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Abstract
The study examines text representations of chivalry in Alexandre Dumas’ novel Les Trois Mousquetaires (1844) in two Greek translations (1972, 1998) of the novel. Findings show that, in representing chivalry, the two versions privilege different patterns of noble conduct conforming to different values along the ‘power distance’ communicative dimension of Hofstede and Hofstede’s model (2005). They favour romantically or realistically oriented representations of chivalry through various manifestations of culture: in public and private conduct, in duels, in love affairs. The paper shows the potential of translation to disseminate gender-conscious and power-conscious representations of reality.
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1. The work and the era
In 17th century Paris, twenty-year-old d’Artagnan from Gascony, leaves home to serve the ideals of justice, loyalty and devotion, in the company of the three musketeers, Athos, Porthos and Aramis. It is a story of

four comrades-in-arms, who serve the Queen of France, and outwit her enemy Cardinal Richelieu and his clever agent, a female criminal. The agent is discovered to be the evil wife of
one of the Musketeers. His private execution of her is the tragic climax of the story. Historic characters are Louis XIII, his queen, Richelieu, and the Duke of Buckingham (The Alexandre Dumas père Web Site, online).

In the middle of political and personal manoeuvres, involving the Anglo-French aristocracy, courageous d'Artagnan is attacked, persecuted, endangered, in love and in the end glorified, always defending the ideological values summarized in the proverbial phrase One for all and all for one.

The work first appeared serially in “Le Siècle” (March-July 1844), and since then, it has been translated and adapted a lot of times, not to mention audiovisual adaptations of it. As societies change and socio-cultural values are shifted, one question is how various translations may have renegotiated the ideal of chivalry and gallantry, and which forms of these values have currency in present day society, which would allow target texts to meet (or challenge) expectations of target societies. The study examines two Greek versions of the novel, which are twenty six years apart, to trace shifts in the texts which have registered a diversified representation of the notion of chivalry.

The data are drawn from the following sources:


**TT1** Αλέξανδρος Δουμάς, *Οι Τρεις Σωματοφύλακες (Α’ Τόμος, Β’ Τόμος), Αθήνα: Πάπυρος Γραφικές Τέχνες 1972 (Μετάφραση Άγγελου Νίκα) / Δ.Ο. Λαμπράκη Α.Ε. 2010

**TT2** Αλέξανδρος Δουμάς, *Οι Τρεις Σωματοφύλακες, Αθήνα: Παρουσία 1998 (Μετάφραση Γιώργου Κοτζιούλα)

The English translation of the French text is derived from *Ye Olde Library* (2006 online). The translation of the Greek target text fragments (into English) are the author’s.
2. Gender-conscious and power-conscious representations

"Gender as a concept is an analytical category" (von Flotow 2011: 122) which can account for systematic shifts in target versions of texts, to reveal gender bias, or any meaningful interventionist pattern on the part of translators. In gender-conscious approaches to translation, attention is drawn to how fe/male identities are registered in texts, whether and how gender affiliation of a writer can favour "interventionist translation in the name of gender politics" (ibid: 125) etc., which can raise ethical questions about gender bias.

Chivalry and gallantry are notions implicitly associated with reflection of gender, not only because the term also means ‘courtesy towards women’1, but because the knights can be given a gender-conscious representation in texts, as example 1 indicates.

Example 1 draws on the episode where d’Artagnan while preparing initially to fight against the company of the three musketeers Athos, Porthos, Aramis, finally duels on their side against the guards of Cardinal Richelieu. Porthos fights against Biskarat. The gender-conscious representation of Porthos is manifested in rendition of ST fanfaronnades: TT1 item φανφαρονισμός (pomposity, splurge) has a rather negative male prosody, whereas TT2 item τσαλίμια implies skillfulness at sword-playing, carries positive connotations underlying his superiority, and has an ambivalent potential as to its gender bias prosody.

