American Parmigiano and the Translator's Visibility

VALENTINA MANIACCO
Griffith University

Abstract

In this paper I compare two English translations of Wu Ming's Italian short story *American Parmigiano* (2008). I seek to demonstrate that the translators can be made visible in their work. My premise is: while a careful analysis of any translation can render the translator visible, a comparison of two translators' work is able to provide a particular insight into an individual translator's style. N.S. Thompson's translation, *American Parmesan* (2013) and my own translation, *American Parmigiano* (2016) are discussed through a lens of the translation strategies foreignization, domestication and explicitation. They are then further explored via a detailed analysis of some components of style – the translator's style, not the style of the original author. In this case the components examined are swear words, contrasting word choices and degree of formality. I argue that the translators are visible because of their translation choices and this comparison has made that identification possible.

Introduction

In *The Translator's Invisibility* (1995/2008), Lawrence Venuti contested the then prevailing view that an 'acceptable' translation must read fluently, appearing as if it is not a translation but an original, with the translator rendered "invisible" (1). While his discussion focused on the so-called "fluency ideal" and he argues that translators should resist this temptation (Wagner and Chesterman, 33) my interest is the question of visibility. However fluent a translation, is the translator ever really invisible? If, as Rita Wilson suggests, all translations are the product of the translator's "interpretative perspective", then "the translator as interpreter **should** become visible in the translation" (emphasis is mine, 121). While a careful analysis of *any* translation can render the translator visible, a comparison is able to provide a particular insight into an individual translator's style.

 American Parmigiano is a short story of approximately 12,350 words by the Italian collective Wu Ming. Wu Ming was born out of an anonymous collective called the Luther Blisset Project, which was retired in 1999. Founded in Bologna in 2000 as a group of five, they are a writing collective of Italian artists. In 2015, they became a group of three. They prefer to remain somewhat anonymous, and while their individual names are known, they choose not to be photographed or filmed by the media as they object to the "celebrity-making, glamorizing machine that turns authors into stars" (Baird 250; Thoburn 124). The group is interesting because they write as a collective and after a period of marketing, they make their work publicly available online, using a Creative Commons License. They appear to have consistent and recurring themes to their stories and, as Baird observed, they use the "spaces left empty" in history to create their imaginative fiction (255).

 American Parmigiano was first published in 2008 as a supplement in the Italian newspaper *Corriere della Sera*. The story revolves around an Italian researcher, who is asked to investigate claims that Benjamin Franklin had successfully imported into America, not only a recipe, but the raw materials and the know-how for making parmesan cheese. What is at stake is the right to use the Italian name *Parmigiano Reggiano,* which a large American dairy

company is attempting to appropriate. The name not only encapsulates the place of origin (the province of Reggio Emilia), but in Europe is controlled under the European Union's Protected Designation of Origin scheme (DOC). The story incorporates real historic events and people, and through the eyes of the narrator and central character (Carlo Bonvicini) explores themes of national pride, the protection of brands, the phenomenon of the brain drain, heroism and a comparison of two cultures, hence the bi-lingual title *American Parmigiano*.

The story was first translated from Italian into English by N.S. Thompson in 2013 and published in the book, *Outsiders: Six Italian stories* (Saviano et al.). There is very little information available on N.S. Thompson, although I discovered that he is an experienced English translator, poet and writer. Smokestack Books, the publisher of his book, *Letter to Auden*, has the following information on its website:

> N. S. Thompson was born in Manchester in 1950. He worked in Italy for several years as the curator of Casa Guidi, the Florence home of Robert and Elizabeth Barrett Browning. His publications include *Chaucer, Boccaccio and the Debate of Love*, several chapbooks of poetry and a full-length collection, *The Home Front*.
>
> <div align="right">(Smokestack Books, 2014)</div>

Thompson is also a regular contributor to *Able Muse*, an American literary journal and its website provides the following:

> N.S. Thompson lives outside Oxford, UK. He has contributed essays and poetry to *Able Muse* and many other publications in the UK and USA, including *Agenda, Ambit, Modern Poetry in Translation, New Walk, Stand,* and *The American Scholar.* His books include the verse epistle in rime royal *Letter to Auden* (Smokestack, 2010) and he has coedited a collection of fifteen cantos in ottava rima chronicling the lively adventures of a twenty-first century version of Byron's hero: *A Modern Don Juan: Cantos for these Times by Divers Hands*
>
> <div align="right">(Five Leaves, September 2014).</div>

My interest was piqued when I saw that the title had been translated as *American Parmesan*. At the time, I did not have access to Thompson's translation, only the title (available on the publisher's website). Given the source text (ST) title has one word in English and one word in Italian, I questioned Thompson's choice of target text title (TT). In my view, the ST title in two languages captured perfectly the essence of a story that bridges two cultures and comments on the differences. It led me to ponder Thompson's other translation choices. Leading me to consider translating the story myself, choosing to maintain the original title.

