expressing emphasis in English and Romanian in general, and the other two are related to the preservation of the stylistic and emotional content in the translation into Romanian of Fowles' *Mantissa* in particular. Hence, the research questions are formulated as follows:

Do English and Romanian possess similar structural means to express emphasis?

Has the emphatic style and the emotional content been successfully preserved in the translation of the novel *Mantissa* by John Fowles?

What solutions did the translator find in order to preserve the emphatic value and intensity in the target text when faced with structural differences between English and Romanian?

From the point of view of the methodology adopted, this study sets off from Swan's (2009) classification of emphatic language means to focus on the fourth category, namely the structural emphasis. The syntactic level is particularly addressed in a descriptive approach which entails an observant stance towards the structural configuration of sentences bearing emphatic value. Different types of sentences are analysed as they occur in the dialogic interactions in Fowles' *Mantissa*. This empirical type of investigation depicts a relevant amount of sentences by type as they appear in the original English version and sets them into contrast with their translations into Romanian. Back translations and sometimes literal back translations are offered as necessary or, when this is not possible due to structural differences, explanations are provided for clarification.

4. Analysis

Given the fact that emphasis has been traced in various types of sentences, the analysis section is structured following a classification of the relevant sentences as has been found suitable for the logical development of this study. The types of sentences comprised in the analysis below are elliptical sentences, positive and negative sentences, sentences with fronted negation and cleft sentences.

4.1 Elliptical sentences

To start with, elliptical sentences are typically used to endow dialogue with vividness in the exchange of replies. Moreover, they are very often employed to enhance some emotional involvement and to stress feelings and (usually) contradictory opinions, perhaps more than non-elliptical sentences. They are most of the times embedded in tense dialogue displaying a variety of conflicting views and/ or negative feelings, such as disagreement, annoyance, anger, indignation, mistrust, disbelief, etc. The examples below are selected as data for the comparative analysis of their structural realization in English and Romanian and the degree to which they generate similar stylistic content:

(2a) "Please don't be angry."
"I'm not. Just shocked. And extremely hurt." (Fowles 1982: 92).
(2b) - Te rog, nu fi supărat.
- Nu sînt supărat. Sînt șocat. Și extrem de rănit. (Fowles 1995: 236).
(2c) Please don't be angry.
I am not angry. I am shocked. And extremely hurt. (back translation).

The reply in the Romanian version uses two full sentences and only one elliptical sentence for the three elliptical sentences in English. The translation of the first elliptical sentence employs repetition instead of ellipsis although a similarly elliptical sentence would have been possible in Romanian too. The repetition seems to provide additional emphasis though. In addition, the expression of the idea in the second sentence *Sînt șocat* (*I am shocked*) uses again repetition, namely of the verb *sînt* (am). Thereby, the ellipsis of the subject is not an issue since the Romanian verb inflects information about the subject, which brings about a full sentence. The vividness and feeling of irritation are not entirely lost though due to the short sentences and the fragmented ideas which mirror emotional involvement.

Sometimes contradiction and annoyance are concealed under warm manners of addressing:

(3a) "Darling, you're right. As always."
"Darling, don't say that. Only sometimes."

"It's just that I feel you're becoming so much better at being impossible than I am."
"Nonsense." (Fowles 1982: 84).
(3b) - Dragule, ai dreptate. Ca întotdeauna.
- Vai, iubita mea, nu spune asta. Doar uneori.
- Doar că am impresia că la capitolul comportament imposibil începi să devii chiar mai bun decît mine.
- Prostii. (Fowles 1995: 216-217).

The verbal irony in example (3) is as obvious in the Romanian translation as it is in English. The emphasis thus expressed creates a tension which is well reflected in both source and target language versions, being mainly created by means of the elliptical sentences. Slight hesitations can also be inferred along the elliptical sentences.

Hesitant replies acquire some emphasis in the following example too, and are additionally highlighted by the italicized word, a mono-lexical sentence:

(4a) "Do you know who ... what I was?"
"Am."
"*Am*."
"Yes." [...] (Fowles 1982: 10).
(4b) - Știți cine ... ce eram înainte?
- „Cine sînt"
- Da, „sînt".
- Da. (Fowles 1995: 22).
(4c) Do you know who ... what I was before?
"Who I am."
Yes, who I "am".
Yes. (back translation).