Example 1

ST Restaient Porthos et Biscarat. Porthos faisait mille fanfaronnades, demandant à Biscarat quelle heure il pouvait bien être… (Ch 5: LES MOUSQUETAIRES DU ROI ET LES GARDES DE M. LE CARDINAL, p. 64)

There only then remained Porthos and Biscarat. Porthos made a thousand flourishes, asking Biscarat what o’clock it could be… (Ch. 5: The King’s Musketeers and the Cardinal’s Guards)

TT1 Έμεναν ο Μπισκαρά κι ο Πόρθος, που με τα αιώνια αστεία του και τον φανφαρονισμό του ρωτούσε τον άλλον τι ώρα να είναι

1 The FreeDictionary online.
Versions of chivalry in The Three Musketeers

3. Attitudes towards rivalry and the defeated

D'Artagnan, supplied with an old horse and a letter of recommendation by his father, leaves his homeland to Paris, where he intends to meet Mr. de Trevil, captain of the famous royal guard of Musketeers. He stops at an inn where he receives an unfriendly reception. Very soon he quarrels with one of the lodgers and fights in a duel. In example 2, TT1 (1972) omits rendition of ST item salua son adversaire (saluted his adversary) as if redundant, while TT2 (1998) makes sure it
is included, following the original, to favour reflection of respect for the rival.

Example 2

ST  L’inconnu vit alors que la chose passait la raillerie, tira son épée *salua son adversaire* et se mit gravement en garde.

(Ch. 1: LES TROIS PRÉSENTS DE M. D’ARTAGNAN PÈRE, p. 14)

*The stranger, then perceiving that the matter went beyond raillery, drew his sword, saluted his adversary, and seriously placed himself on guard.*

..... (Ch.1: The Three Presents of D’Artagnan the Elder)

TT1  Τότε κατάλαβε πως δεν έπρεπε να παίρνει πια το πράγμα στ’ αστεία, τράβηξε κι αυτός το ξίφος του [ ] και με πολλή σοβαρότητα στάθηκε σε ετοιμότητα. (Part I, p. 25)

*Then he realized that he shouldn’t be kidding any more, drew his sword [ ] got serious and ready to fight him.*

TT2  Ο άγνωστος είδε τότε πως η υπόθεση ξεπερνούσε την ασθενιότητα, έσυρε το σπαθί του, χαιρέτησε τον αντίπαλο του και πήρε σοβαρά θέση μάχης. (Part I, p. 13)

*The stranger then saw that the case went beyond ludi crousness, drew his sword, saluted his opponent and got seriously fighting stance.*

In example 3, touchy and irritable d'Artagnan and his friends are preparing to fight in a duel against British noblemen. TT2 differs from TT1 in the representation of the defeated, namely, in the way the following ST item is rendered: *il finit par prendre la fuite à toutes jambes et disparut aux huées des laquais* (the man ended by fairly taking to his heels, and disappeared amid the hooting of the lackeys). The text fragment in TT2 avoids to highlight the derogatory behaviour of the musketeers against the English noblemen (as TT1 does). It rather opts for a neutral rendering, (*τον έθεσε στο τέλος εκτός μάχης [put him out of battle]*)}, connoting respect for the rival on the part of the musketeer.

TT1 also elaborates on the conflict theme by mentioning the nationality of the opponent (*τον Άγγλο του*), which the ST and TT2 omit.
Placing the nationality within the conflict frame may connote some cultural bias in the narrative perspective put forward.

**Example 3**

**ST** Aramis poussa le sien si vigoureusement, qu’après avoir rompu une cinquantaine de pas, il finit par prendre la fuite à toutes jambes et disparut aux huées des laquais. (Ch. 31: ANGLAIS ET FRANÇAIS, p. 359) Aramis pushed his so vigorously that after going back fifty paces, the man ended by fairly taking to his heels, and disappeared amid the hooting of the lackeys. (Ch. 31: English and French)

**TT1** Ο Άραμης στρίμωξε τόσο άγρια τον Άγγλο του, ώστε εκείνος, αφού υποχωρούσε συνέχεια καμιά πενηνταριά βήματα, το 'βάλε στα πόδια και το 'σκασε ενώ οι λακέδες τον γιουχάιζαν. (Part I, p. 369) Aramis pushed so fiercely his English opponent, that he, having retreated in about fifty paces, ran away while the lackeys were shouting down on him.