My approach (or 'skopos', as discussed below) was to render a version that was as close as possible to the original story as I had interpreted it. In the back of my mind was Andrew Chesterman's hypothesis that translators "tend to start from a literal version of the target text and then work towards a freer version" (23). My intention was to try to refrain from being 'too free'. As Umberto Eco states, "there is an implicit law, that is, the ethical obligation to respect what the author has written" (3). My process involved multiple drafts incorporating feedback from various readers. These were colleagues and friends, some only read my English version while others also read the original text. At the same time, I kept a journal of the difficulties encountered and the internal debates and negotiations involved in the problem solving that the translation required. While the challenges encountered would provide considerable material for discussion, it was the comparison to N. S. Thompson's version, which I first read after I had completed mine, that I found far more revealing – and will be the focus of this paper. Through a lens of translation strategies such as foreignization and domestication ("The Translator's Invisibility", 15) and explicitation (in Baker and Saldanha 104), and an examination of the swear words, contrasting word choices and degree of formality, I will

highlight some of the differences between the two translations which, in my view, make the translators visible.

However, prior to making any comparison there are two overarching considerations. Firstly, I am a second generation Australian. As such, I consider my translation to be an Australian English version and from what I know of Thompson, I have assumed his translation is into British English. We both bring our own "cultural capital" to bear – a term borrowed from Pierre Bourdieu's concept of 'habitus', "which is the broad social, identitary and cognitive make-up or disposition of the individual" (Munday 237). In other words, culture, upbringing, education, financial status and environment are among the things that have a bearing on a translator's work. Hence, my translation will inadvertently reflect the fact that I grew up in Australia and Thompson's, in turn, would reflect his English upbringing, in other words our backgrounds influence and are apparent in our work (this will be discussed further under 'Style'). Although, with the little information I have on Thompson, I must refrain from commenting further on his background. Secondly, Thompson's translation was destined for publication whereas mine was an academic exercise. Therefore, our skopoi, from the Greek meaning 'purpose', also has a bearing on our work. Skopos theory was first adopted by Hans Vermeer, in 1978, to reflect the shift away from linguistic approaches to translation, to a more functional approach, taking into consideration the audience of a translated text and the agent who commissions it (in Baker 235). As already mentioned, the purpose of my translation was a purely academic pursuit. It was only after the fact that Wu Ming published it, unchanged, on their website. The reason for including an English version on their site, along with translations into other languages, follows their ethos of making their work freely available after a period of time. One could argue mine was a general Anglophone approach, as I was not bound by publishing or editorial guidelines and my hope, once it was published, was that it could be read by any English language reader. On the other hand, I can surmise that Thompson's skopos was determined by his publisher, that his audience would, at least initially, have been a British one (given his publisher is London based, MacLehose Press). While changes requested by the publishing house and/or editor may have had a bearing on the TT, in an email correspondence Thompson confirmed that "there was minimal editorial change … perhaps the odd word here and there, nothing more". Hence, one could argue that our differing purposes had some influence on our work.

Translation strategy
Venuti gave us the terms "foreignization" and "domestication" ("The Translator's Invisibility" 15), which he developed from Friedrich Schleiermacher's dichotomy; that "[…] either the translator leaves the author alone as much as possible and moves the reader towards the writer, or he leaves the reader alone as much as possible and moves the writer towards the reader" ([1813], 49). A strategy of domestication means that the translator endeavours to produce a text that is fluent in the target language without any trace of what might indicate that it is a translated work and not itself an original. A domesticated translation is more adapted to the target culture, with traces of what is foreign minimized so that the reader can more easily relate to the text. On the other hand, foreignization means that the translator has chosen to retain elements which clearly identify the fact that the work is a translation and not an original text. The reader is more exposed to the foreign culture including elements they may not understand (Venuti, "The Translator's Invisibility" 15-16; Yang 77). While not wanting to reduce the careful negotiations made in rendering our different versions to a dichotomy of foreignization and domestication, they are opposite ends of a continuum and were useful in demonstrating mine and Thompson's differing strategies (Baker, "Reframing Conflict" 152). These can, for example, be evident through my examination of our treatment of honorific titles as seen in the examples provided in Table 1 below. The following examples are taken from the beginning of

the story, when Carlo Bonvicini (the narrator and protagonist) is escorted to a meeting by the receptionist.

Table 1: Comparison of honorific titles

Source Text (ST)	Target Text 1 (TT1) Thompson	Target Text 2 (TT2) Maniacco
- Venga, dottor Bonvicini, … (2)	"This way, Dottor Bonvicini, … " (152)	"Come through, Dr Bonvicini, … " (3)
- L'avvocato ci stava dicendo proprio adesso che il professor Lolli gli ha parlato molto bene di lei, dottor Bonvicini. (2)	"Avvocato Melchiorri was just telling us that Professore Lolli speaks very highly of you, Dottor Bonvicini." (153)	"Our lawyer was just telling us that Professor Lolli has spoken very highly of you, Dr Bonvicini." (3)
Lancio un'occhiata all'avvocato Melchiorri, piuttosto incartapecorito, … (3)	I shoot a glance at Avvocato Melchiorri's rather wizened features, … (154)	I throw a glance at Melchiorri, he's rather shrivelled, … (4)
- Prego, avvocato. (3)	"Please, avvocato, go ahead." (155)	"Please, Mr Melchiorri. (5)"

In Italy, the use of honorific titles is commonplace and professionals are often addressed with, and referred to by, a combination of their professional title and their surname, or just the title. For example, the professional titles *avvocato* (lawyer), *ingegner* (engineer), *architetto* (architect) and *ragionier* (accountant) often precede a person's surname, if that person is so qualified, and *dottor* is used for anyone who has a degree. The use of honorific titles in Italy is to "convey respect, demonstrate recognition of hierarchies and social positions (inferior, equal, superior), and express an attitude towards power" (Caniato et al. 182-184). Thompson has chosen to carry across the Italian honorific titles *Dottor*, *Avvocato*, *Professore*, as they appear in the original text, treating them as if part of the addressee's name. He has even included the final letter 'e' in *Professore* which would normally be dropped in front of a name in Italian, as it is in Wu Ming's text. I assume this is to ensure that his readership does not mistake this Italian *Professore* for an English Professor. Given their surnames, and the context, there can be no doubt the characters Thompson is portraying are Italian. Therefore, it is clear that his use of the Italian honorific titles reflects a foreignization strategy.

