

The translator's discourse and voice in Chimamanda N. Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun*

Andrea Laura Lombardo*
Universidad Nacional de La Plata

Abstract

This paper aims at exploring the nature of the Translator's discursive presence (Hermans, 1996; Schiavi, 1996; Suchet, 2013) in the novel *Half of a Yellow Sun* (2006) by the Nigerian writer Chimamanda N. Adichie (1977–). In this respect, we will focus our analysis on the examination of the translation procedures intervening in the rendering of the “original” postcolonial hybrid text into the translated Spanish version carried out by Laura Rins Calahorra (2014). Accordingly, we will approach the analysis of the translator's discourse and voice as a discursive enunciative subject in connection with the (re-)configuration of the Author discursive image or *ethos* of the original. To this end, on a theoretical level and within the field of discourse studies, we will examine Amossy's rhetorical model (1999, 2001, 2009, 2012) which draws on the idea of stereotypes or pre-existing schemes agreed upon by members of a particular community as having a crucial role in the argumentative construction of the *ethos*. Finally, on the analytical level, we seek to analyze instances of (self-)translation in the “original” text (Ashcroft *et al.*, [1989] 2002; Tymoczko, 1999; Spoturno, [2010] 2014) which exhibit forms of interlingual heterogeneity (mainly in proverbs, language change and switch of code) as well as evaluate how these forms are rendered into Spanish by the translator in discourse. Thus, the ultimate aim is to assess if the Translator's choices or shifts tend to the homogeneity or heterogeneity of the “original” text (van Leuven-Zwart, 1989; 1990) both on the micro and macrostructural level.

Keywords: translator's voice, *ethos*, interlingual heterogeneity

Introduction

Chimamanda N. Adichie (1977-) is a renowned Nigerian author, belonging to the “third generation”¹ of Igbo women writers who have raised their voice in the modern African literature to

* **Andrea Lombardo** is an English Language Teacher and Sworn Translator from the Faculty of Humanities and Educational Sciences at the National University of La Plata (UNLP). She obtained a Magister degree in Translation from the University of Belgrano in the city of Buenos Aires. She is a member of the research group *Escrituras de minorías, ethos y (auto) traducción*, in charge of Dr. María Laura Spoturno. Her research interests are African Literature, Translation Studies and Linguistics. She has participated in congresses and published a number of articles on these areas of study. At present, she is carrying out research mainly on the work of Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie. She teaches at the School of Engineering at UNLP as Adjunct Professor, at Escuela de Lenguas as Qualified Assistance Professor with part-time dedication, at a bilingual school and secondary schools in the province of Buenos Aires. Contact: andrea.lombardo19@gmail.com

SUPLEMENTO *Ideas*, I, 3 (2020), pp. 85-96

© Universidad del Salvador. Escuela de Lenguas Modernas. ISSN en trámite

¹ As Nadaswaran states, “[T]he writings of third generation Igbo women writers provide a composite portrait of Igbo women who are educated, career-oriented and strong-willed, while being wives, mothers and daughters, a combination that replaces the idea of domesticity that has long governed the stereotype of Igbo women in Nigerian literature.” (Nadaswaran, 2011)

decolonize preconceptions and challenge cultural and gender stereotypes. Within this framework, Adichie offers a new perspective of African history, women's identity, and diasporic relations which is articulated in an innovative style of narrative. She is considered the "21st century daughter of Chinua Achebe" (Uwakweh, 2010), the founding father of Nigerian literature. Her work includes three novels, *Purple Hibiscus* (2003), *Half of a Yellow Sun*² (2006), and *Americanah* (2013), and a collection of short stories, *The Thing around Your Neck* (2009). She has received numerous awards and distinctions, including the Orange Broadband Prize for Fiction (2007) for *Half of a Yellow Sun*, which has been translated in thirty seven languages.

Specific use of language in *HYS* and the construction of *ethos*

In this study, we attempt to examine the implications of the peculiar choice of language derived by the postcolonial writing practice³ that defines Adichie's narrative both as regards the configuration of the Author's *ethos* in the original English text and the re-enunciation by the Translator's *ethos* in the Spanish version. Thus, in this first part, we provide an overview of Adichie's specific use of the English language which is marked by the creative application of postcolonial strategies and which depicts her narrative as hybrid, interlingual and intercultural. In terms of language, Adichie writes mainly in Standard English which helps her achieve an international readership yet her narrative is interwoven with the vernacular Igbo language which allows her to speak about the peculiar African experience and signify *difference* within the context of a world language. This particular way of using the English language is subsumed under the umbrella of minor literatures as defined by Deleuze and Guattari ([1975] 1986).