It is obvious that the translator felt the need to enhance comprehension by employing explicitation. This is materialized by the time adverbial *înainte* (*before*) in the first line and the full sentences in the second and third lines for the English *Am*. The explicitation realized by the full sentences reduces the emphatic value of the utterances as does the time adverb *înainte* (*before*). Some emphasis is however preserved in Romanian by the inverted commas instead of the italics used in the English version to mark the stress both in content and in intonation. Hesitation and emphasis in contradiction can be traced in the following swift exchange of mainly elliptical utterances as well.

(5a) "I suppose you're a..."
"A what?"
"Couces. You know."
"Psychiatrist?"
"That's it."
"Neurologist. Abnormal brain function. My special field is mnemology."
"What's that?"
"How memory works."
"Or doesn't."
"Sometimes. Temporarily." (Fowles 1982: 10).
(5b) - Presupun că sînteți...
- Ce anume?
- Cum să spun... canapele...
- Psihiatru?
- Așa.
- Sînt neurolog. Disfuncții ale creierului. Specialitatea mnemonologie.
- Asta ce-i?
- Cum funcționează memoria.
- Sau cum nu funcționează.
- Uneori. Temporar. (Fowles 1995: 22).

Ellipsis is employed similarly in Romanian and produces similar effect in example (5) above, except for the non-elliptical sentence *My special field is mnemology*, which is translated by an elliptical one into Romanian: *Specialitatea mnemonologie* (*Special field mnemology*).

Offence can be often detected in characters' rapid successions of elliptical sentences as spontaneous additions to their own utterances as occur in natural, vivid speech. This formal syntactical simplicity often heightens the intensity of the feelings (more often negative in the text being analysed). Here are two examples thereof, the former (6) indicating offence and a feeling of humiliation directly and explicitly, the latter (7) indirectly, via irony:

(6a) "It's so unfair. I'm not a prig. And humiliating. If my wretched family gets to hear about it." (Fowles 1982: 33).
(6b) - E-așa de nedrept. Nu sînt o prețioasă, dar e așa de umilitor. Dacă bietele mele rude află... (Fowles 1995: 87).
(6c) It's so unfair. I'm not a prig, but it is so humiliating. If my wretched family gets to hear about it... (back translation).

The omitted part at the end of this passage is marked in the target language version by three dots, which is a common way of substituting something obviously bad that affects the speaker and is therefore rather left unsaid. These additional punctuation marks might rise the level of tension in the translated version as compared to the original. However, the translation is again clarified and more explicit: while the dialogic turn in English consists of four elliptical sentences which also display slight incoherence, the Romanian counterpart joins two of the sentences by the adversative *dar* (*but*) into a full and complex syntactical structure which offers a more cohesive and hence coherent and understandable manner of expression.

In the example below, irony is even better highlighted in Romanian (7b) than in English (7a), where its recognition is more context dependent. The creation of mono-lexical segments isolated by commas in the first sentence of (7b) provides a stress to the speaker's ironical position, turning it into sarcasm. The last sentence takes the form of a rhetorical question and thereby preserves the sarcastic tone:

(7a) "Oh, I know it's very wicked of us. To show we can actually think. Whatever next." (Fowles 1982: 44).
(7b) - Păi, da, sigur, ce urît din partea noastră. Să arătăm că putem chiar gândi. Ce mai poate urma după asta? (Fowles 1995: 117).
(7c) Oh, yes, sure, how wicked of us. To show we can even think. What else can follow this? (back translation).

Astonishment, the expression of intense feeling itself, is obvious in the mono-lexical sentence in the last line below, but is perceived also due to the larger context of situation:

(8a) "Darling, you know who I am?"
He stared.
"I am Claire".
Not at all clear.
"Your wife, darling. Remember?"
"Wife?" (Fowles 1982: 5-6).
(8b) - Dragule, mă recunoști?
El se uită lung.
- Eu sînt, Claire.
Nu era deloc clar.
- Soția ta, dragule. Îți amintești?
- Soție? (Fowles 1995: 11).
(8c) Darling, do you recognize me?
He stared.
"I am Claire".
It was not at all clear.
"Your wife, darling. Do you remember?"
"Wife? (back translation).