The form of address where a person's profession is evidenced by their title does not exist to the same extent in most English speaking countries. Medical practitioners and those who have completed a university doctorate can use the title 'Dr' and university professors can use the title 'Professor' (Peters, "The Cambridge Australian English" 291-293; Peters, "The Cambridge Guide to English" 216). Certainly, the use of a title such as lawyer does not exist in Australia. As can be seen in Table 1, my strategy was one of domestication. *Dottor* becomes Dr and *Professore* becomes Professor, while *Avvocato* required particular attention. In some of the dialogue, I have used the words our lawyer, or Mr Melchiorri, to render the formality of the interaction. However, when the honorific is part of the general narration, I have dropped the title altogether in keeping with the way they are not used in English speaking countries. Further evidence of Thompson's foreignization and my domestication is in the use of place and product names. Other than *Parmigiano Reggiano*, *panettone* and *Asti Cinzano*, I only use an Italian word once in my TT. This is the word *via*, Italian for 'street', which appears at the beginning of the story and I retain because the setting at this point is in

Italy and *via* is part of the street name, hence a proper noun. On the other hand, as well as the use of Italian honorific titles and the same place and product names, Thompson includes several other Italian words; for example, *via* (151), *spumante* (153), *ciao*, which appears three times (190; 194) and *Archivio di Stato* (State Archive], which appears twice on the same page (193). The abundance of Italian names, titles and words scattered throughout Thompson's translation supports my suggestion that he has adopted a foreignization strategy. Venuti presents the difference between foreignization and domestication as a dichotomy and the discussion above puts Thompson in the foreignization camp ("The Translator's Invisibility" 15). However, his use of explicitation in other instances demonstrates the weakness of the dichotomy, as explicitation can be viewed as a domesticating strategy (Schmidt 541).

The strategy of explicitation is often used in order to provide extra information to borrowed words or terms in translations that have adopted a foreignized approach. Vinay and Darbelnet first introduced the term explicitation in 1958, defining it as "a stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation" (qtd. in Baker and Saldanha 104). Explicitation is a strategy used when the translator feels that the readers belonging to the target culture might not have certain knowledge inherent in the source culture and makes additions for clarification purposes. Thompson used explicitation frequently where I did not, as can be seen by the examples in Table 2.

Table 1: Comparison of explicitation

ST	TT1 Thompson	TT2 Maniacco
più il titolo di dottore si svaluta … (2)	the more a Ph.D. degree loses its value … (153)	the more a degree is devalued … (3)
A dispetto di Trenitalia, … (4)	In spite of the Trenitalia railway network, … (158)	Despite Trenitalia, … (7)
- Il Panettone? (6)	"Panettone, our seasonal Christmas cake?" (163)	"Panettone?" (11)
Si presenta come l'avvocato Eileen Stone, ma ci tiene che la chiamiamo Eileen. (8)	She introduces herself as Eileen Stone, but insists we call her Eileen, without any formal title. (167)	She introduces herself as Ms Eileen Stone, but prefers that we call her Eileen. (13)
In quattro anni di vita coniugale … (10)	After four years of living together with a partner … (172)	In four years of living together … (18)

The first example in Table 2 is from narration by the protagonist Carlo Bonvicini. One can glean from the context of the story that Carlo Bonvicini has a doctorate and therefore the use of the title *dottore* has the same meaning as *Dr* in both the Australian and English contexts, but the term *dottore* can cause confusion because, in Italy, the title *dottore* can be used by anyone with an undergraduate degree (Caniato et al. 185; Kouwenaar and Dalichow 33). Given the original text uses *dottore*, the reference could be to an undergraduate, a Masters or a PhD degree.

I can only hypothesise as to why Thompson explicated. It may have been an assumption that his target readers would not have been able to decipher the meanings for themselves (Saldanha 32). Or, his decision could have been a risk-management strategy. Pym argues that the process of solving translation problems can be seen as the generation of possible options and then the choosing of a solution that presents the least risk of misunderstanding (7). By choosing to explicate, the translator can "minimize the risk of an undesired interpretation"

(Pym 7). In my early drafts, I had also been more explicit and in the case of 'panettone' and 'Trenitalia', I had added words in a similar vein to those of Thompson, whereas in later revisions I removed them so that the result was less explicit and closer to the ST. I did this because I felt that my readers would be able to discern the meanings from the context. When Carlo mentions *panettone*, he is describing the process of making the Italian cake at home, and when he speaks about *Trenitalia*, he is sitting on a train that is stopped just before it reaches the station at Bologna. In Thompson's case, it is possible that he chose to balance his foreignization strategy with explicitation in order to show his readers that, while his story is clearly a translation, he wants to help them understand words that may be too foreign. Again, our differing strategies are features that make us visible in our translations.