Deleuze and Guattari ([1975] 1986) describe the language of minor literatures⁴ as consisting of a construct in which a major language (English, in the case of *HYS*) is affected by a strong deterritorialization factor and is subjected by a series of displacements carried out by a minor language (Igbo, in our case) in order to express new meanings in a new context. The primary characteristic of a minor literature involves all the ways the language is affected by this deterritorialization. The second is that everything in them is political. In minor literatures, every single individual matter is immediately connected with politics, i.e. an individual problem ends up representing the political milieu of the entire community. The third characteristic is that everything has a collective value. In effect, what is uttered does not only refer to the subject of the statement but includes all subjects in a collective arrangement of utterance. In other words, the deterritorialization of the language allows the postcolonial writer to initiate a minor use of a major language. Specifically, in *HYS*, the minor Igbo language used creatively conquers the territory of the major English language to find a new voice which defines the African idiosyncrasy. In this way, *HYS* as a minor text uses language in a creative way (as we shall see later, proverbs, code-switching or language change are among some of the postcolonial strategies employed throughout the novel to

² Subsequent reference to *Half of a Yellow Sun* will be abbreviated *HYS*.

³ It should be noted that a key feature in postcolonial writing is the creative way in which language is used. If we adhere to the terms coined by Ashcroft *et al.* ([1989] 2002), this creativity in language occurs when the English language is used innovatively as part of an *appropriation* strategy typical of postcolonial texts to fulfill specific purposes and convey *other* meanings. Or else, postcolonial writers use *abrogation* textual strategies which consist of rejecting the categories of the Standard English language and the idea that there is only one meaning "inscribed" in the words. This implies decolonizing the English language and writing with another *english*, one representing the minority languages. For a detailed account of the difference between these two textual strategies, see Ashcroft, B. *et al.* (eds.) ([1989] 2002) *The Empires Writes Back*. London and New York: Routledge. 2^o edition.

⁴ It has to be noted that the authors use the terms "major" and "minor" language not with respect to the hierarchy of the languages themselves but with reference to the fact that these are languages that a majority or a minority speak within a certain geographical context.

achieve this goal) in order to express new culturo-linguistic meanings. This means that it is not only content what matters in a minor literature but it rather begins by “expressing itself” (Deleuze and Guattari, p. 28), i.e. in the way distinctive discursive practices are exposed in the postcolonial text.

In this view, the hybridity exposed by the text creates —what Bhabha⁵ (1994) calls— a third-space of enunciation, or a space in-between two languages and two cultures where new identities emerge and old stereotypes and beliefs are dismantled in an arena of re-signifying meanings. In this new production of meaning, the *other* emerges in a discursive field defined by the minor Igbo language and culture but enclosed in the context of the major English language. Hence, *otherness* and cultural *difference* is made visible in this third-space of negotiation between two cultures and in the juxtaposition of two languages. In turn, these two languages —English and Igbo— engage in a dialogue which results in a “third code” (Bandia, 2006), or a “language in-between”: a creative *translation* from Igbo into English.

By virtue of the fact that Adichie uses features of interlingual heterogeneity in her narrative and postcolonial strategies of *appropriation* which reveal *HYS* as hybrid, intelingual and intercultural, the translation of this kind of double-voiced discourse necessarily requires different strategies from those used in the traditional western models of translation, as expressed by Bandia (2006) and Murphy (2010). In his study of postcolonial literature produced in African contexts, Bandia (2006) argues that the very own characteristics of these texts make African literature create innovative practices and, on account of this, he chooses to refer to this hybrid writing style as “translation as a metaphor”. By analogy to Bhabha’s notion of third space, Bandia (2006) coins the expression “third code”. In other words, he regards translation as a metaphor of transportation and relocation, a “carrying across physical, cultural or linguistic boundaries from a minor language and culture into a hegemonic one” (2006: 4). Consequently, not only does a *creative translation* need to transfer the linguistic and cultural meanings but it has to recreate the cadence and rhythm of the “in-between” language or “third code” (Bandia, 2006) with which they are written and, at the same time, allude to the presence of the *other* in discourse. In a similar vein, Berman (1985) has early maintained that postcolonial writing involves “the work on the signifier” or “word for word translation”, considered vital to the creation of a “third space”, a space of one’s own, a space to inscribe one’s identity and find one’s own voice within a global literary structure. In a complementary fashion, Murphy (2010) clarifies that the strategies employed should draw attention to the *difference* in the translated text without boasting about *the different*. To put it simply, the translation of heterogeneity in *HYS* should reflect the *creative translation* of English-Igbo of the “original”, transforming it into Spanish-Igbo in the translated text.