Romanian follows the English expressive manner whenever the structural patterns coincide. An exception here is in both questions *Dragule, mă recunoști?* (*Darling, do you recognize me?*) and *Îți amintești?* (*Do you remember?*), where the omission in English of the auxiliary *do* in the interrogatives has no equivalent in Romanian since Romanian questions are not formed with auxiliary verbs. Instead, the verb form inflects the information about the subject and therefore no ellipsis is possible. But given the structural differences, the Romanian translational solution is the only one possible and does preserve the atmosphere of the original.

4.2 Positive sentences

In simple positive sentences in English, it is common for emphasis to be marked by the insertion of auxiliary verbs:

(9a) "That bloody woman did tell you something!" (Fowles 1982: 16).
(9b) - Aha, cine știe ce v-a mai spus femeia aia! (Fowles 1995: 40).
(9c) Oh, who knows what else that woman told you! (back translation).

The anger is obvious in this example, being strengthened not only by the use of the emphatic auxiliary *did*, but also by lexical means – the adjective *bloody*, with a strong negative connotation – and by the exclamation mark. By contrast, the Romanian version is void of the possibility of using any auxiliary verb here since the past tense is inflected in the verb form with a similar highlighting alternative as in English. Besides, the adjective *bloody* is not translated at all. Instead, the translator resorts to the exclamation *Aha* at the beginning of the utterance and adds *cine știe ce* (*who knows what*) and the adverb *mai* (*else)* to compensate and obtain a natural Romanian utterance that maintains the intensity of anger.

(10a) "I suppose you did notice?" (Fowles 1982: 38).
(10b) - Sper că tu ai observat. (Fowles 1995: 99).

The lack of a similar structural construction with an auxiliary in Romanian seems to be again conscientiously dealt with by the translator, who adds the pronoun *tu* (*you*). This pronoun in Romanian, just as the auxiliary verb in English, would not have been necessary for a full understanding of the meaning and it quite unnatural since the information about the person is inflected in the verb form. The result has a similar overall emphatic effect which makes it a suitable compensatory solution.

(11a) "I did once tell someone else. Like a fool." (Fowles 1982: 40).
(11b) - I-am povestit unuia odată, ca o proastă ce sînt. (Fowles 1995: 106).
(11c) "I once told someone, like a fool that I am." (back translation).

Due to the same structural impossibility in Romanian, the translation of the former sequence in the example above does not display any emphasis. Moreover, the unification in Romanian of the two sentences also reduces the tension typically created by short, elliptical sentences. The emphatic compensation is obtained by the addition of a slightly stronger expression in the latter sequence *ca o proastă* ***ce sînt*** (*like a fool* ***that I am***).

In contrast to the examples above, the following one does not provide any emphatic element for the English auxiliary *do* to compensate for the impossibility to use an equivalent structure in Romanian:

(12a) "I do hope you'll always cut that particular passage out..." (Fowles 1982: 52).
(12b) - Sper c-o să tai pasajul ăla, dacă vreodată ...știi. (Fowles 1995: 136).
(12c) I hope you'll cut that passage if anytime ... you know. (back translation).

The insertion of an adverbial, such as *chiar sper* (*I really hope*) could have been used to create the same stress. The

same observation applies in the next example, where the adverbial *chiar* (*really, indeed*) would also have added some fitting stress to the target language utterance.

(13a) "If she did exist." (Fowles 1982: 46).
(13b) - Dacă ar fi fost inventat. (Fowles 1995: 108).
(13c) If it had been invented. (back translation).

In rare instances, positive sentences employ inversion to create emphasis:

(14a) "[...] That was it, of course. Out he went." (Fowles 1982: 37).
(14b) - [...] Da, exact, asta era. Așa că a fost dat afară. (Fowles 1995: 97).
(14c) - [...] Yes, exactly, that was it. So he was sent out. (back translation).