Style

One may question how much of a translator's own writing style can be reflected in their translations. Mona Baker (2001) explains that "there has been little or no interest in studying the style of a translator" (244). She does not intend to address the style of the author of the ST and to what degree the translator has been able to capture that style in their translation, she is speaking of whether the style of the translator can be evidenced in their work and tries to develop a methodology which entails reviewing multiple translations produced by the same translator ("Towards a Methodology" 241). I did not have a corpus of Thompson's translations to analyse, nor a corpus of my own, so my analysis is very limited, but on first reading Thompson's translation there was something not immediately obvious about his style that piqued my interest. A more detailed analysis revealed a particular approach to elements of his translation that I consider had more of an affinity to style. There are many elements that could be examined when considering style, but for the purposes of this paper, style is explored via: the choice of swear words, the level of formality, and some very culture specific word choices. As Baker states, "identifying linguistic habits and stylistic patterns … is only worthwhile if it tells us something about the cultural and ideological positioning of the translator" ("Towards a Methodology" 258). This indeed ties back to Bourdieu's concept of habitus and the "cultural capital" mentioned earlier (Munday 237). The elements of style identified and discussed below not only make our presence more apparent, they demonstrate some of the cultural elements we bring to our work.

Swear words

Swear words are renowned for being difficult to translate (Maher, "Taboo or Not Taboo" 367). In representations of contemporary characters, writers need and want to include the swear words that form part of everyday dialogue (Fernández-Dobao 222-223; Pinker 370). There are several instances of swearing in the dialogue of *American Parmigiano*. Dr Carlo Bonvicini, the story's narrator, is an academic and bookworm. Swearing is not part of his normal speech and he only swears once in the story. Max Ardito, on the other hand, is a well-dressed, witty and rather suave lawyer who uses swear words, not for their shock value but as part of his everyday language. While the two characters are of similar age (early thirties) and both university educated, in terms of personality they are quite different.

Brigid Maher explains that "translators are often advised to seek target language swearing of similar strength to that of the source text" ("Taboo or Not Taboo" 369). The word 'strength' may be subjective, yet Table 3 highlights some considerable differences.

Table 2: Comparison of renditions of swear words

	ST	TT1 Thompson	TT2 Maniacco
Max	Invece è roba nostra, l'abbiamo inventato noi, cazzo. (6)	But it's Italian, it's ours, we bloody invented it. (163)	But, this is our stuff, we invented it, for fuck's sake. (11)
Max	Questa gita ha mandato tutto a puttane. (11)	This trip's made the whole thing go tits up. (175)	This trip has fucked everything up. (19)
Carlo	Senti Max, vaffanculo. (16)	Listen, Max, fuck off, will you? (188)	Listen Max, fuck off! (30)
Max	Li ho mandati a fare delle pugnette. (19)	I told them politely to go and play with themselves. (195)	I told them to go fuck themselves. (36)

Thompson's choices in rendering the swear words show a frequent reduction in terms of 'strength' when compared with mine. I suggest there may be three possible explanations for this. The first is that Thompson's editor or publishing house may have requested modifications prior to publication and this relates to Thompson's skopos (the purpose of his work). The publishing house who assumedly commissioned the work had a British target readership in mind. However, when I contacted Thompson via email, to ask whether he had been directed by his editor to tone down the swear words, he clarified that "there was never a problem with my choice" and that he had an excellent editor who knew Italian and they had worked closely together.

The second possibility is that Thompson may have censored himself, either consciously or sub-consciously. José Santaemilia explains that "self-censorship may include all the imaginable forms of elimination, distortion, downgrading, misadjustment, infidelity, and so on" (224). If Thompson did self-censor in relation to swearing, I would argue that the effect is a markedly softer tone and this has an impact on the characterization of Max. Several case studies analyse the effect of toning down the swear words in translation. In separate works, Maher and Ilaria Parini studied Jonathan Hunt's English translation of Niccolò Ammaniti's *Ti prendo e ti porto via* (2004/1999). Maher focused on how the reduction of swearing affected the voices of the characters, resulting in a change in their personalities ("Taboo or Not Taboo" 371-374). In much the same way, by choosing to tone down Max's swearing, Thompson has rendered him a more measured and 'proper' young lawyer, not the forthright and passionate character I perceived. Parini focused on the foreignization and domestication strategies in Hunt's translation yet identified the toned down language as well (154). She states that it would have been "interesting to investigate the reasons underlying the choices made by the translator, to see … whether they [were] the result of reasoning based on solid theoretical grounds, or rather of his **personal style** and intuition" (emphasis is mine, Parini 154).