As indicated previously, the aim of this study is to explore the nature of the Translator’s discursive presence (Hermans, 1996; Schiavi, 1996; Suchet, 2013) in *HYS* focusing our analysis on the examination of the translation procedures intervening in the rendering of the “original” postcolonial hybrid text into the translated Spanish version carried out by Laura Rins Calahorra (2014). Accordingly, we will turn to the notion of *ethos* as paramount to analyze the Author’s image in discourse and how this is rendered in the translated text by Calahorra (2014) to build the Translator’s *ethos*.

In her attempt to delimit the notion of *ethos*, Amossy (1999, 2001, 2009, 2012) provides an integrated rhetorical model building up on the contributions of disciplines such as rhetoric

⁵ For Bhabha (1994), hybridity emerges from reinscribing the past and relocating it in a hybrid new third space of enunciation where the representation of cultural *difference* is positioned in-between the colonizer and colonized.

(Aristotle's art of persuasion⁶), sociology (in the case of Bourdieu's theory of language and power⁷), and the pragmatics-semantics perspective adopted by Ducrot⁸ (1984) in the context of his theory of polyphony⁹ which identifies the configuration of the *ethos* inside the verbal exchange. For Ducrot (1984), within discourse and even in an utterance there might be a plurality of voices speaking simultaneously. In effect, he distinguishes between different enunciative subjects in discourse: the *locuteur* "as such" (L) who assumes the responsibility for enunciation and is designated as "being of discourse", *locuteur lambda* (λ) or "Locuteur as being in discourse" only accessible through L, and the *enunciators* (E), i.e. the points of view introduced in discourse by the *locuteur* and with which the *locuteur* may or may not be identified. As Amossy (2001) points out, in his theory of polyphony, Ducrot illustrates the difference between the speaker (*locuteur*), to whom is imputed the responsibility for the utterance and to whom the *ethos* is attached, and the empirical author, who has produced it and is designated as being in the world. Yet, it should be made clear that this figure lies beyond the scope of Ducrot's study. Furthering the analysis of *ethos*, Maingueneau (1999) focuses on the image of the self the speaker builds in discourse as being determined by what he calls "the scene of utterance". This scene of utterance includes three complementary dimensions: the *global scene* (the type of discourse chosen by the speaker), the *generic scene* (attached to a gender as a discursive institution) and the *scenography*, designating a pre-existing scenario the speaker freely selects for the text. Thus, while the pragmatists' *ethos* constructed is purely internal to discourse and the sociologists' *ethos* is mainly inscribed in a symbolic exchange governed by external institutional positions, Amossy's model for the construction of *ethos* is characterized by the notion of stereotype as playing a crucial role in fashioning the image of self. She maintains that in order to be recognized by the audience, the speaker and the audience have to be bound up with a *doxa*, linked to a shared representation or a fixed collective schema so as to gain argumentative authority. For her, the institutional status of the writer as "being in the world" and the verbal construction of the speaker (or *locuteur*) as "discursive subject", far from being incompatible, overlap and strengthen one another. In this sense, she claims that the efficiency of speech is neither purely external nor purely or solely internal to discourse. Amossy (1999, 2012) concludes that the image of the Author is materialized in the literary text by an array of implicit beliefs, assumed stereotypes or pre-existing schemes held by members of a community, by the tone and style of writing as well as by the linguistic and encyclopedic competence of the speakers (or *locuteurs*).

In *HYS*, the *doxa* would be represented by the general opinions and beliefs associated with the Africans, the Biafran war and the African modern women which set collective patterns of reasoning between speaker and audience, or rather, between the Author as a discursive figure and the readers. In particular, we intend to determine whether the Author's *ethos* contributes to unveil the doxological layers upon which beliefs and pre-existing schemas are built by adopting a particular viewpoint in discourse. Moreover, as we have already described, *HYS* exhibits interlingual, hybrid and intercultural patterns of language which create an image of self by the Author who takes a discursive

⁶ In Aristotle's terms, *ethos* designates the image of self built by the orator in his speech in order to exert an influence on his audience. This image is produced by a manner of speech rather than by its message: the orator does not claim his sincerity but speaks in such a way that his sincerity appears to the audience. Apart from *ethos*, the other two proofs are *logos*, referring to both discourse and reason, and *pathos*, meaning the emotion aroused in the audience.