**TT2** Ο Άραμις πάλι ζόρισε το δικό του τόσο πολύ, που αφού τον ανάγκασε να οπισθοχωρήσει καμιά πενηνταριά βήματα, τον έθεσε στο τέλος εκτός μάχης. (Part I, p. 294) Aramis in his turn strained his opponent so much that, after forcing him to retreat in about fifty paces, finally put him out of battle.

The rival in TT1 is almost ridiculed, whereas TT2 privileges a rather favourable representation of the opponent.

Another variable which seems to diversify the approaches of the two versions to the representation of the rival is the use of offensive language. In examples 4 and 5, TT2 avoids offensiveness, which is favoured in TT1. The *misérable* ST item is rendered in terms of an offensive TT1 item βρομόσκυλο (*filthy animal*) in example 4 and παλιό-σκυλο (*filthy animal*) in example 5, whereas TT2 privileges inoffensive, neutral options (άθλιε, a close equivalent to the source item).

Another shift in example 4 which enforces aggressive behaviour in TT1 is the σιχαίνομαι (*hate/be disgusted with*) option, which is emo-
tionally loaded. The option is neutralized in TT2 through the formal option αποστρέφομαι, which maintains overtones of gallantry.

Example 4

ST  
-ainsi donc plus de retard, plus d’hésitation, ou quelle que soit ma répugnance à tremper une seconde fois mon épée dans le sang d’un misérable comme toi, je le jure par ma foi d’honnête homme… (Ch. 41: LE SIÈGE DE LA ROCHELLE, p.454)  
So no more delay, no more hesitation; or else whatever may be my repugnance to soiling my sword a second time with the blood of a wretch like you, I swear by my faith as an honest man – (Ch. 41: The Siege of La Rochelle)

TT1  
Μπρος, σήκω, χωρίς πολλά λόγια, αλλιώς, όσο κι αν σιχαίνομαι να λερώσω το σπαθί μου με το αίμα ενός βρομόσκυλου σαν και σένα, σου δίνω το λόγο μου ως τίμιος άνθρωπος…  
(Part II, p. 95)  
Go on, get up, with no more talking, or, even if I hate it, dirtying my sword with the blood of a filthy animal like you, I give you my word as an honest man…

TT2  
-Γι’ αυτό λοιπόν μην καθυστερεῖς, μη διστάζεις, γιατί, όσο κι αν αποστρέφομαι να βάψω για δεύτερη φορά το σπαθί μου με το αίμα ενός άθλιου σαν εσένα, σου ορκίζομαι στην πίστη μου… (Part II, p. 50)  
So hurry up, do not hesitate, because, even if I dislike it, staining my sword with the blood of a wick person like you, I swear in my faith…

In example 5, Milady, has paid two people to kill d'Artagnan during his stay in the camp of La Rochelle. D'Artagnan manages to capture them and starts swearing at one of them, Bisamon to whom he will eventually give grace and make him one of his servants.

Example 5

ST  
-Miséable! dit d’Artagnan, ”voyons, parle vite, qui t’a chargé de m’assassiner?” (Ch. 41: LE SIÈGE DE LA ROCHELLE, p. 453)  
"Wretch," cried d’Artagnan, "speak quickly! Who employed you to
The two versions seem to favour a different reflection of the musketeers’ conduct and attitude towards rivals: TT1 exploits (while TT2 avoids) offensive items when musketeers address their opponents, with TT2 highlighting respect towards rivalry in various ways (which TT1 avoids). The musketeer is more of a nobleman in TT2, a less dignified individual in TT1.

The next section examines power relations as registered in the two texts, and gender-conscious aspects of rendition.

4. Nobility and hierarchy

In example 6, the captain of musketeers, Mr. de Trevil calls for a hearing from the king to complain about the arrest and temporary detention of Athos by men of Cardinal Richelieu. Present at the same time in the royal palace is the cardinal himself, having first expressed his own complaints about the musketeers of the king. The two men are competing on who will win temporary favor of the king.

The two versions of example 6 differ in that the king addresses lower ranks in the military by using plural forms of address (in TT1, following the original\(^2\), \textit{Ελάτε, ελάτε, σωπάστε Τρεβίλ}) whereas in TT2 he addresses lower ranks by using singular forms of address (\textit{Ελα, Τρεβίλ, πάφε}) connoting interpersonal proximity. The plural forms of address in TT1 are paired with the TT1 translator’s heightening the nobility status of the king, through the item \textit{είπε η μεγαλειότητά του,}

\(^2\) Greek has a \textit{tu/vous} distinction like French.
whereas TT2 follows the original, rendering ST *dit le roi* as *είπε ο βασιλιάς* (said the king).