Such syntactical structuring is not possible in Romanian, therefore the normal word order is here preceded by the connector *Așa că* (*So*). This connector entails explicitation and enhances the cohesiveness of the message. However, it normally connects two simple clauses within a complex clause. The fact that it is used here at the beginning of the sentence creates an interruption in the flow of the discourse, isolating the last part from the rest and thus providing some emphasis.

4.3 Negative sentences

The matter concerning the use of auxiliary verbs for the sake of emphasis in positive sentences can be extended to negative simple sentences. The difference is that, in negative sentences, auxiliary verbs are obligatory in English, while in positive sentences they are non-obligatory and used only for emphatic purposes. However, they can be provided with a formal kind of emphasis in negative sentences as well, *i.e.* when they are used in a full, non-contracted form with the negation. It is a structural emphatic devise that Fowles resorts to repeatedly, which contrasts with the normal and extensive use of the contracted form throughout the dialogue. This will be illustrated in the following examples:

(15a) "You know perfectly well why."
"No. I do not know why." (Fowles 1982: 16).
(15b) - Știți foarte bine de ce.
- Nu. Nu știu de ce. (Fowles 1995: 41).
(15c) You know very well why.
No, I don't know why. (back translation).

I do not know why expresses contrastive emphasis, which does not have a structural equivalent in Romanian, where auxiliary verbs accompany the negations only with very few verbs and certain verb tenses. Therefore, the emphasis is not similarly strong in Romanian.

Also, a non-contracted negative verb form is used in the next example to express contradiction after an affirmative utterance which includes itself an auxiliary verb to create emphasis:

(16a) "All this just because you realize that after all you do need me a little?"
"I do not need you." (Fowles 1982: 64).
(16b) - Și asta numai pentru că ți-ai dat seama că ai totuși nițică nevoie de mine.
- Da' n-am nevoie deloc de tine. (Fowles 1995: 166).
(16c) And all this because you have realized that you still need me a little.
But I don't need you at all. (back translation).

The back translation of the first line (16c) reflects a more neutral version than the original English one (16a) due to a structural equivalent impossibility in Romanian. In response to this, although a non-contracted form would have been possible in Romanian too as *nu am nevoie* (*I do not need you*), the translator opted for the contracted version (*n-am*) and added the emphasis by means of a lexical item, the adverb *deloc* (*at all*). The same adverb is also used suitably in the following utterance for emphasis:

(17a) "I am not angry with you." (Fowles 1982: 87).
(17b) - Dar nu-s deloc supărat pe tine. (Fowles 1995: 226).
(17c) I'm not angry with you at all. (back translation).

However, some additional emphasis could have been preserved by avoiding the contraction of the copular verb and the negation in Romanian (*nu-s*) just as the contraction of the subject and copular verb in English is possible. Indeed, the contraction of the copular verb and the negation is not only possible but common in Romanian. The effect of avoiding contractions would be similar in both languages.

Indignation is expressed in a non-contracted verb form, where italics are used for additional stress in intonation:

(18a) "Nurse, you also do *not* speak like that about senior staff in front of patients." (Fowles 1982: 20).
(18b) - Soră, nu se vorbește așa despre personalul superior în fața pacienților. (Fowles 1995: 51).

Although the translation is equivalent both in meaning and in structure, the italics are missing in Romanian, which cancels the emphatic value present in the English original version.

The non-contracted verb form in the following example provides the entire sentence with an overall stress, which is similarly expressed in Romanian. Also, the negation takes the front position in the translation so as to isolate the negation from the auxiliary and thereby to offer more pregnant emphasis:

(19a) "I did not start this." (Fowles 1982: 48).
(19b) - Nu eu am început. (1995: 127).
(19c) It is not me who has started this. (back translation).