⁷ As Amossy (2001) states, for Bourdieu (1991), the power of words derives from the connection between the social function of the speaker and his discourse. The notion of *ethos* is composed of the exterior authority enjoyed by the speaker and legitimated by their religious, political, intellectual or literary positions.

⁸ Ducrot (1984) defines *ethos* as a discursive phenomenon not to be confused with the social status of the empirical subject.

⁹ Polyphony, as defined by Ducrot (1984), means the presence and interaction of different voices in discourse even in the context of the same utterance.

stance on the text. In this ideological viewpoint, alterity is acknowledged in the Author's positioning with respect to the visibility of *other* discourses and the emergence of certain doxological assumptions. Another aspect to be considered in the construction of the image of self is that the Author may decide to translate, explain or expand the meaning of these unfamiliar features of heterogeneity (Tymoczko, 1999), mark them typographically on the discourse (through the use of inverted commas, glossing, quotations or italics, in direct or indirect speech), leave them unmarked diluting the *other's* presence in discourse (Authier-Revuz¹⁰, 1984) or provide a self-translation. Each decision inevitably ensue a consequence and, most importantly, constructs a specific image of self. Indeed, this set of features allows for the projection of an image of the enunciative subject which lays the basis for the expression and consolidation of *other* meanings and, at the same time, may encourage the demystification of certain stereotypes. To put it differently, in *HYS* the construction of the image of Author assures enunciative authority, efficiency and credibility in discourse as regards the visibility of heterogeneity to deconstruct long-standing beliefs and assert *otherness*.

The Translator's *ethos* as a (re-)configuration of the Author's image

Among the many critics that have been concerned about the need to incorporate the figure of the translator in the discussion of translated narratives since Venuti's claim to produce foreignized texts and his adherence to the visibility of the translator, we should mention Schiavi (1996) and Hermans (1996) whose essays were written in parallel. Within the field of narratology, Schiavi (1996) locates the Translator's presence as a counterpart to the notion of Implied Author¹¹ with respect to the strategies chosen and in the way they position themselves in relation to the translated narrative. For Schiavi, "the Translator negotiates and intercepts the communication and transmits it —re-processed— to the new reader who will receive the message" (1996: 15). By interpreting the original text, by following certain norms, and by adopting specific strategies and methods, the translator, according to Schiavi, "builds up a new [...] relationship between what we must call a 'translated text' and a new group of readers" (1996: 7). Schiavi points out that the translator's voice is "in part standing in for the Author's and in part autonomous" (1996: 2). As for Hermans (1996), he locates the Translator's presence mainly on paratextual interventions as an index of a second voice, different from the original's, co-producing the discourse through the use of notes, explanations or background information. He coincides with Schiavi in that the Translator's presence depends on the translation strategy adopted and on the consistency with which it has been carried out. However, he highlights the importance of asserting the plurivocality of discourse in translation by destabilizing and decentering the speaking subject and producing hybrid, plural translated texts. Furthering the discussion, Suchet's (2013) contribution is significant since although she accords with Schiavi (1996) that there must be a "Translator's narrator" distinct from the Author's in a translated text, she disagrees in naming this as "implied" because, as she states, implied instances are voiceless and not a single text is voiceless. Suchet (2013) argues that, in the case of translated texts, *ethos* is not attached to one speaker but characterizes an attitude of a "spokesperson" —in her own terms— towards the speaker they are representing and the represented speech. As she maintains, the *ethos* co-constructed by the reader and the translator gives a specific tone to the translation that does not correspond to any "real" voice beyond the text. She concludes that the voice we hear in a translation

¹⁰ Authier-Revuz (1984) defines unmarked revealed heterogeneity as manifesting itself in discourses in which there is no readily delimited frontier between the *one* and the *other*. Free indirect speech, irony, antiphrasis, imitation, allusion, pastiche, reminiscence, and stereotype are informed examples of this kind of heterogeneity.

