Do women and men translate differently? A quantitative study of stylistic differences in four translations of *Madame Bovary*.
Abstract

Gender differences in oral communication are a linguistic fact. The objective of this study is to find out if such differences exist even in written communication, focusing here on the translation of prose texts. Based on a quantitative research model, the investigation aims to find out if gender has an influence on linguistic style in translation. The material examined consists of four different translations from French into English of the same source text, *Madame Bovary* by Gustave Flaubert. The results of the study can not support the assumption that gender has a significant influence on linguistic style in translation.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Women can obviously not reverse park, whereas men do never listen. On the other hand, men are good at reading maps, and women are good at multi-tasking. What some people might dismiss as stereotypes helps others to earn money: many books addressing these (allegedly existing) gender differences have been written and sold. Even though these books can be fun to read, one needs to be aware of the implications arising from wholly and uncritically believing in such claims. This is so because, based on these types of work, it can be argued that one job is suitable for a woman, whereas another is not. Furthermore, this might pave the way for arguments as to why women should be given lower salaries than men. In other words, it would be easy to abuse these alleged gender differences in order to maintain a world in which the subjection of women is thought to be scientifically justified.

Potential differences between the genders are of interest also in the context of translation theory. When reading parallel texts translated by men and women, linguistic differences are often noted, for example with regard to the use of different tenses, clause constructions and nominal expressions. Taking such differences together can lead to the assumption that male and female translators make use of different styles in their translations. But a single person’s impression is very subjective and, additionally, one can not be sure that the differences relate to the translator’s gender. However, by examining quantitatively the assumed influence of gender on different translations of the same source text, this subjective view can be evaluated and gradually replaced by a more objective view on the topic in question.

Naturally enough, quantitatively-based work needs an underlying hypothesis, which can be either supported or refuted through analysis of some set of primary data material. For the present study, the hypothesis will run as follows:

*Gender has an influence on stylistic differences in different translations of the same source text.*

One very famous author with regard to style was the French author Gustave Flaubert. On the basis of his name the expression “flauberian style” has been coined, reflecting his special way of writing. In particular, this term describes his characteristic use of the imperfective tense (*le style indirect libre*), and his use of long sentences to steer and manipulate the reader’s experience of the text. More generally, the flauberian style also implies an author’s obsession with style: in fact, this was one of the reasons why it took him several years to write his novels, as he was constantly looking for *le mot juste*, i.e. the right word. Thus, it is obvious that Flaubert’s writing poses as a promising starting-point for a project investigating matters of style in translation. The specific text that will be studied is his famous novel from 1857, *Madame Bovary*, originally published in French but translated into English in several different versions. With regard to the present paper, the four translations that will be the subject of quantitative analysis are from the 1960s and from the 2010s.

In the subsequent section, a literature review will be given, providing a background for the topic of the present study. This will deal with research in the field of gender and translation.
studies, as well as with some work carried out on stylostatistic matters. The methodology section will explain how the research paradigm was organized, both with regard to material collection and data analysis. Then, the results section will account for the data processing of the material, followed by a discussion of the results of these measures. Last, the final section will be devoted to some concluding remarks on the results of the study, and also suggest some ideas for further research in this field.

2. BACKGROUND
The literature review below gives an account of what stylostatistics is. In addition, a closer look is taken at studies carried out so far in the field of (stylistic) differences in translation and linguistics.

2.1 STYLE AND STATISTICS
The notion style encompasses many, sometimes even controversial, definitions. As a matter of that, Leech and Short (1981: 43) speak of an existing “over-definition” of this term. Consequently, it is not beneficial for this study to rely on one of many definitions of this notion. Instead, it seems more reasonable to follow the example of Leech et al., who abandon a definition of their own and replace it by a conclusion on what multidimensional style is. For the present study, the most relevant property of style is taken to be the following (Leech & Short 2007: 39):

Stylistic choice is limited to those aspects of linguistic choice which concern alternative ways of rendering the same subject matter.

This attribute is not only applicable to one language. It is even valid with respect to the translation process, where a source text is transferred from the source language into the target language, which results in the creation of the target text. In this process, the subject matter, i.e. the story itself, remains unaltered. But in terms of linguistic choice, the translator has a wide range of possibilities to reproduce the stylistic properties of the source text. Thus, stylistics is the starting point for finding out if the hypothesis can be supported or not.

The field of stylostatistics consists of a combination of the linguistic sub-discipline stylistics with quantitative research methods derived from natural science. Quantitative research is defined as follows (Muijs 2004: 1):

Quantitative research is a type of research that is explaining phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analyzed using mathematically based methods (in particular statistics).

In order to collect the necessary numerical data, style needs to be turned into numeric values, for example in terms of how many nouns or verbs a sentence contains, and how many premodifications each noun has. Leech and Short (2007: 60) propose a set of descriptive categories which enable an adequate categorization of a language. They call this the “apparatus of linguistic description” which, based on the idea of the contrastive nature of linguistic categories, permits a collection of stylistic data on a systematic basis (cf. Leech & Short 2007: 75). Furthermore, the checklist is based on the assumption that the stylistic values are associated with grammatical terms accounting to the following:
(a) Lexical categories, i.e. word-classes
(b) Grammatical categories, embracing functions of lexical categories
(c) Figures of speech
(d) Context and cohesion

The arrangement of the lexical and grammatical categories derive from Quirk et al.’s (2008: 67) general view of grammar, whereas the subcategory context and cohesion is based on the work by Halliday and Hassan (1994). The tool for classification, embracing all these four categories, is deemed to enable the successful collection of data which afterwards allows the computations for the quantitative analysis required to test the hypothesis stated in Section 1.

The above description gives the impression that stylistics is turned into a branch of mathematics in the present case. But critics warn for that to happen. They claim that it always needs to be observed that stylostatistics should only serve as an auxiliary measure in order to support or reject linguistics claims (e.g. Ardat 1986: 2). Accordingly, one should not attempt to turn linguistics into a mathematical subject, as this is not possible due to the non-classifiable manifoldness of linguistics. In addition to that, it needs to be asked if it is really necessary to prove one’s way by stylostatistical means. Because there is a likelihood that, by (ab)using mathematical means, something is proved “what no man has not yet pretended to doubt” (Leech & Short 2007: 47). Thus, it needs to be carefully checked if stylostatistical means are really required to carry out a particular linguistic examination. In the present case, the use of stylostatistics seems to be justified, as it enables a more objective view of an otherwise subjective matter. In addition, such an approach lays the groundwork for this topic, since it is assumed that further research will follow, which will not solely rely on statistical means.

2.2 GENDER AND TRANSLATION

So far, little research has been carried out on gender differences in the field of translation studies, even though gender is assumed to play an important role in this context. Sherry (2001: 26) defines the following four gender-related areas in translation studies, none of which directly deals with gender and style:

(a) the historical and contemporary role of women as translators,
(b) the critique of language usually employed to describe language,
(c) the analysis of the particular technical difficulties and ideological questions involved in translating gendered language,
(d) the promotion of feminist translation as a set of principles which should guide translation practice.

While the historical role of women as translators and questions regarding ideology in translation involve important features for the present investigation, none of the deeper-going studies in these subcategories are directly associated with style in translation.