Negatives, such as *nobody, nothing, never*, etc. are felt stronger and can easily acquire emphatic value as compared to *anybody, anything, ever*, etc. used with *not* (Swan 347-348). In the example below (20), the sentence *You know nothing* is emphatic as compared to its semantic equivalent *You don't know anything*, which is stylistically neutral in itself. The distinction does not exist in Romanian since the negation *nu* (*not*) is obligatorily attached to the verb in a sentence comprising *nimeni* (*nobody*), *nimic* (*nothing*) and *niciodată* (*never*). This is due to the fact that the use of double or even multiple negation is the norm in Romanian. The English version and its Romanian translation (including the back translation and the literal translation) in the example below are indicative thereof:

(20a) "I know you secretly want me to, Miles."
"You know nothing." (Fowles 1982: 65).
(20b) - Las' că știu eu că de fapt vrei, Miles.
- Ba nu știi nimic. (Fowles 1995:169).
(20c) I know you actually want it, Miles.
Oh, you don't know nothing.* (literal back translation).

Lexical means of compensation are adopted in the translation above, namely *de fapt* (*actually, in fact*) and the interjection *Oh*. In both translated utterances (20b), the stress is taken over by lexical additions. A similar method of compensation is resorted to in example (21b) below as well, where an entire simple sentence is inserted: *Să știi* (*I'm telling you*). As can be inferred from the back translations, these lexical additions function merely as fillers used for rhetorical purposes. Nevertheless, they do take over the stress and thus generate the desired stylistic effect in a fitting manner.

(21a) "This is getting you absolutely nowhere!" (Fowles 1982: 32).
(21b) - Să știi că nu obții nimic așa! (Fowles 1995: 84).
(21c) "I'm telling you you don't obtain anything like that!" (back translation).

Another kind of emphatic negation named *litote* is also a stylistic or rhetorical device which appears in the text. It manifests as a double negative having the role of strengthening a positive idea, which is thus provided with a nuance unattainable by means of an affirmative statement that would be semantically equivalent. The examples below illustrate it:

(22a) "I hope that's not too uncomfortable." (Fowles 1982: 21).
(22b) - Sper că nu e prea incomod. (Fowles 1995: 52).
(22c) I hope it's not too uncomfortable. (back translation).

In mathematical terms, the double negation equals affirmation. From a stylistic perspective though, where nuances are of utmost importance, they are not perfectly equivalent. This means that, stylistically speaking, *not too uncomfortable* is not the same as *comfortable enough*. The observation can be well extended to Romanian, which the translation in (22b) also exhibits. Nevertheless, not all Romanian adjectives can bear a negative prefix as does *incomod* (*uncomfortable*) above. It is the case of the following example, where a lexical means of compensation is used instead, namely *doar* (here the equivalent of *indeed*):

(23a) "...I'm not unreasonable. I wouldn't have objected to a certain discreet nuance of romantic interest. I'm not totally unaware that you're male and I'm female." (Fowles 1982: 35).
(23b) – Doar sunt o persoană rezonabilă. N-aș fi avut nimic de obiectat la o tușă discretă de romantism. În fond, nu pot ignora cu totul faptul că tu ești bărbat, iar eu femeie. (Fowles 1995: 88-89).
(23c) I am a reasonable person indeed. I wouldn't have objected to a certain discreet nuance of romantic interest. In fact, I cannot entirely ignore the fact that you are a man and I am a woman. (back translation).

As is evident in the next example, stress can be obtained by the use of a negation plus *but*, (meaning *nothing else than/ except*), when an affirmative sentence could have rendered the meaning but would have missed the emphasis:

(24a) "Where do you think the world would have been if we'd all worn nothing but logic since the beginning? ..." (Fowles 1982: 76).
(24b) - Unde crezi că ar fi azi lumea dacă ne-am fi înveșmântat numai în logică de la bun început? (Fowles 1995: 194).
(24c) Where do you think the world would be today if we had worn only logic since the beginning? (back translation).

Although Romanian possesses a similar structural manner of expression (*nimic decât/ în afară de*), the translator opts for the omission of the negation, which determines a lower emphatic level.

For rhetoric and/ or stylistic purposes, authors sometimes creatively opt for unusual and witty ways of expression. Such an exceptional case is the following example, which is presented below despite its perhaps singular occurrence:

(25a) "It's not possible."
"It's not only *not* not possible. It is." (Fowles 1982: 71).
(25b) - E imposibil.
- Nu e deloc imposibil. (Fowles 1995: 185).
(25c) It is impossible.
It is not impossible at all. (back translation).