¹¹ It has to be stated that Schiavi (1996) follows the narratological model of communication and the notion of "Implied reader" developed by Booth and Chatman (1978). For a detailed account of this model, see: Chatman, S. (1978): *Story and Discourse. Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.

did not exist in the source text. In accordance with Bandia (2006) and Rodríguez Murphy (2010), Suchet (2009) considers that the hybridity that defines postcolonial texts necessarily requires new models of translation. In particular, she believes that the notion of *ethos* permits the characterization of translation as discursive strategies and a re-enunciation of the original which becomes indicative of a certain ideological stance of the Translator.

Features of heterogeneity in *HYS*

We will now explore the enunciative procedures displayed in the original and in the translated Spanish version of *HYS* so as to account for the image of self created by the Author and further evaluate if the Translator's re-enunciation of *ethos* tends to heterogeneity of the original or removes all traces of *difference* from the translated text and tends to homogeneity making the language and culture accessible to the Spanish reader by denying alterity or transforming it (van Leuven-Zwart, 1989; 1990).

The novel tells the story of the impact of the Biafran war (1967-1970) on civilians' lives. Adichie as Author presents the pitfalls of the war through the eyes of different characters, providing a patchwork description of the events narrated. Kainene and Olanna are two middle-class women who have received European education and are representative of diasporic language. They are educated, career-oriented and strong-willed, a combination that replaces the idea of domesticity that has long governed the stereotype of Igbo women in Nigerian literature, as expressed by Nadaswaran (2011). Ugwu, Igbo-born and uneducated starts his schooling when he goes to Nsukka to work as a houseboy for Odenigbo, a wealthy university professor. Odenigbo also writes newspaper articles about African socialism and his voice is heard about colonial oppression. Richard is a white Englishman who lives in Nigeria and learns Igbo and loves Igbo culture. He very often writes articles about the suffering of the Biafran people and is an ardent supporter of the Biafran cause. As we can notice, the variety of characters and viewpoints in the narration assure a plurality of voices which is also replicated in the language they employ. In turn, the register used, the selection of words, the grammatical structures and the speech reproduction (direct, indirect, or free), the recurrence of code-switching (English-Igbo and Igbo-English) and code-mixing are part of the Author's discursive strategies to signify *otherness* and *difference*. However, these forms of heterogeneity do not only manifest themselves on the linguistic micro-structural level but are also present on the macro-structural level of analysis. Heterogeneity is also conveyed through the relation between diverse narratives, the co-existence of certain genres (formal written discourses –characteristic of the English language– and informal oral discourses –typical of the minor language), or embedded formal genres which appeal to the impartiality in the narration of events from within and from the standpoint of an Igbo-born (such as the historical essay "The Book" or "The World Was Silent When we Died", which is integrated in the main narrative and generally appears at the end of each chapter, is later revealed as Ugwu's reflections on the political turmoil of the time). The use of flashback techniques, the demystification of stereotypes (seen in the performative role of women, lovingly tormented men, the Biafran war retold by Igbo-born people) are intermingled with features of orality representative of the Igbo language and culture such as songs, proverbs, onomatopoeia, interjections, and forms of address.

In brief, the Author and the Translator as discursive subjects project a given image in discourse through this set of enunciative procedures. Both on the micro- and macro-structural level, the *ethos* projected assures an heterogeneity of voices, viewpoints, languages and cultures which are replicated, with varying degrees, in the translated text.

Code-switching and code-mixing

As Ashcroft *et al* ([1989] 2002) have pointed out, code-switching is one of the most common strategies of linguistic variant that inscribes alterity and installs cultural distinctiveness. Tymoczko (1999) goes on to argue that these textual strategies used by the postcolonial authors not only mediate culture but language, “as they grapple with linguistic interface and intercedes between languages” (1999: 149). Following Tymoczko (1999), imported or borrowed words further bring linguistic polyvalence and are the primary vehicles for inserting meaning from a colonized people’s native language into a text written in the colonizers’ major language.

So, in reference to the postcolonial strategies used, such as code-switching and code-mixing, the Translator re-enacts the *other* culture by integrating the words in the context of the major language or by mixing the two linguistic systems in the context of the same utterance as has been done by the Author. We can thus state that heterogeneity is preserved and recreated in the translated text.

“Good afternoon, sah! This is the child,” Ugwu’s aunty said. (...)

“The houseboy, sah.”

“Oh, yes, you have brought the houseboy. *I kpotago ya.*” (HYS, p.15)

— Buenas tardes, *sah*. Éste es el chico — lo presentó la tía.

— ¿El chico?

— El criado, *sah*.