Leaving the field of translation studies, we may note that more research seems to have been carried out on differences between males and females in general language use. For example, in her work on English language use, Tannen (1990: 79) showed that women and men have different ways of talking, which appears to be partly due to the different gender roles of the individuals participating in the communication. Even though the male and female stereotypes in communication are deemed to be full of contradictions (Giri 2006: 79 ff.), it has again been shown that “differences between gender cultures infuse communication” (Woods
One of Woods’ findings was that misunderstanding between men and women can stem from different interaction styles, which she claims to be rooted in socially defined differences between males and females. But gender performs its influence not only in spoken language. It has an important role also in the field of written language, because language in general can be regarded as a medium of expressing and reflecting gender. This is due to the fact that the notion of gender is socially constructed. Gender stereotypes are a part of this concept, as they are ideological prescriptions for an individual’s behavior. This means that actual individuals have to respond to the stereotypical roles society expects of them. In doing so, the individual contributes to the need of constructing and communicating gender identity (Talbot 2003). Consequently, gender does not only have an influence on spoken language, but also in the production of written language, including translation.

The studies referred to so far show theoretical approaches to the subject of gender and linguistic style in translation. The only problem that arises here is that they merely assume the influences of gender on language, but none of the authors attempts to provide evidence in order to confirm their assumptions. Leonardi (2007) was one of the first scholars to examine the relationship between gender and translation. She questioned, in the framework of a qualitative study, if men and women are likely to translate in a different way due to differences in their gender and/or ideological positioning. The focus of the study was on novels of different feminist authors and the way they were translated from Italian into English. Her results show that the translator’s gender can exert an influence on the translation process to a certain degree, which can lead to differences between the source and the target texts.

### 2.3 Primary and Secondary Factors in Translation of Style

Looking closer at the notion of style, there are numerous factors influencing the application of a certain style in the production phase of a text. Leech et al. (1981: 10) mention the following three factors:

- context
- person
- purpose

In the following, these factors will be referred to as primary factors, as they are assumed to have a strong influence on the translator’s stylistic choice. Additionally, there are a set of minor factors thought to exert an influence as well, which will be referred to as secondary factors. A sample of these factors is of singled out below (cf. Kim 2006: 283):

- socio-economic background of the translator
- translation theory used
- time pressure
- cultural awareness
- linguistic ability
- gender
- historical aspects

The translator’s socio-economic background is a sociological factor that describes influences stemming from the class membership of the translator and his/her family. Another important
factor is time pressure, mainly because translating professionally is a job on a highly competitive market. Thus, it can be assumed that a translator sometimes makes a choice of a stylistic item under time pressure which would not have been employed with more respite available.

A third important factor is the historical aspect. It is quite likely that the form of English used when the translation was carried out can have an influence on the stylistic choices made during the translation process. After all, the English language is subject to continuous changes, showing shifts with regard to word choice, the use of grammatical constructions and the appearance of neologisms, etc.

The factors named above, including several other aspects, are likely to wield influence on the style of the target text. The following figure shows this pattern, with x representing the influencing factors and y the style.

**Figure 1.** Schematic relation between style and influential factors identified

This figure implies a situation where there are numerous influences on style in language. In the case of the present study, the difficulty will be to distinguish gender from all the other factors thought to be relevant here.

### 3. Methodology

Previously it was shown that quantitative methods can be employed to compare style, as well as to classify style, in different target texts. The application of these quantitative methods will be explained in the present section. Further, the main object of study, Gustave Flaubert’s novel *Madame Bovary*, will be presented, as well as the data collection process and the computing of the mathematical analysis.

#### 3.1 Why Quantitative Rather Than Qualitative Research?

There are two main reasons why preference is given to quantitative research in the present study. On the one hand, Leech and Short’s (2007: 74 ff.) classification grid for style allows for a classification of style by means of numeric values, which in turn enables an objective comparison of different translations. Patterns can thus be computed by means of quantitative research, which opens up for valid statements based on objective data. On the other hand,
the results of quantitative research are projectable to the whole population. This means that not every word of every single translation version needs to be analyzed, but it will instead be possible to select a sample, i.e. only a couple of sentences, which are then examined as a substitute for the whole text. Nonetheless, the outcome of the examination allows making claims about the whole version in question. The necessary steps for the quantitative analysis of the data are further explained below.

3.1.1 SELECTION OF SAMPLE POPULATION
In the underlying French source text, the overall number of sentences is 5,605. From this a sample needs to be chosen, this being done in a way in which makes this sample representative of the whole target text. Based on a selection process called “Simple Random Sampling without Replacement”, the result determines a minimum sample size of 66 sentences. This means that in each of the four target texts the same sections need to be examined, corresponding to the 66 sentences in the French version. By doing so, a reliable result can be generated that allows a valid statement about the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis regarding the whole of the target texts.

The 66 sentences were taken from three different parts of the novel, i.e. every excerpt consists of twenty-two sentences in the source text. In this respect, it is beneficial that the novel consists of three volumes, so that one extract with the length of 22 sentences can be taken from each volume. In Appendix 1, the translated excerpts of each of the four translators are given.

3.1.2 CLASSIFICATION OF THE DATA
In order to gain data from each of the 66 sentences, the next step is to define an analysis grid for the classification of data. This grid allows the transformation of stylistic properties into numeric values, which then in turn enables a statistical analysis. For this purpose, Leech’s “apparatus of linguistic description” (Leech & Short 2007: 74 ff.) has been adapted. The adapted grid is shown in Table 1:

**Table 1.** Grid for the classification of data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Lexical Data</th>
<th>II. Grammatical Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>Verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>Adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>Prepositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subord. Conjunction</td>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
<td>Noun Phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun Phrases</td>
<td>Premodification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premodification</td>
<td>Postmodification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmodification</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the four categories proposed by Leech et al. for the classification of style in fiction, only two have been chosen. This is due to the fact that the authors themselves have not
thoroughly defined the category figures of speech. Thus, this one will not be applied, as this topic is rather extensive and would require a complete definition before being put to work. In addition, the categories shown in Table 1 have experienced a reduction compared to the table in Leech et al. (2007: 80 f.), as it was assumed that the adapted grid supplies enough data for a reliable claim about the style of a translation. This is so because many additional categories in the grid by Leech et al. do solely represent a further division of the categories.

The classification of the data was carried out by hand. When a stylistic item could be simultaneously assigned to two categories, the decision for one or the other category was based on available information in Quirk et al. (2008).

3.1.3 CHI-SQUARE TEST

After collecting the data, the next step was to process them. The statistical tool employed for the processing is generally defined by the amount and type of the variables. The present research is based on two variables: the category style, which represents a dependent variable, and the category of gender, which represents an independent variable. The latter characterization is due to its categorical property, since this notion describes traditionally two categories: either male or female. This dichotomy, used in order to refer to the characteristics and behaviors that different cultures attribute to the sexes, denies the existence of other, additional categories. Even though the author does not want to deny the existence of additional groups, this controversial dichotomous understanding of the term gender will be employed, as this is traditionally the case in linguistic research.

For the present variable configuration, Litosseliti (2010: 74) suggests the application of the Pearson Chi-square test. This test is designed to investigate if two variables are dependent on each other or not by means of calculating what the distribution of the variable would be if the null hypothesis were true for the given sample. In other words, the null hypothesis represents the negative form of the hypothesis. For the present study, it reads as follows: The gender of the translator has no influence on the style in the translation.