A third possibility is that the swear words chosen reflect their relative potency within our respective cultures. Thompson clearly has no problem using the word *fuck*, as he has rendered *vaffunculo* as *fuck off*. This is Carlo's only instance of swearing and a strong rendition in translation was required. In all other cases Thompson's choices have been milder. Thompson chose the word *bloody* for a situation where Max is stressing a point and at the same time venting frustration. In Australia the word *bloody* is hardly considered a swear word. Yet in Britain, the 2006 Tourism Australia commercial *So where the bloody hell are you?* was banned as a result of the inappropriate use of the adjective 'bloody'. While this is contrary to research which shows that only a small percentage of Britons find the word offensive (Allan and Burridge, "Swearing" 375), it may be that Thompson considered *bloody* more offensive

than I do, as an Australian. This makes me reflect on our backgrounds and how our individual formations have an impact on our work. For him the Italian word *cazzo* is apparently similar in strength to the English word *bloody*. I consider that the word *fuck* has more affinity to the word *cazzo,* as it captures the "emotional force" that I attribute to Max's character (Pinker 352). This is supported by Lorenzo Vannucci's (2014) analysis of the translation challenges presented by the novel *Trainspotting* where *fuck* is often rendered as *cazzo* (LXI-LXVII). Ana Fernández-Dobao (2006) provides a succinct explanation of the versatility of *fuck* and related words, describing the use as:

> […] a noun, fuck or fucker, a verb, to fuck as well as to fuck up, to fuck about or to fuck off, an adjective, fucking, fucked or fucked up, an adverb, fucking, and … a compound, motherfucker and motherfucking (225).

Given this versatility, it is no surprise that *fuck* is a preference of mine. It may also be a reflection of the fact that in Australia swear words of the sexual variety have lost their potency and not everyone regards them as vulgar now (Allan and Burridge, "Swearing" 380; Allan and Burridge, "Forbidden Words" 35; Maher, "Taboo or Not Taboo" 370). It could be that the degree of use and acceptance of swearing in Australia is similar to that in Italy. This would enable me as an Australian translator to capture the strength of the swearing more readily than Thompson. This in turn has a bearing on my characterization of Max.

In the case of the idiomatic expression *ha mandato tutto a puttane* [literally, 'it has sent everything to the whorehouse'], Thompson chose to use the English idiomatic expression *go tits up.* While it has a similar meaning, in my opinion it does not carry the same level of vulgarity. I had considered *it's all gone to the dogs* or *gone to pot*, although the Italian expression is more vulgar, given the use of the word *puttane* [whores]. Hence, neither of those expressions would have rendered the vulgarity of the original. In my opinion, *this trip has fucked everything up* seemed to capture the strength and conviction of Max's words. The expression *fare delle pugnette* [make little fists], provides a clear image of the action intended, an up and down fist pumping action. In my opinion, Thompson's choice of *play with themselves* does not quite capture the coarseness I have perceived or the graphic quality of the action involved. While his use of the word *politely* may have been to convey sarcasm, in my mind, Thompson's words do not marry with my image of Max. *Fare delle pugnette* is synonymous with telling someone to *go wank themselves*, and in Australia this is simply *go fuck yourself*. There are many possible reasons for Thompson's toning down of the swear words, he could argue that they are not toned down at all, but his choices make his presence noticeable, and may be representative of his personal style.

Formal vs informal language
Given that Australians are characterized by their use of informal language, I explored whether this could be evidenced in my translated text (Butler 160; Peters, "Corpus Evidence" 176). Susan Butler states that "Australians pitch the border between formal and informal language at a point that seems relaxed and colloquial to the rest of the world" (160). Similarly, Pam Peters argues that Australians distance themselves from "behaviour which seems unnecessarily formal or stuffy" and that this is reflected in their writing ("Corpus Evidence" 176). I believe that my informality is noticeable when read alongside Thompson's more formal style, and that it is most apparent in the minutiae of the dialogue. There is a consistent addition of words in Thompson's version and the choice of those words has the effect of making the characters appear more formal. Consider the following example of Max's speech:

Thompson:	"What world are you living in, cloud cuckoo land? The free market doesn't exist. It's a utopian concept, like communism. It's not the quality of a thing that sells it, but the marketing. And the Americans have marketing down to a fine art, investing sums in it with so many noughts you'd go grey counting them all. It's already pretty damaging to us that they can call their shitty cheese 'Parmesan'. If they could sell it as 'Parmigiano' you'd even be able to find it in the South Pole. But it's Italian, it's ours, we bloody invented it. Let them stick to Coca-Cola and hot dogs." (163)
Maniacco:	"Where do you live, in Wonderland? The free market does not exist. It's a utopia, like communism. It's not quality that sells, it's marketing. And the Americans know how to market, they invest numbers with so many zeros that you get old counting them. For us, it's damaging enough that they can call their shit cheese *parmesan*. If they could sell it as 'Parmigiano', you'd even find it at the South Pole. But this is our stuff, we invented it, for fuck's sake. They can keep their Coca Cola and hot dogs." (11)

My version is noticeably shorter (92 words to Thompson's 106) and, I think, sharper and more colloquial, which makes Max seem terser and more confident. In my opinion, this reflects Max's personality more accurately and is consistent with his behaviour in the story. He is a smart, savvy, no-nonsense man, who speaks his mind, especially to Carlo who he considers an equal. This short passage exemplifies the consistent difference in levels of formality between the two translations and, I contend, reflects my Australianness and Thompson's Britishness. Table 4 provides some additional examples of Thompson's language and mine, to illustrate this effect.