— Ah, claro, me ha traído al criado. *I kpotago ya.* (MSA, p.8)

“*Kedu afa gi?* What’s your name?” Master asked, startling him [Ugwu]. (HYS, p. 15)

— *Kedu afa gi?* ¿Cómo te llamas? — le preguntó el señor sobresaltándolo. (MSA, p. 9)

“Do you want some bread?” Ugwu asked another man nearby, who sat hunched. “*I choro bread?*” (HYS, p. 103)

— ¿Quiere un poco de pan? — le preguntó a otro hombre que estaba sentado cerca, con el cuerpo encorvado—. *I choro pan?* (MSA, p. 136)

As regards typographically marked and unmarked lexicon, this is at times reproduced in the same manner as in the original with a few mismatched variants among all the examples. Non-translatable Igbo expressions, glossing, words referring to food, superstitions and festivals as well as Igbo songs are left untranslated in the Spanish version by Calahorra (2016). In this case, we can thus state that she tends to preserve heterogeneity. Nonetheless, the major instance of homogeneity in the translated text is produced by the rendering of onomatopoeia sounds. The Translator decides to decode these sounds by providing a functional equivalent verb or noun in the target language, erasing the traces of the original Igbo sounds and obliterating the *other*’s presence in the translated discourse. However, the strategies adopted for the rendering of onomatopoeia are not consistent throughout the whole narrative.

Non-translatable Igbo expressions

“I told Master you will learn everything fast, *osiso-osiso*,” his aunty said. (HYS, p.14)

— Le dije al señor que lo aprenderías todo muy deprisa, *osiso-osiso* — lo alabó su tía. (MSA, p.7)

Glossing

“My children have asthma. Three have died since the war started. Three are left.”

“Sorry.*Ndo*,” Olanna said. (HYS, p. 225)

Mis niños tienen asma. Ya se me han muerto tres desde que empezó la guerra. Y me quedan tres más.

—Lo siento. *Ndo* —respondió Olanna. (MSA, p. 298)

Words referring to food and festivals

His mother would be preparing the evening meal now, pounding *akpu* in the mortar (HYS, p. 16)

A aquellas horas su madre debía de estar preparando la cena, machacando *akpu* con la mano del mortero sujeta muy fuerte entre las suyas. (MSA, p. 11)

They were opportunities to find her bent over, fanning the firewood or chopping *ugu* leaves for her mother's soup pot. (HYS, p. 17)

Siempre representaban una oportunidad de encontrarla agachada, bien avivando el fuego, bien cortando hojas de *ugu* para el caldo que hacía su madre... (MSA, p. 12)

His grand-mother had not needed to grow her favourite herbs, *arigbe*, because it grew wild everywhere. (HYS, p. 21)

Su abuela no tenía necesidad de plantar *arigbe*, su hierba favorita, porque crecía en estado silvestre por todas partes. (MSA, p. 18)

moi-moi (HYS, p. 64)

chicken boiled with *uziza* (HYS, p. 64)

ori-okpa festival (HYS, p. 65)

moi-moi (MSA, p. 83)

el pollo hervido con *uziza* (MSA,

el festival *ori-okpa* (MSA, p.83)

Superstitions

the *mmuo* (Mr. Richard said they were masquerades, weren't they, and Ugwu agreed, as long as masquerades meant spirits) paraded the village, flogged young men, and chased after young women. (HYS, p. 65)

los *mmuo* (a los que el señor Richard llamaba «enmascarados», término que Ugwu aceptaba si se refería a «espíritus») danzaban por las calles azotando a los jóvenes y persiguiendo a las muchachas. (MSA, p.84)

Song

Caritas, thank you,
Caritas si anyi taba okporoko
na kwashiorkor ga-ana. (HYS, p. 198)

Caritas, gracias,
Caritas si anyi taba okporoko
na kwashiorkor ga-ana. (MSA, p. 260)

Onomatopoeia

His aunty walked faster, her slippers making *slap-slap* sounds that echoed in the silent street. (HYS, p.1)

Su tía apresuró el paso; el ruido de sus zapatillas resonaba en el silencio de la calle. (MSA, p.7)

Gom-gom-gom. "There will be a meeting of all Abba tomorrow at four p.m. in Amaeze Square!" *Gom-gom-gom.* "Abba has said that every man and every woman must attend!" *Gom-gom-gom.* (HYS, p.134)