The result of the chi-square test is indicated with the letter p, which describes the significance level. The range of p is between 0 and 1. The closer p is to 0, the higher the probability that the hypothesis is correct. In the social sciences, the benchmark has traditionally been set at the level of 0.05 (e.g. Leech & Short 2007: 118). So, if p=.049, we can support the hypothesis with a 95.1% probability. If p=.37, the hypothesis is correct with a chance of 63%, which means that we can not support the hypothesis, as the significance needs to be at least at 95%.

3.1.4 CROSS EXAMINATION OF THE DATA

As already mentioned in Section 2.3, there are many secondary factors which can have an influence on the style a translator employs in the target text. One of these factors is the historical aspect. It is assumed that this aspect has an influence on the style in the two pairs of translations from the 1960s and the 2010s. So, if the 1960s and the 2010s versions are compared with regard to gender influence, differences will probably be detected. If these findings then turn out to be related only to the influence of the translator’s gender, a so-called spurious correlation exists (e.g. Vaus 2002: 324), because the historical aspect, contributing to the stylistic differences detected, has been excluded from the research setup in question. In order to avoid the emergence of spurious correlations, cross examinations of the data
should be carried out. The first cross test, dealing with the historical aspect, tries to find out if it yields an influence on style in translation.

If the first cross examination shows that the historical factor has no significant influence on style in the different versions, another cross examination needs to be carried out, i.e. one focusing on if there is a significant relation between the two male versions and the two female versions, respectively. The results of the second examination then contribute to the interpretation of the main results.

3.2 Factors conditioning the selection of the target text
The following discussion will show what particular criteria have led to the selection of a source text by Gustave Flaubert. The second part will then explain how the four different versions of Flaubert’s *Madame Bovary* were chosen for this analysis.

3.2.1 Influences on the target text
In the following, the primary and secondary factors identified in Section 2, exerting an influence on style in the source text, need to be determined. This is of importance as the aim is to construct a test setup in which there is a minimization of all the factors shown in Figure 1, i.e. those exerting an influence on the translation’s style. Thus, it is only the factor of gender that should not be excluded in the test configuration. This arrangement will in turn allow a maximized picture of the influence of gender on style in the target text. The following figure shows the desired test setup for the analysis.

![Figure 2. Desired test setup](image)

Ideally, as already implied, the desired test setup should allow for the examination of the relationship between gender and style only, excluding all the other factors. The only issue that could possibly occur is a spurious relationship. As the possibility of this happening can not be completely excluded by the present setup, the only way of evading such influence is to carefully examine the results and to carry out cross examinations (cf. Section 3.1.4).

The primary factors of style were named in Section 2.1. In the setup for the present study they do not influence style in the translated versions because *the given context* is the
underlying source text; the purpose of the text is defined by the purpose of the underlying source text. The third primary factor, which says that style is produced by a given person, is defined as well, as the aim in translation should be to transport the narrative part of the prose including the author’s style into the target language.

The secondary factors are more difficult to control and thus to exclude. In the present case, it is advantageous that gender is the most basic, socially constructed category for the categorization of human beings. As a result, this category is deemed to wield influence on other secondary factors, whereas there is supposed to be little influence the other way round. Nonetheless, other secondary factors may still have an influence. In this respect, the selection of the target texts is of high importance.

3.2.2 MADAME BOVARY AS SOURCE TEXT
The source text is a novel from Gustave Flaubert, entitled Madame Bovary. The novel was originally published in two volumes in 1857. The story’s heroine is Emma, who is married to the country practitioner Charles Bovary. But her marriage differs from the romantic image she got after reading about married life as a teenager. She tries to make up for the boredom of her marriage by spending a large amount of money on unnecessary items, and by having love affairs with two men. After a couple of years, Emma is in heavy debt because of her lifestyle and both her lovers turn their back on her. The only way of escaping from this situation is for her to poison herself with arsenic.

As Flaubert was so focused on style, and as, additionally, his novels are famous even outside the French-speaking world, it will be assumed that the translators tried to replicate his style as exactly as possible in the target language, which would limit the influence of the secondary factors. Thus, it can be argued that Flaubert’s Madame Bovary is a narrative whose translation can be analyzed with regard to gender, the external circumstances contributing to the reduction of primary and secondary factors influencing the translation process.

3.2.3 THE DIFFERENT TRANSLATIONS
Since the novel was published in 1857, many attempts have been made to translate it into English: so far there are roughly fifteen translations of Flaubert’s most well-known narrative.

The following four versions were chosen for the present study.

1. Paul de Man’s version from 1965. This well-known philosopher has published critical works on several of Flaubert’s novel. His version is, as he claims himself in the preface to his translation, “a substantially new translation based on the version by Eleanor Marx-Aveling” (Flaubert & de Man 1965: II).


3. Raymond MacKenzie’s version from 2009. This is one of the most recent translations, produced by a professor of English at the University of St. Thomas, Scotland. Thomas Pavel, Gordon J. Laing Distinguished Service Professor, is very positive about this version (Hackett Publishing 2010):
Raymond N. MacKenzie now offers us a fresh, superb version of Madame Bovary by Flaubert. Impeccably transparent, this new translation captures the original's careful, precise language and admirably conveys the small-mindedness of nineteenth-century provincial French towns. MacKenzie's tour de force transports the reader to Yonville and compels him to look at Emma with Flaubert's calm, disenchanted eyes.

4. Lydia Davis' version from 2010. She has published novels, book criticism, and French translation works. Her version can be called the most prominent contemporary one, not least because she blogged about her thoughts while translating it (accessible at http://www.theparisreview.org/blog/author/ldavis/). Moreover, one extract from this translation was published in the September 2010 issue of the American Playboy. Hugh Hefner, the founder of this magazine and the current editor, called it "a great read" in his twitter message (username@hughefner) published on August 12, 2010 at 8.45 pm. In fact, the extract was announced in the title of this Playboy issue: "A new translation of Flaubert’s Madame Bovary – The most scandalous novel of all time." (Playboy.com 2010).

In the following, the four chosen versions will be referred to as MacKenzie, Marmur, Davis and DeMan.

4. RESULTS

The following section reports on the results of the chi-square test applied to the present language data. In doing so, only the overall linguistic data for every translator will be incorporated, even though the classification process was carried out for each and every of the three extracts stemming from the three different volumes of Madame Bovary. But the computing of these outcomes does not lead to any statistically reliable results, only their sum is of importance. Nonetheless, in order to allow for a replication of the experiment, the language data for every single extract are given in Appendix 2.

All the figures will be reported in a meticulous way, including the required variables for the chi-square test. This, again, is in conformity with the demand for reliability. The following example shows how the results need to be read: the invented formula $\chi^2 (2, N=2)$, $p= .76$ shows the result of an assumed chi-square test. Specifically, this means that the degree of freedom (d) is 2, where N labels the number of variables that were taken into account, and $p$ labels the result of the $\chi^2$ test. As already stated above (Section 3.2.1.), the result of the chi-square test needs to be either equal to or below 0.05 (i.e. 5%); otherwise, the hypothesis can not be supported by the data available.