The reply under (25a) includes three times the negation *not* in a single sentence. The reply is meant to wittingly and emphatically contradict de previous negative utterance. The adverbial addition *not only* provides the sentence with additional stress. This adverbial is not translated into Romanian (although it is possible), the negation is not repeated, and the entire sentence is simplified and slightly neutralized in stylistic effect. *Not possible* is translated as *imposibil* (*impossible*) and the adverb *deloc* (*at all*) is added to recover some emphatic value, while the italics are missing from the translation.

The same adverbial, *not only*, is commonly used in English for emphasis in sentences where additions need to be highlighted. The Romanian version is structurally similar (no back translation necessary):

(26a) "So he not only saw what I was doing, he must have also known what I was thinking." (Fowles 1982: 39).
(26b) - Așa că nu numai c-a văzut ce făceam, dar cred că a și ghicit la ce mă gândeam. (Fowles 1995: 104).

4.4 Sentences with fronted negation

Negations are often engaged in inverted syntactical constructions for emphatic purposes. Such inversions entail placing the negation on front position in the sentence. Here are a few such examples from many similar ones in Fowles' *Mantissa.* They occur in dialogic contexts revealing annoyance and tension in expressing firmness and a nuance of warning (27), carelessness (28), ironical complaint (29), harsh refusal (30), ironical offence (31). Most of the translations into Romanian display structural and semantic equivalence even if the translator's preferences for the sake of naturalness can be identified:

(27a) "You don't kid a sister. Not for a moment." (Fowles 1982: 28).
(27b) - Nu mă duci tu pe mine. Nici o șansă. (Fowles 1995: 70).
(27c) You don't fool me. No chance. (back translation).

(28a) "Not that I care a damn." (Fowles 1982: 35).
(28b) - Nu că mi-ar păsa cîtuș de puțin. Mie personal. (Fowles 1995: 90).
(28c) Not that I care a damn. Me myself. (back translation).

(29a) "Not that you seem to appreciate it." (Fowles 1982: 31).
(29b) - Nu c-ai fi în stare să apreciezi. (Fowles 1995: 77).
(29c) Not that you are able to appreciate it. (back translation).

(30a) "Not in a thousand years." (Fowles 1982: 66).
(30b) - Nici nu-mi trece prin cap. (Fowles 1995: 169).
(30c) It doesn't even cross my mind. (back translation).
(30d) No way does it cross my mind. (literal back translation).

Alternatively, the translation of the next sentence does not adopt a negation but acquires the form of a rhetorical question, with the meaning and effect well preserved and quite naturally expressed in Romanian:

(31a) "Not that you could ever imagine, being a man." (Fowles 1982: 36).
(31b) - Da' ce poți tu să-nțelegi, bărbat fiind? (Fowles 1995: 96).
(31c) But what can you understand, being a man? (back translation).

4.5 Cleft sentences

Cleft sentences are fairly frequent syntactical constructions used to draw attention to particular ideas. In Fowles' work, it proves to be a quite common occurrence as an effective means of attaching stress to items which could otherwise remain shadowed or would be granted too little attention. It appears indeed suitable in a mostly tense dialogue as is the one in this novel. Romanian possesses similar syntactical means, which is illustrated in the following two examples:

(32a) "What I was actually rather wondering was this (colon) whether there aren't really (comma) in spite of your distinctly exaggerated umbrage at one or two small assumptions I was obliged to make ..." (Fowles 1982: 32).
(32b) - De fapt, ceea ce mă interesează pe mine e următorul lucru (două puncte) dacă nu există cumva (virgulă) în ciuda reacției tale exagerate la vreo două presupoziții minore pe care am fost obligat să le fac... (Fowles 1995: 82).
(32c) Actually, what I am interested in is the following thing (colon) whether there aren't really (comma) in spite of your exaggerated reaction at one or two small assumptions I was obliged to make ... (back translation).

The minor changes that can be noticed in the back translation as compared to the original are only matters of naturalness in Romanian and they do not affect the message in meaning or style.