—¡Mañana, reunión en Aba a las cuatro de la tarde, en la plaza Amaeze! —
¡Pum! ¡Pum! ¡Pum! —. ¡Mañana, reunión en Aba a las cuatro de la tarde, en la plaza
Amaeze! —¡Pum! ¡Pum! ¡Pum! —. (MSA, p.175)

The air was so still that, as they climbed out of the bunker, they could hear the *caw-caw-caw* of some birds far off. (...) The swift roar of planes and the sharp *ka-ka-ka* of antiaircraft gunfire came from above (HYS, p.192)

En el ambiente reinaba tal tranquilidad que al salir del refugio oyeron el canto lejano de unos pájaros. (...) El estruendo de los aviones y el sonido estridente del fuego antiaéreo le llegaba de arriba. (MSA, p. 252-253)

Proverbs

With respect to proverbs, we have to say that these double-voiced expressions involve a literal translation from Igbo to English first and then from Igbo-English to Spanish in what Tymoczko (1999) defines as evidence of intralingual translation. Similarly, Berman (1985) has referred to this discursive procedure as entailing “a work on the signifiers”. This foreignizing strategy rendering the words literally lets the *other* language and culture be visible in the original as well as in the translated text. This creativity in language also involves an operation of deterritorialization (Deleuze and Guattari, [1975] 1986), in that the minor language is made visible through the semantic content but is encapsulated in the morpho-syntactic and lexical form of the major language. Besides, following Spoturno ([2010] 2014), since proverbs in postcolonial texts evoke two layers of meanings representing the major language and culture on the morpho-syntactic level and echoing the minor language and culture on the semantic level, they confront the reader with the challenge of becoming aware of the existence of these two idiosyncrasies and, may it be recognized, decoding them properly. In the Spanish version heterogeneity is recreated by providing a literal translation in Berman’s terms, by recreating the *letter* of the foreign culture and language and also by reproducing the third code in Bandia’s terms.

“He who brings the kola nut brings life. You and yours will live, and I and mine will live. Let the eagle perch and let the dove perch and, if either decrees that the other not perch, it will not be well for him. May God bless this kola in Jesus’ name.” (HYS, p. 118)

—El que trae nuez de cola trae vida. Usted y los suyos vivirán, y los míos y yo también. Deja que el águila se pose en lo alto, deja que la paloma se pose también, y si uno de ellos no permite al otro hacerlo, no conocerá el bien. Que Dios bendiga esta cola en nombre de Jesús. (MSA, p. 154)

“Grandpapa used to say, about difficulties he had gone through, ‘It did not kill me, it made me knowledgeable.’ *O gburo m egbu, o mee ka m malu ife.*” (HYS, p. 238)

—El abuelo solía decir, acerca de las dificultades por las que tuvo que pasar: «Si no me matan, me harán más sabio». *Ogburo megbu, o mee ka m malu ife.* (MSA, p. 317)

Conclusion

We may conclude that the translated *ethos* produced by the Spanish version is neither authoritative nor assertive in the intent on re-writing the original. Rather, the Translator’s discourse and voice (Schiavi, 1996; Hermans, 1996) seems to pursue mediation through the re-enunciation or re-configuration of the Author’s *ethos* in the Spanish language (Suchet, 2013). In reference to the postcolonial strategies used, the Translator re-enacts the *other* culture by integrating the *other’s* language in the context of the major language in the same way as has been done by the Author.

As for the proverbs that appear in the novel, they involve a literal translation from Igbo to English first and then from Igbo-English to Spanish in what Berman (1985) calls “a work on the signifiers”. The concepts of “original” and “translation” are thus blurred and intermingled. In this sense, Adichie-Author becomes a Translator and the original proverb also implies a literal translation from Igbo to English. Likewise, Calahorra-Translator becomes an Author in that she reinscribes the same meaning of *otherness* in the Spanish language by re-writing the “original translated proverb” in a form that echoes Igbo-Spanish in the target language. In effect, both the Author and the Translator make use of this foreignizing strategy which lets the *other* language and culture be visible in either the “original” or the “translated” text.

Without overlooking the fact that the *other's* presence is a little transformed in some cases, the Translator, as a discursive subject, does not deny *otherness*. Yet, there is not steady consistency in the strategies adopted for certain enunciative procedures in discourse. Specifically, there are many instances of homogeneity (van Leuven-Zwart, 1989; 1990) and a need to clarify the content of unfamiliar words or untranslatable forms of the Igbo language to the reader of the translation. On the whole, however, evidence shows that there is no intention to reduce heterogeneity.