The first two subsections report results of the cross-examination, followed by the reporting of the results in the two subsections of the analysis grid. Thereafter, the results of the processing of the overall data will be presented. The discussion of the results can be found in Section 5.
4.1 CROSS EXAMINATION
The following part deals with the cross-examination of the data, containing examinations of same-gender relations and the influence of the historical factor. The theoretical reasoning for this test can be found in Section 3.2.4.

4.1.1 TIMELINE
The hypothesis for the following chi-square test is that the time-gap of fifty years has a measurable effect on style in translation in the present research setup i.e. the style used in these translations is significantly different due to the time span of nearly half a decade which lies between these versions. This idea is based on the assumption that the historical factor is a secondary factor in this context, exerting an influence on the translator’s style in the target texts, as shown in Section 2.

Table 2 shows the initial data. In this case, the numeric values for the male and the female data from the 1960s and the 2010s were added separately.

Table 2. Summary of the data from the 1960s and the 2010s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>II. Grammatical Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coord. Conjunction</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subord. Conjunction</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of the chi-square test $\chi^2 (2, 17)$ was $p = .78$. This means that the initial hypothesis cannot be supported, indicating that the time difference has no significant influence on style in the different translated versions.

This outcome is of importance for the further examination, as it is possible to compare also the two same-gender versions with respect to style.

4.1.2 CORRELATION BETWEEN SAME-GENDER TRANSLATIONS
As shown in the above section, the time difference has no measurable influence on style in the four versions taken. Thus, it can be checked if a correlation in style exists between the versions of the two male and the two female translators, respectively. The hypothesis for the following test runs as follows: there is a significant relationship between the two male translations and also between the two female translations. This supposition is deduced from the initial hypothesis: the assumption that translators belonging to different genders employ
different styles implies that translators of the same gender employ the same style while translating the same source text.

The chi-square test led to the following results: in two cases a non-significant relationship between the styles of the same-gender translators was found. In the Davis-Marmur version, the relation is at the p= .06 level, in MacKenzie – De Man at the p= .70 level, in both cases with d= 17, N= 2. Thus, it can be concluded that the versions of the same-gender translators have no stylistic correlation with each other.

### 4.2 OVERALL RESULTS FOR THE GENDER COMPARISON

The following table shows the summary of the data gained during the style analysis of the three extracts. One column was designated to each translator, with each column showing the number of lexical or grammatical items in question by means of numeric values for the individual translators. Looking at the table, we can see, for example, that MacKenzie uses 285 nouns in all the three sections examined, whereas Marmur only uses 276. In the Marmur version, on the other hand, 27 modal auxiliaries were found, which are 12 more than those in the Davis version.

**Table 3. Overall results of the gender analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Clauses</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Independent clauses</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Dependent clauses</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Verb Phrase Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Modal Auxiliaries</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Progressive Aspect</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coord. Conjunction</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Perfetive Aspect</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subord. Conjunction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Passive Voice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Noun Phrases</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Premodification</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Postmodification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sections deal with different aspects of the analysis of the data shown in Table 3.

### 4.3 GRAMMATICAL DATA

This section deals with the results of the examination of grammatical data. A first glance at the early translators shows that the overall numbers of chosen grammatical items are quite different. For grammatical choice in general, there is a difference of 3% between the two versions. The highest difference is perceived in the subcategory “dependent clauses” where the difference is 40%. This lack of dependent clauses was compensated for by a proportionally higher number of independent clauses (122 vs. 91) in Marmur’s data. (cf. Table 3, II. Grammatical Data). The application of the chi-square test on this subset of data shows that these two sections are at $\chi^2 (7, N = 2), p = .01$. Consequently, gender has a significant influence on the stylistic properties of the translated versions regarding grammatical data.
The grammatical data for the late translators show smaller differences between the two versions. The most important one is Davis’ usage of half as many modal auxiliaries compared to her colleague, but this is of relatively low importance as these figures contribute to the overall data with less than 1%. The result of the chi-square test is the following: \( \chi^2(7, N=2), p= .27 \). In this case, the connection of the two variables gender and grammatical style can not be regarded as significant, as the hypothesis could only be supported to the extent of 73%.

4.4. Lexical Data
While the grammatical data show a generally higher number of grammatical items in use by the contemporary translators, this turns out to be the case in the lexical subset as well. This is due to the fact that a higher number of words is used by the modern translator, which leads automatically to a high number of grammatical items. With regard to the word count, the early and late versions differ from each other with nearly 5% (cf. Table 3, I. Lexical Data).

The 1960s versions are not identical: Marmur uses about 10% more adjectives than the female translator, whereas De Man similarly utilizes 5% more nouns. This again is outbalanced in the overall number of lexical items, where the difference between the overall number of items is less than one percent. The chi-square test leads to a result of \( \chi^2(12, N=2) \) p= .33.

Finally, the analysis of the 2010 versions leads to a very balanced data table; the only major difference is perceivable with regards to adverbs: Davis uses such items about 18% more than does MacKenzie. The chi-square test for these two versions leads to a result of \( \chi^2(12, N=2) \), p= .69.

4.5 Overall Results
In the preceding sections, 4.3 and 4.4, the chi-square test was carried out solely with subunits of the overall data, i.e. once with the lexical data and once with the grammatical data counted for each and every author. Examining the overall results, on the other hand, means combining for every author the numeric values from the lexical and the grammatical subunits, which are then computed with the help of the chi-square test.

Thus, the result of the chi-square test for the MacKenzie and Davis versions is p= .47, whereas the test for De Man and Marmur leads to a result of p= .01. In both cases, the degree of freedom (d) is at the level of 19, and the number of variables is two, i.e. N=2. These results mean that in the MacKenzie /Davis case no correlation can be found between gender and lexical/grammatical style. For the DeMan and Marmur versions, in contrast, a significant correlation between gender and lexical/grammatical style was found, specifically p < .05 with p=.01.
5. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The following subsections further explain the findings from Section 4. The first section refers to the findings relating to time and same-gender versions, whereas the second attempts to throw light on the accuracy of the initial hypothesis.

5.1 FINDINGS REGARDING TIME AND SAME-GENDER VERSIONS

In Section 2.3, the influences of primary and secondary factors on the text were discussed. Among other things, it was assumed that the chronological difference between the two version pairs could be due to a spurious factor, which in turn can cause a misleading outcome. With regard to the time difference, the results indicated a significance figure of $p = 0.78$. This means that, even though nearly half a century lies in-between these two sets of versions, the historical factor does not seem to exert a significant influence on the style in translation.

This result leads further to the assumption that it is possible to carry out cross-examinations between translations from the 1960s and the 2010s, as the historical factor does not indicate any influence on style in these versions. The results of the comparison of the same-gender versions show that an insignificant correlation exists between the style of the male-male and the female-female translations. This seems to mean that the translators examined in this study employ different styles in their translations, even though they belong to the same gender group.

5.2 DOES GENDER INFLUENCE STYLE IN THE TRANSLATIONS EXAMINED?

It was shown in Section 2.2 that, theoretically, it can be assumed that gender has an influence on style in translation. The following table gives an overview of the results reported in Section 4. The table shows three types of results: one for each of the two subtests and one for the overall examination, always for each pair of translators. The last column indicates whether or not the hypothesis is supported by the p-value.