Despite the different constructive manner in the translation of the next example, the translation options are employed also for suitability reasons and do not determine any significant change of content or style:

(33a) "And all you do is take advantage of my decency, my trying to keep up with the times." (Fowles 1982: 33).
(33b) - Iar tu nu faci altceva decît să profiți de bunul meu simț și de dorința mea de a ține pasul cu istoria. (Fowles 1995: 86).
(33c) And you do nothing else but take advantage of my decency and my desire to keep pace with history. (back translation).

The cleft sentence in the next example includes the negation *not* in italics, which indicates the rising tone used to stress an idea expressed in contradiction to the previous intervention. Disapproval and even indignation are mirrored effectively in this way, which importantly contributes to the creation of a tense atmosphere:

(34a) "What you forget is that I am *not* something in a book. I am supremely real." (Fowles 1982: 30).
(34b) - Ai uitat complet că nu sînt personaj de roman. Sînt cît se poate de reală. (Fowles 1995: 78).
(34c) You have completely forgotten that I am not a character in a novel. I am as real as possible. (back translation).

The translation adopts a different formal expression, using the common syntactical pattern but adding the adverb *complet* (*completely*) to make up for the otherwise missing emphasis. The italicized marker is missing from the Romanian version.

5. Findings

The analysis has revealed the following findings in terms of the research questions posed:

(i) Do English and Romanian possess similar structural means to express emphasis?

The elliptical sentences proved to be employed in both languages with similar stylistic effect even if there are structural dissimilarities stemming mainly from the fact that Romanian verbs inflect the information about the subject and therefore can by no structural means omit part of the information embedded in the verb form as can English. This seems the major structural difference reflected not only in elliptical sentences, but also in full positive and negative sentences. The English positive sentences commonly include a non-obligatory auxiliary verb for emphasis, which does not exist as such in Romanian. Also, the negative sentences in which the auxiliary verb is omitted do not have an equivalent structural solution in Romanian. Neither have most non-contracted forms engaged for obvious emphatic purposes. Except for some tense-related structures and the association of subject plus few verbs, contractions are not possible in Romanian. Besides, double or multiple negations are used in English only exceptionally, for evident stylistic purposes. On the contrary, in Romanian they are the norm in any neutral discourse, generating no stylistic effect whatsoever. In such situations, Romanian resorts to alternative solutions which will be discussed below. As far as cleft sentences are concerned, they display similar constructive manners in English and Romanian, with their translation posing no problem.

(ii) Has the emphatic style and the emotional content been successfully preserved in the translation of novel *Mantissa* by John Fowles?

Most of the times the stylistic and emotional content was rendered successfully and at similar intensity in the Romanian target version. Even though some slight reduction of intensity could be noticed in few cases, the nature of the emotion has been preserved, whether it was contradiction, anger, disagreement, disbelief, astonishment, etc. Irony and sarcasm could also be well inferred in the speakers' tone in the translation when they were present in the source text. The inherent structural differences between English and Romanian discussed in the answer to the first research question were most of the times dealt with by the translator, who adopted a flexible and dynamic stance to the creation of the desired emphatic effect, for the expression of the same semantic but also stylistic and rhetorical values.

(iii) What solutions did the translator find in order to preserve the emphatic value and intensity in the target text when faced with structural differences between English and Romanian?

Considering that (i) there are structural differences between English and Romanian for the realization of emphasis and (ii) that the overall meaning, intention and effect have been preserved in the translation, it is clear that there have been means of compensation for the lack of formal equivalence in the manifestation of emphasis in the translation. Moreover, the translation indicates that the translator's preferences can also have a say in the options made. This is visible in the examples where similar structures as in English could have been adopted in Romanian, but others have been used instead. The explanation might lie in the translator's endeavour to produce a more natural target language version. The means of compensation or alternative solutions that have been identified in this study can be summarised as being the following ones: lexical means of compensation (mostly adverbials), repetition (for ellipsis in English), explicitation or paraphrase, punctuation marks and typographic elements (italics, capitalization) as equivalents of the prosodic stress in speaking.