Table 4: Comparison of style reflecting formality

ST	TT1 Thompson	TT2 Maniacco
Fa le presentazioni troppo in fretta … (2)	He makes the introductions in so great a hurry … (153)	His introductions are way too fast … (3)
… che annuisce appena e prende la parola (3)	… who nods slightly and starts to hold forth. (155)	… who nods subtly and takes the floor. (5)
Non dovrebbero essere la domanda e l'offerta a regolare il mercato? (6)	"Shouldn't it be supply and demand that rules the market?" (163)	Shouldn't supply and demand regulate the market? (11)
Non ho detto una parola. (9)	I'd said not a word. (169)	I hadn't said a word. (15)
… ho troppa poca esperienza. (18)	"…I've too little experience" (195)	"…I don't have enough experience." (35)

While there is barely a difference in the length of the sentences in Table 4, one only needs to read the lines aloud for an Australian ear to hear the difference in formality. Thompson's choices seem more deliberate and refined. In contrast, mine are more prosaic and down to earth.

The choice between the words *perhaps* and *maybe* lends additional support to the case regarding formality. In Thompson's translation, the word *perhaps* appears sixteen times and the word *maybe* does not appear at all. In comparison I have used *perhaps* once and *maybe* thirteen times, mostly where Thompson has used *perhaps*. *Maybe* is considered informal in both British English and Australian English possibly because of its "frequent occurrences in conversation" (Peters, "The Cambridge Guide to Australian" 499; Peters, "The Cambridge Guide to English" 341). The two words are synonymous, yet the *British National Corpus* (BNC) has *perhaps* appearing three times as frequently as *maybe* (Peters, "The Cambridge Guide to English" 341). While the *Australian Corpus of English* (ACE) has a similar ratio,

Peters argues that "the affinity between *maybe* and less formal writing may be seen in the fact that more than half the instances […] are found in the fiction samples which make up only a quarter of the corpus" ("The Cambridge Guide to Australian" 499). I attribute this distinct pattern in the use of *perhaps*, on Thompson's part, to his more formal style, and my use of *maybe* to my more informal style.

Word choices

A further distinction between the two translations is due to other word choices that reflect our varieties of English; that is, Thompson's use of British English and my use of Australian English. According to Peter Trudgill and Jean Hannah, it is "usually not possible to tell if a text has been written by an English or Australian writer – unless by the vocabulary" (18). In the case of Thompson's translation, several of his word choices made him visible to me, as they are words more commonly used in Britain than Australia. Here I will explore a small sample – *rush hour, lads, knackers* and *supper* – and offer my contrasting choice where appropriate (see Table 5). I have referred to the following resources in order to explore my claims and must acknowledge that, while both dictionaries are based on several large corpora, the two Australian-specific corpora are limited in size:

The *Oxford Dictionary of English* online (OED).
The Australian English *Macquarie Dictionary* online (MD).
The British National Corpus (BNC).
The Australian Corpus of English (ACE).
The International Corpus of English-Australian (ICE-Aus).
The corpus of Global Web-based English (GloWbE).

Table 5: Comparison of word choice

ST	TT1 Thompson	TT2 Maniacco
E' lunedì, è l'ora di punta, piove. (2)	It's Monday morning rush hour and raining. (151)	It's Monday, it's peak hour, it's raining. (2)
… è chiaro che nei supplementari i ragazzoni in maglia gialla … (7)	… if it goes to extra time the big lads in yellow jerseys … (164)	… it's clear that in extra time, the big blokes in the yellow jerseys … (11)
I miei maroni che girano. (12)	My knackers getting in a twist. (178)	My balls whizzing around. (22)
… e che torno a casa per cena. (19)	… and will be back home for supper. (196)	… and that I'll be home for dinner. (36)

Rush hour versus peak hour

The OED defines rush hour as "a time during each day when traffic is at its heaviest", but it has no entry for the term peak hour. In contrast, the MD provides a succinct definition of rush hour, simply peak hour. It would seem that rush hour is the more common term in Britain, whereas peak hour is more common in Australia. This is supported by data from the BNC, which reports rush hour with a raw frequency of 114 as compared to peak hour with a raw frequency of 10. GloWbE also supports this claim with rush hour appearing 1.9 times per million words in its British corpus versus 0.5 times per million words in its Australian corpus. On the other hand, peak hour appears 0.1 times per million words in its British corpus compared to 1.6 times per million words in its Australian corpus.

Lads

The OED and MD provide similar definitions of the word lad. Yet, for the plural lads, the OED includes the additional usage indicator of British. The various corpora are also revealing. The BNC indicates that lads is used 0.1483 times per 10,000 words while the ACE and ICE-Aus both show the frequency of 0.01 times per 10,000 words. The GloWbE corpus also reveals that lads is more common in Britain than Australia with a frequency per million words of 13.8 compared to 3.9. Therefore, I surmise that the word lads, as used by Thompson to describe a sporting team, is much more common in British English than Australian English.

Knackers

Again, while the OED and MD provide similar definitions of the word *knacker/s*, the OED includes the usage indicator of *British*. There are only twelve instances of *knackers* in the BNC, of which only two are referring to testicles (which is the way the word is used by Thompson). There are no instances of the word *knacker/s* in either ACE or ICE-Aus. GloWbE reports that *knackers* appears with a frequency of 0.2 times per million words in its British corpus, versus 0.1 in its Australian corpus. Of the instances in the raw frequency data that I was able to observe 28 of the 60 in the British corpus were clearly references to the use of knackers meaning testicles. Whereas, of the 14 instances in the Australian corpus only 1 was a reference to testicles. Hence, I conclude that the word knackers meaning testicles is much more common in Britain than Australia.