Table 4. Relationship between the initial hypothesis and the p-value outcome of the present study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Hypothesis supported?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammaratical Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie/Davis</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMan/Marmur</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexical Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie/Davis</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMan/Marmur</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie/Davis</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMan/Marmur</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we can see, Table 4 shows that style can be directly related to gender in only one of the two subtests. This is the case for the grammatical data in the early translations, where the hypothesis can be supported with a probability of 99%. As for the lexical data, it is clear that the hypothesis cannot be supported in either of the two cases. Regarding the overall results, the hypothesis can be supported by the DeMan/Marmur versions, but not by the MacKenzie/Davis versions.

As a definitive answer cannot be given by solely examining the main outcome of the study, the results of the cross-examination of the data need to be taken into account here as well. In Section 4.1, a cross-examination of the data was carried out, which showed that the two male versions had no stylistic similarity regarding their style (p= .077), whereas the two female versions were quite similar in this respect, although not similar enough for the result to be statistically valid (p= .06). Interpreting the results for the main hypothesis with this knowledge, we can see that there is certain likelihood that this correlation between gender and style in the 1960s versions is a fortuitous relationship. Accordingly, it can be concluded that it is unlikely that gender has an influence on style in translation in the material examined.

6. CONCLUSION

The present study has shown that gender does not significantly correlate with linguistic style in translation. Regarding the two subareas of the Leech & Short grid, style can only be directly related to gender in the grammatical data in the early translations with a probability of 99%. With regard to the lexical data, the hypothesis cannot be supported by means of the chi-square test. Furthermore, the overall results of the DeMan/Marmur versions, but not the overall outcomes of the MacKenzie/Davis versions, can support the main hypothesis. Checking the main hypothesis on the basis of the results of the cross-examinations, there is a certain likelihood that this correlation between gender and style in the early versions represents a fortuitous relationship.

This quantitative study shows that while the four translators studied employed different stylistic means in their translations, these differences cannot be clearly linked to the translator’s gender. Hence, the outcome of the study goes against the idea of there being a gender difference in style with regard to the translations examined. Thus, the results cannot be added as yet another piece of evidence to alleged gender differences, such as the ability to drive a car or that of performing multitasking. Instead, the present outcome should be regarded as a contribution to the branch of gender studies in linguistics in order to get a better idea of the situation, suggesting at the same time that further research be carried out on this topic. This could be done, for example, by taking the present data into account, as there are still unanswered questions that need to be clarified in order to fully understand the picture. Such questions include the following: How would the results be affected if a larger group of translators were included? Are the differences perceived only linked to the translator’s idiolect, or can gender-based differences be detected?

In addition to these future objectives, this quantitative study also needs to be completed by the employment of a method of triangulation. This means that multiple methods are applied to the same data material, which can help to overcome intrinsic biases that come from single-handed methods, i.e. single-observer and single-theory studies with a low number of
versions examined. For example, a successful triangulation could involve a qualitative research approach. The present study contains a considerable amount of data material, but due to its quantitative approach it enables superficial analysis only. Thus, a complementary qualitative study could give further insights, as this type of study makes it possible to look beyond the present results. This is so because differences perceivable in the present data could be thoroughly examined and located directly in the different translations, which means that the numeric values could be followed back to the underlying linguistic material. In this respect, a semantic analysis of the lexical components of each translation, for example, could give a more holistic view on possible differences between men and women in making their stylistic choices.
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APPENDIX I

VERSION LYDIA DAVIS

VOLUME I, CHAPTER 1
She made excuses for him, shifting the blame for his failure to the unfairness of the examiners, and steadied him a little, taking it upon herself to sort things out. Only five years later did Monsieur Bovary know the truth; it was old by then, he accepted it, incapable, moreover, of supposing that any man descended from him could be a fool. Charles therefore set to work again and prepared, unremittingly, the subjects for his examination, for which he learned all the questions by heart in advance. He passed with a fairly good grade. What a great day for his mother! They put on a grand dinner.

Where would he go to practice? To Tostes. There was only one elderly doctor there. For a long time, Madame Bovary had been waiting for him to die, and the old gentleman had not yet breathed his last when Charles was installed across the road, as his successor.

But it was not enough to have raised her son, seen to it that he got his medical training, and discovered Tostes for his practice: he needed a wife. She found him one: a bailiff’s widow from Dieppe, who was forty-five years old with an income of twelve hundred livres.

Although she was ugly, thin as lath, as thick with pimples as the spring is with buds, Madame Dubuc certainly had no lack of suitors to choose from. To achieve her ends, Mère Bovary was obliged to supplant them all, and she very skilfully foiled even the intrigues of the pork butcher favored by the clergy.

Charles had foreseen in marriage the advent of a better situation, imagining that he would have more freedom and would be able to do as he like with himself and his money. But his wife was the one in charge; in company he had to say this, not say that, eat no meat on Fridays, dress as she expected, pester at her command those clients who had not paid. She would open his letters, spy on his movements, and listen to him, through the wall, when he saw patients in his office, if they were women. She had to have her hot chocolate every morning, she wanted endless attention. She complained incessantly about her nerves, about her chest, about her spirits. The sound of footsteps was painful to her; if people left her, the solitude would become loathsome to her; if they came back, it was to see her die, no doubt.

VOLUME II, CHAPTER 14
First of all, he did not know how he was going to compensate Monsieur Homais for all the medicaments that had come from his pharmacy; and although, as a doctor, he could have chosen not to pay, nevertheless he felt a little ashamed that incurring that obligation. Then the household expenses, now that the servant was in charge, were becoming frightening; the notes were raining down on the house; the trades people were complaining; Monsieur Lheureux, above all, was harassing him. Indeed, at the height of Emma’s illness, Lheureux profiting from the circumstances to pad his bill, had promptly brought over the coat, the overnight bag, two trunks instead of one, an abundance of other things as well. It was in vain
that Charles said he did not need them; the merchant answered arrogantly that all theses articles had been ordered from him and that he would not take them back; besides, it would be upsetting to Madame during her convalescence; Monsieur should think it over; in short, he was resolved to pursue him in a court of law rather than give up his rights and take back his merchandise. Charles afterward ordered everything to be sent back to the shop; Félicité forgot; he had other worries; it was not thought of again; Monsieur Lheureux returned to the attack and, by turns threatening and complaining, maneuvered in such a way that in the end Bovary signed a note payable in six months. But scarcely had he signed this note, than a bold idea struck him: to borrow 1,000 francs from Monsieur Lheureux. And so he asked with a look of embarrassment if there was not some means of obtaining this amount, adding that it would be for one year at any rate of interest he liked. Lheureux hurried to his shop, brought back the ecus, and dictated another note, whereby Bovary undertook to pay his order, on September 1 next, the sum of 1,070 francs; which, with the 180 already stipulated, came to exactly 1,250. Thus, lending at 6 percent, augmented by a quarter’s commission and a profit of a good third at least on the goods, the whole thing should, in twelve months, yield a profit of 130 francs; and he hoped the matter not end there, that the notes would not be paid, that they would be renewed, and that this meager capital, having been well nourished in the doctor’s home as though in a private sanatorium, would return to him, one day, considerably plumper, large enough to split open the bag. Everything, moreover, was going well for him. He was the contracting party to the Neufchâtel hospital; Monsieur Guillaumin had promised him some shares in the Grumesnil peat bogs; and he was thinking of setting up a new coach service between Argueil and Rouen, which would soon, no doubt, spell the end of that old rattletrap at the Lion d’Or and, being faster, costing less, and carrying larger loads, would thus put all the Yonville trade into his hands.