**Example 6**

**ST**

- Procès verbal de gens de robe vaut-il la parole d’honneur, répondit fièrement Tréville, d’homme d’épée?
- Allons, allons, Tréville, taisez-vous, dit le roi.

(Ch. 15: GENS DE ROBE ET GENS D’ÉPEE, p. 173)

"And is the written report of the gownsmen to be placed in comparison with the word of honour of a swordsman?" replied Treville haughtily.

"Come, come, Treville, hold your tongue," said the king.

(Ch. 15: Men of the Robe and Men of the Sword)

**TT1**

"Οι καταθέσεις των δικαστικών μπορούν να έχουν την ίδια αξία με τον λόγο της τιμής ενός στρατιωτικού;" ρώτησε περήφανα ο Τρεβίλ.

"Ελάτε, ελάτε, σωπάστε Τρεβίλ" είπε η μεγαλειότητά του. (Part I, p. 183)

"The statements of members of the judiciary can be compared with the word of honor of a military officer?" asked proudly Treville in return.

"Come, come, be quiet Treville" said his Majesty.

**TT2**

"-Μια έκθεση δικαστικών αξίζει το λόγο τιμής ενός πολεμιστή; " Αποκρίθηκε περήφανα ο Τρεβίλ.

-Ελα, Τρεβίλ, πάψε, είπε ο βασιλιάς." (Part I, p. 142)

"-Is a judicial report of the same importance with the word of honour of a combatant? responded in pride Treville.

-Come you, Treville, be quiet, said the king."

It seems that TT1 is concerned with enforcing hierarchical structures in the representation of the military, whereas the TT2 allows closer interpersonal relations in the military.

A military campaign against La Rochelle is about to begin in which the four friends fight on the side of King Louis XIII against the English. Soldiers fund their own preparation for the war (horse, harness, etc.). Porthos attempts to convince his wealthy mistress to
fund his participation in the war. Example 7 shows the nobleman to be addressing his beloved differently in the two versions: using plural forms of address in TT2, with singular ones favoured in TT1.

**Example 7**

**ST**
- Ingrat que vous êtes!
- Ah! Je vous conseille de vous plaindre! dit Porthos.
- Allez donc avec votre belle duchesse! Je ne vous retiens plus.
- Eh! Elle n’est déjà point si décharnée, que je crois!

*(Ch. 29: LA CHASSE À L’ÉQUIPEMENT, p. 173)*

"Ingrate that you are!"

"Ah! I advise you to complain!" said Porthos.

"Begone, then, to your beautiful duchess; I will detain you no longer."

"And she is not to be despised, in my opinion."

*(Ch. 29. Hunting for the Equipment [The struggle for supplies]*)

**TT1**
- Τι αχάριστος που είσαι!
- Μάλιστα! Θα τολμήσεις να παραπονεθείς τώρα! είπε ο σωματοφύλακας.
- Εντάξει, πήγαινε με τη δούκισσά σου, δεν σε κρατάω!
- Αυτή, πιστεύω, δεν μου φαίνεται τόσο προσβλητικά.

*(Part I, p. 358)*

"Ingrate that you are."

"I see! Would you dare to complain?" said the musketeer.

"Alright then, go find your duchess, I shall no longer detain you!"

"Well, she doesn’t seem that broke, anyway!"

**TT2**
- Τι αχάριστος που είστε!
- Σας συνιστώ να βάλετε τα κλάματα! είπε ο Πόρθος.
- Τραβάτε κοντά στην ωραία σας δούκισσα. Εγώ δε σας κρατώ άλλο.
- Αυτή, πιστεύω, δε θα φέρνεται τόσο προσβλητικά. (Part I, p. 285)

"Ingrate that you are!

"I recommend that you start crying! said Porthos.

"Go on and meet your finest duchess, finally. I wouldn’t detain you no more."
-She, however, wouldn’t be so offensive against me.