Supper versus dinner

The OED describes supper as an evening meal, while the MD describes it as a "very light meal", consisting of, for example, "a biscuit and cup of tea, taken at night". The second definition in the MD adds the usage indicator Chiefly British and US, and describes it as the "evening meal, the last major meal of the day", which is similar in meaning to the MD's definition of dinner. The names used for meals can be a source of confusion in English speaking countries, with the midday meal called lunch or dinner and the evening meal dinner, tea or supper (González 47). Australians tend to have their main meal of the day in the evening and it is called either dinner or tea while the term supper only ever refers to a snack taken late in the evening (Peters, "The Cambridge Guide to Australian" 218).

If, as Edith Grossman states, translators are the "speakers of a second text" then the words chosen for that second text must be the translator's own (10). The word choices described above are a small example of many that identify Thompson's linguistic repertoire and cultural background. In other words, his Britishness is reflected in his style, much as my Australianness is revealed in mine. Our word choices reflect our varieties of English and therefore they reveal our presence in the text.

Conclusion

The differences in mine and Thompson's translation made for a revealing analysis. Most notable were the different translation strategies chosen, in line with the varying skopoi. In handling honorific titles, Thompson favoured a strategy of foreignization while I chose to domesticate. In other instances, Thompson opted to explicate whereas I elected to refrain. We chose different strategies. Yet there was something more, and further scrutiny revealed a difference in styles. We were not merely reflecting the style of the original author – our translations reflected our own. Thompson's translation had a noticeably different flavour to mine and this was evidenced in a number of ways. There was a difference in the strength of the swear words and I argued that there were two possibilities for this. Thompson may have either consciously or sub-consciously self-censored, and/or swear words in British English carry a

different significance to those in Australian English. The toned-down swearing, combined with a more formal register in the dialogue, had the effect of rendering Thompson's characters more British, reflecting Thompson's own cultural background and variety of English, while my characters seemed more Australian and informal, a reflection of my world view. All reflections of our individual 'cultural capital'. Of course, some of our word choices consolidated the effect. All things combined to reveal us in our work: neither of us is invisible. Thompson has left his metaphoric fingerprints all over *American Parmesan*, much as I have left mine on my version of *American Parmigiano*. It is simply not possible to produce a work of any length without injecting something personal (Baker, "Towards a Methodology" 244). This comparison and process of analysis brought me a deeper and more nuanced understanding of my own visibility in the translation and with it a heightened sociolinguistic awareness. This awareness will certainly inform my next translation and I hope that the nuances observed are helpful to others on their translation journey. In light of these findings, it would seem that the topic of the translator's visibility, particularly in terms of style, might warrant further research.

Bibliography
Able Muse. *N.S. Thompson*, 2014. http://www.ablemuse.com/v17/bio/n-s-thompson. Accessed 11 August 2015.

Allan, Keith, and Kate Burridge. *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Allan, Keith, and Kate Burridge. "Swearing." *Comparative Studies in Australian and New Zealand English: Grammar and Beyond.* Eds. P. Peters, P. Collins, and A. Smith. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2009. 361-386.

Baird, Robert P., and Wu Ming. "Stories are Not all Equal: An Interview with Wu Ming." *Chicago Review*. 52.2/4 (2006): 250-259.

Baker, Mona. "Skopos Theory." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* Routledge, London;New York; 1998.

Baker, Mona. "Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator." *Target.* 12.2 (2001): 241-266. doi:10.1075/target.12.2.04bak.

Baker, Mona. "Reframing Conflict in Translation." *Social Semiotics.* 17.2 (2007): 151-169.

Baker, Mona, and Gabriela Saldanha. "Explicitation." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Butler, Susan. "Australian English – An Identity Crisis." *English in Australia.* Eds. D. Blair, P. Collins, 151-162. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2001.

Cambridge Dictionaries Online. *Self-censorship.* http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/self-censorship

Caniato, Manuela, Claudia Crocco, and Stefania Marzo. "Doctor or Dottore? How well do Honorifics Travel Outside of Italy." *The Journal of Specialized Translation.* 23 (2015): 131-204. http://www.jostrans.org/issue23/art_caniato.php.

Chesterman, Andrew. "Reflections on the Literal Translation Hypothesis." *Methods and Strategies of Process Research: Integrative Approaches in Translation Studies*. Eds. C. Alvstad, A. Hild, and E. Tiselius. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2011. 23-35.

Choate, Debra (Producer), and Rob Sitch (Director). *The Castle* [Motion Picture]. Australia: Village Roadshow Pictures, 2008.

Du, Xiaoyan. "A Brief Introduction of Skopos Theory." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2:10 (2012): 2189-2193.

Fernández-Dobao, Ana. "Linguistic and Cultural Aspects of the Translation of Swearing: The Spanish Version of Pulp Fiction." *Babel*. 52.3 (2006, 222-241.

Eco, Umberto. *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation*. London: Phoenix, 2004.

Formica, Denise, and Mirna Cicioni. "Translating Idiolects: Natalia Ginzburg's *Lessico famigliare*." *Monash University Linguistics*. 5.1 (2006): 17-25.

González, Félix Rodríguez. "The Naming of Meals." *English Today*. 9.4 (1993): 45-52. doi:10.1017/S026607840000732X.

Grossman, Edith. *Why Translation Matters*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Kouwenaar, Kees, and Fritz Dalichow. "The Situation of Academic Recognition in the European Community." *Higher Education Policy*. 6.1 (1993): 30-33. doi: http://dx.doi.org.libraryproxy.griffith.edu.au/10.1057/hep.1993.7.