Charles often asked himself how he was going to be able to pay back so much money the following year; and he would search his mind, imagine various expedients, such as appealing to his father or selling something. But his father would have turned a deaf ear, and he himself had nothing he could sell. And he encountered so many difficulties that he would quickly put such unpleasant reflections out of his mind. He would reproach himself for forgetting Emma; as if all his thoughts belonged to her and he was stealing from her if he failed to think about her all the time.

The winter was harsh. Madame’s convalescence was a long one. When the weather was fine, they would push her in her armchair up to the window, the one that looked out over the square; for she now had an aversion to the garden, and the shutters on that side always remained closed.

VOLUME III, CHAPTER 11

Rodolphe had remained silent. And Charles, his head in his hands, went on in a dull voice, with the resigned tone of endless suffering: “No, I don’t hold it against you anymore!”

He even added a grand phrase, the only one that he had ever spoken: “Fate is to blame!”

Rodolphe, who had determined the course of that fate, found him very compliant for a man in his situation, comical even, and rather low.
The next day, Charles went to sit on the bench in the arbor. Rays of light passed through the trellis; grape leaves traced their shadows on the sand, jasmine perfumed the air, the sky was blue, cantharis beetles buzzed around the flowering lilies, and Charles was suffocating like an adolescent under the vague outpourings of love that swelled his grieving heart.

At seven o’clock, little Berthe, who had not see him all afternoon, came to call him for dinner.

He was leaning back against the wall, his eyes were closed, his mouth was open, and he was holding in his hands a long lock of black hair.

“Papa, come!” she said.

And thinking he wanted to play, she pushed him gently. He fell to the ground. He was dead.

Thirty-six hours later, at the apothecary’s request, Monsieur Canivet came. He opened him and found nothing.

When everything was sold, there remained twelve francs seventy-five centimes, which was used to pay Mademoiselle Bovary’s fare to her grandmother’s house. The old woman died the same year; Père Rouault being paralyzed, it was an aunt that took charge of her. She is poor and sends her to work for her living in a cotton mill.

Since Bovary’s death, three doctors have followed one another in Yonville without success, so promptly and thoroughly has Monsieur Homais routed them. He himself has an infernally good clientele; the authorities treat him kindly and public opinion protects him.

He has just been awarded the cross of the Legion of Honor.

**VERSION MILDRED MARMUR:**

*Volume I, Chapter 1*

She made excuses for him, blamed the failure on the unfairness of the examiners, and cheered him up a bit, taking it on herself to arrange matters. Only five years later did Monsieur Bovary learn the truth; by then he accepted it as ancient history. Moreover, he was unable to accept the fact that a son of his might be a fool.

So Charles went back to work and prepared unceasingly for his examination. He memorized all the questions beforehand and passed with a decent grade. It was a happy day for his mother. They celebrated with a big dinner party.

Where would he practice? In Tostes. There was only one old doctor there. Madame Bovary had been watching out for his death for a long time, and the good soul had barely expired when Charles moved in across the street of his successor. But it was not enough to have raised her son, arranged for him to study medicine, and discovered Tostes for him to practice in. He needed a wife. She found him one: the widow of a Dieppe bailiff, who was forty-five years old and had an income of twelve hundred pounds.

Although she was ugly, thin as a rail and had as many pimples as the springtime has buds, Madame Dubuc was not lacking in suitors. In order to achieve her goal Mother Bovary had to
overcome them all, and she even frustrated quite cleverly the intrigues of a pork butcher whose suit was being supported by the priests.

Charles had hoped for better days following his marriage. He assumed he would be freer to choose his own actions and spend his money as he pleased. But his wife was the ruler; he had to watch what he said and didn’t say in public, eat fish on Friday, dress as she described, and harass the patients who didn’t pay. She would open his letters, spy on his whereabouts, and listen behind the partition when there were women in his consulting room. She had to have her chocolate every morning and constantly demanded various services. She complained incessantly about her nerves, her chest, her moods. She couldn’t stand the sound of footsteps; if he went away she couldn’t bear solitude; if he hovered near her it was surely in order to see her die.

**Volume II, Chapter 14**

In the first place, he didn’t know how he could reimburse Homais for all the medicines he had supplied; and although as a doctor he didn’t have to pay, he still felt embarrassed. Then too, now that the cook was mistress, the household expenses were becoming frightening; bills poured into the house, the tradespeople grumbled. Lheureux in particular was dunning him. He had even, when Emma was at the critical point in her illness, taken advantage of the circumstance to increase his bill; he had quickly delivered the cloak, traveling bag, two trunks instead of one, and a number of other things as well. Charles protested vainly that he didn’t need them. The shopkeeper answered with arrogance that all the items had been ordered from him and that he wouldn’t taken them back. Besides, if he did, it might be detrimental to Madame in her convalescence. Monsieur ought to think about it. In brief, he was determined to bring him into court rather than give up his rights and take the merchandise back. Charles then ordered the goods to be returned to the store; Félicité forgot, Charles had other worries, and they though not further about it. Monsieur Lheureux resumed the attack and managed, by alternating whines and threats, to maneuver Bovary into signing a promissory note to be paid within six months. The ink was barely dry on the note when Charles had a daring thought. This was to borrow from Lheureux. And so he asked with embarrassment if he could borrow them, adding that the loan would be for one year and at the stipulated rate of interest. Lheureux ran to his store, brought back the money, and dictated another note, on which Bovary declared that he had to pay to his order, on September 1 following, the sum of one thousand seventy francs, which, with the 180 already stipulated, made an even 1,250. Thus, lending at six percent, plus twenty-five percent commissions, and with the goods bringing in another third at least, he would have 130 francs’ profit in a year. He was hoping that the matter wouldn’t stop there, that Charles wouldn’t be able to pay the notes and that they would be renewed, and that his meager funds, having nourished themselves at the doctor’s expense like a patient in a rest home, would return one day considerably plumper, and fat enough to burst his moneybag.

Besides, everything was going his way. He had the contract for supplying cider to the Neufchâtel poorhouse; Monsieur Guillaumin had promised him shares in the Grumesnil peat bogs; and he was thinking about establishing a new coach line between Argueil and Rouen, which would certainly put a quick end to the rickety old Golden Lion carriage and which with its greater speed, lowered prices and greater baggage capacity would concentrate all the business of Yonville in his hands.
Charles kept wondering how he would be able to pay back so much money the following year; he tried to think about various schemes – such as turning to his father or selling something. But his father would turn a deaf ear, and he personally had nothing to sell. Then the difficulties seemed to loom so large that he thrust the unpleasant thoughts from his mind. He reproached himself for forgetting Emma as if he owed her all of his thoughts and were robbing her by thinking of other matters.

It was a severe winter. Emma’s convalescence made slow progress. When the weather was good, they would push her over to the window, the one overlooking the square, because she hated the garden now and the shutter on that side was always closed.