6. Conclusions and Further Investigation

This study aimed at investigating the realization of emphasis in various types of sentences in English and Romanian from a translational perspective. The material set under the lens was extracted from the fictional dialogue in John Fowles' novel, *Mantissa*. The comparative examination of the examples considered representative in the English original and their translation into Romanian took account equally of the formal manifestation of emphasis and on its diverse

functional values. Moreover, focus was laid on the relation between the formal construction of elliptical sentences and their functional accomplishment.

From a conceptual and theoretical vantage point, the classifications of emphasis pertain either to the linguistic realm or to the stylistic one. This entails a separation of the formal and the functional approaches to emphasis, whereas its communicative value arises exactly from the coherent employment of both. Looking separately at the components of emphasis – the formal and the functional one – does provide insights into both language studies and contrastive studies on the one hand and into stylistics on the other. But no act of communication operates effectively apart from the relation that needs to be established between form and function. Of course, this is valid in the act of translation as well, when this relation needs to be of a comparative nature, with the ultimate aim to produce a comprehensive, natural target language version with the meaning, intentions and effect in place.

Given this observation, Swan's classification seems to lack this necessary relation and intertwining of form and function. More precisely, Swan's first category – emotive and contrastive emphasis – is of a **functional** type, whereas the other three types – pronunciation, vocabulary and structures – fall within the **formal** area of expression, referring to language means enabling the achievement of emphasis in discourse. Nevertheless, emotive and contrastive emphasis (the first category) is not complementary to the other three categories, instead it is a functional value which is achieved by means of the devices enlisted in the other three categories.

The limitations of this study derive from the fact that the investigation of emphatic devices depicted from only one novel could not possibly be all-comprising since it is strictly dependent firstly on the author's style and preferences in shaping the features of the characters. Secondly, the results of such a study are also subject to the characters' idiosyncracies. This might be the explanation for the predominant and repeated use of certain emphatic language mechanisms, while others are not present even though they are mentioned in the theory and are the same common in English as the ones the occurrence of which is repeatedly encountered. Moreover, the study of only one translation is also a matter of the translators' preferences. Therefore, a complete comparative study of emphatic devices in English and Romanian would require a sizable corpus consisting of a variety of literary texts, authors and translators. Such undertaking is worthwhile since several small-scale studies proved so rich and rewarding in findings.

Bibliography:

Arhire, Mona. "Lexical Emphasis in the Fictional Dialogue: A Translational Perspective." *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica* 11, no. 3 (2019): 105-118, https://doi.org/10.2478/ausp-2019-0029.

Bell, Roger T. *Sociolinguistics: Goals, Approaches, and Problems*, London: Batsford, 1976.

Bishop, Ryan. "There's Nothing Natural About Natural Conversation: A Look at Dialogue in Fiction and Drama." *Oral Tradition* 6, no. 1 (1991): 58–78.

Bonaffini, Luigi. "Translating Dialect Literature." *World Literature Today* 71, no. 2 (1997): 279–288.

Fowles, John. *Mantissa.* New York, Boston, London: Little, Brown and Company, 1982.

Fowles, John. *Mantisa,* Translated by Angela Jianu. Bucharest: Univers, 1995.

Fludernik, Monika. *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: The Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Gardiner, Alan. *English Language*. London: Pearson Education Limited, 2008.

Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay on Method*, Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980.

Herman, David. "Dialogue in a Discourse Context." *Narrative Inquiry* 16, no. 1 (2006): 75–84.

Holmes, Janet. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. U.K.: Longman, 2008.

Hudson, Richard. A. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: CUP, 1996.

Kinzel, Till, and Jarmila Mildorf. "New Perspectives on Imaginary Dialogues: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue." In *Imaginary Dialogues in English: Explorations in a Literary form,* edited by Till Kinzel, and Jarmila Mildorf, 9–30. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2012.

Spolsky, Bernard. *Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Swan, Michael. *Practical English Usage*, Third Edition, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Thomas, Bronwen. *Fictional Dialogue: Speech and Conversation in the Modern and Postmodern Novel*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2012.

Trudgill, Peter. *Sociolinguistics*: *An Introduction to Language and Society*. London: Penguin Books, 2000.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Basil Blackwell Inc., 2010.