Maher, Brigid. *Recreation and Style: Translating Humorous Literature in Italian and English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2011.

Maher, Brigid. "Taboo or Not Taboo: Swearing, Satire, Irony, and the Grotesque in the English Translation of Niccoló Ammaniti's *Ti prendo e ti porto via*." *The Italianist*. 32.3 (2012): 367-384. doi: 10.1179/026143412X13455482977633.

Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge, 2013.

Parini, Ilaria. "Domesticating or Foreignizing Texts? Case Study: Niccolò Ammaniti's *Ti prendo e ti porto via* Translated into English." *Thinking Translation: Perspectives from Within and Without. Conference Proceedings, Third UEA Postgraduate Translation Symposium*. Eds. R. Hyde Parker and K. Guadarrama Garcia. Boca Raton: Brown Walker Press, 2008. 135-155.

Peters, Pam. *The Cambridge Australian English Style Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Peters, Pam. "Corpus Evidence on Australian Style and Usage." *English in Australia*. Eds. D. Blair and P. Collins. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2001. 163-180.

Peters, Pam. *The Cambridge Guide to English Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Peters, Pam. *The Cambridge Guide to Australian English Usage.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Pinker, Steven. *The Stuff of Thought: Language as a Window Into Human Nature.* Penguin, 2007.

Pym, Anthony. "Explaining Explicitation." *New Trends in Translation Studies. In Honour of Kinga Klaudy.* Eds. K. Klaudy, K. Károly, and Á. Fóris, 29-34. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó, 2005.

Saldanha, Gabriela. "Explicitation Revisited: Bringing the Reader into the Picture." *Transkom.* 1.1 (2008): 20-35.

Santaemilia, José. "The Translation of Sex-related Language: The Danger(s) of Self-censorship(s)." *TTR: Traduction,Terminologie, Redaction.* 21.2 (2008): 221-252. doi: 10.7202/037497ar.

Saviano, Roberto, Carlo Lucarelli, Valeria Parrella, Piero Colaprico, Wu Ming (Writers collective), and Simona Vinci. *Outsiders: Six Italian Stories.* Translated by A. Asher, B. Faccini, R. Servadio, M. Mahan, C. Jiang, N.S. Thompson, London: MacLehose Press, 2013.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "On the Different Methods of Translating." *The Translation Studies Reader.* 2nd ed. Ed. L. Venuti. Translated by S. Bernofsky. New York, NY: Routledge, [1813] 2004. 43-63.

Smokestack Books. *Letter to Auden*, 2014. http://smokestack-books.co.uk/book.php?book=46. Accessed 12 August 2016.

Schmidt, Goran. "Foreignization and Domestication in the Croatian Translations of Oscar Wilde's The Picture of Dorian Gray." *Jezikoslovlje.* 14.2-3 (2013). 537-548.

Thoburn, Nicholas. "To Conquer the Anonymous: Authorship and Myth in the Wu Ming Foundation." *Cultural Critique,* 78 (2011). 119-150.

Thompson, N. S. Message to the author. 24 August 2016. Email.

Trudgill, Peter, and Jean Hannah. *International English: A Guide to Varieties of Standard English.* 4th ed. London: Arnold, 2002.

Vannucci, Lorenzo. "Trainspotting: Analisi delle problematiche traduttive e linguistiche. Traduzione di K. Ashley, Welsh in Translation." *The Edinburgh Companion to Irvine Welsh.* Ed. B. Schoene, 113-125. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014. https://etd.adm.unipi.it/theses/available/etd-01082014-144151/unrestricted/15_1_2014_versione_finale_con_modifiche.pdf.

Venuti, Lawrence. "Translation, Community, Utopia." *The Translation Studies Reader.* Ed. L. Venuti, 482-491. London: Routledge, 2004.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation.* 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Wagner, Emma, and Andrew Chesterman. *Can Theory Help Translators?: A Dialogue Between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface*. London and New York: Routledge, 2014.

Wilson, Rita. "Eco Effects." *Meanjin.* 64.4 (2005): 119-123.

Winters, Marion. "F. Scott Fitzgerald's Die Schönen und Verdammten: A Corpus-based Study of Loan Words and Code Switches as Features of Translators' Style." *Language Matters.* 35.1 (2004): 248-258.

Winters, Marion. "A Corpus-based Study of Speech-act Report Verbs as a Feature of Translators' Style." *META.* 52.3 (2007): 412-425.

Winters, Marion. "German Modal Particles - from Lice in the Fur of our Language to Manifestations of Translators' Styles." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology,* 21.3 (2013): 427-445.

Wu Ming. *American Parmigiano.* Milano: RCS Quotidiani S.p.A, 2008. http://www.wumingfoundation.com/italiano/AmericanParmigiano.pdf.

———. "American Parmigiano." Translated by Valentina Maniacco. *Wu Ming Foundation,* 2017. https://www.wumingfoundation.com/American_Parmigiano_trans_by_VManiacco.pdf.

———. "American Parmigiano." Translated by N.S.Thompson. *Outsiders: Six Italian Stories.* London: MacLehose Press, 2013.

Yang, Wenfen. "Brief Study on Domestication and Foreignization in Translation." *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* 1.1 (2010): 77-80. doi:10.4304/jltr.1.1.77-80.