*Volume III, Chapter 11*

Rodolphe remained mute. Charles, with his head in his hands, repeated in a muffled voice and in a resigned tone of infinite sadness: “No, I don’t blame you, anymore.” He even added a rhetorical phrase, the only one he ever uttered: “Fate is to blame.”

Rodolphe, who had manipulated that fate, found him much too easygoing for a man in his situation – rather comic and even a bit contemptible.

The next day Charles sat down on the bench in the arbor. Rays of light passed through the trellies; the vine leaves cast their shadows over the gravel, the jasmine scented in the air, the sky was blue, beetles buzzed about the blossoming lilies. Charles was choking up like an adolescent in love in the vague flood of emotion that swelled his unhappy heart.

Berthe, who had not seen him all afternoon, came to fetch him for dinner at seven. His head was thrown back against the wall. His eyes were closed, mouth open, and in his hand he held a long strand of black hair. “Come, Papa,” she said. Thinking he wanted to play, she pushed him gently. He fell to the ground. He was dead.

Thirty-six hours later, in response to the apothecary’s request, Monsieur Canivet came. He performed an autopsy but found nothing.

When everything was sold, there remained twelve francs and seventy-five centime, enough to pay for Mademoiselle Bovary’s fare to her grandmother’s. The old lady died the same year. Since old Rouault was now paralyzed, an aunt took her in. She is poor and has sent her to work in a cotton mill to earn a living.

Since Bovary’s death, three doctors have succeeded one another in Yonville without being able to establish themselves, so effectively does Monsieur Homais rout them. He has an enormous clientele. The authorities cultivate him and public opinion protects him. He has just received the Legion of Honor.

*Version Raymond MacKenzie*

*Volume I, Chapter 1*

She made excuses for him, blaming his failure on the unfairness of the examiners, and, giving him little encouragement, took it upon herself to arrange things. Monsieur Bovary only learned about it five years later: by then it was old news and he could accept it, incapable of
believing that a son of his could be a fool. So Charles went back to work and prepared nonstop for the examination, memorizing all the questions in advance. He passed with a respectable grade. What a great day for his mother! They gave him a fine dinner in celebration.

Where would he go to practice his art? To Tostes. There was only one old doctor there. Madame Bovary had been watching and waiting for news of his death for a long time, and the good old man had scarcely packed it in when Charles was installed across the stress as his successor.

But it was not enough to have raised her son, to have him learn medicine and to have discovered Tostes as the place he would practice: he needed a wife. She found him one: the widow of a Dieppe bailiff, who was forty-five, with an income of 1,200 livres.

Although she was ugly, as dried out as an old stick, and as pimpled as a budding springtime, Madame Dubuc nevertheless did not lack of suitors. To achieve her ends, Madame Bovary was obliged to oust them all, and she played her hand so well that she outmaneuvered a pork butcher who had had the support of the priests.

Charles had expected that marriage would mean a better kind of life, imagining that he would be more free, that he would be in charge of both himself and his money. But his wife was the master: in company, he had to say this and not that, to fast every Friday, to dress the way she wanted, to harass, on her orders, clients who had not paid up. She opened his letters, spied on his comings and goings, and listened through the partition when there were women in his consulting room.

She insisted on her chocolate every morning and made endless demands on him. She complained incessantly about her nerves, her chest, her moods. His footsteps annoyed her; he would go out; solitude became horrible for her; when he returned, she would complain that he had only come back to watch her die.

**Volume II, Chapter 14**

In the first place, he didn’t know how he could pay Homais for all the medications he brought to him: and even though as a doctor he was not required to pay for them, still he blushed at the obligation. Then the household expenses, now that the kitchen maid had taken charge, had become horrific; bills rained upon the house; the tradesman grumbled; Monsieur Lheureux in particular harassed him. In fact, when Emma’s illness was at its worst, the latter took advantage of the circumstances to increase his bill, hurriedly delivering the cloak, the overnight bag, two trunks instead of one, and a great many other things as well. In vain Charles said he didn’t need them, for the merchant arrogantly responded that all these things had been ordered, and he could not return them; besides, this would only upset Madame during her convalescence; Monsieur ought to think it over: in short, he was determined to pursue his case in court rather than give up his rights and take back the merchandise. Afterwards, Charles gave orders that it should all be returned to his shop; Félicité forgot to do it; Charles had other worries; he though no more about it; Monsieur Lheureux went back on the attack and, alternating between menacing and whining, managed to get Bovary to sign a promissory note, due in full in six months. But he had scarcely signed the note when an audacious idea occurred to him: to borrow a thousand francs from Monsieur Lheureux. So he
Charles often wondered how he would be able to pay so much money back in the following year; and he imagined various expedients, such as asking his father for help or selling something. But his father would turn a deaf ear to him, and he personally didn’t have anything to sell. Then the problems seemed so large and intractable that he quickly dismissed such unpleasant topics from his mind. He reproached himself for having forgotten Emma; as if, since all his thoughts rightfully belonged to her, it was robbing her of something not to be continually thinking of her.

The winter was a harsh one. Madame’s convalescence was slow. When the sun was out, her chair could be pushed up near the window, the one overlooking the square, because she could no longer bear looking at the garden, and the shutters on that side of the room remained permanently closed.

**VOLUME III, CHAPTER 11**

Rodolphe remained silent. And Charles, his head in his two hands, repeated lifelessly, with the resigned tone of infinite sorrow:

“No, I don’t blame you any more!”

He added on fine phrase, the only one he ever uttered: “Fate is to blame.”

Rodolphe, who had been in charge of that particular fate, found him awfully easygoing for a man in his situation, comical even, and a bit cowardly.

The next day, Charles went to sit on the bench in the arbor. Rays of sunlight streamed through the trellis; the vine leaves threw their shadows on the sand path, the jasmine scented the air, the sky was blue, flies were buzzing around the lilies in bloom, and Charles was suffocating like an adolescent under the vague waves of love that were swelling his despondent heart. At seven o’clock, little Berthe, who had not seen him all afternoon, went to
him for dinner. His head was leaning back against the wall, his eyes closed, his mouth open, and his hand holding a long lock of black hair.

“Papa, come in!” she said. And thinking that he wanted to play, she pushed him gently. He fell to the ground. He was dead.

Thirty-six hours later, at the request of the pharmacist, Monsieur Canivet hurried over. He performed an autopsy and found nothing.

When everything was sold, there were only twelve francs and seventy-five centimes left over to pay for Mademoiselle Bovary’s trip to her grandmother’s. The good old woman died the same year; old Rouault was paralyzed, and it was an aunt who took her in. She is poor, and she sends the girl to a cotton mill to earn a living.

Since Bovary’s death, three different doctors have followed him in Yonville without being able to succeed, so soundly does Homais defeat them. He has a hell of a practice; the authorities watch over him, and public opinion protects him. He has just been awarded the Cross of the Legion of Honor.

**Version Paul de Man**

*Volume I, Chapter 1*

She excused him, threw the blame of his failure on the injustice of the examiners, encouraged him a little, and took upon herself to set matters straight. It was only five years later that Monsieur Bovary knew the truth; it was old by then, and he accepted it. Moreover, he could not believe that a man born of him could be a fool.

So Charles set to work again and crammed for his examination, ceaselessly learning all the old questions by heart. He passed pretty well. What a happy day for his mother! They gave him a grand dinner.