In short, the Translator's presence does not disrupt the text by incorporating background information or complementary notes (Hermans, 1996). Rather, the Translator's *ethos* replicates the oral language (Rodríguez Murphy, 2010), reflects the creative and innovative style of the Author's narrative as well as it recreates the rhythm and cadence of the Igbo language, ensuring a hybrid, plurality of voices.

References

- Adichie, C. N. (2006) *Half of a Yellow Sun*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Adichie, C. N. (2014) *Medio Sol Amarillo*. Translated by Laura Rins Calahorra. Barcelona: Literatura Random House.
- Amossy, R. (ed.) (1999) *Images de soi dans le discours. La construction de l'ethos*. Lausana: Delachaux and Niestlé.
- Amossy, R. (2001) “Ethos at the Crossroads of Disciplines: Rhetoric, Pragmatics, Sociology”. In: *Poetics Today*, 22:1.
- Amossy, R. (2009) “La double nature de l'image d'auteur”. In: *Argumentation et Analyse du Discours* 3: 1-13, <http://aad.revues.org/662>.
- Amossy, R. (2012) *L'argumentation dans le discours*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Ashcroft, B. et al. (eds.) ([1989] 2002) *The Empires Writes Back*. London and New York: Routledge. 2^o edition.
- Authier-Revuz, J. (1984) “Hétérogénéité(s) énonciative(s)”. In: *Langages*, n°73. Les Plans d'Énonciation, directed by Laurent Danon-Boileau. pp. 98-111.
- Bandia, P. (2006) “African Europhone Literature and Writing as Translation. Some Ethical Issues”. In: Hermans, T. (ed.) *Translating Others*. Manchester- Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing, pp. 349-361.
- Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Berman, A. (1985) “Translation and the Trials of the Foreign”. In: Venuti, L. (ed.) ([2000] 2004) *The Translation Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, pp. 284-297.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*, translated by G. Raymond and M. Adamson, edited and introduced by John B. Thompson. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. ([1975] 1986) (translated by Dana Polan) *Kafka. Toward a Minor Literature*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hermans, T. (1996) “The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative”. In: *Target*, 8:1, pp. 23-48.

- Maingueneau, D. (1999) "Ethos, scénographie, incorporation". In: Amossy, R. *Images de soi dans le discours. La construction de l'éthos*. Paris: Delachaux and Niestlé, 75-100.
- Nadaswaran, S. (2011) "Rethinking Family Relationships In Third-Generation Nigerian Women's Fiction". In: *Relief*, 5 (1).
- Rodríguez Murphy, E. (2010) "Traducir la diferencia a través del tercer código *Things Fall Apart* en España". In: *Sendebarr: Revista de la Facultad de Traducción e Interpretación*, N° 21, pp. 59-89.
- Schiavi, G. (1996) "There is Always a Teller in a Tale". In: *Target*, 8:1. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 1-21.
- Spoturno, M.L. ([2010] 2014) *Un elixir de la palabra. Heterogeneidad interlingüe en la narrativa de Sandra Cisneros*. Doctoral dissertation, Universidad Nacional de La Plata. Memoria académica, FaHCE, UNLP. Retrieved from: <<http://www.memoria.fahce.unlp.edu.ar/tesis/te.354/te.354.pdf>>
- Suchet, M. (2009) "Translating literary heterolingualism: *Hijo de hombre's* French variations". In: *Translation Research Projects 2*, edited by Anthony Pym and Alexander Perekrestenko. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, pp. 151-164.
- Suchet, M. (2013) "Voice, Tone and Ethos: A Portrait of the Translator as a Spokesperson". In: *La traduction des voix intra-textuelles / Intratextual voices in translation*, edited by Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov, Myriam Suchet. York: Vita Traductiva, pp. 159-184.
- Tymoczko, M. (1999) "Postcolonial writing and literary translation". In: Bassnett S. and Trivedi H. (eds.) *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge. pp.19-40.
- Uwakweh, P. (2010) "Breaking Gods. The Narrator as Revelator and Critic of the Postcolonial Condition in *Purple Hibiscus*." In: *Emerging African Voices. A Study of Contemporary African Literature*. Ed. Walter P. Collins. Amherst/ New York: Cambria Press. 53-74. Print.
- van Leuven-Zwart, K. M. (1989) "Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities, I". In: *Target* 1:2, pp.151-181.
- van Leuven-Zwart, K. M. (1990) "Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities, II". In: *Target* 2:1, pp. 69-95.

