

10. Abstract

This work analyzes the patterns of linguistic irony in segments of dialogue in the English novel, *Pride and Prejudice*, by Jane Austen, and compares them to those of the Hebrew translation, *Ahava ve-Ga'ava*, [Love and Pride], by translator Tala Bar. Applying the pragmatic approach in Translation Studies and the definition of verbal irony, the various linguistic methods used to express irony in the source language and in the target language are defined and examined, and the two compared. The comparison is made in order to examine whether the irony transfers from source to target language, and if so, to what extent and by which linguistic means. The underlying hypothesis is that differences between the two languages and in the cultural and social circumstances within which the original and the translation were written, sometimes require different linguistic means in the translated version to achieve an ironic effect that is the same as – or at least similar to – that of the original. Thus, cases were examined in which the translation could not resort to the same means as those used by the original due to various deficiencies, to determine whether any compensatory mechanisms were applied as means of fulfilling the same pragmatic functions. In addition, we examine whether the discrepancies and gaps were in fact unavoidable due to differences in accepted discourse patterns, and if so, whether they were compensated for by the translator when possible, or could in fact have been avoided or compensated for, and should therefore be viewed as shifts in the translation.

The analysis concludes that for the most part, the ironic overtones in the English novel do appear in the Hebrew version, albeit somewhat weakened. Those cases where the level of irony is significantly different from that of the original do, in fact, stem from shifts that result in a lack of corresponding pragmatic means in the translation language compared to those in the source language. The principal shifts appear as translations that are too literal; loss of significant components of phrases in the translations as compared to the original; changes in emphasis which distance the translation from the original text; omission of important phrases; and in rare cases, even linguistic errors.

In conclusion, apparently in this novel at least, despite the existing linguistic and cultural voids, the vast majority of differences can be compensated for successfully, and a translated work can have a pragmatic ironic effect similar to that of the original.