Where should he go to practice? To Tostes, where there was only one old doctor. For a long time Madame Bovary had been on the look-out for his death, and the old fellow had barely packed off when Charles was installed, opposite his place, as his successor.

But it was not everything to have brought up a son, to have had him taught medicine, and discovered Tostes, where he could practice it; he must have a wife. She found him one – the widow of a bailiff at Dieppe, who was forty-five and had an income of twelve hundred francs.

Though she was ugly, as dry as a bone, her face with as many pimples as the spring has buds, Madame Dubuc had no lack of suitors. To attain her ends Madame Bovary had to oust them all, and she even succeeded in very cleverly baffling the intrigues of a pork-butcher backed up by the priests.

Charles had seen in marriage the advent of an easier life, thinking he would be more free to do as he liked with himself and his money. But his wife was master; he had to say this and not say that in company, to fast every Friday, dress as she liked, harass at her bidding those
patients who did not pay. She opened his letters, watched his comings and goings, and listened at the partition-wall when women came to consult him in his surgery.

She had to have her chocolate every morning, attentions without end. She constantly complained of her nerves, her chest, her liver. The noise of footsteps made her ill; when people went away, solitude became odious to her; if they came back, it was doubtless to see her die.

**Volume II, Chapter 14**

To begin with, he did not know how to reimburse Monsieur Homais for all the drugs he had supplied and although, as a doctor, he could have forgone paying for them, he blushed at the thought of such an obligation. Then the expenses of the household, now that the maid was in charge, became staggering. Bills flooded the house, the tradesman grumbled; Monsieur Lheureux especially harassed him. At the height of Emma’s illness, he had taken advantage of the situation to increase the bill; he hurriedly brought the cloak, the travelling-bag, two trunks instead of one, and a number of other things. Charles protested in vain; the shopkeeper rudely replied that the merchandise had been ordered and that he had no intention of taking them back. Besides, it would interfere with Madame’s convalescence; the doctor had better think it over; in short, he was resolved to sue him rather than give up his rights and take it off his hands. Charles subsequently ordered them to be sent back to the shop. Félicité forgot and, having other things on his mind, Charles thought no more about it. Monsieur Lheureux did not desist and, alternating threats with whines, he finally forced Bovary into singing him a six month promissory note. But hardly had he signed the note that a bold idea occurred to him: he meant to borrow a thousand francs from Lheureux. So, with an embarrassed air, he asked if he could get the sum, adding that it would be for a year, at any interest. Lheureux ran off to his shop, brought back the money, and dictated another note, by which Bovary undertook to pay to his order on the 1st of September next the sum of one thousand an seventy francs, which, with the hundred and eighty already agreed to, made just twelve hundred and fifty. He was thus lending at six per cent in addition to one-fourth for commission; and since the merchandise brought him a good third profit at least, he stood to make one hundred and thirty francs in twelve months. He hoped that the business would not stop there; that the notes would not be paid on time and would have to be renewed, and that his puny little investment, thriving in the doctor’s care like a patient in a rest home, would return to him one day considerably plumper, fat enough to burst the bag.

All of Lheureux enterprises were thriving. He got the franchise for supplying the Neufchâtel hospital with cider; Monsieur Guillaumin promised him some shares in the turf-bogs of Gaumesnil, and he dreamt of establishing a new coach-service between Argueil and Rouen, which no doubt would not be long in putting the ramshackle van of the “Lion d’Or” out of business. Travelling faster, at a cheap rate, and carrying more luggage, it would concentrate into his hands all of Yonville’s business.

Charles often wondered how he would ever be able to pay back so much money the next year. He tried to think of solutions, such as applying to his father or selling something. But his father would be deaf, and he – he had nothing to sell. He foresaw such difficulties that he quickly dismissed so disagreeable a subject of meditation from his mind. He reproached himself for forgetting Emma, as if, all his thoughts belonging to this woman, it was robbing her of something not to be constantly thinking of her.
It was a severe winter. Madame Bovary’s convalescence was slow. On good days they wheeled her arm-chair to the window that overlooked the square, for she now disliked the garden, and the blinds on that side were always down.

**VOLUME III, CHAPTER 11**

Rodolphe remained silent. And Charles, his head in his hands, went on in a broken voice, with the resigned accent of infinite grief: “No, I can’t blame you any longer.”

He even made a phrase, the only one he had ever made: “Fate willed it this way.”

Rodolphe, who had been the agent of this fate, thought him very meek for a man in his situation, comic even and slightly despicable.

The next day Charles set down on the garden seat under the arbor. Rays of light were straying through the trellis, the vine leaves threw their shadows on the sand, jasmine perfumed the blue air, Spanish flies buzzed round the lilies in bloom, and Charles was panting like an adolescent under the vague desires of love that filled his aching heart.

At seven o’clock Berthe who had not seen him all afternoon, came to fetch him for dinner. His head was leaning against the wall, with eyes closed and open mouth, and in his hand was a long tress of black hair.

“Papa, come!” And thinking he wanted to play, she gave him a gentle push. He fell to the ground, he was dead.

Thirty-six hours later, at the pharmacist’s request, Monsieur Canivet arrived. He performed an autopsy, but found nothing.

When everything had been sold, there remained twelve francs and seventy-five centimes, just enough to send Mademoiselle Bovary off to her grandmother. The woman died the same year; and since Rouault was paralyzed, it was an aunt who took charge of her. She is poor, and sends her to a cotton-mill to earn a living.

Since Bovary’s death three doctors have succeeded one another in Yonville without any success, so effectively did Homais hasten to eradicate them. He has more customers than there are sinners in hell; the authorities treat him kindly and he has the public on his side. He has just been given the cross of the Legion of Honor.
### Appendix II

#### Lexical Data

**Volume I, Chapter 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Word Classes</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Marmur</th>
<th>DeMan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Verbs</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
<td><strong>188</strong></td>
<td><strong>184</strong></td>
<td><strong>188</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Word Classes</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Marmur</th>
<th>DeMan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiners</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Coordinating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subordinating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>194</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>413</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>378</strong></td>
<td><strong>371</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Volume II, Chapter 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Word Classes</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>DeMan</th>
<th>Marmur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>316</strong></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
<td><strong>298</strong></td>
<td><strong>301</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Word Classes</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>DeMan</th>
<th>Marmur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Word Classes</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>DeMan</th>
<th>Murmur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Word Classes</th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>DeMan</th>
<th>Murmur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coord.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subord.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>318</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
<td><strong>314</strong></td>
<td><strong>305</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GRAMMATICAL DATA**

**Volume I, Chapter 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>DeMan</th>
<th>Murmur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clauses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Clause</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Clause</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal Phrases</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal Auxiliaries</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Aspect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective Aspect</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Voice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noun Phrases</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premodified</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmodified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Volume II, Chapter 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>DeMan</th>
<th>Marmur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clauses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Clause</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Clause</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal Phrases</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal Auxiliaries</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Aspect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective Aspect</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Voice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noun Phrases</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premodified</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmodified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Volume III, Chapter 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MacKenzie</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>DeMan</th>
<th>Marmur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clauses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Clause</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Clause Ratio</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Phrases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal Auxiliaries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Aspect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective Aspect</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Voice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun Phrases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premodified</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmodified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>