In example 7, in TT1, the musketeer is still more aggressive towards his female addressee, in that he uses singular forms of address, but also in that he avoids the irony of the ST item *je vous conseille de vous plaindre*. By contrast, TT2 exploits the irony to the fullest through the Σας συνιστώ να βάλετε τα κλάματα option. Although currently unconventional, the plural forms of address towards the female partner, heightens the implication of nobility in the representation of the musketeer. The two versions seem to favour a different pattern of noble conduct in the public and private spheres. TT2 seems to favour interpersonal closeness in the public sphere, but when addressing women in the private sphere, interpersonal distance is preferred. By contrast, TT1 privileges interpersonal distance in the public sphere, with interpersonal proximity in the private sphere. Table 1 summarizes findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sphere</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>public</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D’Artagnan accompanied by his servant, Planchet, leaves for St. Germain, to trace the mysterious man with the scar whom he considers a kidnapper of his beloved Constance Bonacieux. On a par with example 6, in example 8, TT1 highlights reflection of power imbalance between d’Artagnan and his servant, through TT1 item *αφένη* (*master*), whereas TT2 avoids reflection of power differentials by simply referring to the master’s name: *ντ’ Άρτανιάν*. The source version uses the name (d’Artagnan).

**Example 8**

ST  Planchet tourna et retourna le billet, puis, accoutumé à l’obéissance passive, il sauta à bas de la terrasse, enfila la ruelle et rencontra au bout de vingt pas d’Artagnan. (Ch. 30: MILADY, p. 354)
Planchet turned and returned the billet. Then, accustomed to passive obedience, he jumped down from the terrace, ran toward the lane, and at the end of twenty paces met d’Artagnan, who, having seen all, was coming to him. (Ch. 30: D’Artagnan and the Englishman)

TT1 Ο Πλανσέ στριφογύρισε το γραμματάκι στα χέρια του κι έπειτα, συνηθισμένος να υπακούει παθητικά, πέρασε γρήγορα κάτω απ’ το λιακωτό, χώθηκε στο δρομάκι και πριν προχωρήσει είκοσι βήματα βρέθηκε μπροστά στον αφέντη του… (Part I, p.364)

TT2 Ο Πλανσέ γύρισε από δω κι από κει το σημείωμα κι έπειτα, συνηθισμένος να υπακούει τυφλά, πέρασε το στενό και κάνοντας είκοσι βήματα αντάμωσε τον ντ’ Αρτανιάν… (Part I, p. 290)

In Example 9, the Duke of Buckingham, being in love with Anne of Austria, meets the beautiful Queen of France secretly at the Louvre palace. The English nobleman, full of enthusiasm for the much desired meeting with his beloved, is making a love confession, asking her to spend a night with him. In showing the Queen his devotion, he asks her to take all his belongings from him (Take my wealth, my fortune, my glory, all the days I have to live). Rendition of this line in the two versions shows a different perception of the figure of the nobleman:

- more romantic in TT1, where the nobleman is offering the Queen everything – even his life (Πάρτε μου το καθετί, τα πλούτη μου, τη δόξα μου, τη ζωή μου, όση μου μένει ακόμη να ζήσω) displaying a rather passive devotion to her (see Πάρτε μου [take my wealth]).
• more realistic in TT2, in that the nobleman more actively offers his wealth, (see TT2 Δίνω τα υπάρχοντά μου [I give my belongings] vs. TT1 [take my belongings]) but no reference is made in TT2 to offering her his life.

Example 9

ST  Oh! reine, reine! oh! Vous ne savez pas tout ce qu’il y a de félicités du ciel, de joies du paradis enfermées dans un moment pareil. Tenez, mes biens, ma fortune, ma gloire, tout ce qu’il me reste de jours à vivre, pour un pareil instant et pour une semblable nuit! Car cette nuit-là, Madame, cette nuit-là vous m’aimiez, je vous le jure.
(Ch. 12: GEORGES VILLIERS, DUC DE BUCKINGHAM, p. 145)

Oh, Queen! Queen! You do not know what felicity from heaven, what joys from paradise, are comprised in a moment like that. Take my wealth, my fortune, my glory, all the days I have to live, for such an instant, for a night like that. For that night, madame, that night you loved me, I will swear it.
(Ch. 12: George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham)

TT1  Ω, βασίλισσα, βασίλισσά μου! Να ξέρατε πόση ουράνια μακαριότητα, πόση παραδείσια χαρά κλείνουν μέσα τως αυτές οι στιγμές! Πάρτε μου το καθετί, τα πλούτη μου, τη δόξα μου, τη ζωή μου, όση μου μένει ακόμη να ζήσω, για μια τέτοια στιγμή, για μια παρόμοια νύχτα! Πιστεύω τη νύχτα, κυρία, μ’ αγαπούσατε σας τ’ ορκίζομαι. (Part I, p. 154)
Oh, Queen, Queen! If you only knew what celestial beatitude, what joys of paradise enclose these moments! Take my everything, my riches, my glory, my life, as much I have still to live, for such a moment, for a similar night! Because that night, madame, you loved me, I swear it.

TT2  Ω, βασίλισσα, βασίλισσά! ο! δεν ξέρετε τί ουράνια ευδαιμονία, τί χαρές του παραδείσου κλείνονται σε μια τέτια στιγμή. Δίνω τα υπάρχοντά μου, την περιουσία μου, τη δόξα μου [ ] για μια τέτοια στιγμή και για μια παρόμοια νύχτα· γιατί εκείνη τη νύχτα, κυρία, εκείνη τη νύχτα μ’ αγαπούσατε, παιρνώ όρκο γι’ αυτό. (Part I, p. 121)
Oh, Queen, Queen! Oh! You cannot imagine what celestial bliss, what joys of paradise that moment enclosed! I give my possessions, my fortune, my glory [!] for that moment, for that night; because that night, madame, you loved me, I would take an oath for that.

Table 2 summarizes the value certain variables are assigned in the two versions. In TT2, the knight respects the opponent, is smart and has fair conduct in battle, has a more realistic relationship with his beloved, is self-controlled in expressing anger. In TT1, the knight rather ridicules the opponent, has a more romantic relationship with his beloved and does not mind offensiveness in expressing anger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for rival</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control in expressing anger</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military hierarchy blurred</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic reflection of noblemen in love</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paper aimed to show that the two versions favour a diversified pattern of nobility and gallantry, raising ethical questions, especially if the version addresses young audiences.

5. ‘Invisible’ levels of culture and construction of roles

The paper attempted a socio-culturally oriented approach to aspects of nobility and gallantry constructed in the two versions. One question is what the significance of certain features might be, which are favoured in one of the versions and not in the other. For instance, what the significance is of the concern for social hierarchy in TT1, which is not favoured in TT2.
In anthropological linguistics, cultures have been distinguished into high-power distance and low-power distance ones depending on whether they favour power differentials in communication. The (high-/low) power distance feature is one of the five communicative dimensions of context in Hofstede and Hofstede’s model of social behaviour, with English favouring the low-power distance end of the continuum, and Greek showing partial preference for high(er)-power distance also manifested through English-Greek translation, Sidiropoulou 2008, 2012). The power distance index in Hofstede and Hofstede’s model (2005) shows to what extent less powerful members of a society accept the power differentials in that society.

If findings in this study show that power differentials in the public sphere are favoured in TT1 more than in TT2, and Greek favours high power distance to some extent, the assumption is that TT2 version is a more westernized type of representation of The Three Musketeers, than TT1 is – which, conversely, seems to privilege higher power imbalance (between master/servant, king/knight etc). Had we had access to TT2 translator, we would have asked whether he has consulted the English translation of the novel, at all.

The assumption is that the lower-power distance feature in the public sphere, which is favoured in TT2, disseminates patterns of conduct which have currency in present day society, and others (e.g. towards the mistress) which highlight intended aspects of nobility assuming gender bias.

The power-distance dimension seems to be an aspect of the invisible level of Hall’s iceberg model of culture (Katan 2011). It may be assumed to be a type of discursive formation (in Foucault’s terms, Hall 1997), which generates knowledge about hierarchical relations of fictional characters and shapes their representation in target versions.

Evidently, a larger scale, quantitative research of the features favoured in the two versions would allow a more detailed account of preferred patterns of translator behaviour across versions and a fairer picture of the reasons why these patterns are privileged.
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